ONTARIO

First Session

of the

Twenty-Fourth Legislature

of the

Province of Ontario

Toronto, Ontario, February 21, 1952, et seq.

Volume I

Thursday, February 21, 1952

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES—Speaker

R. C. STURGEON.
Chief Hansard Reporter,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE, OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1952, et seq.

And the House having met at three of the clock p.m.

The Honourable The Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Ontario then entered the House and took his seat upon the Throne.

HON. ARTHUR WELSH (Provincial Secretary): I am commanded by the Honourable, The Lieutenant-Governor to state that he does not see fit to declare the causes of the summoning of the present Legislature of this Province until a Speaker of this House shall have been chosen according to law, but to-day at a subsequent hour His Honour will declare the causes of the calling of this Legislature.

His Honour The Lieutenant- Governor was pleased to retire.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly; it is my duty to call upon you to elect one of your members to preside over your deliberations as Speaker.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Clerk, I desire to move the resolution that the member for the electoral district of Windsor-Walkerville be elected as Speaker of this House.

The member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Davies) will uphold the traditions of this historic assembly which goes back to the days in the Niagara Peninsula of 1792, and I am sure that he will uphold these traditions in a dignified and becoming manner.

We feel, indeed, that he will give sympathetic assistance to all the members of this House. I know he will uphold the dignity of the position, and will represent all the members of this Assembly, and in so doing all of the four and one-half million people of this Province in a dignified manner, and in upholding the dignity of this Assembly, he will be upholding the dignity of all our citizens.

Mr. Clerk, I therefore, beg to move, seconded by Mr. Oliver (Gray South) that the member for the electoral district of Windsor-Walkerville, Mr. M.Cooke Davies, be elected as Speaker of the House.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Are there any further nominations? There being no further nominations, I declare the nominations closed, and I also declare hon. M. Cooke Davies duly elected as Speaker of this

hon. House.

---Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: It is with a deep sense of humility that, at your request and through your demand, I assume the high position of Speaker of this honourable Legislative Assembly. For three years it has been my privilege to try to guide and govern the House -- in that period I have learned even more definitely my own weaknesses and shortcomings but, too, I have had the unique opportunity of finding the understanding, sympathy, and kindness of all who serve in this Chamber. The many happy recollections which are mine through these associations, are among my most cherished rewards.

The office of Speaker is one of the most ancient in free and democratic assemblies. While it does not carry the physical dangers of olden times which made one shrink from accepting this high position, the demands upon the patience, understanding and tolerance of one human being, are not to be overlooked.

It will be my highest aim to listen to your debates with sympathy, and your questions with kindness and to your needs with due regard. You will, I know, appreciate my position of wishing to be impartial in my decisions, seeking only to try to maintain the place

of justice and fairness, allowing every Member his just due in his contributions toward the betterment of our free form of government, heeding the demands for free expression of his aims and granting him the full privilege of his elected office in the guidance of our province.

At all times we shall, I know, dedicate ourselves to the high purpose of unquestionable loyalty to our most gracious sovereign Queen Elizabeth -- of sincere purpose to further the good and right way of life -- of splendid representation for our people.

May I plead for your indulgence in my weaknesses, understanding in my rulings, and charity in my relationships? I pray that Divine guidance may be granted me in order that I may bring some small added honour to this ancient and honourable position. I pledge my loyalty to our sovereign Queen and her chosen representative in this province of Ontario, the Lieutenant-Governor. May the Almighty God, the Supreme Ruler of the universe lead us and bless us in our deliberations.

The House will adjourn during pleasure.

The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province then re-entered the House, and being seated upon the Throne;

MR. SPEAKER: May it please your Honour:

The Legislative Assembly have elected me as their Speaker though I am but little able to fulfil the important duties thus assigned to me.

If, in the performance of these duties, I should at any time fall into error I pray that the fault may be imputed to me and not to the Assembly whose servant I am, and who, through me, the better to enable them to discharge their duty to their Queen and Country, hereby claim all their undoubted rights and privileges, especially that they may have freedom of speech in their debates, access to your person at all seasonable times and that their proceedings may receive from you the most favourable consideration.

HON. ARTHUR WELSH (Provincial Secretary): I am commanded by the Honourable, The Lieutenant-Governor to declare to you that he freely confides in the duty and attachment of the Assembly to Her Majesty's person and Government and not doubting that the proceedings will be conducted with wisdom, temperance and prudence he grants, and upon all occasions will recognize, and allow the constitutional privileges.

I am commanded also to assure you that the Assembly shall have ready access to His Honour upon all suitable occasions and that their proceedings as

well as your words and actions, will constantly receive from him the most favourable construction.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor was then pleased to open the Session by the following gracious speech:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly:

As you assemble here today for the First session of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Province of Ontario, we meet in an atmosphere of deep and profound sorrow that His Gracious and Well Beloved Majesty, King George the Sixth is dead. By his great courage, his unsurpassed devotion to duty, his simple dignity, his example as a husband and as a father, his fortitude in adversity and by his serenity of spirit, he has made an enduring impression upon his peoples throughout the world. Truly was he an inspiration to unity of purpose among our great commonwealth of nations. Truly was he our beloved Sovereign. In her grief, we tender to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth the Second, our loyalty, our devotion and our affection. It is not long since we were honoured by having her among us and we are confident that her reign will be characterized by the wise and beneficent leadership given so devotedly by her father. We pray that it may be long and happy.

To Elizabeth, The Queen Mother, Queen Mary, The Princess Margaret and to other members of the Royal Family, our sympathy and commiseration are extended.

On the occasion of this Assembly, my first as Her Majesty's representative, I wish to take the opportunity of expressing my pleasure in meeting you and to extend a welcome to each one of you, especially to those who sit in this Assembly for the first time. I wish also to express my confidence that as the elected representatives of the people of this Province, you will address yourselves to your duties with diligence and with judgment.

Since the last meeting of this Assembly, the growth of our Province has continued strong and its pace has increased. The urgent and demanding requirements for national defence have been expanding. World events continue to demand the assumption by our nation of increasingly greater responsibilities for our own security and indeed for that of the free world. The conflicting influences of an inflated economy and of measures being taken to halt the trend toward a dangerous inflation are producing problems in government, great in difficulty and complicated of solution. While the Government of Ontario, by virtue of its constitutional jurisdiction, is limited in its capacity

either to control inflationary influences or to take measures which exercise direction upon the national economic structure, nevertheless it will do all in its power to maintain and preserve soundness and security within the nation.

One of the greatest needs of the people of this Province in these troubled and difficult times is for adequate housing. Very considerable progress has been made in this direction but the problem is still most acute. The capacity of our people to build and to own their own homes is not equal to the demands upon them to provide the initial financing. With credit restrictions which have increased the down payment required, there has been a slowing-up in the construction of homes. Measures will be introduced designed to stimulate in several ways the provision of more housing in the Province.

Legislation will also be introduced establishing a Crown Corporation which will qualify as an approved lending institution under the National Housing Act. The purpose of this corporation will be the provision of funds for the construction of homes in the villages, hamlets and farms throughout the Province. Recognizing the need for assistance and encouragement in expanding the agricultural development of the Province, other

measures will be introduced under which young farmers may obtain assistance. A prosperous and expanding agricultural industry is essential to Ontario. It is a vital requisite for high standards of healthy living for all our people, and great strides have been taken to make farming more productive and more attractive. Research is constant in the many fields of agricultural development and will be continued unabated.

One of the influences which affects the supply of adequate housing for our people is the control of rents. The Government has continued the control of rents following the abandonment of this field by the Federal Government. New regulations have been formulated with the end in view of assuring, so far as is possible within the restricted jurisdiction of a provincial government, simplicity of operation, clarity of interpretation and intent, and fairness to both landlord and tenant. A select committee of this Legislature will be set up with authority to keep all matters involved in the control of rents, under constant examination and study.

Under the law as it stands at the present time, no one is permitted to bring an action against the Crown

represented by the Province of Ontario without Her Majesty's consent, first obtained in appropriate manner. The Government proposes to abolish this requirement in certain cases and the necessary legislation will be introduced for your consideration.

Under legislation passed last year The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario was empowered to examine the rural telephone systems of the Province with a view to modernization, expansion and general improvement. Substantial progress has been made during the year and further legislation will be introduced to provide for betterment of our rural systems.

The Labour Relations Act of Ontario was designed to enable labour and management to bargain collectively and to provide an atmosphere in which differences can be composed. The conciliation services made available by the Department have operated with a great degree of success. Legislation will be introduced which will have the effect of improving and strengthening the already highly commendable provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act.

During the past year a special committee representative of Government, the Municipalities concerned

and of the mining industry, has been studying ways and means of making more equitable, the provision of financial assistance to municipalities within the major mining areas of the Province. Proposals which are designed to establish a sound and permanent basis for assistance to our mining municipalities will be submitted for your consideration.

During the past months a committee composed of all of the interests concerned in provincial-municipal relations has been examining the many and complicated problems of this difficult field of government. The attentions of the Government are directed toward the solution of fiscal and other administrative problems of the many municipalities.

The expansion and betterment of our great highway system has been proceeding satisfactorily despite substantial shortages of the many materials required and despite the restrictions upon the construction of public works requested by the Federal Government as a measure against inflation. Motor vehicle registrations continue to increase and the necessity for expansion and improvement of our highway system is correspondingly more pressing. The campaign for safety is being pressed constantly and with vigour. Assistance to municipalities in solving their highway problems will again

be given emphasis.

Many of the legislative provisions regarding the incorporation of companies have been under study with the view to improvement and modernization. The Government will introduce for your study and examination, a new and completely revised Companies Act.

With the commencement of the current calendar year, the terms of The Old Age Assistance Act, passed at a special session of the twenty-third Legislature last September, came into effect, concurrently with the commencement of universal old age pensions for Canada. Under the Ontario legislation, and complementary federal legislation, assistance upon a means test of an amount up to forty dollars each month is now being paid to our needy elder citizens between sixty-five and seventy years of age. Legislation will be submitted at this session of the Assembly for your consideration, which will carry further the provision of assistance for needy and deserving citizens of our Province. Under its terms an amount up to forty dollars per month, determined upon a means test, will be paid to persons who are totally and permanently disabled, who are between eighteen and sixty-five years of age and who are not otherwise being provided for under other pension or

compensation legislation, or under other public assistance programs.

Legislation effecting clarification and extension of Mothers' Allowances will also be introduced.

You will be asked to give your consideration to a measure ratifying and confirming an agreement entered into last December between the Governments of Canada and of Ontario under which the Province will undertake the development of the Canadian half of the power resources in the international section of the St. Lawrence River, in conjunction with the construction of an all Canadian canal. The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario will undertake the Ontario share of the power development concurrently with an appropriate agency authorized by the United States and is ready to proceed at once with the work.

With the assistance of the best advice obtainable, the Government is progressing rapidly toward the ultimate goal of fully sustained yield from the vast resources of our forests and crown lands. Ontario has maintained its lead in forestry reform -- and there will be introduced for your study and consideration a consolidation and revision of the laws concerning Crown timber.

The conservation of our fish, game and wild life is of paramount concern and you will be asked to give careful study to proposals designed to control the taking of fish and game from aircraft, or with the use and assistance of aircraft.

Further measures having to do with the treatment of cancer will be introduced. In particular will be a bill establishing an Institute of Radiotherapy designed to manage and direct the cancer centre at Wellesley Hospital in Toronto and other outside clinics. Very considerable progress has been made toward the establishment in Ontario of the finest and most modern cancer research facilities in the world. Special mention is made of the introduction of the "Cobalt Bomb" to the treatment facilities of the cancer clinic in Victoria Hospital, London. It is the intent of the Government to take all steps within its power to defeat this dreadful scourge.

A comprehensive program for the rehabilitation of prisoners confined to Ontario's penal and reformative institutions, has been expanded and strengthened. On an experimental basis a thirty-bed clinic for the treatment of alcoholism among the prison population was opened at the Mimico Reformatory, the first of its

kind in America. The results have proved most successful and it is planned to expand these facilities. Supervision by rehabilitation officers after discharge is made available to those requiring help and very good results are being experienced.

A new emphasis has been placed upon the growing importance of probation in the administration of justice, by the appointment of a Chief Probation Officer for Ontario. The function of this official will be to organize and co-ordinate the work of probation services in the Juvenile and Family Courts and in the adult courts as well. The extension of probation in justifiable cases should tend to reduce the number of inmates in penal and reform institutions and generally improve the administration of justice.

Provincial grants in aid of education have again been increased during the current year. Increasing population necessarily leads to increasing costs of education and it is the view of the Government that the capacity of our people to meet these costs must be balanced most carefully with the real and essential needs. Only by so doing can our high standards be preserved. The very best of educational facilities are the heritage of the children of our people and the Government will continue to strive toward their maintenance.

Substantial progress has been made in preparations for civil defence. Ontario is the first Province in Canada, and indeed one of the first jurisdictions in the world, to take measures to standardize fire-fighting equipment. It is expected that this work will be completed during this year.

Other legislation will be introduced by the several departments for your consideration, all of which will tend to preserve and to improve the way of life of our people.

There will be presented to you a survey of the fiscal condition of the Province, together with the plans for the ensuing year. The Public Accounts for the last complete fiscal year and the Estimates for the year 1952-53 will all be submitted for your study and consideration.

By their loyal efforts and diligent application to their duties, the members of the Public Service of Ontario have earned our thanks and appreciation. By their devotion to duty your decisions and directions are carried out. Our thanks for the years of long service given by those who have earned retirement during the past year are extended, and we remember with respect those who have died.

May I express the wish that in the interests of the people of our Province, your deliberations and decisions will be guided by Divine Providence.

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

Prayers. 3.35 o'clock p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg to advise the House that I have a copy of His Honour's speech which I will now read.

(Take "B" follows)

MR. SPEAKER: I beg to inform the House that the hon. Member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) is recognized as the Leader of the Opposition.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is the time for the introduction of the traditional Bill which by its introduction re-affirms the rights of the representatives of the people here assembled.

Under the circumstances, I propose to take an unusual course, of course, with the consent of the House.

We are met here in an atmosphere of deep gloom, and in extending our sympathy to Her Majesty the Queen, the Queen Mother, Queen Mary, the Princess Margaret, and members of the Royal Family, and as well, sir, that we would, of course, desire to express our loyalty and devotion to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II.

Therefore, I move, seconded by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), who will say a few words, a resolution which I shall not read, but which I will ask you, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all the hon. Members of this House to read, after the seconding of the motion by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver).

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I gladly second the motion moved by my friend, the hon. Prime Minister. To me, it is particularly fitting that on this day of a new Legislature,

we should move a motion of this character, and we should say in an official way, what our hearts have said before in the quietness of our homes.

We should remember, it seems to me, that in the passing of King George the Sixth, we have lost not only a great Sovereign, but a great man. Never within the memory of any of us in this Legislative Assembly has the passing of a man brought forth such an avalanche of sympathy and grief throughout the world, as the passing of His Majesty King George the Sixth.

It was, it seems to me, not so much that he was King of England and of the Commonwealth of Nations, but it was that he was a good man, a great man, and a great leader of men. He did not lead men on the battlefields, for instance, as some of his predecessors had done before him, but he led men by example, by giving to them a copy of a life well lived, of an understanding heart, and of a furtherance of things which are foremost in the lives of the people of the world, and it is fitting, too, that at this time we should give a new Queen, Queen Elizabeth II, our unswerving loyalty, as she enters upon her reign as Queen of England and of the Commonwealth.

It is fitting also, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution of loyalty should go out from us, not from the Government of the Province of Ontario, but

from the hon. members of the Legislature, and it is well, I know, that we do not raise anything of a partisan nature, but that we say to the new Queen that we wish for her the best possible in the great task which she has now undertaken.

In these words, Mr. Speaker, I gladly second the motion of my friend, the hon. Prime Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest that the hon. members of the House please rise, during the reading of the resolution.

Mr. Frost moves, seconded by Mr. Oliver:

(C-1 follows).

That an humble address be presented to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen expressing the sincere sympathy of this House on the death of Her father, His Late Gracious Majesty, King George the Sixth, and also conveying to Her Majesty the assurance of the abiding loyalty of the Members of this Her Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, and to these ends that the following address be adopted:-

To The Queen's Most Excellent Majesty

Most Gracious Sovereign:-

Your Majesty's loyal and devoted subjects, the Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, have heard with deep sorrow of the death of your beloved Father our Most Gracious King, George the Sixth, and desire to express to you, to Your Gracious Mother, and to all the Members of the Royal Family, the sincere sympathy of this Assembly and of all the people of Ontario in the great loss you have sustained.

His Late Majesty's deep sense of responsibility and His devotion to the duties of His High Office, following on His splendid services as an Officer of the Royal Navy in the First Great War, undoubtedly hastened His death and left the Empire and Commonwealth in a

state of sorrow which has probably never before been experienced. His qualities as a man and a Monarch, who lived a good life and who performed a heavy task bravely and well, endeared Him to all His people throughout the World.

May we take the liberty of intruding on your great sorrow by extending our congratulations and expressing our great joy on your accession to the Throne. Your recent visit to our Province has left with us a sense of personal friendship and we feel that in you the Empire has a worthy successor to your Beloved Father. It is our fervent hope and prayer that your reign may be a long and happy one and that under your guidance the Empire and Commonwealth may enjoy an unbroken era of prosperity and peace.

Resolution agreed to.

SONG: "GOD SAVE THE QUEEN"

HON. L. M. FROST:(Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the introduction of Bills, I move, seconded by Mr. Oliver, that the address just adopted by the House be suitably inscribed, and sent through the proper channels to Her Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

THE SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to Amend the Summary Convictions Act", and the same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Porter, that the speech of The Honourable The Lieutenant-Governor to this House be taken into consideration on Tuesday next.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, because we have reached the end of the formalities opening this first session of the twenty-fourth legislature of Ontario, I would just like to say a few words now, and I know the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) will wish to say something, because he also has many memories and recollections of such occasions as this.

The opening of the Legislature has become, in the course of the years, a place of recollections of other days, indeed, a place where assembled those who have taken part in government, in one way or another,

in the province.

It is a very great pleasure to-day to recognize among those seated in this Assembly, former Speakers, those who in other days preserved order in the Chair in which you are now sitting; I see former Prime Ministers of this province, former ministers of the Crown and some former members of this House, but what is more important, I also see their wives.

Now, at this time when we are remembering those who have had their day and time in this Assembly and who have rendered great service to our people, I am, of course, reminded of one who wanted to be here, who expected to be here, and from the progress of whose health it appeared might be here, but has passed on in the last day or so. I refer, of course, to a great friend of ours, hon. Russell Kelley, a personal friend of many of those in this Assembly to-day. Mr. Kelley died yesterday, after a prolonged illness.

Russell Kelley was one who throughout the days of his life performed great services for the people. He was by all measures, a successful man. He had been a successful business man; his contributions to the work of the Red Cross are well known. As the Ontario President of that Organization, he did a great work.

At a time of life when perhaps he might have

turned to easier ways, he devoted his attention to public service, became the member for Hamilton-Wentworth, and subsequently a Minister of the Crown, the Minister of Health, of this province. That, sir, is a great and distinguished record.

I would say, however, that our recollection of Russell Kelley is that far above everything, his successes in many of the things of life, was his kindly and sympathetic attitude to people and to affairs. That I think was his outstanding quality. Perhaps when all is said and done it is the greatest quality, that of human relationships.

I know that all hon. members of the House would like me to express regret at his passing and extend our sympathy to the members of his family.

There are many things I could say about the twenty-fourth Legislature, at its opening. There is one thing, however, which impresses me as being unique. I notice the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) smiling, but I do not think I am thinking of what he is at all.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FROST: One thing that is unique is the fact that in this Legislature, which is the twenty-fourth in order of succession from that to which I

referred this afternoon, the Assembly on the banks of the Niagara in 1792, when the first Assembly met. Here to-day we have amongst our membership no less than three sons of former members, and beyond that, those three hon. members are sons of former Ministers who have served the Crown in this province.

We have here in this Assembly to-day, the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie, (Mr. Lyons), the son of a former member of this Assembly for Sault Ste. Marie, and a former Minister of Lands and Forests.

The hon. Mr. Lyons represented this riding for many years. He was more familiarly known here and at Sault Ste. Marie as "Jim" Lyons.. I have a very great personal interest in that, because the riding of Sault Ste. Marie was represented by my grandfather, Andrew Miscampbell, some fifty years ago.

Then we also have in the Assembly to-day the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) and I know this will interest the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) that the hon. member for Riverdale is the youngest member of the House, because for many years the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) held that position in this House.

The hon. member for Riverdale is the son of a former Minister, a member for South York, the hon.

Leopold Macaulay, whom we are very glad to have with us this afternoon. The hon. Leopold Macaulay was a Minister in various Cabinets, Provincial Secretary, Minister of Highways, Minister of Public Works, and latterly, he was Leader of the Opposition when I came into this House fifteen years ago. He was a very valiant fighter, one who added great colour to this Assembly, and as I say, we are glad to see him here this afternoon, and I know it is a proud moment for he and his wife to see their son sitting as a member of the Assembly.

Another new member of the House is the member for Kingston, and old class-mate of mine. You would not think so, from his youthful appearance and my grey hairs, but, nevertheless, that is true. He is the son of a former Attorney-General, the hon. W. F. Nickle. Mr. Nickle, Senior, was the Attorney-General for the province back in the twenties. He served in his day and generation in this House, indeed, for many years. Mr. Nickle became a member of the Legislature in 1908 when Sir James Whitney was the Leader of the Government.

I always have a warm feeling for Mr. Nickle because I well remember the days when my brother and I commenced the practice of law in a famous town in this province, the town of Lindsay, and we at that time achieved a forensic triumph, mainly through the efforts

of my brother, by having a man acquitted of the charge of murder, and well do I recall that while it was a victory, it represented disaster of the worst magnitude, in fact, we were in a worse position than the accused, who at least saved his life.

At that point, the hon. Attorney-General of that day stepped into the picture, a stern and just Attorney-General, who had a great sense of fairness, and he found ways and means of rescuing the counsel for that particular accused from the difficulties in which they found themselves.

It is a great pleasure to have Mr. Nickle here to-day to see his son take the same seat in the Legislature which he himself occupied. That I think is also a matter of history, and a matter of interest.

I would like to tell another personal incident about Mr. Nickle. I called up Mr. Nickle myself the other day to invite him to come and see his son take his place in the Legislative Assembly, and I was advised by his secretary that he was in court.

Now, let me remind you that Mr. Nickle was sitting in this House in 1908, forty-four years ago, and it is my earnest wish, sir, that those who are particularly young men may have the experience of sitting in this House forty-four years from this day,

still practising their business or their profession. That is a great thing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I would like to say how glad I am that you recognized the hon. member for South Grey, (Mr. Oliver) as the Leader of the Opposition.

As I have said, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, in his day, had the distinction of being the youngest member of this House, being elected in 1926, and he has been a continuous member for his riding since that time, despite any efforts to the contrary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FROST: I am glad you recognized the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) as the Leader of the Opposition and before moving the adjournment of the House, perhaps he might care to say something at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Here, here!

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I realize the very real danger looming up, the danger being that I am continually agreeing with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. OLIVER: This sort of thing must come to an end. However, before we bring it apparently to a termination, I want to agree still further with him,

(Take D Follows)

I have not had the opportunity of speaking as yet, but we on this side of the House feel, Mr. Speaker, that we have in this Legislature, as we had in the last, a Speaker who will preside over the deliberations of the House with justice to everyone and with a fairness which is unique.

I may say that at one time we harboured the idea that we proffer a name in nomination from our own particular group. The two outstanding reasons why we did not pursue the matter further was because, first, we had such a high regard for you as the Speaker of the House, and the second reason was -- and I guess by far the more important, was that we felt that the end was hardly attainable, at the moment at least.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: So we will have to bide our time, and as we pursue our studies in this House and do our work for the people of the Province of Ontario in this Legislature, we can have the satisfaction of knowing that we have a Speaker who will preside over the deliberations of the House with a keen sense of duty and a sense of fairness.

I want to agree with the Hon. Prime Minister in welcoming our distinguished guests to the Legislature this afternoon. That is a habit which has grown

up in the past few years which I think should be continued. It is a very fine and moving thing that year after year we see in this Legislature men who, in the past, have made great contributions to this Province of Ontario, whether in their capacities as private members or as members of the various cabinets which have come and gone over the last number of years.

I agree with the Hon. Prime Minister that this is a very unique occasion when we can welcome to the House three new hon. members whose fathers were cabinet ministers in the days which are gone. It is a very extraordinary situation, and I want to say to these three young hon. members that I have had the opportunity -- as have some of the other hon. members of the House -- of sitting with those who were their fathers in the days that are gone.

I know something of the calibre of men they were, something of the contributions they were able to make to the public life of the Province of Ontario, and we will be hoping from this side of the House that they will follow nobly and ably in the footsteps of those who have gone before.

As I close, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we appreciate the attendance of these many men and women here this afternoon, and we hope that as they go

to their various homes they will not forget about us in the next six weeks, but will, by their attendance and their interest, show that they are with us in thought, if not in action, as we carry forward the legislation which is intended to be in the interests of the province of Ontario, and that we may know we have their support and their interest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. J. GRUMLETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few words, I want, first, to agree with the Hon. Prime Minister that it is our solemn duty to remember a great old friend who was in this Legislature not so long ago, the Hon. Russell Kelley. I am sure that each and every one of us was saddened when we heard of his death. He was a man who was so regarded by most of us; he never passed any of us in the corridors without stopping to say a few words. He was a man who was a friend of everyone in the Legislature. We regret his passing, and we ask that our sympathy be passed on to his family.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has stated that the time has come to disagree with the Hon. Prime Minister. I wonder if discretion was not the better part of valour when we look around and regard the number of the opposition here. It might have been

all right to disagree a little more last year, but not this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Speaker, I, too, am pleased to see so many former members of the Legislature in this House, some of whom I know, having met them a number of years ago, and I have followed their records with a great deal of care before I, myself, became a member of the Legislature. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we welcome these men who have contributed so much to our Province, and we are glad to know that they are still following the fortunes of Ontario, and that even though their days of service are gone, they are still with us. We are encouraged by their presence to carry on the duties which have been assigned to us in the public service of the Province of Ontario.

As regards the three new hon. members of this House, sons of former ministers, I am wondering why the Hon. Prime Minister corralled them all on the far side of the House. Was he afraid they might become contaminated if he allowed them to sit here amongst the Opposition? I know it is a great honour for their dads who, years ago, were members of the different cabinets of the Province of Ontario, to sit here to-day and see their sons occupying seats in the

Legislature. We hope that they will follow in the footsteps of their fathers.

Mr. Speaker, I have very little more to say. I wish to add a few words of congratulation to you on your re-election to the office of Speaker. We have all enjoyed serving under you in previous years, and I know we are going to enjoy it in the future. Your sense of fairness and your kindliness will guide the Legislature through the Sessions which are to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, lest it be misunderstood, because none of the previous speakers spoke on behalf of what is undoubtedly a small section of the Province, I wish to utilize this opportunity in joining the other speakers and the other groups of the Legislature in extending our sympathy to the family of the late Minister of Health, Mr. Russell Kelley. My experiences with him were really of a sort which endeared him to me. I found him at all times very approachable, and extremely devoted to the task with which he had been entrusted, and at all times anxious to help every hon. member and in every case which an hon. member brought to his attention.

May I also join the previous speakers in expressing satisfaction at the presence of former premiers, and the members of former governments. It is good to see them year after year at the openings of the Legislature, and I hope I will have the privilege of seeing them with us for many, many years in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to join those who spoke before me in welcoming the three sons of members of former governments. I think their fathers have every reason to be proud of their achievements.

I might, however, say that I have the privilege of knowing only one of the three fathers, and I object, Mr. Speaker, to any suggestion that that father is in any way a person who belongs to a past day or age. As a matter of fact, I have always considered Mr. Leopold Macaulay as being away on vacation, and as one who will undoubtedly come back to this or another legislative body.

May I, however, say to the three sons that I, too, differ somewhat from what the previous speakers have said. Certainly your fathers want you to follow in their footsteps, and equally certainly you undoubtedly desire to follow in their footsteps,

but I would suggest in doing that, you also strike out toward new horizons and new goals, and I am sure your fathers will be proud of the newness you will introduce in addition to the absorption of all that is good that they have done before.

The Hon. Prime Minister has spoken of the changes which have taken place, and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has spoken for the Opposition, and the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) has spoken for the C.C.F. group. May I offer a word of advice to my fellow oppositionists, and say that we are now in a position where we have Conservatives to the right of us, Conservatives to the left of us, and Conservatives in front of us, and under such circumstances, there is only one thing to do, attack, attack, and attack. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that under your guiding hand we of the Opposition will fulfill our task which is so especially required under present circumstances.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House and in so doing I perhaps should follow the custom of telling the hon. members what the procedure on the following day will be.

To-morrow and Monday, of course, are going to be organizational days, during which committees will be struck, bills will be introduced, and the business of the Session will get under way.

On Tuesday we will have the speeches from the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.17 o'clock p.m.

- - - - - - -

ONTARIO

First Session
of the
Twenty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 21, 1952, et seq.

0

Volume II

Friday, February 22, 1952.

0

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

R. C. Sturgeon,
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

S E C O N D D A Y

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE, HELD IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22nd, 1952, et seq.

Hon. (Rev.) W. C. Davies, Speaker,
Presiding.

- - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Friday, February 22, 1952.

- - - - - - -

The House having met. 3 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting reports by Committee.

Motions.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Porter, that during the present Session of the Assembly, provision

be made for the taking of stenographic reports of the debates and speeches, and to that end, that Mr. Speaker be authorized to employ the necessary stenographers at such rate of compensation as may be agreed upon by him; copies of such stenographic reports to be supplied to the Honourable The Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk of the Assembly, the Legislative Library, to each member of the Assembly, to the offices of the Leaders of each party represented in this Assembly, and the reference libraries of the Province, and the Press Gallery.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Hon. Prime Minister if the printing of Hansard is to be done on the same basis as last year?

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. OLIVER: No improvement whatever?

I think this whole question, Mr. Speaker, calls for some comment, and I believe that the Hon. Prime Minister himself is conversant enough with the situation to realize that the present method of printing Hansard is not satisfactory.

The hon. members of the House will recall that we first had a Hansard, I believe, in 1944. For the first three years, 1944, 1945 and 1946, the Hansard

was not printed; for the next two years it was printed, and was bound at the end of the Sessions and made a handy reference for those who sought to peruse its pages.

Then for the three succeeding years we had mimeographed copies again.

I suggest to the Hon. Prime Minister, in all seriousness, that if we are going to have Hansard in this House -- and it is established we should have Hansard -- let us have a Hansard worthy of the traditions of this Legislature, and a Hansard which will be of some value to those in the years to come who may want to peruse the pages.

The way it is now, we get a mimeographed copy, and if you save them up during the Session, you have a half-ton truck full of them. To get any rhyme or reason out of that mess of stuff, would take a Philadelphia lawyer, as the saying is.

Surely this Government with all its income such as it has at the present time, could unbend enough in financial matters to provide mimeographed copies throughout the Session, and then, after the Session is over, to have the proceedings printed and bound into one volume, so that it would be readable and of some value, not only to the hon. members, but to those who want to read Hansard and get something from it.

When the Hansard was printed, I understand an effort was made to have it printed in a day or so, and we immediately ran into a situation where it had to be printed at night, requiring over-time work, and the expense was very significant, but it seems to me that the end result we desire could be obtained if we have the Hansard printed after the Session, when there is lots of time, and a good job could be done, and we could then put it in our libraries and it would be of some use to those who wish to use it.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly agree with the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. The one great objection to Hansard in its present form is, if you want to look up anything, you may want to take a volume home or to your office. At the present time, as has been suggested by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, if you want to do that, you have to get a half-ton truck to get these volumes from place to place, and if you have been sitting in the House for eight or ten years, you require a special room to hold them.

AN hon. MEMBER: A vault.

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes, a vault to store them in.

When they were printed in 1948 and 1949, they made very attractive volumes, and were very useful. You could carry them home and study them at your leisure, and I strongly urge the Hon. Prime Minister to consider going back to the old system of printing Hansard, which was very useful, and a very attractive way of keeping a record of the proceedings of this House.

I strongly support the plea made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. FROST: (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have presented the motion to-day in the same form as it has been presented for the last three years. It was in 1950 when the present system was adopted. This House had no Hansard up until 1944. The Government, of which I was then a member, introduced the first Hansard in that year. I may say it was a matter over which I never enthused very much. I felt we had done pretty well in previous years without any Hansard at all. However, it was felt desirable at that time we should have Hansard, and the idea of Hansard followed pretty much the same practice as we have at the present time. The Hansard proceedings I think at that time were very limited. My recollection is, copies were limited to the Leaders of the Parties. However, some hon. members

of the House at that time desired to have the opportunity of referring to Hansard in a manner similar to the opportunity given to the Leaders of the Parties, and that one or two copies were not sufficient.

As a result, there was a considerable extension of the Hansard and the expense increased, until we arrived at the year 1950.

The expense, as I explained to the House last year, began to grow, but, of course, that is one of the difficulties of these days, with expanding services and expanding demands, there is always a growth of the expense involved. I have not before me the figures, but the expense began to mount very, very rapidly. With that in mind, in 1950, we adopted the present practice.

While I will agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that the Hansard as we have had it in the last three years does involve a great deal more bulk, I do not know that I would agree with him that a half-ton truck is necessary, but certainly it is difficult to take home the sessional report in one armful. However, I would say if the hon. members are interested in the proceedings of the House, it is perhaps possible for them to take them home, and, of

course, it does save the taxpayers a great deal of money.

If there is a way -- which I doubt -- in which the proceedings of the House might afterwards be printed, I would be prepared to consider that. At the present time, in financial matters, my humour is very bad, because I am engaged with another Budget, and mounting costs are always difficult for a Treasurer.

However, perhaps the Committee on Printing might be able to make some suggestion about that. In the House I do not think there are any difficulties. We have the proceedings of the day before printed and put on the hon. members' desks the following day, and what I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) have referred to, is the bulk of these daily editions as accumulated in the course of a Session. However, we all have to do without some of the things we would like.

I must admit that the size of the Hansard does not rank in importance with me with the bulk in the size of the Budget.

I will say to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. members of the House, that if the printing committee, which will be sitting shortly

care to look into that matter, which could be brought up by the Opposition members of the Committee, it will be given consideration without prejudice.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I am not very hopeful, frankly speaking, of getting a printed Hansard. But I was very glad to hear the Hon. Leader of the Opposition raise the question. We have discussed it, as you will recall, on previous occasions.

The Hon. Prime Minister has suggested that the matter be brought to the attention of the members of the Printing Committee. It has been my experience, as a member of that Committee in the past, that they meet only within the last two or three days prior to the adjournment of a Session. Would the Hon. Prime Minister be prepared to assure this House that the Committee on Printing will be convened immediately after it is constituted, so that we can deal with this matter early in the Session, rather than when it is too late?

MR. FROST: I will say it will be convened in time, anyway.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, in time --

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) has asked his question

and received an answer.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Before calling for the Orders of the Day, it is customary that once or twice during the Session, we have group photographs taken of the House in Session for the Provincial records, and after the items under "Motions" have been completed, I will ask you to be good enough to make yourselves comfortable, and to direct your attention toward the upper left-hand corner of the Chamber.

However, before the photographs are taken, we will proceed with motions.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Porter, that Standing Committees of this House, for the present Session, be appointed for the following purposes: 1. On Privileges and Elections; 2. On Education; 3. On Private Bills; 4. On Standing Orders; 5. On Public Accounts; 6. On Printing; 7. On Municipal Law; 8. On Legal Bills; 9. On Agriculture and Colonization; 10. On Fish and Game; 11. On Labour; 12. On Mining; 13. On Government Commissions; 14. On Lands and Forests; -- These last two were additions last year, as the hon. members opposite will recall.

15. On Travel and Publicity; 16. On Health.

Which said Committees shall severally be empowered to examine and enquire into all such matters and things as shall be referred to them by the House, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the Hon. Prime Minister that I had hoped the Government would have given some consideration to adding another Committee to this list, that is, a Committee on Conservation. That is a question which has been discussed in this House, and upon which a Parliamentary Committee sat for some weeks, and about which there is a great deal of interest in the Province at the present time.

Conservation, as it affects the Provincial Government, overlaps, as the Hon. Prime Minister knows, a great many departments. You cannot get at the fundamentals of the problem by going into the estimates or workings of any one department. For instance, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Public Works, and the Department of Education, are interwoven very closely.

Conservation is a comparatively new subject, and a new problem in this Province -- or, at least, we have just recognized it as a problem in this Province. It is one which well justifies the setting-up of a standing committee of the Legislature, so we could bring to it, or have brought to it, the recommendations and thoughts of those who are fostering this great subject of conservation throughout the province.

I would like the Hon. Prime Minister seriously to give some consideration to that.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I first point out that in connection with the standing committees of the House, last year we added two new Committees, one on government commissions, and the other on lands and forests. This year we are adding two more Committees, one on travel and publicity, the purpose of which, of course, is really to emphasize the importance of the tourist business in this province. The other is in connection with health, which is a very wide field.

It is our intention, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize this year, and in the coming Sessions of this Legislature, more work for the Committees. Personally, I believe that a great deal can come from

committee work, and I think perhaps, from looking over many years past, we have not availed ourselves of the talents and the views of the hon. members as a whole, regardless of whether they are Government or Opposition members, in a way perhaps we might have done.

Last year we started to broaden the idea out, and I can assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition we are not at the end of our Committee ideas as yet, but we are giving consideration to the matter he has mentioned, and also, incidentally, some other matters.

It will be our intention at this Session, Mr. Speaker, to ask this House to appoint a select committee on the Elections Act. I would not want the hon. members of this House to think in doing this that we anticipate an election, or anything of the sort.

MR. HARRY DIXON (Brant): Or any dissatisfaction with the result of the last one?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

(Take "B" follows)

MR. FROST: The fact is that at the last Session we introduced and passed a new Election Act and certain provisions in connection with the Voters'Act. We felt that this was an excellent time to have the House give consideration to the workings of the Act. If there are improvements which can be made, or if there are defects in the workings of that Act, which were made manifest in the election last Fall, now would be a good time to consider the revision of it.

We felt that the Committee on Privileges and Elections was hardly the committee to consider that, and we thought it might better be done by a select committee of the House. It may be desirable that the committee have power to sit at times when the House is not in Session. That will be an additional committee which we will ask the House to constitute.

Then, of course, the Speech from the Throne yesterday indicated a committee in connection with rent control, a select committee of the House to thoroughly go into the regulations and the steps which have been taken in connection with that very difficult and important subject.

Later on we propose to ask that a committee be set up to consider the revisions of the Companies' Act. This was referred to yesterday in His Honour's

speech, and it is our intention to set up a committee representative of all of the parties in the House to consider that very important matter.

In connection with the suggestion made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) we have that under consideration at the present time, together with some other matters, and I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition that we will give it the utmost consideration, with the end in view of making the best use we can of the abilities of the hon. members of this House in connection with a large number of matters.

In connection with the committees which are mentioned in the motion itself, it is our desire that they should be as active as possible, and a great deal of the legislation which will come before the House will be referred to those committees, in order that they may be studied in detail.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Porter, that a Select Committee of eleven members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient despatch lists of the members to compose the Standing Committee ordered by the House, such Committee to be composed as follows: Messrs. Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk); Allen (Middlesex South);

Chartrand, Collings, Cowling, Grummett, Kerr, Mackenzie, Murdoch, Pringle, and Robson.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: I would now ask that the hon. members be good enough to face the camera.

----photograph taken of the House in Session.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICES' EXPENSES ACT

HON.DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Administration of Justices' Expenses Act" and the same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, in explanation of this Bill, which I foresee I shall be pressed for, I may say that the present jail surgeons' fee for the examination of prisoners eligible for removal, or sentenced to penitentiary or a reformatory and for making the certificate is $1.00. It is proposed this be raised to $2.00.

CUSTODY OF DOCUMENTS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker,

I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Custody of Documents Act", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: This Bill, Mr. Speaker, provides for certain increases in fees payable in the registry offices for deposit under the Custody of Documents Act, to meet the increasing expenses at the present time.

DIVISION COURTS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Division Courts Act", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill provides, together with several other bills which will be introduced, for a five-day week in the Division Court offices. Similar bills will be introduced with reference to the Registry offices and other public offices.

It also provides for the replacing of the present times during which the offices are open, namely, generally from ten to four. The Bill proposes they

be open from nine-thirty to four-thirty, from Mondays through Fridays inclusive, instead of as presently arranged.

There is another section in this Bill which deals with the jury aspects of Division Court cases. As the hon. members may know, there is still provision for juries in Division Court cases, and there are some cases -- very few, although there may be some -- which may be tried by a jury. The amendment is to prevent jurymen from being challenged on purely technical grounds, specified in the Bill.

THE EVIDENCE ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Evidence Act", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is designed to bring up to date, in the light of international developments, the provisions of the Evidence Act respecting the taking of oaths, outside of Ontario by members of the Diplomatic and Consular services. At the present time, they are not entitled to take oaths

under the Ontario Legislation, and this amendment will give them that power.

I may say this has been recommended by the Conference of Commissioners on Uniformity of Legislation in Canada, and also recommeneded by the Department of External Affairs.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE ACT, 1952

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "Justices of the Peace Act, 1952", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this is mainly a routine, general revision of the Justices of the Peace Act, which was last revised in 1926. There are a number of obsolete provisions which have been omitted, and some very minor changes in accordance with present-day practice.

The only substantial change in principle provides for the prevention of Justices of the Peace who are on salary, from performing other duties in connection with magistrates' courts. We now have some Justices of the Peace who act as clerks in the

magistrates' courts, on a salary. This will prevent them from retaining their fees as Justices of the Peace, if by receiving them, it would make the combined income from the two capacities too great, having regard to the services rendered.

JUVENILE FAMILY COURTS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Juvenile Family Courts Act", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, at the present time juvenile courts can be established for a city, town or county. This amendment will permit the establishment of juvenile courts for districts composed of two or more counties.

THE MAGISTRATES ACT, 1952

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "The Magistrates Act, 1952", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this is a routine, general revision of the Magistrates Act, which was last revised in 1936.

There are, however, two new principles involved in this, and it is designed to bring all the magistrates under the Public Service Act with respect to superannuation.

Also, the magistrates assigned to cities, who are now paid by the cities, will receive payment direct from the province, so that they will be enabled to benefit from the cost-of-living bonus, as do other Civil Servants, and the province will be reimbursed by the cities.

There is a slight change so that the magistrates may take advantage of the cost-of-living bonus, which in some cases they do not receive at the present time.

THE REGISTRY ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Registry Act", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill brings

the registry offices in line as to the five-day week, in a similar way as in a Bill recently introduced into this House.

It also provides that in the registry office a person may use ink for copying documents, whereas now they are denied that valuable privilege.

It also provides for the recording in the general registry, the orders made under the Mental Incompetency Act, as well as the other orders already provided for.

It also makes certain new provisions in respect to abstract indexes, and what shall be included in them, and it also provides for an increase in the fees for the registration of certain documents.

SURROGATE COURTS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Surrogate Courts Act", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill provides for the five-day week, along the same lines as in the other Bills, which have already been introduced.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Foote, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Vocational Education Act", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. DUNLOP: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is intended to provide for retarded children who have been in auxiliary classes in the elementary schools, and who are likely to be considered capable of promotion to the classes in a special industrial school, and provides provisions for the Board to make that arrangement possible.

THE PAROLE ACT

HON. J. W. FOOTE (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunlop, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Parole Act", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. FOOTE: This Bill increases the membership of the Parole Board from six to nine, and it brings into one Department, under one director, the assistant parole officers and the rehabilitation officers. The purpose

is to avoid overlapping, and give a wider coverage throughout the province.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I might intimate to the hon. members that Monday will again be devoted to "organizational business" -- if I may put it that way -- the getting of business onto the order paper.

In connection with the Bills which have been introduced to-day, I think perhaps the hon. Leader of the Opposition will be interested in knowing that we will not proceed with second readings on Monday. It will be difficult to get the Bills printed and onto the order paper, and it would not allow the hon. members of the House much opportunity to read the Bills and find out what they are about. It is not our intention to proceed with second readings on Monday, but to proceed with organizational business, of which probably at this early stage there can be but very little, for the reason that it is doubtful that the committee appointed to strike the standing committees will be able to complete their work by Monday. Of course, if they can complete it, then we can proceed with the recommendations made to the House by that committee. It would,

therefore, appear, as is the usual course, that Monday will be a very short day. I will try to make up for it later on.

On Tuesday the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne will devote themselves to the speech of His Honour.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that next Friday, unless there is objection from the hon. members of the House, we will perhaps revert to the system of last year and of some preceding years, that is, of having the House meet at two o'clock, in order to meet the convenience of hon. members who desire to get their trains on Friday afternoons.

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

MR. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, if, before we conclude the business of this Session, it will be possible to have a report from the provincial-municipal committee. Is there any chance of that report being before the House, before it is prorogued.

MR. FROST: I would like that myself, Mr. Speaker, but frankly I do not think there is any such possibility. I do hope to have a report in connection with the mining municipalities, but the other matter

is a huge one. The work of the committee so far has been very largely getting the statistical background, and I am sure the hon. Leader of the opposition can see the problem to be faced in that, because it involves a host of subjects.

I may say that I am going to discuss this matter with the Minister and with the Chairman of the committee, and it might be possible for the committee to make certain interim reports, so that they may be considered, and there might be certain matters, in connection with which we could make progress.

One of the great difficulties of a committee dealing with so vast a subject, is that when the report comes in, it is, in itself, so vast, that it takes a very great deal of time for the hon. members to go through even a portion of the report.

I think there is a great deal to be said about bringing in interim reports covering certain phases of the problem. I intend to speak to the Minister, and to the Chairman of that committee, Mr. Chater, the Provincial Statistician, to see what might be done in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER: May I also request the hon. members who have been asked to have their photographs taken at designated times to be as prompt as possible,

in order that there shall be no unavoidable delays. I am given to understand it will take about ten days to get the photographs of all the members, and I ask your full co-operation in this regard.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3:57 of the clock, p.m.

- - - - - - - - - -

ONTARIO

First Session
of the
Twenty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 21, 1952, et seq.

0

Volume III

Monday, February 25, 1952.

0

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

R. C. Sturgeon,
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

T H I R D D A Y

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE, HELD IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21st, 1952, et seq.

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

- - - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Monday, February 25, 1952.

- - - - - - - -

The House having met. 3 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: May I draw the attention of the hon. members please to a possible difficulty which might arise?

We are not trying to limit the freedom of the enjoyment of the hon. members when the House rises, and I know we all enjoy a smoke as soon as possible, especially when we have been sitting here for three or four hours listening to addresses by the

hon. members, but I suggest, if at all possible, you be very, very careful of a match which has not been completely extinguished, or the pipe, the contents of which you may wish to empty, or of cigarette butts. We had a little experience here on Friday where there was a smouldering cigarette left on the carpet. While it is quite true that smoking in the Chamber is not permitted, we have always allowed a little liberty in that regard as soon as the House arose, but I would ask you in the future to please be as careful as possible.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: The following petitions have been received:

Of the Corporation of the Town of New Toronto, praying that an Act may pass repealing Section 2 of Chapter 106 of the Statutes of Ontario, 1937.

Of the Board of Trustees of the Roman Catholic Separate Schools for the City of Sarnia, praying that an Act may pass fixing the number of Trustees at eight, to hold office for two years, four to be elected annually.

Of the Corporation of the City of Stratford, praying that an Act may pass authorizing a municipally operated bus service.

Of Sarnia Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association, praying that an Act may pass exempting the lands, buildings, etc., of the Association from taxation, except for local improvements.

Of the Corporation of the City of Sault Ste. Marie, praying that an Act may pass increasing the membership of the Sault Ste. Marie Public Utilities Commission from three to five.

Of the Roman Catholic Separate School Board of the Town of Timmins, praying that an Act may pass providing for the election of the six members of the Board by a general vote of the Separate School ratepayers.

Of the Corporation of the City of Fort William, praying that an Act may pass increasing the amount chargeable for sewer tax and for other purposes.

Of the J. L. Thompson Supply Limited, praying that an Act may pass vesting in the Company that portion of the Old Cemetery on plan 247 for the Town of Wallaceburg at present occupied by the Company.

Of the Corporation of the Township of Scarborough, praying that an Act may pass providing for the election of Reeve, Deputy Reeve and five Councillors, and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Synagogue and Jewish Community Centre of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass exempting the Corporation's lands, etc., from taxation, except for local improvements.

Of the Corporation of the City of London, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the payment of annuities to employees retiring with less than twenty years' service, and for other purposes.

Of the Trustees of Massey Hall, praying that an Act may pass incorporating the Trustees of Massey Hall as a body corporate and politic.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Hespeler, praying that an Act may pass withdrawing the said Town from the County of Waterloo.

Of the Corporation of the County of Waterloo, praying that an Act may pass establishing a Waterloo County Roads Commission, and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Municipality of Neebing, praying that an Act may pass ratifying the redivision of the Wards of the Municipality, providing

for the election of an additional Councillor, and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Ottawa Association for the Advancement of Learning, praying that an Act may pass changing the name of the Corporation to University of Carleton College, and for other purposes.

Of St. Patrick's Home of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the transfer of all its assets, etc., to the Grey Nuns Immaculate Conception.

Of the Corporation of the City of Oshawa, praying that an Act may pass providing for changes in the procedure for imposing the special frontage rate for the construction of watermains, and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Orillia, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Corporation to enter into an agreement with the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario for the purchase of power.

Of the Young Men's Christian Association of Belleville, praying that an Act may pass exempting the lands and other assets of the Association from taxation.

Of the Corporation of the Township of Pelee,

praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Corporation to expend up to $10,000.00 in any year from the revenue received from non-resident hunting licenses on drainage works.

Of the Corporation of the Grand Lodge of Ontario of the Independent Order of Oddfellows, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Corporation to acquire shares of the I.O.O.F. Hall Association of Toronto.

Of the Corporation of the City of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Corporation to pass by-laws fixing a standard of fitness of dwellings for human habitation, and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Township of Toronto, praying that an Act may pass establishing a Board of Education for the Township, and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Barrie, praying that an Act may pass vesting in the Corporation the land known as the Market Block of the said Town.

Of the Canadian National Exhibition Association, praying that an Act may pass to provide that notices of appointment of representatives of various associations must be given by 12 noon on the third Wednesday of January in each year.

Of the Corporation of the City of Toronto, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the regulating and governing of the erection of television antennae, and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Fort Erie, praying that an Act may pass providing that all Committees, commissions and boards established under The Department of Education Act, the Community Centres Act, and The Public Parks Act may consist of the same persons.

Of the Corporation of Credit Foncier Franc-Canadien praying that an Act may pass removing the limit of $100,000.00, on the value of real estate which may be acquired by the Corporation.

Of the Corporation of the City of Kingston, praying that an Act may pass validating Orders of the Municipal Board authorizing the Corporation to impose sewer rental charges, and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Township of McKim, praying that an Act may pass permitting the cost of service connections between the dot-line and watermain to be averaged between the users in water and sewer area No.6 in the said Township.

MR. SPEAKER: Reports by Committees.

MR. J. A. PRINGLE (Addington): I beg leave to present the First Report of the Select Committee appointed to prepare lists of Members to compose the Standing Committees ordered by the House, and move its adoption.

(Take "B" follows)

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: Mr. Pringle, from the Select Committee appointed to prepare the lists of Members to compose the Standing Committees of the House, Presents the following as its first report:

Your Committee recommends that the Standing Committees ordered by the House be composed as follows:--

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Messrs. Collings, Downer, Edwards, Elliott, Fishleigh, Frost (Bracondale), Hall, Janes, Leavine, Lyons, Murdoch, Nixon, Oliver, Root, Stewart, Thomas (Ontario), Warrender - 17.

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

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Messrs. Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk), Beech, Brandon, Chartrand, Child, Cowling, Dent, Downer, Fishleigh, Hanna, Herbert, Janes, Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Kelly, Kerr, Leavine, MacOdrum, Manley, Morningstar, Morrow, Murdoch, Nault, Nickle, Patrick, Pringle, Pryde, Robson, Root, Thomas (Ontario), Villeneuve, Wardrope, Whitney, Wren - 33.

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

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE BILLS

Messrs. Allan (Middlesex South), Beckett, Brandon, Cathcart, Chartrand, Collings, Cowling, Dent,

Edwards, Elliott, Fishleigh, Frost (Bracondale), Fullerton, Gordon,Grummett, Hall, Hanna, Harvey, Herbert, Houck, Janes, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Johnstone (Bruce), Kerr, Leavine, Lyons, Macaulay, Mackenzie, MacOdrum, Mapledoram, Morningstar, Morrow, Murdoch, McPhee, Nault, Nickle, Noden, Parry, Patrick, Pringle, Pryde, Reaume, Roberts, Root, Sandercock, Stewart, Villeneuve, Weaver, Wren, Yaremko - 51.

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

COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS

Messrs. Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk), Allen (Middlesex South), Beech, Cathcart, Chartrand, Child, Connell, Gordon, Grummett, Hall, Hanna, Harvey, Leavine, Lyons, Macaulay, Mackenzie, MacOdrum, Manley, Mapledoram, Morrow, Murdoch, McPhee, Nault, Nickle, Noden, Parry, Patrick, Pryde, Robson, Sandercock, Stewart -, 31.

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

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Messrs. Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk), Allen (Middlesex South), Beckett, Beech, Brandon, Cathcart, Chartrand, Child, Collings, Connell, Cowling, Dent, Downer, Edwards, Elliott, Fishleigh, Frost (Bracondale), Fullerton, Gordon, Grummett, Hall, Hanna, Harvey, Herbert, Houck, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Johnstone (Bruce), Kelly, Kerr, Lyons, Mackenzie, Mapledoram, Morningstar, Morrow, Murdoch, Myers, Nixon, Oliver, Patrick, Pringle, Pryde, Robarts, Roberts, Robson, Root, Salsberg, Stewart, Villeneuve, Ward, Wardrope, Warrender, Weaver, Whitney, Yarmeko - 55.

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

COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Messrs. Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk), Allen (Middlesex South), Beckett, Brandon, Collings, Connell, Cowling, Dent, Fullerton, Gordon, Hunt, Kelly, Kerr, Manley, Murdoch, McPhee, Nickle, Pryde, Robarts, Sandercock, Thomas (Ontario), Wardrope, Weaver - 23.

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

COMMITTEE ON MUNICIPAL LAW

Messrs. Allen (Middlesex South), Beckett, Beech, Brandon, Cathcart, Chartrand, Child, Collings, Connell, Cowling, Downer, Edwards, Elliott, Frost (Bracondale), Fullerton, Hall, Hanna, Harvey, Hunt, Janes, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Johnstone (Bruce), Kelly, Kerr, Leavine, Lyons, Macaulay, Mackenzie, MacOdrum, Manley, Morningstar, Murdoch, Myers, McPhee, Pryde, Reaume, Robarts, Roberts, Salsberg, Thomas (Ontario), Villeneuve, Warrender, Weaver, Whitney, Wren, Yaremko - 47.

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

COMMITTEE ON LEGAL BILLS

Messrs. Beckett, Chartrand, Dempsey, Downer, Grummett, Macaulay, MacOdrum, Murdoch, Nickle, Nixon, Noden, Parry, Pryde, Robarts, Roberts, Root, Sandercock, Wardrope, Warrender, Yaremko - 21.

The Quorum of this Committee to consist of 7 members.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

Messrs. Allan, (Haldimand-Norfolk), Allen, (Middlesex South), Cathcart, Child, Connell, Dempsey, Dent, Downer, Edwards, Frost (Bracondale), Fullerton, Hall, Hanna, Herbert, Houck, Hunt, Janes, Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Johnstone (Bruce), Kelly, Leavine, Mackenzie, Manley, Mapledoram, Morningstar, Morrow, Murdoch, Myers, McPhee, Nault, Nixon, Noden, Oliver, Parry, Patrick, Pringle, Pryde, Robarts, Robson, Root, Sandercock, Thomas (Ontario), Villeneuve, Ward, Wardrope, Whitney, Wren - 47.

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

COMMITTEE ON FISH AND GAME

Messrs. Allan, (Haldimand-Norfolk), Allen, (Middlesex South), Beckett, Beech, Cathcart, Chartrand, Connell, Dempsey, Dent, Downer, Edwards, Elliott, Fishleigh, Frost (Bracondale), Fullerton, Grummett, Hall, Hanna, Harvey, Herbert, Houck, Hunt, Janes, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Johnstone (Bruce), Kelly, Lyons, Mackenzie, MacOdrum, Manley, Mapledoram, Morningstar, Murdoch, McPhee, Nault, Nixon, Noden, Parry, Patrick, Pringle, Pryde, Robson, Root, Sandercock, Villeneuve, Ward, Wardrope, Warrender, Whitney, Wren - 51.

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

COMMITTEE ON LABOUR

Messrs. Beech, Brandon, Child, Collings, Elliott, Fishleigh, Harvey, Herbert, Johnston (Parry Sound), Kerr, Macaulay, MacOdrum, Manley, Mapledoram, Morningstar, Murdoch, Myers, Nault, Nickle, Pryde,

Reaume, Roberts, Robson, Salsberg, Stewart, Thomas (Ontario), Wardrope, Warrender, Weaver, Wren, - 30.

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

COMMITTEE ON MINING

Messrs. Brandon, Cowling, Dempsey, Elliott, Fullerton, Grummett, Harvey, Herbert, Houck, Hunt, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnstone (Bruce), Macaulay, Mapledoram, Murdoch, McPhee, Nickle, Noden, Oliver, Pringle, Pryde, Roberts, Stewart, Villeneuve, Ward, Wardrope, Warrender, Weaver, Whitney, Wren, - 30.

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

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, arising out of what I said when the House adjourned on Friday last, referring to the time of convening the Legislature on Fridays, I move, seconded by Mr. Porter, that, commencing on Friday, February 29th, and thereafter, on each Friday of the present Session of the Assembly, this House shall meet at two of the clock in the afternoon and that the provisions of Rule No. 2 of the Assembly be suspended so far as they might apply to this motion. If any of the hon. members want that motion to stand, I am satisfied.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. ARTHUR WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the following reports:

Public Accounts of the Province of Ontario for the Fiscal Year ended 31st March, 1951.

Report of the Provincial Auditor, Ontario, 1950-51.

Fifth Report of the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario for the twelve months fiscal period ending on the 31st day of March, 1951.

Twenty-fifth Report of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario for the twelve months fiscal period ending on the 31st day of March, 1951.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St.Andrew): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like your permission to draw the attention of the government to a matter of grave public urgency and to inquire as to its intention insofar as that problem is concerned. I want to bring to the attention of the government, the

factwhich is widely known in the province and not unknown to the government, that of the serious unemployment which exists. , The rules of the House will not permit me to deal with the question at this time in the manner that I hope to do at a later date. At this moment, however, I want to advise the government that in the city of Toronto, and undoubtedly elsewhere as well, there are thousands of citizens who are unemployed who, according to present laws and regulations, are receiving no assistance whatsoever. These are men who have no roofs over their heads, no beds to sleep in, and no assurance of income to sustain themselves. In my own riding, that problem is as serious as it is in any other riding in the province, and in Toronto at this time there are about 125 men sleeping on the floor of the Fred Victor Mission, no beds, no covering, no food. About 90 men are allowed to sleep every night on the floor of the House of Providence, again no food provided but an opportunity to sleep on the floor.

I have here a photograph that I want to send to the government benches, which was taken last night in the House of Providence at Power and Queen Streets, where you will see men stretched out on the stone floor of the hall-way, under

benches, both sides of the hall-way occupied by these men who have no home, no room, no bed --- nothing. One hundred and fifty men or thereabouts are sleeping in the St. Lawrence Market hall. That is provided by the city. The city is paying for the beds and is providing them also with two meals.

I want to advise the government further that at the Scott Mission at the corner of Spadina and College, a part of my constituency, about 500 men line up every morning, in these cold mornings, waiting for an opportunity to enter and get some food.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg), I think said he had a question to ask the government. There will be ample opportunity for the making of an address on this subject later. May I suggest we get along with the business and the question be asked and the answer be given.

MR. SALSBERG: I appreciate your guidance, Mr. Speaker, and of course, I am praying for your leniency, that I be permitted to preface the question with a statement of a matter that I wanted to draw to the attention of the government. I am just about finished drawing its attention to it, and I will forthwith proceed to ask the question. About 500 men are lined up every morning waiting for an opportunity to get a bowl of soup. This is just

around the corner from my office. Now, Mr. Speaker, in asking the government to do something to alleviate this situation, I am not unmindful of the divided responsibility, nor am I unmindful of the failure of the Federal government in this regard, but I do suggest to the government that in regards to such a matter, we cannot turn our backs upon these men, and say that they are not our responsibility.

- - - - - - -

(Take C-1 follows.)

"I appeal to the Government and I urge the Government to announce to-day that they will assume responsibility for those, at least, who receive no other assistance, so that they may have a room to sleep in and assistance to buy food to sustain them. After all, is said and done, according to the British North America Act, health and welfare do remain the responsibility of the Provincial Government until such time as other arrangements can be made with the Federal Government. I say to this Government that we cannot shift this responsibility to the over-burdened municipalities, and we cannot shut our eyes to so serious a situation as we witness every day in almost every large community in the Province.

Having drawn the attention of the government to these facts, and having appealed to them, I now ask the question whether the Government is prepared -- and I hope that they are, and will be -- to assume its responsibility in the present situation, whether it is a temporary one or a permanent one. It is not easy for a man to starve, or to sleep on a stone floor, even if it is only temporary, for three months or one month or six months.

"HON. WM. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the very short and concise question which the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) has stated this afternoon before the House

-- I am sure we older Members realize that in this respect he has changed a great deal and that he gets to the point much more quickly than he formerly did --

Mr. SALSBERG: Out of consideration for you, Sir,

Mr. GOODFELLOW: Thank you -- I want, in the first place, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Government, to make it abundantly clear that we are quite aware of the fact that there is unemployment in many of the large centres in this Province, as well as in many centres across Canada. We are also vitally concerned with the plight which the municipalities of this Province might find themselves in were they to assume full responsibility, or responsibility in conjunction with the Provincial Government, for the welfare of the so-called "unemployed employables."

I also want to pay tribute to the many welfare agencies who are assisting materially in trying to help some of these unfortunate people who, at least temporarily, are out of employment.

The hon. member for St. Andrew mentioned one very worth-while organization in this city which has made a great contribution down through the years: I refer to the Victor Mission. At this time I would like to read a

copy of a letter which is addressed to the Honourable Mr. Gregg, Minister of Labour at Ottawa, from the Rev. W. A. Hunnisett, head of the Victor Mission, and dated January 31st:

"Dear Sir:

I write to you regarding a problem that has reached a dangerous degree in this District - and probably true much farther afield

We understand that there can be no relief given to anyone physically able to work, despite the fact that they are not working and not entitled to Unemployment Insurance, or waiting for Unemployment Insurance. We have from SIXTY TO SEVENTY-FIVE of these families coming to us each week seeking assistance. The Bill in one Grocery Store alone for orders of $1.00 to $2.00, for the month of January is over TWO HUNDRED DOLLARS. You can understand that we just cannot keep this up, and yet we cannot see children going without food. We do believe the majority of these cases are really needy.

We have called the Relief Office, but the answer is always the same - NO RELIEF FOR EMPLOYABLE MEN.

Is there any way in which there can be

some easing of these regulations?

It is not just the Mission facing this difficulty, but all the Churches in the District. One Church Worker said the other day that she just could not sleep at night thinking of all those who needed help."

That is from the head of the Victor Mission.

We have been cognisant of this condition for some time; but we feel, looking back over the condition which existed across this country in the thirties, that it would be most unfortunate for us as a Provincial Government to involve the municipal governments in responsibility for providing for the needs of employable unemployed people. I might read a Press release over my name dated January 31 of this year:

"An enemployment problem in many Ontario centres is causing concern; Ontario shares with the municipalities the cost of assistance rendered to those persons who are unable to accept employment".

"Financial responsibility for assistance for employable persons is entirely a matter for the Government of Canada. Both the Province and its municipalities should, under no circumstances,

be burdened with financial commitments required to grant relief to these persons. The Dominion Government is the only government with the proper taxing base to provide assistance to needy employable persons, and with the administrative machinery at its disposal, is in a position to meet the problem"

While unemployment has been increasing in the Province recently, and exists mainly in the larger municipalities, it is believed that much of it is seasonal and of temporary duration.

The Federal Government has employment offices operated by the Unemployment Insurance Commission which are national in scope, and the Unemployment Insurance set-up which grants benefits to the bulk of persons who are unemployed. "There is no reason why administrative services should be duplicated either by the Province or its municipalities. The Federal Government could very well render supplemental assistance where required."

Persons without employment are already known to the Federal Employment Offices. Duplication of services would be an additional public expense and is wholly unwarranted.

Unemployment in any event must be treated as a national problem and it is quite unfair to expect either the municipalities or the Province to treat the problem on a local basis and financed from local taxation." The Province is already meeting very heavy commitments for social services, and indeed, at this time is preparing legislation which will grant allowances to disabled persons as a total charge on the Province.

The economy of the country is guided by the fiscal policies of the Federal Government and these policies have a decided effect on the employment situation as a whole. The only alternative to supplementary assistance is employment. The responsibility is clear-cut and definitely a matter requiring immediate attention. No contribution is made by the Federal Government toward the maintenance of persons who are unable to work and are presently being provided for by the Province and its municipalities."

Mr. Speaker, I have read that Press release into the records of this House to make it clear that the Government feels that the Federal Government has a definite responsibility, and that we would only be leading the municipalities

of this Province into very difficult problems in the days that lie ahead if we were to deviate from the policy we have enunciated.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Might I just add a word, from a little different angle, to what my hon. friend has said? Two years ago we were faced with a somewhat similar problem to the one we now have, coming from a different direction. At that time, sir, it appeared that there was to be a levelling-off in our economy and that we were going to be faced with a certain amount of unemployment. At that time we were not sure that the unemployment was going to last throughout the year. At that time, sir, some of the hon. members of this House will recollect the public works programme which we instituted in the Province, - the first time, in fact, that we were able to do that since the days of the War. We instituted among other things a programme in connection with highways involving an expenditure of a minimum of $150,000,000. over a period of years, with a very considerable building programme; and linked up with that was a very considerable housing programme. The problem we are faced with today is one which is very largely artificial. It is caused by credit restrictions and credit control and things arising from a very heavy defence programme and the inflationary effects

of that programme, with the result that the Federal Government has introduced certain measures which have had a very far-reaching effect.

In some of the municipalities of this Province, with credit restrictions involving such articles as refrigerators motor-cars and what-not, there is a very large degree of unemployment; and of course the national agencies understand that, and they have taken some measures at least to provide for the spreading over of these unemployed persons into places where employment is at a very high level.

That is the situation that we are faced with today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are certain things I think a provincial government can very properly do in connection with unemployment. My hon. friend the Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) has mentioned unemployment from the standpoint of the employable unemployed. This House will be considering this year further measures in connection with totally and permanently disabled persons which will help not only those unfortunate people but will help the municipalities that are presently paying half of the cost. There are other things that we have done, I think, for our unemployable persons in this Province. While there might be things that could be desired, nevertheless, I think that by and large they are probably being better cared for in

this Province than in any other Province.

MR. SALSBERG: Not according to that picture, sir,

MR. FROST: The point I am coming to is what the Provincial Government can do in the matter of employment of employable persons. We have taken the position here, and I think this has been recognized at all the Federal - Provincial conferences, that the provinces and the municipalities should be prepared to institute work programmes to take care of them.

Sir, our position is just this. We are sitting here with a very large programme of works ready to be proceeded with. As a matter of fact we have been asked to withhold those works because of the shortage of material; indeed, the shortage of labour in some cases; and in order to prevent further inflationary tendencies in Canada, we have been asked to withhold these works. I would say that if we could get the "green light" from Ottawa, and they would remove the suggestion that they made about restricting building, we would go ahead at once with the Osgoode Hall work for which my hon. friend (Mr. Porter) has been asking for some time; we would go ahead with the extension of the East Block and avoid the crowding we now have, and perhaps if we could do that, we would be able to give some hon. members here better quarters. I think that if we could extend the

East Block we would get a little more breathing space, as well as employ a lot of people. The Liquor Control Board is in need of a new place on the waterfront. Across the province, conditions are much the same. I could take my hon. friends to all sorts of places needing bridges and overpasses and things of that sort which we would be glad to build if we could just get the steel and the materials and also the credit facilities to go ahead. In the meantime we have this situation, - that a year ago the Province was able to borrow money, generally speaking, at three percent; at any rate that was the position a little earlier perhaps than this time last year. Today we are faced with shortages of money because of credit restrictions which have been imposed in the national interest.

That, sir, is the problem which confronts us. It is not a question of us turning our backs on any problem. We are prepared to go ahead. We are prepared to institute programmes of public works when it is in the interests of the country so to do. I might say that many of these unemployment situations, in fact all of them, have been created at the present time by reason of these restrictions. I was going to call them "artificial" restrictions, but they are not so very artificial because they have very definite effects in municipalities and communities across this

Province. Nevertheless, they are there.

The other side of the story, if I may just repeat what my friend the Minister of Welfare said, is that our advice from national agencies is that, beginning about the first of April, employment levels in the Province will be the highest on record, and it appears that 1952 is going to be a very busy year indeed.

As I think my hon. friend the Minister of Welfare said, this Legislature back in 1941 or 1942 consented to the passage of a constitutional amendment which permitted the Federal Government to impose and collect unemployment insurance rates throughout the country. That was done; and, I think in 1943 - the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) may recollect this - the statutes here were amended to provide that the Federal Government was to have free play in connection with employment of the employables, and that we would bear our share of the load in taking care of the unemployables.

(Take "D" follows.)

Mr. Speaker, that is the situation and I think the hon. members opposite havebeen given complete information.

MR. SALSBERG (St. Andrew) may I ask a question?

MR. SPEAKER: The matter is not one for debate. The question was asked, and quite naturally I allowed the leader of the government (Mr. Frost) to augment a statement by one of his ministers. The question is not one for debate.

MR. OLIVER: Surely you were not going to limit the discussion on this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: If we allow debate on a matter of this kind, the business of the house will be seriously curtailed. I think we must subscribe to the rule, and if we allow a general debate on the second or third day of our session some minor question might be raised which would take up the whole afternoon. I think we must follow the general policy that once a question is asked and an answer given, that clarifies the situation, at least for the present.

MR. OLIVER: I was under the impression that when a member poses a question surely each party should have the right to make its position clear .

MR. SPEAKER: There was no motion before the house at the time. It was just a plain question.

MR. SALSBERG: May I, Mr. Speaker,--

MR. SPEAKER: No, I am sorry

MR. SALSBERG: If the hon. Prime Minister agrees may I put a question to him?

MR. SPEAKER: No, I am sorry.

Orders of the day

HON. L.M. FROST(PRIME MINISTER) Mr. Speaker, on Friday I intimated to the house, and particularly to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that we would not pro with second readings of the Bills which were introduc on Friday and are on the order paper today, for the reason that the hon. members would not have sufficient opportunity to read the printed bills in the Bill book. I think that point was raised a year ago on the third day of the session, therefore, we will not be proceeding with these Bills until Wednesday.

Tomorrow, we will proceed with the traditional debate on the reply to the Speech from the Throne, and the mover and seconder will address the House and on Thursday upon the continuation of the debate in reply, the hon. Leader of the Opposition will have the opportunity of making his usual eloquent contribution, and, I presume, the hon. member Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett).

We have today set

There are still four to be selected, and it is our intention to convene the committess at once. I was anxious they should be struck early in the session, so they would be enabled to avoid being crowded in at the end, and so that matters c m g

before the committees could be considered in a more orderly manner.

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

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker may I say to the hon. Prime Minister before the House adjourns, when he speaks of the committees meeting earlier, would it not be a splendid idea if the committee on Government Commissions could be called much earlier than it was last year? They met only shortly before the session prorogued.

MR. FROST: That is right. The members were not appointed to the committee today, and are not in the list of names given to the House. As soon as the committee is constituted, we will arrange to have the committee meet.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.05 o'clock P.M.

ONTARIO

First Session
of the
Twenty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 21, 1952, et seq.

0

Volume IV

Tuesday, February 26, 1952.

0

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

R. C. Sturgeon,
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

F O U R T H D A Y

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE, HELD IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21st, 1952, et seq.

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

- - - - - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Tuesday, February 26, 1952.

- - - - - - - - - - -

The House having met. 3 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting reports by Committee.

Motions.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to

Amend the Interpretation Act", and the same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: This Bill amends the Interpretation Act to provide that proclamations shall be judicially noted in the courts.

LAND TITLES ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Land Titles Act" and the same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill amends the Land Titles Act with reference to possessory titles, that is the first provision. Lands registered under the Land Titles Act are not affected by titles arising from length of possession. This is to extend it to any interest in land as well as to an absolute title in land.

I might say there are several of these bills having to do with legal offices and matters pertaining to the administration of civil justice that will be referred on second reading to the Legal Bills

Committee so that they may be considered in greater detail than we could perhaps do conveniently in the House.

Then, in the second place this Bill provides that all cautions that are registered under the Land Titles Act expire within five years of the registration unless they are renewed.

In the third place, there is an amendment to overcome the present conflict and rather expensive procedure which is provided to remove conditions and covenants from the Register after they expire. This will now be done by a simple process.

EXECUTION OF TRUSTS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to Repeal the Execution of Trusts Act,1939" and the same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, the Execution of Trusts Act, 1939, was designed to facilitate the trusteeship by a trustee on war service. This was applicable only to World War II and is therefore now

spent and it is considered advisable to repeal it.

DEPENDENTS RELIEF ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Dependents Relief Act", and the same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, in the first place, this Bill brings the practice under the Dependents Relief Act in line with that under the Surrogate Courts Act. Certain cases have arisen where it was questionable whether the applicant would have to appear in person on the hearing under the Dependents Relief Act or whether it would be possible to take commission evidence where the applicant lived beyond the jurisdiction or to take evidence de bene esse where the applicant was not able to attend personally. This brings it into line with the usual court procedure and permits an applicant to do that. In the second place, it widens the right of appeal.

PLANT DISEASES ACT

HON. F. S. THOMAS (Minister of Public Works):

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy, I move, seconded by Mr. Dunlop, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Plant Diseases Act", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

WARBLE FLY ACT

HON. F. S. THOMAS (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy, I move, seconded by Mr. Dunlop, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Warble Fly Act", and the same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE ACT

HON. F. S. THOMAS (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy, I move, seconded by Mr. Dunlop, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Agricultural College Act", and that the same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

CROWN TIMBER ACT

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests):

Mr. Speaker, I would like the consent of the House to the introduction of a bill intituled, "The Crown Timber Act, 1952". This has not appeared on the papers but I just got it yesterday afternoon and I am rather anxious to have it printed. This is rather a lengthy Bill and I would like to get it printed so it may be reported to the Committee on Lands and Forests for study.

I move, seconded by Mr. Griesinger, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "The Crown Timber Act, 1952", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Minister explain the Bill?

MR. SCOTT: In the Royal Commission report on Forestry one of the recommendations was that we had various statutes dealing with Crown timber which over-lapped to a certain extent here and there where a person studying the Act would have to refer to the different statutes. For the last two years, our Department has been drawing up a consolidation of eight different acts, the Crown Timber Act, The Cutlers Act, the Forest Management Act, the Forest Resources Regulation Act, the Provincial Forests Act, the Pulpwood

Act, the Forestry Act and the Mills Licensing Act. This Act embodies all the features that are in these with the exception of those which may be referring to reforestation. Later on I will be bringing in a Bill embodying many of the features on that phase of this Department which are not included in this Act. I might say that this Act has been studied by the Advisory Committee, and also by outside legal talent, as well as our own staff in the office of the Hon. Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. ARTHUR WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the following:

50th Annual Report of the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission for the year ended December 31, 1951.

65th Annual Report of the Niagara Parks Commission for the fiscal year ended October 31, 1951.

Report of the Board of Governors of the University of Toronto for the year ended June 30th, 1951.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. W. M. NICKLE (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to ask a question of the Hon.

Prime Minister, which is of considerable importance in connection with a problem of very great importance concerning which there has been some comment to-day, both in the Press and over the radio, and which has a very great effect upon the breeders of pure-bred dairy and beef animals.

It is reported that in the Regina area there has been an outbreak of foot and mouth disease, and I would like to ask the Hon. Prime Minister if the government has any information to give to those who are engaged in the animal industry in this province, as to what steps have been taken by his government to prevent the spread of this disease in this province.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, supplementary to what the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) has said: I wanted yesterday to bring this matter to the attention of the Government, in view of its great importance to the economy of the Province of Ontario, as well as of the Dominion of Canada. I desired, of course, that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) be in his seat, and I had hoped he would be here to-day. Perhaps the Hon. Prime Minister, in replying, might indicate just how soon we can expect the Hon. Minister of Agriculture to resume his seat in the House.

Following what the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) has said, two or three things seem to stand out in this picture. In the first place, it is a very dread disease. It is one that is very contagious, and is apt to spread to other districts than where it is presently localized, and we believe the government should be prepared to tell the House this afternoon what steps have been taken by the government of the province of Ontario to see what can be done to stop the spread of this disease into this province. One need not recount the great damage that it would do to the cattle industry and the economy of this province, generally.

I understand that out west an embargo has been placed against sending this cattle, or the products of this cattle, to other provinces in other parts of the Dominion. The fear I had in my mind, Mr. Speaker, was that prior to the placing of that embargo by the affected areas of the west, it may have been that in transit between the western provinces and Ontario, would be found cattle which may be carrying that dreadful disease. If that is the case, then no measure is too stern or too strict for us to impose here to see if we can stamp it out

in the province of Ontario.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I, of course, had notice of the questions which were intended to be asked by the two members, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), and I at once contacted the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) who has been ill. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture felt it was a matter important enough for him to be in the building, but he felt it was undesirable for him to come into the Chamber as he has a form of influenza, and we might become infected by that highly-contagious disease.

The question is one of the greatest public importance and interest. As the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said, the foot and mouth disease is a very highly-contagious disease, for which I believe there is no known remedy, except the destruction of the animal. We have had in the past sporadic outbreaks in Canada, although I do not think we have had one for some considerable period of time. Not long ago there was an outbreak in Mexico, which had the effect of quarantining the whole Mexican market for quite a considerable time.

In view of the question which I understood would be asked, I immediately made enquiries, and yesterday a telegram was sent to the Hon. Mr. Gardiner, by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, in these words:

> "Wish to request that no livestock and no meats in a form that would carry disease be moved from Western Canada into Ontario until foot and mouth disease is cleaned up."

That, of course, Mr. Speaker, is a very radical request, for this reason; that it practically implements as far as Ontario is concerned the effect of the embargo which the United States Government has imposed on Canadian animals. The outbreak itself, as the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) has said, is in the vicinity of Regina, and it is hoped, of course, that it can be localized.

Mr. Speaker, may I read to the House a letter written by the Acting Principal of the Ontario Veterinary College, and also a short report given to me by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture on the subject, and I may have some comments to make as I go through them.

The letter written by Doctor Jones of the Ontario Veterinary College to Doctor Childs, the Veterinary Director Agent of the Department of

Agriculture, dated yesterday, is in these terms:

> "Dear Doctor Childs:
>
> The Press announcement indicating that foot and mouth disease has been diagnosed in the Regina area, prompts me to write and offer every assistance possible on behalf of the Ontario Veterinary College and the Department of Agriculture. If we can assist with personnel or facilities, please do not hesitate to call on us.
>
> I have been directed by Doctor R. D. Defries to let you know that the virologists--"

--Whatever that may be --

> "-- of the Connaught Agricultural Research Laboratories will be made available as consultants, if their assistance appears worth while."

Mr. Speaker, may I now read the comment by Mr. Graham in regard to this matter. I asked him to put it in written form. He says:

> "I am attaching hereto copy of wire sent to Hon. J. G. Gardiner by the Minister of Agriculture, Colonel, the Hon. T. L. Kennedy.
>
> I have just spoken to the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Dr. J. G. Taggart, and he tells me that the movement of livestock from Western Canada to this Province has been stopped. They are not in a position as yet to stop the movement of meat, as a good part of Northern Ontario, and also a good part of Quebec, depends on the packing plants in Western Canada for supplies.
>
> He assured me this matter was being watched very closely.

In regard to the disease known as 'foot and mouth disease', it is a reportable disease to the Health of Animals Branch of the Dominion Department of Agriculture, and as such they are directly responsible for methods used in control. We have in this province a number of inspectors, each inspector having a definite district to cover. These men have all been duly informed, and the veterinary profession as a whole will be on the look-out for this disease.

In speaking to the Deputy Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa, I offered him every co-operation of the Ontario Veterinary College, and the staff of that Institution, to prevent the spread of this disease into this province.

I am also attaching copy of a letter forwarded by the Acting Principal of the Ontario Veterinary College to the Veterinary Director General, and also to Dr. C. A. Mitchell, Animal Disease Research Institute, Hull, Quebec.

In regard to the export of livestock and meats to the U.S., I have been informed by the Deputy Minister, Doctor Taggart, that exports from Canada have been stopped except for canned cooked meats.

I trust the above information is what you require. If I can be of any further help, I will be pleased to assist."

In my discussion of this matter, I found that the control and prevention of the matter, constitutionally and by practice, comes under the Federal inspectors, and Federal veterinarians and it is their veterinarians who investigate and control matters and institute matters of control.

I assume that it was as a result of asking that all exports into Ontario from the western provinces be stopped, that drastic action has been taken. I understand that some of the western provinces feel that is a bit too drastic.

I quite agree with my friend, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) that this is a type of thing with which we cannot trifle. It might cause losses of untold millions of dollars here, by contaminating the farms, with the result that we might have a recurrence of this for a number of years, if we did not take drastic action.

That is all the information I can give the House at this time. I regret the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is not able to be present, but as I get further information, I will give it to the House.

MR. OLIVER: It seems to me that the element of the danger which remains is this: I am not afraid of a spread of the disease from the west to our cattle after the embargo was placed, but I am concerned with the cattle cars leaving western Canada just prior to the putting on of the embargo, and which are coming

to our stockyards here. It seems to me we should take very definite note of that situation, and be sure that all cattle cars which have come from the west of late, are thoroughly disinfected, and we should definitely see that that is done.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order Number 1.

REPLY TO THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order, consideration of the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session.

MR. J. P. ROBARTS (London): Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to say what an honour I consider it to be for the constituency I represent, and to myself personally, that I have been given the privilege of moving the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. It is with a humble feeling of my shortcomings, as a junior member of this Assembly, that I approach this duty to-day.

(Take "B" follows)

MR. J. P. ROBARTS (London): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Root, that a humble address be presented to the Hon. the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:

> "To the Honourable Louis Orville Breithaupt,
> "Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Ontario:
>
> "We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us."

We are meeting here today in the shadow of a great sorrow. It is but a few days since this nation, the Commonwealth, and indeed the whole democratic world were shocked to hear that His Majesty, King George VI, had passed quietly away in his sleep. On Friday, February 15th, he was laid to rest with his forebears with all traditional pomp and ceremony in St. George's Chapel at Windsor, the historic burial place of Britain's monarchs.

No words of mine can match the tributes of our leaders of church and state. If there was a single dominant note in all that has been written and said of this good and great man, then I think that note was one of sincerity. As a King and as a man he was enshrined in the hearts of all his people. His name will live long in the history of Britain and

Empire.

I shall not attempt to deal with his striking career in any detail but I think I should speak briefly of a few phases that I know will long linger in our memory.

At no time of his life was George VI content to be, shall I say, a "Royal figurehead".

It was his personal inclination and decision that early led him into a naval career. Three times, I think, the rigors of a life at sea made it necessary for him to seek medical and surgical attention. He returned, however, to his duties as a junior officer and participated aboard H.M.S. "Collingwood" in the battle of Jutland in World War I. Many of the hon. members here today will recall this epic struggle in which Jellicoe and Beatty broke the power of the German navy. Our future King on this occasion served with honour and distinction in one of the great naval battles of all time, an action that marked one of the major turning points of World War I.

Some fifteen years ago, out of a blue sky, he faced another crisis in Britain's history. With the abdication of his elder brother, Edward VIII, he was called upon to ascend the Throne. It is most

improbable that his inclinations had ever led him in this direction. Physically, he was not strong. He was wrapped up in the welfare of his family and the joys of family life. He was content with a quiet country life in surroundings which held his enduring affection. He performed cheerfully and well the functions demanded of a younger son of Royalty. His personal handicap, a congenital defect of speech, was through training and dogged persistence, corrected to the point where he became a sincere if not an eloquent speaker.

It would not be true to say that he was not trained for his new responsibilities. His whole career was so close to the Throne that with his native wit and intelligence and the example of his Royal father, he could not help but be aware of the nature of the duties and responsibilities which now faced him.

With the outbreak of World War II, George VI set an example to his people in Britain's darkest hour. His London home, Buckingham Palace, suffered the ravages of German bombs in common with the homes of so many of his subjects. He saw the destruction of the historic House of Commons. He mixed and mingled with his people of all ranks of life in the

areas throughout the length and breadth of the British Isles. His qualities of steadiness and of leadership were equalled only by those of Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill at a time when the fate of democracy depended in no small degree on these very qualities. These two men, more than any others, steeled the peoples of the democracies in the trials which were their lot.

Then came the trials of the post-war years -- almost as hard to bear as those of the years of the blitz. Britain entered the years of austerity, a period still with the British people. The problems of this gallant island are not made lighter when we realize that by two wars in two generations Britain has had destroyed a great section of what today would be leadership material.

Recent months saw his Majesty's health failing following two serious operations which he bore with his usual patience and fortitude. Certainly his medical advisers knew his days were numbered. His Majesty's own thoughts must have told him the end could not be too long delayed. Notwithstanding what he must have known and felt, he carried on. He bade farewell to his eldest daughter and her husband

as they departed on a protracted tour of the Commonwealth, and he probably knew he was unlikely to see them again in his life.

George VI was more than a good king. He was a good man, a decent man, a kindly man, a man of great native ability and a man of humbleness in high office. No slightest breath or hint of scandal ever touched his private or public life.

Our sympathy goes out to his Royal mother the Queen Dowager and to his sorrowing widow the Queen Mother. In fact our sympathy goes out to every member of the Royal family, and more especially to his daughter, our gracious Queen, Elizabeth II. This young, charming and able woman, so recently a distinguished and happy visitor in our midst, takes up the heavy duties of her great office at a time when most women of her age look forward to at least a few more years of youthful pleasure and limited responsibility.

Her father's passing is all the more tragic to her in that her Royal duties found her thousands of miles away when the call came to her beloved parent.

However, when the healing hand of time has lightened the burdens that now bear so heavily on every member of the Royal family, I hope that our

gracious Queen and her distinguished consort will again find time and opportunity to visit these shores. When that time comes, I hope they will be able to move freely among our people, and see in a more intimate way something of the Canadian people and the Canadian way of life. I hope those in authority may be able to relieve them in some degree of the trying round of official duties for whatever time they may be with us. I trust that they may be permitted to move more freely among us in the way that has endeared them to their own people in their own land.

I hope, I trust, indeed I am sure, that under Her Majesty Elizabeth II, Britain and the Commonwealth will find solution of their problems and troubles. In the fulness of time I see Britain regaining her traditional wealth and power, and our new Queen heading an Empire that once again will be the rallying point of a new and greater world democracy.

At this time I should like to extend my warmest congratulations to the Hon. the Prime Minister for the expression of confidence reposed in him and his administration by the people of this Province on November 22nd, last. I believe this particular occasion represents the warmest expression of approval ever registered in this province at any general election,

certainly if modern history is a guide.

Until quite recently the Hon. the Prime Minister of this Province enjoyed the honour of heading the only Conservative government within the boundaries of the Commonwealth. I am happy to say that he now has an eminent partner in that distinction.

Within recent months the electors of the United Kingdom again decided to entrust their affairs at a most difficult moment in their history to that great world statesman, the Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill. They have placed their fortunes in safe, tried and competent hands.

Not being too familiar with the intimate British political scene, I am not prepared to say they were motivated by a study of good government as exemplified by a Conservative administration in Ontario. None the less, they have decided that they will best be served at this time by a party with tried and proved political principles, and this after a none too successful experiment on the part of theorists whose Canadian and Ontario counterparts would like to impose on us a form of government that has been a failure wherever the people have been unfortunate enough to give it a trial. We are indeed

fortunate, I think, in having before us the results of experiments in Australia, in New Zealand and finally, Great Britain, as a warning as to what happens in countries that flirt with this particular will o' the wisp.

Not only is the Hon. the Prime Minister the recipient of a resounding vote of confidence but every member of his Administration won re-election. In most instances the Ministers of the Crown and the private members on the government side of this honourable House, received most impressive majorities at the hands of their respective electorates.

I do not, I assure you, regard the result of the November 22nd election as a mere party victory. It implies much more. It places on the shoulders of this Administration a heavy responsibility, a grave duty in relation to the conduct of our provincial affairs for the next five years or whatever may be the life of this Assembly.

It is obvious to me, and I am sure, to all of us, that all sections of our people, members of all parties, united in their support of a Premier and an administration who have rendered outstanding service to this great community we call Ontario. We do more

than appreciate that support. All of us on the Government side of this House enter on this session with the determination to be worthy of the confidence reposed in us. Only by so doing can we be assured of continued good government in Ontario. Only by so doing can we hope to deserve and retain the widespread support so generously accorded to us.

In the debates of coming weeks I am sure that the hon. members of all parties, whatever may be their differences, will work for the good of this province, and will keep in mind the seriousness of the times in which we find ourselves.

May I say that we all regret the enforced absence from our deliberations of our friend and colleague, the Minister of Highways and Deputy Prime Minister. Our hon. friend has done a magnificent job in expanding and improving one of the finest highway networks on this continent. His ready accessability, his sound common sense, his kindness, to mention a few of his many admirable qualities, have won for him the most marked esteem throughout the whole province.

We all regret the unfortunate accident that has halted for so many weary months an outstanding career of public service. We have reason to hope that the hon. Minister may be with us well before the con-

clusion of this session of the Assembly.

May I also extend my hearty congratulations to our colleague the worthy representative of the Riding of Elgin, on his well deserved elevation to Cabinet rank. As most of you know our hon. friend has served a fine apprenticeship, as a graduate of the C.A.C., as a soldier in World War I, as an Agricultural Representative, as a practical farmer, as chairman of the Select Committee on Conservation, and as a private member of this Body. I know of no one better qualified to administer the affairs of the important and growing Department of Public Works. I am sure that the Hon. the Prime Minister and his colleagues of the Cabinet welcome the hon. member for Elgin as a valued addition to their counsels. I wish him well in his new post as a minister of the Crown.

May I also extend my congratulations to the Hon. the member for Toronto, Eglinton on his warm acceptance at the hands of one of our great metropolitan ridings, and also on his appointment as a Minister of the Crown. His long and full experience in the educational field, his academic training and his native ability all fit him admirably for his post as Minister of Education. I congratulate the hon. the Prime Minister on his success in including in his inner

counsels a distinguished citizen of this great province, and one who has already proved his worth by rendering long years of outstanding service in the important field of education.

I think there is no single phase of governmental activity where more credit is due than that relating to the development of our system of King's highways. Necessarily, during the war years there was not only a curtailment of new construction, but there was also a substantial backlog of work related to general maintenance. The Hon. the Minister is to be commended for the vigor with which he tackled departmental problems and on the results which have been obtained.

I should like here to say a word of commendation respecting a project that is of great importance to the whole of Southern Ontario, and more especially to Southwestern Ontario. In the whole history of the highways system, I think one of the most important landmarks was the decision to construct an entirely new, dual-lane highway leading easterly from Windsor. This project on which work has already been commenced will serve that populous and prosperous section of Ontario centred around such points as Windsor, Chatham,

London, Ingersoll, Woodstock, Stratford, Kitchener, Galt and Brantford. Whatever may be the exact route, all these centres of population and the surrounding districts are bound to receive immense benefits. Such a modern, direct route will encourage the establishment of new industry. It will aid in farm marketing. It will be a boon to the tourist trade. Undoubtedly it will bring to Ontario thousands of American visitors travelling from New York and New England States to Detroit, Chicago and other mid-west U.S.A. points.

This highway will ultimately connect with the new interceptor road across the northern environs of Toronto, thence with Highway "2A". As I see it, we shall shortly have a dual-lane, limited access highway from Windsor to Newcastle and Port Hope. It does not require much imagination to see the day when this huge project will be carried through to the Quebec border. Certainly, pending developments on the St. Lawrence will hasten completion of the project clear across Ontario.

Again, I must commend the Administration for constructing the new, dual-lane highway from Toronto to Barrie. As I understand it, one lane is

already paved and in use and plans are to the effect that the second lane will be paved during the current year. Governments for the last 20 years or more have realized the inadequacy of the existing Highway No. 11, more especially the Toronto-Barrie portion which gives ingress to one of Ontario's most popular tourist areas. It was left to this administration to rectify a condition that has long been a nightmare to motorists, especially during the summer season.

Also, I think the House will entirely approve of the steps which have been taken to bring the Trans-Canada Highway into being. I am sure that the success of the Hon. the Prime Minister and the Hon. the Minister of Highways in reaching agreement with the Federal authorities on this great project deserve the hearty congratulations of this Assembly. This all-Canadian route is vitally needed to ensure the development of the great natural resources of the North. More than this it might well be a vital factor as an item in the vastly important program of national defence. A modern, paved highway from Halifax to Vancouver is a mammoth undertaking, and it is indeed difficult to appraise fully its ultimate great importance.

There has also been a most realistic approach to the problem of municipal roads. I shall not attempt to detail the many coneessions that have been made to the municipalities. However, I should like to point out

that when this government took office only about 450 municipalities were receiving provincial aid for roads. Under enactments of the past few years, provincial aid for roads and streets has been expanded to the point where it now assists some 1,400 municipalities -- this by including villages, towns and cities as well as counties and townships. Grants to municipalities in this connection are now nearly $30 millions a year, whereas when this Administration took office they amounted to only $3,600,000. a year. We have here, I think, very fair evidence as to how we view municipal problems.

The limited access highway is a feature of increasing importance. It is recognized by engineering authorities that modern, through highways can no longer serve the purpose of affording speedy, safe transportation, while at the same time giving access to adjoining land. Sometimes local interests demand concessions as to entrances, and so on, that are, shall I say, contrary to the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number. Generally, however, I think our people are taking a very sane and realistic view as to the controlled access feature. Indeed, every other consideration aside, the average person realizes that we simply cannot afford to build limited access highways at a cost of say, several hundred thousand dollars a mile, and then proceed to have the utility of such highways immediately destroyed on account of local interests.

I should also like to commend the Department of Highways in respect to their continuing campaign of safety education. The whole-hearted support of press and radio has been of immense value, also the efforts of very many organizations. More especially, the campaign is reaching into the schools, and certainly safety education cannot begin at too early an age.

Law enforcement on the highways is not, of course, the duty of the Highways Department. This problem is one for the Hon. the Attorney-General and the Ontario Provincial Police.

However, in this matter, the Highways Department is able to give considerable assistance in keeping our motoring public in line. Would-be drivers are given careful examination before receiving their licenses. As to the Province at large about seven to eight per cent fail on their initial test. In the Toronto metropolitan area, where traffic conditions are difficult, about 20 per cent of the candidates fail on their first trial.

In addition, a re-examination for license is always required in the following cases:

1) Following a fatal accident;

2) Where a driver has two accidents in 12 months;

3) Where a driver has three accidents in two years:

4) In any case where a driver over 70 is involved in an accident;

5) Yearly where a driver is over age 80; medical test and vision test is also required.

Back in 1943, there were 5,087 drivers who lost their licenses by suspension; 8,070 in 1947; 11,004 in 1948; 12,998 in 1949; 16,000 in 1950; and between 17,000 and 18,000 in 1951. And re-instatement is accompanied by numerous safeguards.

Despite all that has been done, if we are going to reduce the toll of deaths, injuries, and property damage on the highways, it would seem that law enforcement must be tightened up. I suggest to the Hon. the Attorney-General with all deference, that there should be constituted a stronger and better-equipped branch of the Provincial Police to deal with the law-breaking minority that infests our highways. I believe that adequate patrols doing this one job and no other would cut the traffic toll from its present formidable figures. Certainly we cannot afford to have the lives of almost a thousand people yearly snuffed out on our streets and highways, to say nothing of injuries and property losses. Perhaps also, the time is coming when a closer control of the mechanical condition of the vehicles using our public roads and highways will become necessary to ensure the safety of our people.

One measure that has proved its worth is the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, which was established in July, 1947. Under this noteworthy piece of legislation 896 unsatisfied judgments, 107 of them in relation to hit-run cases, have been paid for out of the fund to the extent of $2,056,466.77. Aside from the monetary compensation afforded innocent accident victims, it is worth noting that the offending drivers are off the road until they have repaid their indebtedness and have filed satisfactory proof of financial and physical responsibility.

In leaving this subject, I should like to remark that the difficulty as regards drivers is this. While the Department assures itself that a driver can drive safely, there can be no such assurance that he will drive safely. And this, as I see it, is the reason that we must step up the tempo of our police work on the highways so that we may round up the relatively few drivers who operate in defiance of good motoring manners.

In turning to another department for a moment, I am impressed by the extent to which provincial revenues are being devoted to the cause of education. Some $12 millions or thereabouts was the provincial contribution to this great public service when the present Administration took office. Today, the annual provincial expenditure is approaching

$60 millions, nearly $50 millions being represented by provincial grants respecting elementary and secondary schools.

Back in 1943, these education grants were only about $8½ millions a year. This enormous increase is reflected in several directions. We have more and better schools. In addition we are assisting in keeping the school tax on homes and farms within reasonable bounds. It has of course, been necessary to provide increased teachers' salaries more or less in line with the increased cost of living, and indeed, to continue to attract young men and women into the profession.

However, much more has been done than to provide additional finances to ensure the welfare of the 750,000 pupils in our elementary and secondary schools.

Recent enactments now require the furnishing of free text books to pupils in elementary schools. Furnished initially by the local authority, reimbursement is made by the Province to the extent of $3 per pupil per annum. Aid is also given in the provision of books for school libraries.

There is a pronounced swing toward the establishment of area schools throughout the Province. There are now 536 township school areas, involving the dissolution of 3,469 school sections, more than 64

per cent of the total number of such school sections in the Province.

Needless to say, these latter changes in the educational setup are first subject to approval of the local authority.

As a further contribution to the health and general welfare of the pupils in the elementary schools, the provincial undertaking to contribute one half the cost of supplying milk is welcomed as a desirable and progressive measure.

We all shall await with interest the details as related to our educational system which will no doubt be laid before us by the Hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop). One remark I should like to place on the record. I am greatly impressed by the facilities afforded by our technical institutes, the Provincial Institute of Mining at Haileybury, the Provincial Institute of Textiles at Hamilton, the Lakehead Technical Institute at Port Arthur and the Ryerson Institute of Technology in Toronto.

(Page B-20 follows)

More especially is the work of the Ryerson Institute coming to the fore. We feel, I think that there is a gap between the High Schools and Collegiates on the one hand and our Universities on the other. There are very many of our young folk who lack the inclination or the resources, or who for some sound reason do not seek to embrace a university career. Our technical schools, still more or less in their infancy, seem to me to constitute a bridge for this gap. Their facilities offer a combination of academic, scientific and practical training that fit hand and brain for a successful career in a nation that is presenting unexcelled opportunities for the youth who looks forward to an industrial career.

Schools of this type have long featured the American scene, and I think they have made a notable contribution in the construction of the most impressive industrial producing machine in the history of the world. Here in Ontario, there are unexcelled opportunities for example, in the electrical sphere, and this is natural enough when we consider the amazing growth of the Hydro enterprise.

Our predecessors in office for nine years managed to bring into production an inadequate expansion of the DeCew Falls plant near Niagara Falls. Never in

our history was there a more sordid, complete failure, a more total lack of vision than that displayed in relation to Hydro, and indeed in relation to the industrial growth of Ontario. The scene was not very long in changing when this Administration took over.

The Ear Falls plant on the English river was stepped up by 8,000 horsepower, coming into service in 1948.

The Stewartville plant, , producing 84,500 h.p. came into service in the same year.

Also in the same year the Aguasabon plant brought in an added 53,600 h.p.

In 1950, the Tunnell Site plant near Thessalon began to produce 56,000 h.p., urgently needed by the great industries in the Sudbury mining area.

The same year saw the completion of the Pine Portage plant at Nipigon, 80,000 h.p., and the mighty Des Joachims plant, 480,000 h.p. on the upper Ottawa.

Then the Cheneaux plant on the same river began delivery of 40,000 h.p., with an added 120,000 h.p. in 1951.

LaCave on the upper Ottawa began producing 64,000 h.p. in 1951 and will be delivering another 192,000 h.p. in 1952.

By the end of 1953, the Windsor steam plant

will be able to produce 354,000 h.p. and the Toronto steam plant, 536,000 h.p.

Developments at Queenston will give another 700,000 h.p. by 1955. Of this 400,000 h.p. will be available in 1954.

Projects completed or under construction will give Ontario an additional 2,874,700 h.p. by the end of 1955. Any one of the projects I have mentioned would, a few years ago, have been regarded as a major development, and indeed they are enormous projects.

As to the St. Lawrence, Ontario's share of undeveloped power here amounts to 1,100,000 h.p.,and, as the Prime Minister has intimated so often, Ontario is ready to go ahead just as soon as the green light flashes at Ottawa.

The St. Lawrence seaway, of course, is a federal matter, the responsibility of the federal authority. But the power development is an Ontario-New York State project, and here, this Province and New York State are in perfect agreement.

I am sure that every hon. member of this Assembly will join with me in demanding that Ottawa and Washington clear the way so that Ontario and New York State shall not be further hampered by international obstinacy.

The Hon. the Minister of Labour, and the members of his conciliation staff merit recognition for their good work. They have through the press and otherwise, been given full credit for successful intervention at a time when a dispute between employer and employee threatened to burgeon into a strike that would have been a disaster to the Toronto metropolitan area. I refer, of course, to the wage dispute between the Consumers' Gas Company of Toronto and its workers.

Again, their unceasing efforts brought about a cessation of hostilities as between the Toronto Transportation Commission and its operating staff, this after a 19-day strike that caused no small inconvenience in this great metropolitan area. More recently, the personal efforts of the Honourable Minister and his staff have contributed in no small way to bringing peace and satisfaction to both labour and management in the settlement of the differences between the Ford Motor Co. of Canada and its employees at Windsor.

Under the Minister's able sponsorship we have been able to enact some very advanced labor legislation. I might mention the establishment of the Ontario Labour Relations Board, the Act relating to fair employment practices, the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, and the generous and far-reaching amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act.

The legislation relating to stamp credits has been of immense benefit to many thousands of our workers who change jobs from time to time. This particular piece of legislation has resulted in the payment of more than $20 millions of what one might term "holiday money" to our casual workers.

Labor legislation presents many difficult problems. We are living in a highly competitive world, and our legislation must be sufficiently realistic to recognize the fact that we must not legislate ourselves out of our world markets. I think the voice of our working men and women was most definitely heard in approval of our efforts on November 22nd, last. I hope, and I indeed expect, that we shall continue to deserve their warm-hearted support.

May I add, also, that I believe the legislation of last session requiring equal pay for women doing the same work as men has won warm feminine approval. It just goes to show how captious was some of the criticism

levelled at this measure when it was before this honourable House.

In the field of health, our general hospitals are feeling the benefit of the increased scale of provincial aid.

In 1943, capital grants to general hospitals and allied institutions were just $17,500. In 1951, they were $2,039,174.

Maintenance grants in 1943, were $1,142,400., while in 1950 they were $7,840,600.

More than 10,000 beds have been added to our general hospital establishment, and before too long it is expected the increase will exceed 20,000 beds. The same story might be related as to aid to sanatoria. It is our hope that in the fulness of time, we may provide our citizens with sufficient hospital accommodation to render some scheme of hospital insurance at least worthy of consideration with some hope of providing the continuing benefits that such a scheme would entail.

Again, this same department is caring for nearly 20,000 mental patients. Some 300 beds have been added at Orillia. A 600-bed extension is under way at Brockville.

At Smith's Falls a new hospital and school for defectives is coming into being. Now housing more

than 400 patients, it will care for 2,400 men completed. It is interesting to recall that when the former government took office some 18 years ago, one of their first acts was to stop work on this badly needed institution--this in the face of a waiting list of 2,500 on file at the over-crowded Orillia institution.

In the Department of Reform Institutions we find the same story of progress. The Industrial Farm at Monteith has been re-established, while new and similar institutions have been established at Neys in Northwestern Ontario, at Burritt's Rapids in the East and at Burtch near Brantford.

The Schools for Boys at Galt and Brampton are continuing a work launched back in the days of the Conservative Government headed by the late G. Howard Ferguson. At Cobourg, the Girls' School likewise continues a notable work.

Impressive improvements have been made at the Guelph, Burwash and Mimico Reformatories, likewise at the Andrew Mercer Reformatory for Females here in Toronto.

In all these institutions the loss of liberty is the primary punishment. Reform, however, is the main objective of the Hon. the Minister and his officials. Training courses for custodial officers, the provision of educational facilities, outdoor

recreation, competitive sports and physical drill -- all these items feature a program of reclamation, more especially as to young offenders. I am sure that we shall all listen with the greatest interest whenever the hon. the Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) finds it convenient to inform this House as to the details of a most impressive program.

Again, we have seen a revolutionary revision of procedure in lands and forests administration. The former Department of Game and Fisheries has become the Wild Life Division of the Department where it logically belongs.

Without waiting for the final results of the mammoth survey of forest resources, the hon. the Minister of Lands & Forests (Mr. Scott) has proceeded to get our forest industries placed on a sustained yield basis.

A reckless and short-sighted program of export of our unmanufactured pulpwood and timber initiated by a former government has been halted and is about to disappear entirely. As a result we see such fine new towns as Terrace and Marathon and Red Rock which have come into being during the life of this government. All are built around new forest industry operating on a permanent basis. All of them are the homes of Ontario workmen and their wives and

children. All of them are complete with every modern facility -- stores -- churches -- schools -- hotels. And let me stress this point -- not one of these fine new centres would have existed today had not this government insisted on home manufacture of Ontario raw materials.

We have seen the introduction of a streamlined system of selling or leasing summer resort lands -- an immense aid in furthering the work of the Department of Travel and Publicity. This Department, the only one of its kind in the world, is giving real assistance in developing our tourist and holiday trade. Its work in establishing border information centres, in sponsoring courses for the training of young people entering the resort business, in licensing and inspecting resort establishments, and in advertising in many ways the advantages of Ontario as a vacation land -- all these activities are paying dividends in relation to our $200,000,000. a year tourist trade.

May I also commend the hon. the Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) for the part played by him and the hon. the Prime Minister in co-operating with the federal government so that the universal old age pension is now available to our older citizens. No Minister has been more assiduous in the performance of a great humanitarian work than has the Hon. the Minister of Welfare. I am glad that he has made such an

excellent recovery from his recent illness and I trust he may long be spared to direct a work that is so close to his heart.

One subject which requires the most serious consideration at this time is the incidence of taxation, coupled with the problems related to Dominion-Provincial-Municipal relations. Governments in this nation, faced with all sorts of demands, some deserving, some not so deserving, are required to find money and more money.

It is, I think, rather a startling commentary when we realize that the Dominion Government by way of sales tax, income tax and corporations tax -- the three main sources of revenue -- is taking more from the people of Canada today than at the very peak of spending during World War II.

A sheep can be sheared many times -- but the human being is the only known animal that can be skinned time after time -- and after a fashion survive the operation. However, the human being can stand only so much taxation, and, considering the three levels from which he is attacked in this country, I say that far too much of the tax dollar is going to the federal treasury -- too little to the provinces and the municipalities. The governments of our municipalities are called upon to give innumerable

services that touch intimately the lives of the people -- services that give direct, tangible benefits. It is very hard to convince the man on the street that he is getting very much tangible value for the billions that are being poured into the federal treasury.

I think it is generally agreed that grants or subsidies are not the best methods in relation to governmental finance. That they are necessary under present conditions cannot be denied. Our government here in Queen's Park has in the last eight or nine years increased its subsidies, mostly to municipal governments from less than $20 millions a year to $100 millions a year. I hate to think of what the position of our municipal authorities would be, lacking this aid.

Ottawa at this time has a surplus caused by over-taxation amounting to probably $600 millions. Let us say that Ontario carries 40 per cent of the Ottawa tax load -- actually Ontario's share is more. It follows that the people of Ontario have handed to Ottawa in the last seven or eight months at least $240 millions that Ottawa does not need. Call our provincial budget $260 millions a year, and then just imagine what Ontario could do with even a part of the extra $240 millions which is going to Ottawa. Think of this in terms of schools and universities,

roads and bridges, mental hospitals, aid to general hospitals, help as to housing, and so on.

Or think what even a quarter of this $240 millions would mean to our municipalities in terms of roads and streets, water supply and sewage disposal services, education, street lighting, and many other municipal facilities.

Here in Ontario we have a committee trying to formulate a plan for a new Provincial-Municipal setup. But basically, the trouble is that too much of the tax dollar goes to Ottawa and too little to the provinces -- all the provinces -- and the municipalities.

There has to be a new deal. Our business men cannot face the future with confidence -- they cannot lay up for a rainy day -- they are hampered in meeting the just demands of their employees -- just so long as the federal government is out to grab every loose dollar in the land. Even Ottawa is waking up to these elementary facts. Said Finance Minister Abbott in the House of Commons in October last:

> "I have made no secret of my concern over a system of taxation under which more than half of company profits are taken away by governments.
>
> The effects on incentive and efficiency can be extremely dangerous at a time when

"maximum output and economy in operations is so important as it is today."

Strange words are these from the author of the system that is grinding the ultimate dollar out of companies and individuals.

We are living in a great country and in prosperous times. But the prosperity, the living standards we now enjoy are nothing to what we could have if we could throttle down the spending proclivities of our federal masters.

I suggest that what we need is a realistic approach, federally, provincially and municipally to the whole question of taxation. We need a new delimitation of responsibilities and taxation fields. Our taxation needs to be geared reasonably to our resources, to our obvious needs, and not according to the spending whims of bureaucracy.

Our Prime Minister has found it possible to co-operate with the federal authority. We have reached agreement on the Trans-Canada Highway and on old-age pensions. We must, and I am sure we can, reach some sound basis in relation to governmental revenues, and whatever settlement is made must take cognizance of the needs of our municipalities. True, they have the enormous field of real estate taxation, yet even this great source has an absolute limit which

is being rapidly approached. The Dominion Government enjoys the fruitful, yes abundant field of income and corporations tax, sales tax, customs and excise, and innumerable other revenue sources. The provinces have fields that are definitely circumscribed, (and it is to the credit of this Administration that new taxation has been almost entirely avoided. But the key to our problem is in the hands of Ottawa and if there is not in that quarter a realistic and indeed early approach to solution, it is not unlikely that something approaching disaster will face our municipalities.

Looking forward to the immediate deliberations of this session, my hope is that among many other matters, we may bend our energies toward furthering a solution of our housing problem. Here, our difficulty is not merely a lack of accommodation. In a word, it is also a matter of costs. Where people of modest means are concerned, housing is just about pricing itself out of the market. The solution again, is largely in the hands of Ottawa. Control of materials and the financial aspects of the problem require more vigorous Ottawa action if we are to overtake one of our most serious domestic shortages.

I am most heartily in accord with proposals to be introduced whereby our unemployables will be granted pension assistance. Their situation is a bad,

indeed often a tragic one, and I think it is right and proper that these unfortunate people should be recipients of the same type of aid as those older citizens who no longer can provide their own support.

I am sure also, that the House will heartily approve of any legislation that will further the development of the enormous power going to waste on the St. Lawrence. It is heartening to recall that when Washington last turned its back on the scheme, the hon. Prime Minister of this province was able to assure the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister of Canada that Ontario was entirely prepared to make its contribution to the development in case Canada has to "go it alone". Indeed, I feel that many of our people would welcome the opportunity if it should happen that Canada undertook this vast project with no assistance from our neighbours to the South, for no one doubts our technical and financial ability to make it a reality.

We are gaining in Ontario in population.

Development of our natural resources brings ever new projects to the fore, as witness our iron ore developments. It is indeed fortunate that Ontario and Labrador are prepared to take up, in this field, where the Misabi deposits in Wisconsin reach the end of the trail. There is no more important element in the whole North American economy.

May I again congratulate the Hon. the Prime Minister on the proud position that he and his Administration have won in the hearts and minds of the people of this Province of Ontario. We face a period of unparalleled development in this great province, and to him and them has been entrusted the control of this tremendous flood of growth during the next five years, in a vote of confidence such as has never been granted to any leader in modern times.

May I also congratulate the representative of Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Davies) upon his re-election to be Speaker of this House, - a position he will fill as he has done in the past, with fairness and justice to all.

May we all in the deliberations in which we shall take part during the coming weeks, remember always the trust that has been given to us, and pray for guidance from Him without whose blessing and aid our every endeavor will be as nothing.

(Take D follows)

MR. J. ROOT (Wellington North): Mr. Speaker: In rising to second the motion for the adoption of the address presented to this House by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, I sincerely appreciate the honour thus extended to the constituency which I have the privilege to represent in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate you on the high position which you occupy. On various occasions I have been in the gallery and have watched you preside over the proceedings of this House. Having watched you and having met you, I know it will be a pleasure to serve in this House under your direction.

I should like to join with the hon. Member from London (Mr. Robarts) in expressing in a humble way the sadness that, I am sure, is felt by all of us because of the death of His Majesty King George VI.

The passing of His Majesty has brought forth through press and radio a great volume of eloquent tribute - eloquence that cannot possibly be equalled by any words of mine.

His home life was a model for Britain and the Commonwealth, a model for the whole world.

He had a keen sense of responsibility. He was a man who realized that there is a greater power than that of earthly kings. He used his high position to serve his people. His whole demeanour was in the very highest tradition of Royalty at its best, and the world is all the poorer for his passing.

We have a New Sovereign, Queen Elizabeth, Second, - Long may she reign, happy and glorious, and may we always sing from the heart "God Save the Queen".

Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) on the great personal vote of confidence he received last November from the people of Ontario. In my opinion there has never been an individual who has held the respect of more people in the province of Ontario at the same time than the hon. Prime Minister holds to-day.

I should like to congratulate the hon. members of the Government on the fact that every member was returned to this House to continue directing his department. This is not only a great personal tribute to these men. It is a great tribute to the policies the government has developed and is pursuing.

I feel that those of us who are private members supporting the government should take our place in this Assembly with a feeling of humility, a sense of responsibility and a desire to serve. I know that local issues play a part in elections, but I think we all realize that the main reason that hon. members supporting the government have taken over practically all of this House is the fact that thousands of men and women back in the constituencies broke past political traditions to register their approval of a record of sound, sane, progressive administration.

Perhaps I should say a word regarding the honourable members who sit in Opposition. I think they

should take it as a personal tribute that their seats did not go along with the rest. In the light of what took place all over the province I can't think they are here because of the policies they supported.

I should like to express my personal regret that the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) is not able to take his place in the House as a result of his unfortunate accident. In expressing my own regret I am sure I am expressing the regret of every hon. member in the House. I am sure every hon. member joins me in the hope that he will shortly be able to resume his heavy and important responsibilities.

May I congratulate the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) on the recovery he has made from his recent illness. It gives us all pleasure to see him again resuming the numerous duties of his most important post.

I should like to congratulate the hon. Member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas) and the hon. member for Toronto-Eglinton (Mr. Dunlop) on their elevation to Cabinet rank.

The hon. Member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas) has had a varied experience along a number of lines, has served his apprenticeship as a private member, and adds strength to the government as he administers the important portfolio of Public Works.

The hon. Member for Eglinton (Mr. Dunlop) has many qualifications that eminently fit him to head one of the most important posts within the gift of the province, the Department of Education.

I am sure the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is happy in these recent additions to the ranks of his immediate advisers.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word of appreciation as to the Civil Service of this great Province. During the past eight years I have been in contact many times with various branches of the Service and have found in every department men and women who are courteous and efficient. This, I believe, is a great asset to the Government.

It is my intention this afternoon to deal with a few phases of the record of this administration and perhaps leave one or two suggestions for the government and the honourable members to consider.

The hon. Member for London (Mr. Robarts) and other hon. members represent large urban centres. No doubt in the course of this debate we will hear from hon. members from Northern Ontario, eastern Ontario, in fact from all parts of the Province. Since the constituency I have the honour to represent is one of the finest rural constituencies in the Province, comprising 2/3rds of Wellington County and 2/3rds of Dufferin County, I hope the hon. members will understand why most of my remarks will deal with policies that affect our rural people.

I do not suppose there is any policy developed during the past eight years which has done more to change the rural way of life, which indeed has done more for Ontario, as a whole, than the policies with regard to hydro development and rural electrification. In 1945 the dependable

peak capacity of our hydro system was about 2,597,400 H.P. In 1950 it was up to 3,659,900 H.P. For 1955 the estimate is 5,554,200 H.P. and this without allowing for the St. Lawrence development that will give an added 1,100,00 H.P. This tremendous increase in electrical power is making possible a great expansion in industrial life. In this period of expansion the rural people have not been forgotten as too often they were forgotten in the past.

Back in 1942 the Government of that day added 43 miles of rural hydro lines, in 1943 only 21 miles. In the years 1945-51, inclusive, hydro has added 18,339 miles of new rural lines providing 185,761 new rural services. As you all know one-half of the cost of installing rural lines is paid by the government. In the period 1945-51 more than $49,000,000 has been paid out of the provincial treasury to assist in the construction of rural lines. To appreciate what this means to rural people I will give the figures for Wellington and Dufferin Counties.

In 1941 in Wellington County 34.4% of farms had hydro service, in 1951 in Wellington County 69% of farms had hydro service.

Under the previous administration the rates in Dufferin County were higher than in some other districts with the result that only 16.3% had hydro in 1941. In 1951, sixtyOnine per cent of the farms had hydro.

To appreciate the difference in the policies of this administration and those of the government that was

in power prior to 1943 I would remind you that on March 25th, 1941 a question was answered in this House about hydro installations on the Queen Elizabeth Way between Niagara Falls and Hamilton. Members were advised that 36.5 miles of lighting was being installed on this highway from the Windemere Cutoff to the Thorold Road. Cost was $263,433.82 with another $15,000 to complete. There you have the picture of a government taking the tax dollars of the people of Ontario to build a lighting system on a highway. At the same time the farm people were crying for service. They were groping in the gloom of the same lamps and lanterns their fathers and grandfathers used before them.

Under the policies of the present Administration the picture has changed. To-night the lights will be out on the highway but all over rural Ontario the lights will twinkle in the farm homes as they have never twinkled before in the history of this province.

We know that in the homes where those lights twinkle the farm women have refrigeration, electric stoves, electric washing machines, pumping systems with water on tap and bathrooms facilities instead of the primitive toilet in the back yard.

We know that in the barns there are electric grinders, milking machines, milk coolers and many other labour-saving devices. The people of Ontario appreciate the hydro policies of this Government. They are well pleased that by a program of steady pressure and co-operation with the federal Government, at last

we are assured that with or without the co-operation of the United States we will see the development of the St. Lawrence Waterway -- the St. Lawrence with all that it means in power development, with Ontario cities becoming Ocean ports - Ocean ports that will give us freer access to wider markets.

In the Department of Highways we find a realistic and progressive program. All over Ontario we find on the Provincial Highway system evidence of a great construction and paving program.

When this Government took office 450 municipal units received grants amounting to $3,600,000 a year. To-day Provincial aid goes not only to counties and townships but it is extended to cities, towns, and villages as well, in all some 1400 municipal units. The subsidies have increased to nearly 30 millions a year, more than eight times as much as under a former government.

This increase in municipal assistance is making it possible for the local municipalities to develop a program of construction and snow-plowing which they were not able to undertake in the past.

Better roads mean a better way of life for the rural people. They make it possible for those engaged in transport to give better service moving goods and produce between different municipalities. The whole Highway program makes for a better way of life for everyone in the province of Ontario. Good roads are perhaps one of the greatest attractions to the thousands, yes millions, of tourists who visit our province.

There is one feature of the Provincial Highway system that I would like to mention for the consider tion of the government. This situation creates a bottle-neck in the highway system and places a burden on the taxpayers of my constituency. There are five provincial highways ending on the borders of North Wellington and Dufferin. We have Highway No. 89 between Cookstown and Primrose with pavement ending at Shelburne. We have No. 87 carrying traffic from the Lake Huron district as far as Harriston and, again, is a dead end. We have No. 23 coming up from the London or Western Ontario district to Palmerston or Teviotdale and again we have reached the edge of North Wellington. No. 19 comes from the Stratford area to Tralee and again we have reached the border of North Wellington. We have No. 25 starting at Burlington, coming through Halton County to Acton and there at the south end of Wellington North we have reached the end of the highway system and are back on the gravelled county roads. This situation must be a gre t source of irritation to people using these five Provincial highways and you will appreciate that five highways pouring traffic onto the county road system increases the burden of traffic and taxation and creates a serious problem for those responsible for maintaining our County Road system.

I realize that this administration is not responsible for this situation. It was created in 1937 by a government that was turned out of office in 1943. I know that I am expressing the sentiment of a great many people in

my own constituency as well as others when I say I hope the day is not too far distant when this bottleneck can be eliminated.

The Department of Public Welfare has done a magnificent job with increased pensions and assistance for the aged, the blind, dependant mothers, and neglected children. In Wellington & Dufferin Counties the assistance for the year 1943-44 amounted to only $261,301. In the year 1949-50 the same counties received $534,442. These figures show that the Department of Welfare is doing its part for those people who through no fault of their own are unable to provide the necessities of life.

I understand that the Department intends to introduce legislation to provide assistance for people who are totally incapacitated. This is another step in the right direction. It will be appreciated by thousands of people who are confronted with problems they cannot themselves solve.

As time goes on we shall appreciate more and more the policies which have been developed by the Department of Education. To-day thousands of boys and girls are receiving advanced education their parents were not able to receive. This advanced education is made possible by the generous grants provided by the province.

These grants make it possible for local school boards to improve their schools, to pay teachers fair salaries, provide transportation so that many of our rural boys and girls can attend high school and yet be home at night, thus maintaining their contact with their

family circles.

In my own constituency the grants for education have increased from $56,088 in 1943, to $351,110 in 1950. These increased grants have done much to relieve the burden of direct taxation on the property owner.

For many years one of the crying needs of this province was more hospital facilities. This government was the first to recognize the necessity for capital grants to help our general hospitals to provide necessary extensions.

Maintenance grants also are paid on a vastly increased scale. I think the hospitals that serve North Wellington and Dufferin are typical of the hospitals that serve every community in Ontario. In the fiscal year 1942-43 our hospitals received grants amounting to $17,833.30. In the fiscal year 1950-51 the very same hospitals received grants amounting to $397,983.58 -- more than 22 times the amount paid by a previous administration.

The Department of Health is truly doing a magnificent job.

(Page E-1 follows)

While I am speaking of hospitals I should like to draw the attention of the House to a pioneer venture in the village of Shelburne. The people of that fine district have organized what I believe is the first co-operative hospital or nursing centre in the province of Ontario. It may be that the co-operative idea will help to solve the problem of high hospitalization costs. I am surethe hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) will keep an eye on Shelburne and lend every possible assistance.

I should like to congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) on the financial position of the province. A great expansion program has been carried out without increasing the per capita debt. Ontario is one of the most attractive provinces in all of Canada in which to establish a new home or industry.

This government unlike its predecessor, has never collected any personal income tax. I hope it will never have to. I can't think of any form of taxation that does more to destroy initiative and curtail the production of essential goods than personal income tax.

The people of Ontario are becoming more and more conservation conscious. The output of our provincial nurseries for re-forestation is steadily

increasing. I believe in 1951 almost 20,000,000 trees were provided.

Our fish hatcheries are distributing hundreds of millions of fry and fingerlings each year. This will pay big dividends in added tourist trade as well as assuring recreation and sport for our own people.

The government is assisting in the construction of huge conservation dams. I should like to stress a further development - I am referring to the construction of farm ponds.

Many people are concerned about falling water tables. If the provincial government could see its way clear to give leadership and some financial aid I think it would only be a matter of time until we could have thousands of farm ponds scattered all over the province. These ponds would help to check run-off. They would feed water back into the sub-soil. They would provide a reserve of water for livestock and in many cases for fire fighting.

Fire is a constant menace to rural people and with the coming of hydro the old cisterns and hand pumps are disappearing leaving many farms without adequate water reserves. No doubt some of these ponds fed by springs or running streams could be stocked with fish.

I should like to offer special congratulations to the hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy). His stature was never greater than it is at the present time. He is one of those men who become great by rendering service.

The department of Agriculture has done much for Ontario as a whole, and for rural people in particular. Under the present Government we have seen a great increase in grants to agricultural societies and farm organizations. Hard work has always been associated with farm life but "all work and no play makes Jack a dull boy." With that in mind the government in 1946 introduced the Community Centres Act. Since that Act was introduced over $1,200,000 has been contributed by the province to assist in the construction of Community Halls, skating rinks, athletic fields and swimming pools. These are the things that help to keep our young men and young women on the farm.

The Ontario Agricultural College continues to make its great contribution to rural life and to the province as a whole.

The Ontario Veterinary College has won a world wide reputation and its service to farmers cannot be measured in dollars and cents. For the past seven years this College was under the direction of one of

North America's outstanding veterinarians, the late Dr. A. L. MacNabb. I am sure that everyone in the House regrets the passing of this great citizen of Ontario during very recent days.

I understand that the Government intends to introduce legislation to give financial assistance to farmers' sons and generally young people who intend to make their living by farming.

There was a time when it did not take too much capital to start farming. To-day the high cost of labour makes power equipment a necessity. To-day's inflated prices make it impossible for many people to start farming who would like to farm. So I am sure every member in this Assembly will think favourably of any legislation to assist young people to establish farms, because after all agriculture is the back-bone of any successful economy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one suggestion that I hope will receive favourable consideration from the Government. Down through our history we have erected monuments and memorials to great men and women. We have our war memorials, we have memorials to men and women like Laura Secord, Sir Isaac Brock, Sir Adam Beck, Sir John A. MacDonald and many other historic figures. What I want to suggest is a memorial to our pioneers,

the common people, who laid the foundations for the development of our Province. There are a few small local museums. The Women's Institutes are compiling the Tweedsmuir History of Rural Ontario - and a very good job they are doing.

I suggest that Ontario should have a central, permanent memorial or museum, perhaps connected with the Ontario Agricultural College. It is not for me to say what the final form of this museum should be but I can visualize a log house of substantial size re-erected on the site chosen for a museum. Adjacent, we could erect a typical pioneer log barn. In these buildings we could place every type of pioneer furniture, implement and machine, we could locate. Let us do this before it is too late.

In the barn we would find such implements as the cradle for harvesting the early crops, the scythe, the sickle, the wooden forks and rakes, the yoke for the oxen, the iron kettle that reminds us that the pioneers went to the maple bush for their sugar supply.

In the house we would have the fire-place with the iron cooking utensils, the spinning wheel, the dash churn with the wooden butter bowls, the molds for making candles, the muzzle loading musket for hunting game, perhaps a rope bed and a wooden cradle.

On the shelves we might place the stories of some of the pioneer families. On the table we would find the candlestick and perhaps a family Bible, that book which was the only book in many of the pioneer homes, containing the records of the family, births, marriages and deaths, outlining the principles that were a guide to the men and women who with courage and vision laid the foundations of this province.

I hope the government will give serious consideration to this suggestion. I know of nothing that would be of greater interest to future generations than an establishment of this type that would give an accurate picture of how the founders of this province lived.

I think it would be a good thing for Ontario if every year thousands of people could visit a museum of this kind and realize that great problems can be solved by common people as well as by great people - people who co-operate with their fellow-men, people who have faith in God, courage, initiative and vision.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

MR. OLIVER: Will the hon. Prime Minister tell us what is going on to-morrow?

MR. FROST (Prime Minister): To-morrow we will proceed with the Bills.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4:52 of the clock, p.m.

- - - - - - - - - - -

ONTARIO

First Session
of the
Twenty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 21, 1952, et seq.

0

Volume V

Wednesday, February 27, 1952.

0

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

R. C. Sturgeon,
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

F I F T H D A Y

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE, HELD IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY FEBRUARY 21st, 1952, et seq.

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

- - - - - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Wednesday, February 27, 1952.

- - - - - - - - - -

The House having met. 3 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

HON. L. D. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Porter,

That a Select Committee of this House be appointed to inquire into all matters affecting leaseholds and rentals in the Province with authority to consider in connection with property values, all rentals charged for various types of accommodation including shared accommodation, room rentals, room and board and all other matters which the Committee considers should be investigated.

The Committee to have authority to sit during the interval between Sessions and have full power and authority to call for persons, papers, and things, and to examine witnesses under oath, and the Assembly doth hereby command and compel the attendance before the Committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the said Committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings or deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.

The said Committee to consist of nine members and to be composed as follows:

Mr. MacOdrum, Chairman

Messrs. Cecile, Fishleigh, Mapledoram, Porter, Reaume, Roberts, Thomas (Ontario) and Warrender.

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

In the event of a vacancy occurring in the membership of the Committee the vacancy shall be filled by the appointment of a member on the recommendation of the leader of the party to which the former member belonged.

Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion to the House, I would like to make some explanations in regard to this matter, which has been referred to in the Speech from the Throne.

The Hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity

(Mr. Cecile) under whose charge the matter of rentals has been since last spring, is away to-day with a cold, and I am going to take this opportunity of explaining, in his place, some of the matters relating to this very fascinating problem, and I will ask the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter), who sat on the Select Committee last year, to give a general report to the House as to what took place, and the course the Select Committee followed during and following the last Session of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I asked the Rental Administration to place on the desks of the hon. members the new regulations which are just printed. If they are not already there, they will be very shortly. I also asked them to have placed on the desks of the hon. members a summary of the regulations perhaps, in other days, we might have referred to as "Rental Regulations Made Easy".

This summary, of course, is not intended as a substitute for the regulations, but it is a summary which is said to be written -- and I may say I have not as yet read it myself -- in language that laymen can understand. If such be the case, if the lawyers in the Rental Administration have been able to produce a summary of these regulations which is understandable

to the "man on the street", it will have achieved a great deal, perhaps more than lawyers have ever been able to achieve in previous days.

The Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) has just handed me the regulations and summary, and some other material to which he will refer in a few moments.

I would like to give the hon. members of this House a little of the background involved in this very vexing problem, at least we found it vexing. Indeed, the Federal Government found it so vexing that they considered it as a sort of "hot potato" which they dropped, and there was no alternative but for us to pick it up.

In referring to the Federal Government, I am not one of those who continually likes to harp at the Federal Government. The fact of the matter is, rather than find differences with the Federal Government, I like to find points of agreement. There are some cases, however, in which I disagree with the Federal Government, and this is one of them. In a few days we will have legislation here which will show the measure of agreement we found ourselves able to achieve with the Federal Government, in connection with the very important matters which will come before

the House.

The background of this problem goes back, I think, to the very dark days of the last war. I think, in 1941, there was introduced into this country a series of controls to prevent the increase in the cost of living, and which were designed in those days to help Canada pull its full weight in the struggle which threatened our very existence. At that time, rental controls were introduced.

These rental controls continued, with many variations, up to, I think, the 30th of April, 1951, at which time the Federal Government dropped out of the picture. And I may say to the hon. members of this House, quite frankly, that we here would have liked to have been left out of that picture altogether. We felt if the rental controls had been continued for a measurable time, perhaps a year or two, provided the rate of housing construction was continued at the rate it was progressing in the fall of 1950, that rental regulations would automatically vanish from the picture. Indeed, they were becoming less pressing all the time.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government, co-incidentally with dropping the rental regulations,

also dropped the provisions we had arranged with them in connection with construction of houses, with the very apparent effect that the construction of houses in the province was going to fall off. In the light of that, there was no other option but for this Government, and this House last year, to take the responsibility of picking up the rental regulations where the Federal Government had dropped them, and in picking them up, we hoped to do a better job than they had done, and I think that, by and large, a better job has been done.

I think the policy can best be taken from the wording of the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the last regular Session, where it says:

> "It is with apprehension that my Government views of the expressed intention of the Government of Canada to abandon at this time, the control of rents. It is hoped that the emergency with which the nation is faced in these unusual days may result in a reconsideration of this intention."

Those were the very words used by his Honour at that time, when speaking before the House. It goes on:

> "In the event that there is no change, a measure will be introduced for your consideration which will enable the Government of Ontario, within its limited power, to continue control over rents in these times when shortages are evident on every hand,

and to lessen hardships for tenants and landlords."

That was the policy then. It is the policy to-day.

Last Session, Mr. Speaker, we appointed a Select Committee of the House. It was representative of all parties of this House. Some of the members of that Committee are not members to-day, but I would like now to pay tribute to them for their job, which was very well done indeed. The approach of this Committee to the problem of rentals was a completely non-partisan approach. As a matter of fact, all of the decisions of the Committee, as far as I am aware, were unanimous decisions, and the decisions of the Committee were accepted without question by Cabinet Council without any variations, and were translated into the regulations. The Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) will explain what took place in connection with the freezing of rentals, effective, I think, May 1st, and the letting-up of the freezing of rental regulations, which took place on the recommendation of the Committee.

We found amongst other things, that the rental regulations consisted of an immense hodge-podge of the regulations, commencing in 1941, with

almost countless amendments, with the result that lawyers or laymen found it an almost impossible task, unless they were familiar with the background, to ascertain exactly what the meaning of the law was.

(Take "B" follows)

As a result of that, a revision of the regulations has taken place and that revision is tabled here to-day. I hope that the revision is a good one. I hope it is intelligible. It would be too much to say that it is perfect, but I think that these new regulations will make it easier for those engaged in rental controls to know the meaning and the effect of the law and the regulations now. That, I think, is one of the problems with which our people have been faced, the matter of understanding of what the regulations mean. As far as the part I referred to about "rental regulations being made easy"; that is something to enable the average layman and lawyers to read over and get the gist of what is meant by the regulations. But that statement is in no way intended to supercede the regulations themselves.

This Committee which is mentioned in the motion before the House is a committee which I trust will also function in a completely non-partisan way with a view to bringing to bear on this problem the best thoughts and the best ideas of the members who are very widely representative of this province. I might say, Mr. Speaker, the Chairman himself is one who had experience in the days of rental administration during the time the Federal government

handled that problem. He is familiar with the old regulations and is familiar with the importance of them and has many ideas concerning the betterment of practices.

This Committee is also representative, of course. A Committee that is empowered to sit between Sessions, and to call witnesses, would necessarily have to be a small committee. But nevertheless, it is representative of Toronto. It is representative of the lakehead; representative of London and Hamilton, representative of the Opposition, also. I might say I discussed this matter with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) and I think it might have been the Liberal group perhaps properly could have insisted upon two members, but on the other hand, in order to get a territorial report, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) raised no question at all. He nominated the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume), the present Mayor of the city of Windsor, representing another important area in this province and the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett); and a representative member for southern Ontario who has his riding in that fine progressive city of Oshawa (Mr. Thomas) Ontario.

I think there we have a group of members of this House who can take the rental regulations without any reservations whatever, look them over with a view of giving to our people, both landlords and tenants, every degree of reasonable treatment and justice which can be given to them.

Mr. Speaker, personally -- and I know this is the feeling of the House -- I think our policies should be designed towards a decontrol as soon as that is possible, but I see no possibility for some very considerable time with the pressure of the growth of population and people coming into this province. With the Federal material and credit restrictions, it is going to be indeed difficult to keep up to our tempo of 1950 of 35,000 houses. We would like to run that up to 50,000 houses because if we were to have a year or two at 50,000 houses, the pressure would be very much eased.

Without in any way directing the Committee in what they should do, we have made this suggestion publicly, that controlled areas of this province might be immediately decontrolled, that is, wide stretches of the agricultural portion of this province and small communities and hamlets. After all, the real pressing problem is centered around communities.

which I mentioned as being those places represented by members of the Committee, the larger areas. It is not desirable to spread our efforts into places where perhaps you get a few of the more freakish demands for rental control, or some areas which should not be controlled at all. We have made this suggestion. If I am wrong about this the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) can correct me, but I think the suggestion was made that the Rental Administration should get in touch with each member of the House here and ask what areas in the members' opinion should be or might be decontrolled. Then, in order to safeguard the matter, to advise the clerk of the municipality that it is felt this area might be decontrolled and that action would be taken in, say, six months or three months' time unless municipal council passed a resolution to the contrary. In other words, it would leave that part of the matter in the hands of the municipal council and we would get away from the application of these regulations in the areas of Ontario where there is not any real need for them and probably never was.

That leaves, of course, the hard kernel of this problem, that is, , the larger communities and areas in the province of Ontario, places where we have the pressure due to growth and expansion, and other

large places to be dealt with by this Committee in its wisdom. That, Mr. Speaker, is the purpose of this Select Committee. I am satisfied that the other Select Committee we had previously, produced very real results for the province, and effected very real betterment for the province, and I am satisfied with this Committee which is presently nominated will do the same thing.

In order to bring the hon. members up to date in connection with the matter I would ask your permission to have the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) follow me and speak, and tell of the work of the Committee and fill in the part of the story that I have not told.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, the problem which has been outlined by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is, of course, one of the most difficult, and in the view of some people, the most difficult problem that can be laid at the door of any government. About a year before the Ontario Leasehold Regulations Act came into effect, about two years ago, there was a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada to decide whether or not the Leasehold Regulations of the Federal government, which were then applicable to all rent control throughout the Dominion of Canada, were still in effect and were constitutional at the time.

This government was represented at that hearing and it was decided in that case at that time, under the circumstances that the control policy of the Federal government was being carried on for the purpose of winding up or bringing to a gradual termination, an orderly conclusion the work which they had commenced during the emergency of War. Although, as in normal times, leaseholds and the control of individual ownership in real estate is a provincial responsibility and comes within one of the provincial powers under the British North America Act, nevertheless, it has been decided that in a War emergency where a system of controls is required to make possible the orderly progress of the economic life of the country that the power to deal with leasholds along with the power to deal with many other matters such as price control, was for the time being, a Federal power.

In the case that came before the Supreme Court of Canada, it was held that two years ago conditions were such that the leasehold regulations then were within the power and capacity of the Federal government to continue, and that they be effectively enforced, in view of the fact that there was evidence that a general policy of decontrol was being adopted.

. One of the features of that policy of decontrol was that as soon as tenants vacated any property after a certain date, that property became free of control entirely. The result of that simply was this, that in due course we had throughout the country, a great many properties which had been freed from control, where rents were charged according to whatever the traffic might bear, where very much higher rents in some cases were charged, and quite legitimately charged, than those properties that remained under control.

In other words, where these properties had been freedfrom rent control, there existed a very unfair and unequitable situation.

Now, as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has mentioned, if the building of houses had continued at the steady and increasing rate that we had up to the last year, then the whole situation might have rectified itself in due time and these inequities that appear to have developed, might have turned out to be temporary, but that is not what happened.

A year ago, the Federal government decided that it was time for them to discontinue controls and, of course, the power to deal with the matter reverted to the provinces and that was the reason why we

passed the Act in 1951 known as the "Leaseholds Regulations Act."

When we took over rent control we were first of all faced with the great inequities that appeared as between those properties that had been freed from control and those properties which were still under control.. Therefore, in passing the Act, we passed a measure which in the first place, simply took over the Federal regulations as they were and gave us full power to make amendments as and when we saw fit. Of course, it required some time and a great deal of investigation before we were in a position to decide on the matter of policy and what sort of changes should be made. The Act came into force on April 30th, 1951, and it brought into effect a continuation of the rental regulations that were then in force in Ontario under the Federal regulations. It was at that time the government decided to set up a rentals committee and that committee sat over a period of several weeks. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has mentioned the composition of this committee and the very constructive work that was done and I wish to second what he has said about the work that was done by the various hon. members of the committee, especially including those hon. members of the Opposition Party who sat on it, and approached this problem in an impartial way. I think

great headway was made under all the circumstances. This committee not only held meetings in the Parliament Buildings but also moved about into some of the cities of Ontario such as Toronto, Hamilton, Windsor, London and Sarnia. The committee had intended to move into some other of the cities but a certain event of some importance--at least, of some importance to us--took place and the committee was dissolved before we were able to proceed any further on the itinerary.

The first thing that was done on the recommendation of this committee was to pass what was known as a "Freeze Order" which was to have a temporary effect, so that all the rents as of April 17th, 1951, were frozen by regulation, so that no landlord could increase any rent that was in effect at that time. The purpose of that order was that during the time the committee was sitting and before any general regulations were amended, it would be impossible for any legitimate increase of rents. That "Freeze Order" was finally dissolved some months later after the rents committee made its first report. The committee reported on August 1st, 1951, at least they reported shortly before that but regulations were passed following this report, on August 1st, 1951, and these regulations were in all respects, designed to carry out

in detail the recommendations of this Select Committee.

The regulations that were passed at that time were, to this effect, first, all dwellings which were formerly decontrolled under the Federal decontrol policy under the latest regulations of the Federal Government, as they became vacated, were brought under control again and they had to submit to appraisals and evaluations, just as they had in the earlier days of control.

Secondly, certain additional provisions were made for increases of rent, certain new reasons for increases were provided, whereby a landlord could apply for an increase in rent. These were enlarged to the following three classes of cases: where there was substantial renovation or repair; where there was sub-letting by a tenant; where there was an increase in the municipal taxes. I might say that in the course of the proceeding of the rent committee, the committee sat in the various cities I have just mentioned and many deputations came forward, many representatives of groups of interested organizations and also individuals, and we had the advantage of every conceivable viewpoint on every aspect of the whole rent control problem.

(Page C-1 follows)

In the third place, these amendments provided that the landlord was to be given the right on six months' notice to recover possession of a dwelling if he desired the dwelling as a residence for himself or members of his family. This widens the former regulations to some extent, - if he desired it for his family it was not necessary to prove need, as previously. In other words, the landlord, as the result of this amendment, if he wished to put into that house either himself or members of his family -- which relationships were defined -- all he would have to do would be to give the six months' notice. Following that, a number of these six months' notices were given, and landlords were able under these circumstances to get possession of their property.

In the fourth place, it was provided that two-year leases that might be made between a landlord and tenant where the tenant was already in possession of the property would be effective to fix the maximum rental without the necessity of applying to a rentals appraiser. This may require some little explanation.

Under the rental regulations, once a tenant was in possession the tenant had what is described as security of tenure. No system of rent control can possibly be effective unless some security of tenure is provided for; and it was only under certain conditions and for certain reasons that a tenant could be evicted from controlled property. So that, if a

tenant was once in possession he could not be put out unless he came within some of the special provisions in the regulations. It was thought it might be a good departure at that time to provide for the greatest possible freedom of contract between the landlord and tenant, when the two parties had a reasonable equality of bargaining power, so that the tenant could not be overborne by a landlord who had the right to put him out. If the landlord did not have the right to put him out, the landlord could then come to him and say, "I will give you a two-years' lease on certain terms, if it is worth something to you to have that definite security of tenure. That will mean that, even if I want the house for my family use I won't be able to put you out during those two years." The idea of this provision is that gradually, we hope, a number of landlords and tenants will get together and work out leases on a reasonable basis which will be fair to both parties.

That has been followed by a very large number -- some thousands -- of two-year leases of that kind being entered into. We do hear complaints. There are cases where landlords have misrepresented the position to some extent. Perhaps they have got a higher rent from their tenants than they would have had if the tenant had been fully aware of the position. But by and large, the information we are given by the Administration would indicate that, although these

two-year leases represent on the average some increase in rent, they do not represent anything like the great increase that might have been expected, and they do represent what is a fair rent decided upon by two parties dealing at arms' length without having any outside appraiser or official determine in an arbitrary way what that rent will be. I think that on the whole that provision served a very useful purpose and relieved the situation to a very great extent.

At a later time, some further regulations were passed. These amendments that I mention were the result of specific recommendations of the Committee. There were a number of other matters which the Committee discussed and upon which it was not prepared to make unanimous recommendations; and some of these matters were later considered by Cabinet Council; and further amendments were brought in and included in the complete revision of the regulations to which the hon. Premier has referred.

First, rental boards are provided for to replace the Court of Rental Appeals which had been set up under federal regulations, and these rental boards are given somewhat enlarged powers. One of the complaints constantly received in the sittings of the Rental Committee was that the Rental Court of Appeal was not always a suitable tribunal for the purpose of deciding the peculiar problems which arise

between landlords and tenants. The only power that a judge had was to consider an appraiser's appraisal of property and decide whether that appraiser had done the right thing within the limits of his specific authority to appraise. The result was that very few appeals were ever allowed. Also it was one of the complaints that these rental courts sat during the daytime; they were carried on with some formality the formality of a court, and many tenants found it extremely inconvenient to present their cases, and very often they were not in a position to employ counsel even though they thought that it might have been of assistance to do so.

In some cases, the personnel of the rentals boards which are contemplated by these amendments may be the same as those who sat on the former courts, -- the courts which are still sitting. They might be members of a court of revision; they might be others who are appointed from outside. An object of the change was that in most urban areas these boards would be free to sit in different parts of a city, perhaps in a place convenient for people to go. One of the prime functions of these boards would be to attempt conciliation between the two parties. They would not be bound down by a too rigid set of rules as to appraisals. If they were satisfied that a landlord

and a tenant who came before them were in a position to present their cases fully and satisfactorily, and could bring them to an amicable compromise, then they would fix the rent on that basis, if they were satisfied that it was fair, and that would be the maximum rent. This is the principle behind the change involved in the amendment.

In the second place, the rental appraisers who appraise these properties are given a somewhat greater latitude under the new amendment to fix the rentals at the generally prevailing level as of January 1st, 1952, and in coming to their conclusions they are permitted to look at the level of rents that has been established in that area under these two-year leases if there are a sufficient number of them to show any trend or any sign of a change. They are just permitted to look at them, they are not bound by them. They may find in some cases that two-year leases have some elements of unfairness in them. But they are allowed to look at them as one of the measuring sticks by which they can decide what is the generally prevailing rent in the area.

In the third place, there are certain restrictive by-laws in many of the cities which have been overriddenby the Federal rent control regulations, and many premises were turned into boarding houses and other types of business of that kind which would

never have been allowed under the municipal by-laws. That was one of the regulations known as Regulation 200. We have by this amendment changed that, and we now revert to the municipal by-laws. It is up to the municipality to decide whether a restrictive by-law of that kind should apply or whether it should not, but this does not affect any existing business that has been established; it will prevent any new business of that kind being established legally under the regulation where a municipal by-law prevents it.

In the fourth place, the landlord's rights in respect to obnoxious and destructive tenants are somewhat enlarged.

In the fifth place, where a tenant is sub-letting, the landlord is given greater consideration in the matter of increasing rents.

In the sixth place, as the hon. Premier has pointed out, a provision is included for exempting municipalities where it is felt that rent control is no longer necessary, and it is simply provided that where by order-in-council a certain municipality is exempted from rent control, the effect of that would be that within six months of that order that municipality will be entirely free from control unless in the meantime the municipal council by resolution requests that the control continue. It does not in any sense shift the responsibility for the rent control administration upon the municipalities,

but it merely gives the municipal council the right, if they feel that there is still a need for rent control in spite of the exemption that may be given by order-in-council, to insist that the rent control be continued. I believe that that will have a very wide and beneficial effect upon decontrolling those areas of the province where rent control is no more than a nuisance and is unnecessary.

Finally, after taking over the rent control, several offices have been opened by the province. When we took over rent control there were only two offices left in Ontario, -- one in Ottawa, one in Toronto. We took over these offices. Now we have opened offices in a number of other municipalities. Hamilton, London, Windsor, Sarnia, Belleville, Sudbury, St. Catharines and Guelph have offices which have been opened in the last few months, and consideration is being given to opening additional offices at Kingston and at the Head of the Lakes.

That, Mr. Speaker, is an outline of the history of this matter from the time we took it over up to the present day. We are in hopes that the revised regulations will be a great convenience to the legal profession and to the public, and that the summary which is attached will also be of great assistance.

This is a problem to which, I suppose, we can hardly hope ever to find a perfect or fully satisfactory solution. The problem of rent control

will exist so long as there is an acute shortage of housing accommodation. The only cure is more houses. So long as we have an expanding population, expanding immigration, and a cutting down of the building of houses, rent control will continue with us whether we like it or whether we do not. The most we can do is to see so far as is humanly possible that the regulations work out as equitably and are administered with as much common sense as we can expect under the circumstances.

For this reason the rent control committee of this house is being re-appointed for the purpose of looking at the changes we have made, considering them, watching the way they work out as they are applied, and recommending from time to time new changes and improvements, always keeping an eye on weaknesses which may develop. We think that this committee, if it does its work as well and as conscientiously as the committee which was established in the last session of the last legislature, will make a further contribution to the solution of this problem. In a matter of this kind, no regulations can be regarded as final. They must be constantly under scrutiny; and as weaknesses develop and changed conditions arise we must be ready at a moment's notice to make the changes which appear desirable.

MR. FARQUHAR R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there is of course no issue between the

government and the opposition in regard to the motion of my hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). Much as we would like at times to rid ourselves of controls of one kind and another, anyone who is conversant with the housing situation in the province of Ontario today, particularly in the larger areas of population, would be unwilling, I am sure, to agree to decontrol so far as rents are concerned. I agree with the Prime Minister that the committee that sat on this problem last year did -- in my judgment -- a magnificent job. My examination of their activities convinced me that they conducted themselves around the problem to be examined and that they did not display a political bias of any kind. A committee which works in that atmosphere and with that goal in mind can do very much towards solving or at least alleviating a problem of this particular character. The committee that is to be formed as a result of my hon. friend's motion today will, I am sure, carry on with the same ideal in mind and the same purpose in view.

I have found from what I know of rent controls that the difficulty in the past appeared to be that people did not know what the regulations were, and when they found the regulations, it was almost impossible to interpret them. It would seem to

me as a layman, Mr. Speaker, that one of the moves forward that could be made would be to acquaint the public generally as widely as possible with these regulations and to help in any way to interpret them so that the people would know exactly what their rights are in respect to rent control in a given situation.

(Take D follows)

I would like to ask the Hon. Prime Minister, in regard to the motion he has introduced, if the motion he has presented this afternoon gives the Committee as wide powers as it had last year?

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. OLIVER: Precisely the same powers?

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. OLIVER: There is one more question I would like to ask of the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) which came to my mind when he was speaking. Were the recommendations forwarded to the Executive Council to be incorporated into regulations forwarded as unanimous recommendations?

MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. OLIVER: There were no recommendations which were not unanimous?

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. OLIVER: Does the Hon. Attorney-General feel that should be the policy of the Committee this year?

MR. PORTER: That was the policy at the time, and, as I pointed out,we subsequently made some changes which resulted from discussions which were carried on in the Committee, but about which the

Committee was not prepared to make unanimous recommendations. Some of the members of the Committee had not quite made up their minds, whether it was the right thing to do or not. I do not say they were divided on the subject, but they were undecided. Of course, the new Committee can look over those, and can make some further changes if they wish. I do not think it should necessarily be the policy of the Committee to expect only unanimous recommendations to be adopted, but in view of the novelty of this problem to this Government, we thought it was the wise thing , to move a little slowly, and we felt as long as the recommendations we sent forward were unanimous, it would meet with the greatest satisfaction, and perhaps be of more benefit in the later experiments we wished to make, and which might work out better later on.

I may say to the hon. members that the regulations will be published in the Ontario Gazette, and a short summary will be printed, and sent out to every barrister and solicitor in the province. They do not all subscribe, but, nevertheless, they will all be sent out, and that will enable them to more readily advise their clients. Copies will also be available for any other section of the public which

may request them.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask one further question or make this comment. I am sure the Government will appreciate the great good that will come in getting this Committee's work started as soon as possible.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, on the motion: I am in favour of the motion before the House, insofar as I am in favour of the continuation of rent control, but I am afraid we will require to control the rentals so long as this Government pursues its present policy on housing, which is a very negative one, a policy which fails to encourage the construction of new homes, which does not help the people of small means to acquire houses, not even to the extent that the Government did a few years ago, when they had a second mortgage scheme in operation.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we will be obliged to retain rent control so long as the Government fails to carry through what was the major plan in the Conservative program for a number of years, namely, the construction of low-rental houses in this province, and so long as the Government fails to honour a very important pledge which was made particularly by my very good friend, the Hon. Attorney-

General, when he publicly promised to the people of Ontario that slums would be cleared within ten years.

MR. PORTER: I do not know that I ever made any such promise. I was just perhaps expressing a hope.

MR. SALSBERG: No, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Attorney-General did not express a hope. He made a very positive promise.

MR. PORTER: Oh, no.

MR. SALSBERG: And he had no objections to the widest publicity being given to that promise, which was adorned with his very pleasant picture.

MR. PORTER: I would like to see that. We will table that one.

MR. SALSBERG: May I advise the Hon.Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker, that I kept that treasure, and I shall be glad to-morrow to bring it down to the Chamber.

MR. PORTER: We want it to-day. It will be too late to-morrow.

MR. SALSBERG: I will give it to the Hon. Attorney-General. I am always ready to accommodate the Hon. Minister, and will make sure he will have that in his hands to-day.

I would like to remind the Hon. Attorney-General that six of those ten years have gone, and there has been no slum clearance, as far as this Government is concerned. There has been no construction of homes, as the situation requires, and so long as it is the policy of the Government to do nothing, as far as housing is concerned, and so long as that policy is continued, the people in the major industrial areas of the province will be facing the crisis in which they find themselves at this moment.

That being the case, the Opposition I am sure will undertake to change the situation, as far as they are able, and to propel this cumbersome Government into motion, but we will require rental regulations in the meantime.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, as far as the old regulations are concerned, I think a great error was committed by the Government in not making known, and providing in the regulations, what agreement could be arrived at on a voluntary basis between landlords and tenants on a two-year lease.

MR. PORTER: You are only in favour of compulsion.

MR. SALSBERG: I am, like yourself, in favour of controls, because you do not do anything.

MR. PORTER: I said "compulsion".

MR. SALSBERG: I said nothing about "compulsion". I was trying to express a critical point of view about your regulations which were widely publicized, that landlords and tenants could agree on any amount.

And may I say, Mr. Speaker, in this unhappy state of affairs, when so many people are so hard-pressed for quarters, that regulation was tantamount to an automatic increase of rent of about fifteen percent.

MR. PORTER: No, no; nothing of the kind.

MR. SALSBERG: When so many people are crowded together with such a small blanket to cover them, and so horrible a frost around them--and now we have more than one "Frost" -- with everybody pulling at the bit of blanket to cover his freezing body, it stands to reason they will accept the best they can, under the circumstances. This at a time when they know they cannot move, and the landlord asks them to please agree to a two-year lease, provided they give twenty-five percent more rental, they dodged,

and hesitated and struggled for a moment or longer, and then they gave in.

MR. PORTER: Not necessarily.

MR. SALSBERG: I have had people coming to see me, and the crisis is very serious.

MR. PORTER: You may have badly advised them.

MR. SALSBERG: I am aware of the cost of living, and when I was informed of their incomes, I advised they should try and not pay more, because they would be taking food and other things from their children, if the rents went up. But they said, "But, Mr. Salsberg, what are we to do?" and I said, "Hold out as long as you can, you are not obliged to," and they said, "No, we are not obliged to, but the landlord will create conditions which will be unbearable, so we had better sign."

Every hon. member in this House knows what are the facts of the case , and what the circumstances are. The hon. members who support the government -- I do not expect them to bang the desks, but I am glad to see smiles on their faces, because they know that what I am saying is true, but they are not able to express their feelings, because they are supporting the Government.

I repeat, it was tantamount to an increase in rentals throughout the province.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my few remarks in regard to this motion with the statement that I am in favour of it. I hope the Committee which has been set up will enable the hon. members of this House, and for that matter any group or any public-spirited organization to appear before them and make representations and suggestions, and I hope that their studies and deliberations will benefit the people of this province.

But the most important thought I want to leave with the Hon. Prime Minister is that the problem can be solved in one simple way, the construction of new housing units by the thousands. This government has the power, despite shortages in some areas, although the shortage of housing construction materials, I am told, has practically disappeared; there is an abundance of bricks, so much so, that the brickyards are laying off workers; there is an adequate supply of plumbing, and we can get all the lumber we want, and this Government has the power to basically solve the problem by going into the construction of houses.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, let me keep the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) on the right track. He leaves the impression that we can just press a button and build thousands and thousands of houses. We just cannot do that. It is not as simple as that. It is an involved, difficult problem. May I say there is only one way for us to achieve the building of fifty thousand houses a year in this province, and that is by having thirty-five thousand or forty thousand houses built by private builders. Governmental intervention in the housing problem directly can only possibly deal with a small corner of that problem. I mention that to the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) because I want to keep him on the track. It is a problem we are intensely interested in, but it is not a simply matter to build thousands and thousands of houses. It is a very involved problem, and involves the whole field of credit.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I am thankful to the Hon. Prime Minister for trying to keep me on the right track. I appreciate that.

MR. PORTER: He gets off so easily.

MR. SALSBERG: I am, of course, on the right track, but I can hardly credit the Hon. Premier for that. I agree with the Hon. Prime Minister you

cannot press a button and get houses. But I do say that a government, and a government commission which can undertake to build the great hydro project they are correctly and properly undertaking, which can undertake to tunnel through rock, dam rivers, and turn the flow of lakes into the opposite direction, can surely undertake, if they wanted to, the construction of houses on a vast scale.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the Hon. Prime Minister really saddens me. From what the Hon. Prime Minister said a moment ago, I draw the conclusion that all the headlines in the papers, all the prominence given to certain words in the Speech from the Throne, and other utterances made by the Hon. Prime Minister, hold very little in store for the people, insofar as housing is concerned, and insofar as this Session is concerned.

The Hon. Prime Minister's remarks indicate, I think, all too clearly and sadly, that the Government has no plan for entering the field of housing, the only plan which could really solve this critical problem for the people.

Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree, there will be other occasions on which we can discuss this

matter, and we will pursue it further at that time.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

THE COUNTY COURTS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the County Courts Act", and the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to bring the County Court offices in line with the other offices already mentioned in some of the other Bills, as to the hours of remaining open, and also it makes some changes in the opening dates for the sittings of the district courts at certain places.

THE GENERAL SESSIONS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a Bill, intituled, "An Act to Amend The General Sessions Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill makes certain provisions for the opening dates of sittings of the Courts of General Sessions of the Peace in certain named counties. In addition, certain changes are made in connection with some of the counties.

THE SHERIFFS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Sheriffs Act," and the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill brings the Sheriffs' offices in line with the other court offices, and provides for the changed hours of work. It also makes provision for a slight change in the fees for sheriffs' certificates, under certain circumstances.

THE JUDICATURE ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that

leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Judicature Act", and the same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill, in addition to bringing the general court offices in line with the new working hours which have already been mentioned, introduces a subject of some considerable importance.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Government proposes to approach this change with an open mind. This Bill, like all the other legal Bills, will be referred to The Legal Bills Committee, so that all representations may be considered, and this whole question gone into very carefully.

As the hon. members no doubt are aware, the Judicature Act provides for a certain type of jury known as the "Special Jury".

The "Special Jury" section is very rarely invoked. Occasionally, however, -- particularly in cases such as libel cases and some cases where highly technical evidence is to be brought before the court -- the party has the right to a special jury, a jury that is called and supposed to be

selected in a somewhat different way from the ordinary jury.

A great deal of consideration has been given to the position of the special juries over a period of years. The matter was discussed by the Select Committee which sat when Mr. Conant was Attorney-General, under his chairmanship, and various recommendations were made at that time. But the whole question of whether at the present time a special jury is still a necessary adjunct to our system of justice, is a very wide-open question.

(Take "E" follows)

To-day with the general understanding of citizens as a whole and problems of living and problems that might be mechanical and scientific, there may be less to be said for a special jury than there was in the early days when it was introduced and this Bill proposes to abolish the special jury.

That does not mean by any means that this Bill affects the right to a jury nor does this Bill touch the question of the grand jury. There is no proposal to deal with either of these institutions which we still regard as very fundamental institutions in our system of justice but a special jury is a jury that may be called at the instance of a party to litigation in civil cases where the party deposits a sum, I think it is $400., and requests a special jury. There is then a special panel called and from that panel the jury is selected. Now, one of the features of it is that the man who is prepared to pay that extra money has a different type of tribunal than the man who is not prepared or who perhaps is not able to spend that extra money and that is one of the features of the special jury which seems to make it an anachronism at the present time.

There are certain types of cases for which this special jury should be preserved, such as a libel

case or cases of that kind but I think they are matters that can well be discussed by the Legal Bills Committee. However, it has been decided to bring this Bill forward and to allow it to have the very fullest possible discussion whatever the outcome may be.

THE JURORS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Jurors Act", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, in the first place, this Bill provides for a slight change in the selection of jurors. Where the latest voters' list has not been completed it will be allowable to look at the assessment roll for juries in ordinary cases. The other provision of this Act is complementary to the abolition of special juries which has already been mentioned.

SECURITIES ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Securities Act", and that same be now read for the

first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this amendment deals with the prospectus of a company, a copy of which under the present Act, is sent out prior to the completion of a stock transaction in cases of mining companies and industrial companies and so on, who are selling their securities to the public.

The change involved is simply this; that when the initial literature is sent out, or the initial offer is sent out to the public, it should be accompanied by a summary of the prospectus, that is, a summary in terms that the public might be expected to understand more readily than the full prospectus that is filed with the Securities Commission. The form of the contents of the summary is to be approved by the Securities Commission. Then, when the transaction is completed and the confirmation note is sent out, a copy of the full prospectus will be sent. It is considered this will improve the machinery in these transactions.

MOTHERS' ALLOWANCE ACT

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Welsh, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled,

"The Mothers' Allowance Act, 1952", and that the same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, although this is entirely a new re-drafting of the Bill, there is very little change of principle. It has been felt advisable to dispense with the Commission and place the administration under a director. We did that last year in our Public Assistance branch. We felt it would be better administrative practice and due to the fact that the Commission was mentioned so many times in the old Act, we felt it was advisable to re-draft the old Act this year.

Last year we found that in the administration of the amendment to the Act, whereby an allowance may be granted to a mother up until the child was eighteen years of age provided the child was showing good progress at school or the child was disabled, we had made no provision whereby a mother could qualify for a mother's allowance if she had not been receiving mother's allowance before the child was sixteen, and the amendment

a mother may qualify for the mother's allowance whose child may be seventeen years of age and is making good progress at school or is disabled.

We are also making provision whereby the allowance can be continued in respect to a disabled husband if a mother is receiving mother's allowance as long as any child is qualifying under eighteen years of age.

HOMES FOR THE AGED ACT

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Welsh, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Homesfor the Aged Act", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, this is a very minor amendment at the request primarily of the City of Toronto. We found it necessary under the existing Act for the head of the municipality to sign all applications for admission to a home for the aged and it applies to any city of less than 100,000 that some other person can be designated to sign the admissions to homes for the aged.

OLD AGE ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Welsh, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, " "An Act to Amend the Old Age Assistance Act ,1951", and

that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, this is merely a clarification of local authority as to giving the municipalities the authority to appoint someone to take applications under the Old Age Assistance Act which was passed at the last Session.

AUXILIARY CLASSES ACT

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Foote, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Auxiliary Classes Act", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. DUNLOP: Mr. Speaker, this amendment is an amendment intended to do away with an obsolete name, namely "School Medical Inspector" of whom there are none now, and to set up a Board made up of the principal of the school and an Inspector. Where there are two or more Inspectors in a city or town, any one of them may be nominated to be on the Board and a psychiatrist or medical practitioner form the third member, the idea being to make it simple to arrange to have a child, who is a slow learner, admitted to an auxiliary class.

CONTINUATION SCHOOLS ACT

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Foote, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Continuation Schools Act", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. DUNLOP: Mr. Speaker, this amendment is intended to relieve county councils of the obligation that has been theirs for a long time, to pay $500. a year to the agricultural department of a aontinuation school in the county. It is felt that the continuation schools with their agricultural departments can now be fully looked after by the Department of Education in the usual way. So, we are asking that burden on the county council be removed.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following reports:

34th annual report of the Civil Service Commission for Ontario for the year ending March 31, 1951.

31st annual report of the Public Service Superannuation Board of Ontario for the fiscal year

ending March 31, 1951.

Report of the Provincial Auditor and the Public Service Superannuation Fund for the year ended March 31, 1951.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 2.

SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, second reading, Bill No. 37, "An Act to Amend the Summary Convictions Act", Mr. Porter.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St.Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) --

MR. PORTER: If you will let me explain it.

MR. SALSBERG: I thought you explained it on first reading.

MR. PORTER: I have to persuade you now. It is a little different, more cautious. This Bill, as was mentioned on first reading, arises as the result of an amendment that was made to the Criminal Code in 1948.

(Page F-1 follows)

The Code was amended to provide that in summary conviction cases there can be a further appeal to the Court of Appeal from the decision of a county court judge on appeal from a magistrate decision. Appeals from a magistrates decision in summary conviction cases generally go to a county court judge, that is the regular practice, and the county court judge generally hears the evidence de novo, that is he doesnot have a transcript of the evidence before him as the Court of Appeal has, he hears the witnesses and tries the case all over again. Then there has been a right of appeal under the provincial Summary Convictions Act, which reads now as follow;

"If the Attorney-General for Ontario certifies that in his opinion a judgment or decision of a county or district court on an appeal under this Act involves a question of law of sufficient importance to justify an appeal, an appeal shall lie therefrom to the Court of Appeal."

Now that is the section which in this Bill is proposed to be repealed and the reason for the repeal is that in 1948 the Criminal Code was amended to deal with this matter. Section 769A of the Criminal Code provides now for appeals to the Court of Appeal and it reads as follows:

" An appeal to the Court of Appeal as defined in Section 1,012 against any decision of the court under the provisions of Section 752 or Section 765, with leave of the Court of Appeal or a judge thereof, may be taken on any ground which involves a question of law alone. Provisions of Sections 1,012 to 1,021 inclusive shall, insofar as the same are applicable apply to an appeal under the section. A decision of the Court of Appeal shall have the same effect and may be enforced in the same manner as if it had been made by a judge at the hearing. "

Now that covers the sort of case that was previously covered by the Provincial Statute and therefore it overrides the Provincial Statute, so that the section that is to be repealed has really become superfluous.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, what I want to ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) is something that may have no relation to this Bill, and this is a case where I will be very glad to be guided by the hon. Attorney-General. The point I want to raise is about individual citizens who have been convicted and wish to appeal but just have not the money to provide for the expenditures involved in an appeal. What is the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) offering people in that

position? May I say that I have in mind particularly a case that received a lot of publicity some months ago when a citizen was convicted of an offense which was evidently a serious one and he had no money to make the appeal and the newspapers gave a lot of space to this. The matter was brought to the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Porter's) department and at that time I think his department refused to do anything or declared that they had no authority. I cannot recall what the argument but evidently there was a rejection of the wide-spread demand that the funds required for the appeal be provided by the government.

Now this question may have nothing to do with this Bill and if so I will not pressfor an explanation, but if the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) would care to make any comment on this question at this point I would appreciate it and I am sure that other hon. members of the House would as well. Would the hon. Attorney-General care to?

MR. PORTER: I speak last. I do not speak until everybody else has had an opportunity.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, I beg your pardon.

MR. PORTER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought the

hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) knew by now that on the second reading of a Bill it was time for argument in connection with any point that arises in the Bill. However, the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) has asked a question as to the provision of costs for impecunious litigants.

MR. SALSBERG: A question on second reading.

MR. PORTER: And if the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) will recall information that was given to this House a year ago, which apparently he does not, he would know that the Law Society of Upper Canada has now made provision for the very situation that the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) mentioned and that if a person is involved in litigation and is unable to pay the proper bill, then there is a fund provided for free legal assistance under those circumstances.

That is done entirely by the Law Society of Upper Canada.

MR. SALSBERG: The "hon. member" remembers very well what took place about this --

MR. PORTER: Well, I am not going to answer any more questions. I have said all I am going to say, and the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) is out of order.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, it is Mr. Speaker's prerogative to decide that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order , please.

MR. SALSBERG: Not the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Porter)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SALSBERG: And it is too early for the hon. Attorney

General (Mr. Porter) to start that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SALSBERG: I will, Mr. Speaker just say that this reply --

MR SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SALSBERG: - does not cover the point I had in mind and I will bring it up on the proper occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Let us please keep things in order, shall we?

MR. SALSBERG: Why of course.

MR. SPEAKER: When Mr. Speaker rises, I think the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) knows well enough that he has to give way. The explanation requested is entirely irrelevant and in my opinion has nothing to do with the Bill, and I am ready to put the motion.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE EXPENSES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third order, second reading of Bill No. 38, "An Act to amend The Administration of Justice Expenses Act".. Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 38, "An Act to amend The Administration of Justice Expenses Act".

I hardly think this Bill needs any further explanation Mr. Speaker, than was given on first reading.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

CUSTODY OF DOCUMENTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth order, second reading of Bill No. 39, "An Act to amend The Custody of Documents Act". Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 39, "An Act to amend The Custody of Documents Act".

I think also this Bill, Mr. Speaker, does not require very much further explanation.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

DIVISION COURTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth order, second reading of Bill No. 40, "An Act to amend The Division Courts Act". Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move a second reading of Bill No. 40, "An Act to amend The Division Courts Act".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE EVIDENCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth order, second reading of Bill No. 41, "An Act to amend The Evidence Act". Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 41, "An Act to amend The Evidence Act".

Mr. Speaker, in this Bill the first section corrects a typographical error as will be seen from the Bill in the

Bill Book. The second section provides for the taking of oaths by certain members of the diplomatic and consular services so that an officer of any of Her Majesty's diplomatic and consular services exercising his function in any country other than Canada, including an ambassador, envoy, minister, charge d'affaires, counsellor, secretary, attache, consul-general, consul, vice-consul, pro-consul, consular agent, acting consul-general, acting consul, acting vice-consul and acting consular agent, or an officer of the Canadian diplomatic, consular or representative services exercising his functions in any country other than Canada, including, in addition to the diplomatic and consular officers mentioned in clause "j," a high commissioner, permanent delegate, acting high commissioner, acting permanent delegate, counsellor and secretary, or a Canadian Government Trade Commissioner or an Assistant Canadian Government Trade Commissioner exercising his functions in any country other than Canada, so that they may now take affidavits which apparently they couldn't under our Act before.

This is just further co-operation with the Federal Authorities.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): "Further co-operation".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh order, second reading of

Bill No. 42, "The Justices of the Peace Act, 1952". Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 42, "The Justices of the Peace Act, 1952".

Mr. Speaker, this being a general revision of The Justices of the Peace Act, the only point I might mention is Section 11 where a change was made as I mentioned on first reading. I think hon. members are fairly familiar with the functions of justices of the peace, their powers and manner of appointment. I may remind hon. members that, although the appointment of a justice of the peace in the first instance is recommended by the Attorney-General to the Lieutenant Governor In Council, nevertheless before he can function he must appear before a county court judge and satisfy the judge that he is qualified to act as a justice of the peace and that there is need for that additional justice of the peace in the district. The intention is that the public shall be protected in that such persons as a matter of fact have certain privileges and powers of quite wide implications. Section 7 shows what some of these powers are:

> "A justice of the peace acting within his territorial jurisdiction,
>
> (a) may take informations or issue search warrants or summonses or warrants returnable before a magistrate; and

(b) may hear and determine prosecutions under municipal by-laws."

In addition to that there are certain provisions in the Criminal Code where two justices of the peace sitting together can hear certain types of cases. A justice of the peace, furthermore, has power to draw certain documents. Section 11 provides that:

> "Where a person who is a justice of the peace is employed on salary in any capacity connected with a magistrate's court, the authority which employs and pays him in such capacity may require him to pay over to it all or such portion as it determines of the fees collected by him as a justice of the peace, and where his salary is paid out of the revenues of the magistrate's court such fees or the portion thereof so determined shall be paid over by him to the magistrate and shall form part of the moneys that accrue to the treasurer of the municipality."

MR. W.J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, my remarks in connection with the principle of this Bill apply more specifically to omissions, that is sections of the old Act which have been left out of the new Act.

Take for instance Section 7 of the present Act, which has not been carried forward into the new Act. Section 7 provided a disability for sheriffs and coroners being appointed as justices of the peace. I was wondering

why that had been left out of the present Act. I think that disability should be carried into the new Act.

Section 8 (2) of the present act provided that a justice of the peace should take his oath within three months or his appointment would be cancelled. That section also has been omitted. I think that was a very necessary provision, a justice of the peace should be compelled to take his oath of appointment within a certain period of time.

Section 8 (3) of the old Act provided that the oaths of the newly-appointed justices of the peace had to be filed in the office of the Clerk Of The Peace. At the present time, under the new Act, the oaths are to be filed in the office of the Inspector of Legal Offices.

Section 8 (4) of the old Act stated that "the Clerk Of The Peace shall keep a list of J.P.s open to inspection without fee." Now there is no similiar in the new Act, no provision whereby the Inspector of Legal Offices should keep a list. I was just wondering how one would eventually know who the J.P.s were. Just where is the record kept which will show the active J.P.s in the Province?

Section 8 (7) provides a fine of fifty dollars for acting without having taken the oath. There now is no continuation of that provision in the new act, that section has been completely omitted.

Section 11(2) of the old Act placed a limitation of

power on the J.P., he might act outside his jurisdication only under the direction of a magistrate or the Inspector of Legal Offices. In your new Act, Section 7 (2) shows that the J.P. is still subject to the direction of the magistrate but removes any direction of the Inspector of Legal Offices. I think it should be the other way around, The Inspector of Legal Offices should have full control over the J.P.s.

Those are the notes I have made in connection with the Bill and I was wondering if the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) could explain them.

MR. PORTER: I will see if there is any further discussion first.

Mr. Speaker, I should have mentioned in connection with the other Bills which have had second reading to-day that I propose to refer all these Bills to the Legal Bills Committee, and I think that might be a very good place for these points to be raised because at that Committee we can have the officers of the Department appear and go into those matters in great detail, and if it is decided that some of those sections should be restored, then of course the Committee may do that.

MR. GRUMMETT: That is fine.

Motion agreed; second reading of the Bill.

(Take G follows)

JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURTS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General) moved second reading of Bill No. 43, an Act to amend the Juvenile and Family Courts Act.

He said: I might give the House a certain amount of information about the Juvenile and Family Courts in general, and then the proposed amendment can be seen in better perspective.

The Juvenile Courts are set up as the result of a section in The Juvenile Delinquents Act, which is an act of the Federal Parliament passed in 1908, and subsequently revised in 1914. That measure provided for a different manner of handling charges against children than was generally applicable in such cases, and it contemplated the setting up in the province of Juvenile Courts for the purpose of treating particularly with juvenile problems that came before the courts and provided for a different method of handling them with reference to penalties and so on. In the province of Ontario a Juvenile and Family Courts Act was enacted which went further than merely providing the machinery for Juvenile Courts: it provided also for something which was quite new, namely a system of family courts before which disputes between husband and wife could come, rather than a new type of tribunal, and be settled as a result -- in many cases -- of conciliation

instead of having to be threshed out by means of a lawsuit, although of course the courts could deal with the matter if the parties were unable to arrive at a settlement.

Now the Juvenile Courts have expanded substantially in the province. Immediately after the First World War Juvenile Courts were established as such and have been functioning ever since, so their history, as hon. members will see, is not a very long one. There are 48 provincial jurisdictions, either county or district, under The Territorial Jurisdictions Act, and at present there are Juvenile Courts in the following counties or districts: Brant, Carleton, Cochrane, Dufferin, Essex, Grey, Halton, Haldimand, Huron, Hastings, Kenora, Kent, Lambton, Lincoln, Middlesex, Muskoka, Nipissing, Norfolk, Northumberland and Durham, Ontario, Oxford, Peel, Perth, Peterborough, Prince Edward, Renfrew, Simcoe, Stormont, Sudbury, Temiskaming, Thunder Bay, Waterloo, Welland, Wellington, Wentworth, York. There are also Courts in the cities of Toronto, Windsor, Oshawa and Kingston, and in the town of Port Colborne. The last Court to be set up was established in the County of Peel this year. It is estimated that the jurisdictions of these various Courts cover considerably more than seventy-five per cent of the population of this Province.

In the areas where there is no Juvenile Court set up, it is usual for the magistrate to deal

with juvenile and family cases, by virtue of his appointment under the following social Statutes: The Children's Protection Act; The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act; The Minors' Protection Act; The Parents' Maintenance Act; Section 13 of The Married Women's Property Act, being the section dealing with the Orders of Protection. The number of Courts functioning has increased in the last ten years from eighteen to forty. The method of setting up these Courts has been the same in that the initial step has been taken by the municipal Council, sometimes irrespective of whether the municipality is in a county or a district, and after different representations have been made to the Honourable the Attorney General, who administers the Statute, and his approval secured to the setting up of the Court and the nomination of an individual to be the judge, an Order-in-Council is passed, asking that the Court be set up, and naming the judge, and this is forwarded to Ottawa to the Deputy Minister of Justice, asking that The Juvenile Delinquents Act be proclaimed in the area referred to in the Order-in-Council, and that the necessary publication be made in the Canada Gazette.

After the publication in the Canada Gazette, the judge is sworn in, and arrangements are made to secure the services of a court clerk and a court reporter and such staff as may be necessary in the case of the more populous areas, and after all these

individuals are sworn in, the Court commences to function.

It has been the practice until now to allow the requests to come from municipalities, rather than have the Department suggest to municipalities that courts be established, and it is apparent that this system has worked reasonably well, as now thirty-six out of the forty-eight counties or districts in the Province are areas where Juvenile Courts are functioning. There have been instances where, for example, a court was set up in a county, discontinued, and then started again, and others where one municipality in a county would have a Court and then finally all would join together, and other instances still where at present there are two Courts within the one county, such as Toronto and York, Ontario and Oshawa.

The purpose of this amendment is to provide for a Court to be set up for an area consisting of two or more counties. There may be one or two instances where that would be desirable in the near future, and it is a further step in making The Juvenile and Family Courts Act a very practical statute for the conditions that are arising.

I may add this, that in the development of the Juvenile Courts a very great deal of the success

of these Courts depends upon the probation service, and it may be of interest to note that the Government, a few months ago, appointed for the first time a Chief Probation Officer for the Province of Ontario to coordinate the services of Probation Officers who work in the juvenile and family courts, and it, , from time to time, to make recommendations for an improvement and enlargement of that service. I may say that probation, in the sense that it is used in the courts to assist the judge in determining the proper sentence under all the circumstances, is in its infancy in this province. Compared with the progress that has been made in Great Britain and some other jurisdictions, probation has not progressed on such a large scale as in some places elsewhere, and that may be one of the reasons why in this Province we have, on a per capita basis, so many people in penal institutions compared, for instance, with Great Britain. In Great Britain today more than half of all convicted persons are out on probation, so that penal institutions are denied the privilege of keeping them and the taxpayer is relieved of that very great expense. In addition, because the probation service over there has been developed to a very large extent, and intensively, and most of the probation officers are persons well trained for that sort of work,

and because the persons who go out on probation do so upon the recommendation of a probation officer who has a thorough understanding of the case, who has looked into the whole background of the man's career and situation in society and the sort of work he can do, the result very frequently is that he does not become a repeater to the same extent as he might if he found himself in a penal institution, although I must say that now conditions here have entirely changed as a result of the labours of my hon. friend and his predecessor. Indeed they have done so much to improve the reform institutions that one might almost think that this sort of provision is not necessary. It is, however, a very important development in the enforcement of justice in this Province. If we can prevent people from getting into penal institutions and can set them up in a way that they will not likely repeat offences, we are striking at the very initial roots of the problem, and society and the administration of justice and of penal institutions will be relieved of a great deal of expense and a great deal of dissatisfaction.

The whole question of probation is a very interesting one if one considers what a judge is faced with when he is appointed to the bench. A judge of the Supreme Court or the County Court is invariably chosen from the legal profession. A family court judge is not

necessarily so chosen, nor is a magistrate. These, of course, are provincial appointments, and in this Province we have always been very flexible about these things. We choose a good man, no matter what his occupation may be. In most cases it is desirable that a man have some understanding of legal procedure and it is generally a sound practice to appoint members of the legal profession; but when we find a man who has the qualifications although he is not a member of the legal profession we frequently appoint him as a magistrate, or a juvenile or family court judge, as the case may be. In most instances the judges who have to decide what the sentences are to be in criminal trialsare members of the legal profession. Some of them have had a practice which has never brought them into contact with the criminal courts at all. Regarding those hon. members who belong to the legal profession -- and today the House contains such a profusion of lawyers that it has got a "new look", and I have to be so much more careful than I was in previous sessions -- I believe it will be found that every one of them has had to some extent a different type of practice. Some of them, perhaps, have had no occasion to practice in the criminal courts. But of course lawyers who act for the accused in criminal cases tend to develop a little bias in favour of an accused; they think that perhaps after all he is not such a bad person. On the other hand

a man who has been a crown attorney during most of his professional life may have a slight bias the other way. But a judge, as soon as he is appointed to the bench, is faced with a problem of deciding what sort of a sentence he is to impose as the result of the information that is before him. Now, with a proper system of probation, with trained personnel, you have men who can come before the court and give an outline of the background of the accused and assist the judge in coming to a conclusion that the man should be given a tough sentence, or a lenient sentence, or be let out on probation. Probation is a sound policy as long as it is confined to justifiable cases, but that can only be assured if we build up a well-trained probation service to handle these cases with a view to reducing the number of convicted persons who will go into penitentiaries and reform institutions. As a result, society will benefit in many ways.

That may be somewhat of a digression. Nevertheless, looking at this very simple amendment of the Juvenile and Family Courts Act against the whole background of development of Juvenile and Family Courts in this Province, considering the great progress we have made, and viewing the prospects in developing the probation service which must be built up to go along with it, I think you will see

that a provision which will enable the setting up of a court to cover two or more counties where there may not be sufficient business in one county to keep a judge occupied, would be a very desirable provision indeed.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): I wonder if the Minister would tell me whether there is an ambiguity in that subsection 1, which reads as follows:

> "(1) In every city, town or county, or in a district composed of two or more counties in which The Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1929 (Canada) is proclaimed, there shall be a court of record to be known as the "juvenile court" of the city, town, county or district, as the case may be."

Should not another word, "district", be inserted as follows:

> "In every city, town, county, district, or in a district composed of two or more counties...."

MR. PORTER: There may be some merit in that, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to speak until there has been further discussion, if there is any.

I may say that I propose to refer this Bill to the Legal Bills Committee, as I have referred all the Bills up to this one, and that might well be

considered there. In the meantime I would like to give it some further consideration myself.

MR. GRUMMETT: That is satisfactory. My thought was that the Bill as it reads at present excludes districts. Our northern portion of Ontario is divided into districts, and I think you need to insert "districts". The word in the sentence "district composed of two or more counties" means a totally different set-up from the ordinary district, so I think perhaps the word "district" should be inserted after the word "county", and that would clarify the situation.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

AN ACT TO AMEND THE PAROLE ACT

HON. JOHN W. FOOTE, V.C. (Minister of Reform Institutions) moved second reading of Bill No. 48 an Act to amend the Parole Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill deals with the very important question of rehabilitation, and is similar in its intention to Bill No. 43 which has just been moved by the Attorney-General (Hon. Mr. Porter) so far as concerns its purpose, -- to keep people out of our custodial institutions. We think that an adequate rehabilitation service will cut down

the number of repeaters coming to us; and although the cost of such an increased service will be considerable I believe that the obvious savings will be recognized and endorsed by anyone who gives the bill any study. There would be a great saving in reduced legal and custodial costs. We hope that our plans will not be confined to building larger institutions but rather will be applied to training and rehabilitation to get people gainfully and happily employed in civilian life. The obvious benefit by way of increased earning power of people who can be kept out of our institutions is apparent, as is the saving which will be effected in the cost of caring for their dependents. Of course the great object which will commend itself to all is the gain in terms of human happiness and welfare.

In the past the Parole Board, with the help of the parole officers and of the John Howard Association, has carried on a rather limited program of rehabilitation.

(Take "H" follows)

The Chairman of the Parole Board is also the Chief Rehabilitation Officer. We found that this was far too much work for one man. Then, too, the territory which is to be covered in the Province of Ontario is far too big for the few assistant parole officers we had.

Then there are a good many people discharged from our institutions who were not on parole at all, and they primarily did not come under the jurisdiction of the assistant parole officer. These people need help. We began to supplement these services with rehabilitation officers, and we based them at our institutions.

The opening for the clinic for the treatment of alcoholism at Mimico necessitated the services of two rehabilitation officers. We find that perhaps the most important part of this work is dealing with the people after they leave the institution. We began with two officers, and then added a third to the general staff at Mimico, where we have so many sentenced to short terms, and so many repeaters. In fact, some of these people have come back to us four or five or six times in one year.

We have three officers at the Guelph

institution; we have one at Burtch, near Brantford; one at Monteith, to cover the Sudbury area, and we have one at Burritts Rapids, near Ottawa, and one at the Andrew Mercer Institution.

These rehabilitation officers have the advantage of knowing the men and women while they are in the institutions. They have the opportunity of becoming acquainted with them and knowing their needs and their ambitions, and understand some of the reasons which have put them there in the first place; and they are able in a great measure to direct the training programs of the institutions, because they are in touch with the labour market, and they know for what trades there is the greatest demand at the time, and they are able to fit in a man's plans and ambitions with an intelligent training program.

Then there is a great deal of work for them to do in forming contacts with employers throughout the province. This is a job which takes a great deal of time. For one thing, it is very difficult to place a man who has lost the confidence of the public on account of his record. The John Howard Association, to which we give a grant each year, has done wonderful work in preparing the minds of the public

to receive these men and women, and it is due in a large measure to the successful work they have done, that the public has a more receptive attitude toward parolees and discharged prisoners. This is a situation which needs constant attention. We have found that when our rehabilitation officers have obtained positions for men, and have received from the industrialists a willingness to accept them, it takes very careful planning in placing these men. We have one officer who had arranged with twenty firms to receive men who had been discharged, but one by one these firms discontinued taking our dischargees, because they did not fit in, and we saw we had made a mistake in allocating certain men to certain jobs.

We required more wisdom in this respect, and it was required that we follow them up.

This is the job we are doing now throughout Ontario. Many of the men have been placed in out-of-the-way places, such as Camp Borden, where a good many civilians are still employed by the Ordnance Department. We have noticed a great improvement since these men began to work, and the indications are, we will be able to save a great many from drifting back, and becoming unemployed.

Another thing that is necessary to do, is to arrange accommodations for men and women who are getting out of our institutions. The resources we have in Toronto to-day are very, very limited, and the men go mostly to one of three or four main hostels, but the accommodation is limited, and is reserved in many cases for old-age pensioners and the like. Some of the services, like the Salvation Army, have done splendid work, but they are not able to provide for the young man in the environment he wants, until he goes back to work. There is a tendency to get them out of the community life, when they go to the hostels. We are trying to rehabilitate these men. The officers have spent many days travelling around the country, telling the people who have rooms to rent what their problem is, and we have been successful in finding a large number of private homes which will take these men in, and they can then fit into the community, and we try to place them in the area where they have not worked previously.

At present some of them may have jobs in New Toronto or Mimico, and are staying at the Salvation Army, for instance, and travelling back and forth, and they were not being accepted as part of the community life, and that is very important.

This Bill provides that the Chairman of the Parole Board will have his full time available to give consideration to the work of studying these cases and hearing them. The Board is enlarged so we have now nine members. We have in mind two or three people who have taken a great interest, and possess great ability in this field, whom we hope to attract to the Parole Board.

In the second place, the Bill provides that those who were formerly Assistant Parole Officers, those who have been added as rehabilitation officers, will come under one department, under their own chief, who will be located in Toronto, and who will direct the program.

In a year's time we hope to be able to see what difference this has made in our results. Already, they tell me at Mimico, there has been a greater decrease in the number of repeaters. Now that the Board is properly set up, I think we can hope for better things.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, frankly I am reluctant to get up --

MR. PORTER: No; we are always glad to hear from you.

MR. SALSBERG: I believe it would be entirely improper for a measure of such importance as the one before this House to go through without comment from someone, and I am ready to sit down if some other hon. members are ready to speak.

I speak very frankly. I think the measure is important, but I do not think it goes far enough. I think the principle of it is extremely important --

MR. FROST: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that we are not desirous of taking an important measure, such as this, and rushing it through the House. If the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) or any of the hon. members of the House want more time to consider it, we will be glad to have a motion to adjourn the debate.

MR. SALSBERG: Not because of what the Hon. Premier has said, but owing to the importance of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, I do move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House, and in so doing, may I say that we will continue to-morrow with the debate on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and we will be looking forward with pleasure to listening

to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) and the Hon. Leader of the C.C.F. group (Mr. Grummett)--

MR. HARRY NIXON: And the Premier, I presume.

MR. FROST: I might say something.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.34 of the clock p.m.

- - - - - - -

ONTARIO

First Session
of the
Twenty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 21, 1952, et seq.

0

Volume VI

Thursday, February 28, 1952.

0

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

R. C. Sturgeon,
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

S I X T H D A Y

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE, HELD IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21st, 1952, et seq.

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

- - - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Thursday, February 28, 1952.

- - - - - - - -

The House having met. 3 o'clock p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. G. W. PARRY:(Kent West): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, and move its adoption.

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: Mr. Parry, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presents the Committee's first report, as follows:

The Honourable the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.

Gentlemen:

Your Standing Committee on Standing Orders begs leave to present the Committee's First Report.

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

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of New Toronto, praying that an Act may pass repealing Section 2 of Chapter 106 of Statutes of Ontario, 1937.

Petition of the Board of Trustees of the Roman Catholic Separate Schools for the City of Sarnia, praying that an Act may pass fixing the number of Trustees at eight, to hold office for two years, four to be elected annually.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Fort William, praying that an Act may pass increasing the amount chargeable for sewer tax and for other purposes.

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

Petition of the Trustees of Massey Hall, praying that an Act may pass incorporating the Trustees of Massey Hall as a body corporate and politic.

Petition of the Corporation of the County of Waterloo, praying that an Act may pass establishing a Waterloo County Roads Commission, and for other purposes.

Petition of the Ottawa Association for the Advancement of Learning, praying that an Act may pass changing the name of the Corporation to University of Carleton College, and for other purposes.

Petition of St. Patrick's Home of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the transfer of all its assets, etc., to the Grey Nuns of the Immaculate Conception.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Oshawa, praying that an Act may pass providing for changes in the procedure for imposing a special frontage rate for the construction of water-mains, and for other purposes.

Petition of the Canadian National Exhibition Association, praying that an Act may pass to provide that notices of appointment of representatives of various associations must be given by 12 noon on the third Wednesday of January in each year.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Toronto, praying that an Act may pass to authorize the regulating and erection of television antennae, and for other purposes.

Petition of the Roman Catholic Separate School Board of the Town of Timmins, praying that an Act may pass providing for the election of the six members of the Board by a general vote of the separate school ratepayers.

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Hespeler, praying that an Act may pass withdrawing the said Town from the County of Waterloo.

Petition of the Corporation of Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien, praying that an Act may pass removing the limit of $100,000.00 on the value of real estate which may be acquired by the Corporation.

Petition of the Corporation of the Township of McKim, praying that an Act may pass permitting the cost of service connections between the lot-line and water-main to be averaged between the users in water and sewer area No. 6 in the said Township.

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Fort Erie, praying that an Act may pass providing that all Committees, Commissions and Boards established under the Department of Education Act, The Community Centres Act and The Public Parks Act may consist of the same persons.

Petition of Sarnia Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association, praying that an Act may pass exempting the lands, buildings, etc., of the Association from taxation except for local improvements.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(signed) G. W. Parry

Chairman.

(Page A-4 follows)

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

GENERATION OF ELECTRIC POWER IN INTERNATIONAL RAPIDS SECTION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER

HON. L. M. FROST moves first reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act to Approve an Agreement Between Canada and Ontario respecting the Generation of Electric Power in the International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence River".

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill, of course, is the Bill dealing with the Federal-Provincial partnership relative to the development of the St. Lawrence River, both at the Canadian and International section, and this is an agreement between our province and Canada relating to the development of the portion of the river known as the "International section".

There will be a complementary Bill introduced by the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) dealing with the relationship between Ontario and the Hydro Electric Power Commission.

This is, of course, an historic measure; it is one which will fundamentally affect our province and, indeed, our country.

I will not say anything further about the Bill at this moment. I think the general background

is something with which the hon. members are reasonably familiar. The Bill which has been introduced now carries as an appendix, the agreement which was negotiated, and which was signed in Ottawa on the 3rd of December last. I have asked the Clerk of the House to arrange to have this Bill printed by to-morrow so that the hon. members may have the opportunity of studying it over the week-end, and we propose to call second reading on Tuesday or Wednesday of next week, which I think will give the hon. members reasonable opportunity to familiarize themselves with the contents of the Bill.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

POWER DEVELOPMENT IN INTERNATIONAL SECTION OF ST. LAWRENCE RIVER

Hon. G. H. Challies moved first reading of Bill, intituled "An Act Respecting Development of Power in the International Section of the St.Lawrence River."

He said: Mr. Speaker, The Bill which it is my privilege to present for your consideration, is the necessary complement to that which was introduced by the Hon. Prime Minister. The purpose of this second Bill is to assign all of the rights now vested in the province of Ontario to the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, so that it may perform the necessary works and all that goes with them, to

develop the Canadian share of the power available in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River.

The Bill is introduced at this time, so that the Commission may be in a position to proceed with the necessary work the very moment that approval is given by the proper international authority.

Secondly, its introduction should be convincing evidence to convert, if necessary, any one in Ontario, Canada, or elsewhere, who remains sceptical of the sincerity of the province of Ontario, or the Dominion of Canada, when they say they intend to go ahead "on their own", in the development of the St. Lawrence for both power and navigation.

The Bill also places both this province and the Commission on record as being determined to proceed without any delay.

Should any one question the sincerity of the province and the Commission, or their ability to undertake and finance these great works, it should only be necessary to refer them to the Commission's recent achievements. The international agreement which was necessary, before our present activities in further developing the power possibilities of the Niagara could be begun, was only ratified by the United States Senate in August, 1950. The Commission and its contractors went to work at once. They now have well

over 3,700 men engaged in construction on the project. Expenditures to February 16, 1952, exceed $35,000,000.00. Excellent progress has been made on the power-house site, and by the contractors who are undertaking the construction of the great pressure-tunnel under the city of Niagara Falls. In the meantime, what has been the performance of the other party to the Niagara agreement? Our co-partners have done nothing. They have not yet decided what they will do or how they will do it.

These two complementary Bills and the great results which will surely flow from them, will remain an imperishable monument to the aggressive action and the wise foresight of our hon. Premier who, immediately it became clear that the United States Senate was going to refuse to sanction an international agreement on the Seaway, declared publicly that Canada should proceed on its own with the development of the Seaway and that the Province of Ontario and the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario would pledge themselves to proceed at once with the development of power on the international section of the St. Lawrence River.

Let me emphasize again that we are very sincere in our determination to carry out this great development. Ontario must have more power. If the present trend continues we know that the great development program already in progress, whereby new hydro-electric and

fuel-electric generating stations will be added, is not likely to provide us with adequate reserves of power during a period of some two or three years between 1954 and the earliest date at which we could expect power from the St. Lawrence even if we get immediate agreement and are enabled to start construction in 1953.

Therefore, this Bill was introduced in all sincerity, and due to the gravity of the situation, we feel that immediate action permitted by this Bill is imperative.

The hon. Premier has drawn my attention to the fact that when I referred to "our co-partners" I meant by that the partners to the agreement on the American side of the river.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) if that is not a fight between private and public ownership on the other side of the river.

MR. FROST: We do not know.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE POWER COMMISSIONS ACT

HON. G. H. CHALLIES moved first reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Power Commissions Act".

He said: Mr. Speaker, these amendments, with

the exception of one, are made necessary to include the St. Lawrence Development Act of 1952 with the Niagara Development Act of 1951. It is with regard to the powers of expropriation and financing by the government.

The only change in policy, as far as the Commission's activities are concerned, is the question of the appointing of a Commission's representative on one of the three city commissions. As the hon. members know, in Toronto, Hamilton and Ottawa, the Commission appoints one member of a board of three. We have had in two cities cases where the appointee, because of illness, was not in a physical or mental condition to resign, and there was no way by which any other appointments could be made. This Bill merely provides, if the member appointed by the Commission wishes to resign, refuses to act, or is unable for any cause to perform his duties, the Commission may appoint his successor for the remaining term of office, and such successor shall be eligible for re-appointment.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

Mr. R. M. Myers (Waterloo South), moved first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the Town of Hespeler".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

Mr. W. E. Brandon (York West), moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the Town of New Toronto".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

Mr. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls), moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the Town of Fort Erie".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

Mr. W. J. Grummett (Cochrane South), moved first reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the Town of Timmins Separate School Board".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Carleton), moved first reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the Synagogue and Jewish Community Centreof Ottawa".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

Mr. Arthur Frost (Bracondale), moved first reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the Canadian National Exhibition Association".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Carleton), moved first reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting St. Patrick's Home at Ottawa".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

Mr. Kelso Roberts (St.Patrick), moved first

reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

(Page B-1 follows)

CITY OF SARNIA SCHOOL BOARD

MR. O. F. VILLENEUVE (Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Cathcart, I move, seconded by Mr. Warrander, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Sarnia Separate School Board," and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to.

SARNIA YOUNG MEN'S AND YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

MR. O. F. VILLENEUVE (Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Cathcart, I move, seconded by Mr. Warrander, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Sarnia Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order Number 1.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the

Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make some remarks in the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I want first of all to express my pleasure at the return of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) to the House and welcome him back here, because in these times I go along with other hon. members that he has a very heavy responsibility to carry, and it is well that he is in the House and able to participate in the debate to the end that the soundest conclusions may be arrived at.

I want also to congratulate the two new hon. members of the Cabinet since we last met in Session here, the hon. member for Elgin, the new Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Thomas). We have known the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas) for some years, and we have a very high appreciation of his sterling qualities and, within certain well-defined limitations, we would wish him well in his activities as Hon. Minister of Public Works. In respect to the hon. member for Eglinton, the new Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop), I can say at once and with meaning that we are particularly glad to see him

in the House and taking active control and direction, I hope, of the Department of Education. Our great hope is that he has not arrived too late on the scene. His pronouncements thus far have led us to believe that he will make every effort possible to get back to a basis of sanity in dealing with educational problems in the Province of Ontario. I have every reason to believe that he will make much progress along those lines, because, although hon. members may not be aware of it, it so happens that the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) was born in the riding of South Gray, and so has received from that place the impetus that will carry him on to discharge his very heavy responsibilities with credit to himself and to the province.

I would say also, and then I am done with these personal references, that we all miss the Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) from his seat in this Legislature. We all regret very greatly the accident that has caused his absence from this Chamber and his inability to participate in the discussions of this particular Legislative Assembly, and we hope for him the earliest possible return to health and to his position as Hon. Minister of Highways, actively concerned with the affairs of highway construction and maintenance

in the province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, speaking directly to the motion, that is, that we thank his Honour for the gracious speech that he has delivered to us, that of course, is a time-honoured institution in the Parliaments of the British Commonwealth of Nations that we should have the opportunity early in any Legislative Session of speaking on general subjects on the Speech from the Throne. Now, in this particular capacity, Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to say that the Speech from the Throne has come to mean to me at least, down through the years, not a stating of the exact position of governments in relation to proposed legislation, but stating that position in a very general and a very fluid way, setting out, as it were, the broad outline of some of the legislation that the Government proposes to introduce into the current Session of the Legislature.

Therefore, it is difficult for any hon. member to say at a glance whether he approves or disapproves of certain forecasted legislation. It all depends just what emanates from that vague promise in the Speech from the Throne, emanates in the form of the legislation introduced in the form

of Bills on the floor of the Legislature itself.

While we may in general terms say that we do agree with some of the measures proposed, the final reckoning will come when the Bill assumes shape before our eyes on the legislative desks of this Province.

As we meet, Mr. Speaker, in this First Session, which the Government will agree is a memorable occasion, just back from a fresh mandate from the people of the Province of Ontario, and, to put it mildly, in my opinion, the people overdid themselves on this occasion. I believe that in talking to the man on the street they already appreciate that they have erred in this regard. However, in our democratic institutions where the free people of the world can express themselves in elections, they have a peculiar habit of rectifying those conditions at the first and the earliest opportunities, so that, in this Legislative Assembly our deliberations here will be affected, I think, by the world conditions that prevail among the countries in the international field.

Anyone who has read and studied the reports of the NATO Conference at Lisbon must be interested that emanating from that conference have come agreements by the participating countries to share in a

much larger sense the responsibilities for the preparation for peace among the free nations of the world. Those who have studied the outcome of that conference in that light will have found, I am sure, that
our leaders have agreed on our behalf to commit this country to even heavier expense, in order that the days ahead may be free from war, and that we may travel the ways of peace and build in this country sound institutions from which we can make this country greater and stronger in the affairs of the world. There was a time, of course, in the days of man and in the life of legislators, when we could look upon the world picture and not be too concerned about its impact upon our local situation, but, those days are gone. There is an inter-dependence between nations to-day that makes us all liable to participation in the affairs of nations if we wish to see those affairs conducted on a high plane and a high level.

So, as we discuss the affairs of this particular province, we will feel, I suggest, the impact of world conditions upon our political and upon our economic life.

I want to digress, Mr. Deputy Speaker, just for a moment, to say that in my judgment, and this is

the judgment of a layman in this regard, there is a twofold attack that must be made in order to stop the inroad of "isms" that are completely at variance with our way of life and way of thinking. It is not in my judgment a one-front attack. The one-front attack, of course, is before our eyes every day, the building-up of armies, the creation of machinery, and the getting ready to face, if the eventuality arises, force with force. That is one way we have to prepare the free nations of the world to combat what we do not like in the international field.

But, I think we appreciate this, too, that there is another way almost equally as potent to combat the thing we know as Communism, and to stop its initial march into the bastions of free countries of the world, and that is that we should lend ourselves and our efforts, both in our home sphere, our province and country, and in any way we can in the international field to alleviate the suffering of mankind generally, to bring food and shelter and clothes to the backs and the mouths of those people throughout the world who need those things so badly. Some day we will be able to say that as we have conquered the tools of production in this country, and it can no longer

be said that there is any danger of people starving in Canada for want of food, if the distribution operations of our country were effective, some day we will rise up and be able to say and evolve a plan of distribution of goods and services that are produced in such abundance in one country, to other countries.

Now, we have not been able to do that effectively. We have not been able to do it on a scale commensurate with the problem, and until we do, we shall have to remember that armies alone will not stop Communism, but there must be a twin ally, and that is a feeling on the part of the people of this country towards the feelings of the needs and aspirations of the people in the other parts of the world.

Here in Ontario it seems to me that we can best discharge our responsibilities by using that simple phrase of keeping our house in order. We can make our greatest contribution by seeing to-day in this province of ours that our people are fed, and that they are clothed, that they have an opportunity to work, and that they have a house to live in. If we do that, we will have discharged in a very great measure, our responsibilities in the world picture which is so very great and very grave to-day.

As we go through this Session, I believe that all of us are imbued with the ideal that we should bend our legislative efforts toward correcting conditions in this Province that will make our people happier and make their future more secure. I have always believed, and I reiterate again this afternoon that one of the greatest allies of Communism is dirt and filth and things like that, people who have nothing to wear and nothing to eat, they are the ones upon which this ism preys, and under which it multiplies.

It seems to me our greatest contribution, therefore, would be to see within the limits of our powers and of our legislative ability to make our people happy, to see that they have something worthwhile to live for, and that the horizon does not remain stationary, but grows brighter forever in the Province of Ontario.

Then, from that viewpoint I approach not only the Speech from the Throne itself, but the measures that we should adopt in this Province that were not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne.

Now, traditionally we have had the mover and the seconder speaking for the Government, and

I want to say at once that I was impressed with the manner in which they discussed public problems. It may have been that they paid very close attention to the script before them, but that, of course, is excusable, especially upon their first speech in the House. These two men come from constituencies, the City of London, and the Provincial Riding of North Wellington, that were represented in the last House by Liberal members, and I think all the House will agree who knew those two members that they made a contribution to the public life of this Province.

As we go forward in the business of this House, I hope those two hon. members will again participate in the discussions, and that they will also give of their best for the Province and for the things the Province stands for.

I am not going to say anything about the speech of the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. Root) who is, of course, my neighbour up there, and I have known him for some time. He and I have one thing in common, at least, we have earned our living from the top six inches of the soil. He has one thing over me, he did not enter politics until he was pretty well on in life -- perhaps not so far on -- but later

than I was, and, therefore, I suppose he has amassed some of this world's goods before entering the political arena. That is a mistake some of us made, and if we had it to do over again, we probably would not repeat it. But, I do want to say a word or two about the hon. member for London (Mr. Robarts). I listened carefully to his speech and two things set out in that speech, I wish to draw your attention to for a moment. He said, in the course of his remarks, this rather amazing thing: he said the Federal Government is taking more from the people of Canada by way of taxes now than it took at the peak of spending during the Second World War. Now, hear the hon. member (Mr. Robarts) make that statement, using solemn tones and being very serious about letting these words go, you would think he had unearthed something that was, to say the least, a bombshell in the political affairs of this Province and this Dominion, that the Dominion Government was spending more now than at the height of World War II. Well, I doubt if there is any jurisdiction in the Dominion of Canada that is not spending more now than it was at the height of World War II.

Certainly, if the hon. member (Mr. Robarts) took the time to look it up, he would find in the Auditor's Report, that in the Province of Ontario in 1945, we collected by way of taxes $117,000,000, and in 1951 we had collected $265,000,000, from $117,000,000 in 1945 to $265,000,000 in 1951, and so if the Federal Government has sinned, then they are not alone in the crime that they have committed. We have done that in the Province of Ontario, and we are not alone; we are not charged with the responsibility for preparations for defence; we are not charged with the great national problems that are part of the jurisdiction of the Dominion Government, and the danger, of course, of statements like that is, that the innocent ones who read that in the paper, or hear those words, are inclined to think that here in Canada we have a Government that has no consideration for the people at all, and just goes on taxing for the sake of taxing.

In this Dominion of Canada, our Dominion Government is charged, as hon. members know, with a very heavy responsibility, and they are discharging it, in my judgment, in a very satisfactory way.

Now, the other statement the hon. member (Mr. Robarts) made, and about which I want to say a

word, came later on in his speech when he was talking about Dominion-Provincial relations, talking particularly about the proposed agreement between the Province and the Dominion on the exchange of taxation fields. He made this amazing statement. He said that eight of our ten provinces are existing largely by hand-outs from the Federal Treasury under a system which Ontario and Quebec have very properly refused to subscribe to.

Well now, it is true, as hon. members of the House know, that eight out of ten of the provinces of Canada have an agreement with the Dominion Government on the taxation fields, and it is true, also, that these agreements run for five years. I think I am not mistaken in saying that they terminate some time next month, and already some of the other provinces of Canada have re-signed agreements for another five years, which is, in itself, an indication that they do not consider that this was any mere hand-out from the Dominion Government.

Now, I want to come to the Hon. Prime Minister just for a moment in regard to this particular statement. There is one thing that the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is, above other things. He is an astute politician. There was a time when we said that and we

hoped it was not true, but now we have learned it is an actuality, and that the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) can lead a sort of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde life sometimes, and that he has given a demonstration of his ability in that connection in respect to the Dominion-Provincial relations, and the taxation field.

Now, when the election was on, the co-operative spirit of the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), could be seen at a glance, he was so willing, so willing to co-operate with Ottawa, that you would think they were brothers under the skin. No one would doubt from his statements, particularly the way he made those statements, that he was insincere when he said that he was anxious to do everything he could to co-operate with the Federal Government at Ottawa.

Then, after the election is over, the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) seems to put on a coat of a different colour, and the hon. member for London (Mr. Robarts) speaking the other day, and I assume he was speaking for the Government, said that these agreements and the money that comes under them, were hand-outs, and that Ontario and Quebec have very properly refused to subscribe.

Now, about two or three weeks ago, the announce-

ment was made from the Minister of Finance at Ottawa, of the amount Ontario would get under a new deal which would commence, I think, next March, which is a month away. Now, the figure as I have read it and can understand it, is a very substantial improvement upon the amount the Dominion offered for the rental of those fields in the past number of years, and it represents an amount quite considerably greater than the revenues this Province received from these fields in the last few years. How that can be considered a hand-out, and how we can say in one breath and with apparent meaning that we were justified beyond any doubt in not signing those agreements, and in virtually saying that we have not signed them in the past and are not going to sign them in the future, I don't know. I think the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would be better advised to continue the position he occupied when the campaign was on, and to make, if that is possible, a reasonable agreement with Ottawa for the rental of these taxation fields.

He has said time and again, and I believe he means it, that he knows, as we all do, that Ottawa faces very heavy commitments in the years that lie ahead, and if this will help the financing of these great projects and the paying for these

great services which must be rendered by the people of Canada, then we should not dismiss with a wave of the hand any suggestion that we should participate in a rental field, these particular taxation fields.

I want to hear from the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in this particular matter, and I hope that the hon. member for London (Mr. Robarts) was not speaking for the Government completely when he made that rather astounding statement the other day in moving the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

I want to just for a very few moments deal with another subject that has Dominion-Provincial implications, and that has to do with our unemployed people in the Province at the moment.

I want to be perfectly frank with the House and to say just what I think should be done in respect to this great problem; for, Mr. Speaker, a great problem it is. You cannot have the many thousands of people that we have in this Province to-day who are willing to work and who cannot find a job, and not realize that we have a great problem on our hands. The Hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) in speaking the other day, made it

quite clear that we accept in this Province responsibility for the unemployed unemployables -- I believe that is the right term -- but we disclaim any responsibility for unemployed employables. The first point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, in regard to that position is this, that this statement of the Government policy on the part of the Hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) was not from any agreement that they have with the Dominion Government. That was an arbitrary decision on the part of the Provincial Government. It is just a position they take in respect to this matter, without seeking to get an agreement on a three-level basis, Provincial, Municipal, and Federal. It was the outcome of discussions within the province itself, within the Government itself, and they came up with the decision that we are in no way responsible for the payment for relief of those people who are employable and yet are unemployed.

I want to say on that question, Mr. Speaker, to make myself quite plain on it, I agree to an extent and a very considerable extent, that the Dominion Government have a major share of responsibility for looking after the unemployed people who are employable. I agree with that. I believe that after all, national

policies have more to do with current unemployment situations in particular localities, than any other cause. I would agree, therefore, that the Dominion Government should be primarily responsible, but not wholly responsible. I do not think this Province is on safe ground when it says to the people of Ontario and the people of Canada that we will not pay a single red cent for people in our Province who are unemployed, because we think the Dominion should pay the whole of it.

I remember, as the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) does, that back in the days of the "dark twenties" we had just such a situation as this.

(Take "C" follows)

The Dominion would not accept responsibility; the province would not, and the municipalities could not. And we had the dickering back and forth which does not hasten a solution to our problems. I do not know how permanent our unemployment situation is going to be in this province. I believe at the moment, when spring opens up, a lot of it will be dissipated, but I think we should prepare now for the day when it may return. I do not think it is safe for us to say in this House that the unemployment problem will disappear in the spring, and will not reappear again. I think now is the time, Mr. Speaker, for the three levels of government to come to a decision as to the line of demarkation in regard to their responsibilities for this particular problem. I believe, furthermore, if we went to the Dominion government, and if we assumed some responsibilities ourselves, rather than throw it all in their lap, there would be a measure of co-operation which would result in an agreement which would be beneficial to the people, particularly those who are unemployed, and would on the other hand say to the people generally that we care after all; that we feel we have a responsibility for our fellow men, and we feel we have a responsibility for creating conditions of employment for our fellow men.

I do not for a moment think we should help the

fellow who will not work even if he has the opportunity, but I think we should go out of our way to help the man who will work if an opportunity is presented and there are thousands of those people who are unemployed in this province to-day.

I want to say a word on another subject, Mr. Speaker, and it has to do with the Bill the hon. Prime Minister introduced to-day for ratification of the agreement between the province and the Federal government for the development of the St.Lawrence waterway.

I want to say at once that on the general principle of facilitating the development of power on the St. Lawrence, we are with you one hundred percent. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that we should keep this in mind, that this presents an opportunity and a challenge to the people of Ontario and the people of Canada that we should grasp and hang right onto. It provides us with an opportunity of calling on our imagination, if you will, calling on our engineering ability, calling on our man-power and calling on our money to do a great and magnificent job for the people of Canada and of Ontario. And I will say that I agree with the hon. member for Grenville Dundas (Mr. Challies) when he said this afternoon we were not fooling when we spoke about developing the St. Lawrence, but that we do mean it with every breath we possess, and we intend

to pursue this great development until it is completed. I think it will awaken the people of the United States more than anything else to see that we are determined to do this job and carry it through to a final conclusion. It was of interest to read in the Press of the United States within the last two or three days, the discussions in regard to this matter and to see where one of their Senators said, "I believe they mean business on their side of the border". Of course we mean business on our side of the border and it will also serve to show them that we can do a big job without hanging onto the coattails of any neighbour, no matter how great or how influential that neighbour may be.

When the Bill comes down we will naturally look at its provisions, but on the principle and policy of the development of the St. Lawrence, in conjunction with the Dominion government, we are at one, and we will back you up to the limit.

I want to say just a word on one more subject which has already been touched upon in the debates of the House. It has do with with housing. I understand from intimations and from the Speech from the Throne that the government will bring down some legislation which they hope will facilitate the

building of more houses in the province of Ontario. I am quite aware of the difficulties which lie in the path of increasing the number of houses built in this province. I do not need any lecture nor any more information on this particular subject. But, in spite of that, Mr. Speaker, I refuse to believe that this great and wealthy province of Ontario should not and could not do more than they are doing at the present time. This problem is one which presents a great challenge to the people of the Province of Ontario and to this government; it is a problem which cuts across party lines; it is a problem which means something to every person in the province. No matter what course we have to pursue to attain the desired end, we have to develop a policy in this province which will really build houses for people to live in. I want to say frankly to the hon. Prime Minister that as far as I am concerned -- and I am sure those who sit around me will agree -- we are not concerned whether we have to spend a few million dollars in order to attain that end. I think the end itself will justify an expenditure on the part of the Provincial government to make sure this great crisis in our history is overcome and that people will have places in which to live. I hope the legislation which comes down will really tackle the problem and have some chance of success.

I do not want to say much about the Provincial-Municipal situation. The hon. members of this House who were here a number of years ago will recall that I had the opportunity -- and used it -- to bring this problem before the House on a number of occasions, and I was rather interested the other day to read the proposals of the Mayors and Reeves Association and find that they follow pretty well the recommendations I made to the government almost four years ago. I brought this subject up a number of years ago, because I knew that not only was it a great problem, but it was a developing problem, and one which was going to be aggravated, as the years went on.

The position of the municipalities to-day is not very good, from a financial point of view. Every hon. member in this House knows it, and every hon. member in this House knows the reason why. I hope we will have the report from this Committee before long. We have had some experiences in this House with reports of committees. We had at one time -- I do not recall at the moment just how many years ago it was -- the occasion where we looked for a report month by month and year by year, until the time ran up to about six years. I hope that will not be the situation in respect to this particular Committee.

MR. FROST: What did the hon. Leader of the Opposition do with the report then?

MR. OLIVER: What did we do with it? What did you do with it? Do you know where it is to-day?

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, -- and I think the hon. Prime Minister will agree with this -- if the report of this Committee is to be delayed for years, then I think they should seriously tackle the question of interim assistance to the municipalities. The hon. Prime Minister suggested a few days ago in this House that there was a possibility that an interim report would be presented to the Legislature. I hope he will pursue that angle, because the municipalities do not want to wait -- indeed, they cannot afford to wait -- for years for this report to come in and for the government to act upon it.

I do not want to go into the question of provincial-municipal relations to-day, because it is properly before the Committee appointed by the government, and I know they will report sometime, and I hope before too long.

I want to touch for a moment or two on another subject not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne which, in my judgment, should have occupied a major space in that address. That has to do with conservation.

I do not want to dwell at any length on this subject, but I want to emphasize to the hon. Prime Minister again that he is missing a great deal in respect to conservation in this province. All the farm papers are in agreement that there is urgent need for a conservation policy in Ontario. Even the Globe and Mail this morning took the government to task -- in a mild way, of course -- for not having a conservation act brought before the House at this particular Session. The problem, it seems to me, is one which if we do not tackle pretty soon, we will not be able to at all. At the present time you have farm people and people in the urban sections throughout the province of Ontario, who are talking about and are interested in conservation. You have Authorities set up in various parts of the province, and now is the time to strike in regard to conservation in this province. Any delay, even beyond this Session, may well be disastrous to the whole principle of conservation, and all that it means to the province of Ontario. There is, without any doubt, a great field for endeavor there which the government has failed to use; they have failed to implement the report of the committee, they have failed to do anything about it; they are just letting it slide. The disastrous part of the whole situation is--

-- and the hon. Prime Minister will agree with me, I am sure -- that people once concerned about a problem and then having to wait and seeing nothing happen, are gradually but surely having their interest damaged in the question of conservation. You will find that unless something constructive or definite is done in the very near future, the interest the people had in this great problem will have almost disappeared. I think the hon. Prime Minister will agree with me, too, that when you set up conservation Authorities in various parts of the province, and the people go to the Authorities with the idea of getting the job done, when they run up against a stone wall of inactivity, with nothing being done by the government, in a few months the interest of the people lags and the whole thing falls flat. I ask, I plead, I implore

the hon. Prime Minister in the days that remain in this Session to implement in a large way the report of the Committee on Conservation, before it is too late.

I see that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) has left his seat, but I want to say just a word about the farm picture. The picture at the present moment is not good. I think we all realize that the prices of farm products had begun to fall even before the outbreak of the foot and mouth disease in

Western Canada and now the market for cattle and hogs is completely demoralized in Toronto and other centres, and the situation is anything but bright. I think it can be said on behalf of the farmer that they are willing to accept their just share for cutting down the cost of living, but they do not want to be charged with the full responsibility. I will have an opportunity to speak later to the hon. Minister of Agriculture about these matters. I know he understands them and appreciates them, and I hope that by working together we can gain some knowledge and arrive at a solution to these marketing problems.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to speak at any greater length this afternoon. We will have ample opportunity to discuss various measures when they come down in the House.

But I do want to say to the House that in the position which the groups occupy in this legislature at the moment there is a lesson which I think all of us can learn. It is not the lesson which the hon. Prime Minister thinks it is. What I had in mind was this: the government in this Legislature is in a very strong position numerically. They have almost all the Seats, even though they obtained only forty-nine percent of the votes. We have very few Seats

even though we obtained fifty-one percent of the votes. I am not one to cry over spilled milk. It has happened. I can foresee it will be a little disastrous to the province, but we have to make the best of it. I look on this situation in this light; that the stronger the government is numerically, the greater their responsiblity to govern well, and the smaller the Opposition is, on their shoulders rests a great responsibility to uphold the age-old functions of an Opposition.

So far as we are concerned, in this particular section of the House, we are going to view the Legislation that comes down with a critical eye. We are not going to oppose Legislation just for the sake of Opposition, but you can depend upon it we will oppose as vigorously as we can the measures which we think will conflict with the best interests of this province. We think that is proper. Not only is it proper from a political standpoint, but it is certainly preferable from a provincial standpoint, in the interests of the people generally. We will not be concerned, in the days which lie ahead, about small, insignificant matters, but we will give every attention and the closest scrutiny to those things which are of great importance to the province. We will not be slow to criticise where, in our judgment, criticism is due.

The government, on the other hand, can adopt one of two courses. They can either give vent to their feelings and ride roughshod over the Opposition. Sometimes I think that is the better course. I think I would enjoy it more. Or they can pursue a course consistent with the dignity of the responsibilities they carry or they can appreciate if they will -- and I hope they will, in the interests of the province -- that the people generally are afraid at the present time -- and I imagine with some justification -- that their large majority is going to give them the feeling that they are called from some place higher than this to carry on the affairs of the province.

Of course, the government can pursue whichever course it likes, but so far as we are concerned here, we are aware of the responsibilities of the Opposition; we are acquainted with the historic background of Opposition down through the years in British Parliamentary institutionsand even though we are small in numbers, we will do our very best to see that the functions of the Opposition are properly discharged in this Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to say to the House that even though the government came back with a very large majority, and some people might say that the people endorsed the government holus bolus,

that everything they did and everything they intended to do was given the stamp of approval. I do not share that opinion. I feel there are some things the government has failed to do which they certainly should have done, and I believe there are also things which the government has done which they should have avoided doing. To make my position particularly clear, in regard to these remarks, I want to move, seconded by Mr. Nixon,

> That the Motion for an Address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor now before the House be amended by adding thereto the following words:-
>
> But this House regrets:
>
> 1. THAT no definite interim assistance is being provided by the Government for the relief of Municipalities pending the report of the Provincial-Municipal Committee;
>
> 2. THAT the government has failed to provide adequate aasistance to meet the rising costs of Education in the Municipalities.
>
> 3. THAT the government has failed to disclose any plan to remedy the obvious defects in The Labour Relations Act. (1950)
>
> 4. THAT the government has failed to forecast legislation which would implement the unanimous recommendations of the Select Committee on Conservation.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I join with what my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) has said relative to your election to preside over the proceedings of this Assembly, which I know you will do in the best tradition, and in the ways you have demonstrated in the past, with dignity and fairness.

I would also like to join in the word of congratulation extended to the mover and seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. This was done by two very able young men, of whom I feel much will be heard in the days to come. I am sure they will make, in their time, worthy contributions to the affairs of this Province, and to the proceedings of this House. May I also congratulate my friend, the hon. Leader of the Opposition. There are things here, Mr. Speaker, which make me feel at home in this Assembly, the surroundings, many of the faces here, and in particular, the smiling face of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and that of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon).

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): You have more than two friends on this side.

MR. FROST: I am looking at these two at the moment. After all, they are the mover and seconder of this amendment condemning the government, and so I address myself to them in particular.

In regard to the Speech from the Throne; may I say that I am disappointed in the fact that the hon. Leader of the Opposition would not have found at least this opportunity of commending the government, instead of finding some reason to condemn

it. I despair of ever having a Throne Speech prepared which will satisfy the hon. Leader of the Opposition, as much as I have endeavoured to do so in the past. However, I ask him to be of good heart, because out of the last nine speeches with which he has disagreed, in language similar to that he used this afternoon, has come the most progressive legislation which this province has ever seen. I want to congratulate him on the address he delivered this afternoon. It was one of his usual very able speeches. He always make an able speech, and this afternoon's was no exception.

Another matter he mentioned is one upon which I want to touch briefly. That is in reference to the positions of the government and the opposition.

As I said on the very memorable night of the 22nd of November last year, we might, with some justification, have regarded what occurred on that day as a great political victory. However, the government and its supporters are not coming here in an atomosphere of a feeling of jubilation, for what may, in time, be rated as a great political victory. We come here in a spirit of humility, recognizing the responsibilities ... the events of the 22nd of November have imposed upon us. We regard that event, not as a matter for jubilation, but as a matter of responsibility to give to the people of this province, of which the hon. Leader of the Opposition has spoken, as "good government". That is the feeling in which we come here today, the feeling with which we came here at the commencement of this Session. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that our feeling will be as I expressed them prior to and during the election, a feeling of co-operation, and a good feeling toward the people

and toward all governments. May I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that I have not retreated from the stand I have taken in this province in relation to other parties, other governments, and other people who may not agree with us. Our position is the same - one of co-operation.

We have great rights to uphold in this province. Any government worthy of its salt must represent the people it is elected to represent. That, Mr. Speaker, we will endeavour to do. At the same time we recognize that any great partnership, such as the partnership of the Canadian governments, the prime necessity always is the ability of governments for the common good. That will always be our attitude. As I said the other day in connection with perhaps a minor matter, we are not looking for opportunities to disagree with other governments; we are looking for opportunities to agree with them. If there are disagreements, we hope to be able to conciliate and mediate them, in order that we may get on with the business of government.

As regards the Opposition: any co-operation we can extend to them will be extended. I hope there will never be a time during the course of this government when we will "ride roughshod" over the Opposition, because it is small in numbers. I can assure the hon. members opposite that such will never be the case.

MR. OLIVER: I was not afraid of that.

MR. FROST: You expressed some concern about it. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition says he is not afraid of the government doing that, he at least expressed some concern, in that he impressed upon us the position of the Opposition in parliamentary government.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that we will extend to all the hon. members opposite in Opposition, every facility for the performance of the constitutional functions it is their duty to perform. We will lean backward to give that assistance. I may say that we will do our best to see there is no question or no ground upon which they can oppose us. For years I have been endeavouring to convert the Opposition. I have tried to do that on various occasions. I think there is an indication that we have been, to a degree, successful, but while we have not been able to convert the hon. members themselves, at least we have been able to convince the people who elect the hon. members, that our government is worthy of support. We will continue to endeavour to do that.

We have set as our objective the giving of good government to the people of this province. We will do our best to be a good government, to be, as I have said before, the peoples' government, and I say to the hon. members opposite in opposition, if the Opposition is as good as we are a government, it will be the best Opposition this province has ever had.

Mr. Speaker, there are many points which the hon. Leader of the Opposition has mentioned, in his very able speech. I will attempt only to touch upon some of them.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to the unemployment policy. May I remind my hon. friend that the policy we are presently following in connection with the problem is exactly the same policy which was formulated by the government of which he was a mamber, back in 1942, at the time of the passing of the amendment permitting the passage of unemployment insurance. The government which the hon. Leader of the

Opposition then supported took the position - and I believe very rightly - that the matter of employables was a matter for the senior government. We have followed that policy since that time.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the amendment which was proposed, and which I sincerely hope will not pass this house, and which contains a measure of censure imposed, because of the government's alleged failure to go into the matter of conservation.

(Take "D" follows).

I was much interested in hearing my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) say that in the matter of conservation, the Government had done nothing, that it was just letting things slide -- these are his words -- and that people felt that they were receiving no co-operation from the Government, and he implored and prayed that the Government would do something in connection with the report of the Conservation Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservation Committee sat as a result of direction from this House some two years ago; they did not sit for five years, they did a very useful job in some five or six months. They prepared a report under the chairmanship of the now Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Thomas) which is worthy of study and perusal by every hon. member of this House. I commend the report to the hon. members as an excellent report.

My hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) would have us believe that we have taken that report and put it on the bottom shelf of the table. That is not the case. We have done these things, and I would just like to impress them on my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver). I may say that inherent in the Speech from

the Throne, in many phases, is the matter of conservation, in connection with agriculture, in connection with lands and forests and other things. Let me give this very brief report to the House, because the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Thomas) will be dealing with this at some length later on.

Above everything else, I would not want the people of this Province to think that we in any way were overlooking this great problem, and I can assure hon. members that great sums of public money are being expended on it. One of the general recommendations of the Committee was that a Minister should be appointed responsible to the Premier of the Province.

At the outset, we formed a Committee representative of the Departments of the Prime Minister, Agriculture, Lands and Forests, Planning and Development, and Public Works, and we chose as the Secretary of that Committee, the Secretary of the Conservation Committee, Mr. Crown, a very able gentleman. This was in November, 1950. The object was to act as a clearing centre for information on provincial conservation activities, and particularly in the fields of research, education, operation, and co-operation, and to advice generally on matters of conservation with a view to integration.

Now, sir, this report which my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) says we have let slide, and about which we have done nothing, of the eighty-four recommendations in the report, 48 of them are already implemented, 19 are presently being given study, and there are 17 which are being held in abeyance at the moment, making a total of 84.

To show our intention in this matter, one of the actions which the Government took was the appointment last fall of a Minister of Public Works who would be charged with the co-ordination of conservation efforts.

(Page D-4 follows)

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that that in itself was a great step in connection with this problem. Just let me briefly tell you of some of the things that are being done and the millions of dollars that are being spent. the Department of Lands and Forests; the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) will be speaking on that subject shortly. I see here expenditures of nearly a million dollars in connection with matters mentioned in the report, municipal reforestation, nursery extensions, extension of forestry service, soil surveys, certain types of experiments in scientific matters, seed production experiments, forest genetics and the construction of dams throughout the Province for the conservation of water. There you have, Mr. Speaker, nearly a million dollars.

Let us look at the Conservation Authorities. I see during this year something of the order of $2,000,000. being spent on conservation work.

One of the recommendations of the report, was in connection with co-operation between the three levels of government and particularly with the Federal Government. We have been able to achieve that partnership. It is true that because of the demands for defence purposes, the Federal Government has asked us to withhold certain work. Nevertheless we are proceeding with such gigantic works as the Fanshaw Dam where a minimum expenditure

of between $4,000,000. and $5,000,000. is required Thisis in progress at the present time. The Hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) will mention these matters more specifically. These are things which are positive, and we have formed a partnership in connection with our senior government and also with the junior governments.

I may say in connection with Lands and Forests that there we have a very close liaison with the Federal Government. We have as a consultant to the Government, General Kennedy who is associated with the great works being done on the east slope of the Rockies and who is giving us the benefit of his advice in connection with many of these things.

This, Sir, is a very many-sided problem indeed. For instance,in connection with the Department of Agriculture, at the present time soil surveys in conjunction with the Federal Government, involving millions of acres of land --

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Well, that is not new at all.

MR. FROST: It is not new, but nevertheless at the present time instead of "letting things slide," as my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) said we have nearly nineteen million acres of soil survey completed in Southern Ontario. That is a big thing. Regarding the work we are doing in connection with soils and agricultural engineering: Just recently we acquired

a farm at Guelph, near the College Farm, and further studies in that important study are under way. We have experiments in erosion and in other things carried on by the Department of Agriculture.

In Public Works we have what has been done in connection with drainage, which my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) knows is extensive, following the passage of the Provincial Drainage Act, which I think was before this House following the report, in which the Government very greatly increased its grants and assistance in regard to drainage. There again we have a very large sum of money expended and very large sums of money laid out in connection with those matters.

Consider the whole field, for instance of forest management, which of course is a phase of conservation. On that important matter we have spent millions of dollars. We have now the first forest inventory in the history of America about to be completed, where our great forest lands have been aerially photographed and checked by ground crews, with the result that we are getting more and more information concerning the great problem of conservation and of protection of our resources wherever they may be in this Province.

I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), and I think he is bound to agree with this, that no government in the history of this Province has done more for conservation than this Government

has done in the last two years, and I think my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) to start with might take paragraph 4 out of his amendment and forget about it.

I will say to my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), that I share with him the concern of our people that we should never let up on this problem. I share his concern on that subject and I may say that our concern is emphasized by the action we have taken in selecting the chairman of the Committee which made this great, monumental and historic report as an hon. Minister in this Government who is charged with the co-ordination of the various Departments of government that have the subject of conservation in their charge.

Mr. Speaker, if I may work back in this amendment. I see that "the Government has failed to disclose any plans to remedy the obvious defects in The Labour Relations Act of 1950". I have listened very intently to what my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) said on that subject. I was anxious to hear what he might say on the subject and, he never said a word about it at all, -- not a thing.

MR. OLIVER: I did not mention it.

MR. FROST: He did not mention labour when he came to this amendment which condemns the Government. I would be interested in hearing what my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) has to propose in connection with that very important subject.

MR. OLIVER: Well, you will certainly hear what we have to say on it.

MR. FROST: . . I would have expected that on a subject of such importance, as my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) would have taken the first opportunity of impressing upon the House his views in connection with that problem.

If I may, I should like to refer to that subject. I will not evade it as my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) has done, I will deal with the subject and tell my hon. friends of the success and indeed perhaps some of the failures we have had in connection with that great new subject of labour relationships. In so doing may I say this? The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) is not here but I think we can say beyond a shadow of doubt that our hon. Minister of Labour with his ability, with his good humour, with his knowledge of human relations is making the greatest contribution to industrial peace anywhere in the Dominion of Canada. Indeed I may say we have a Minister of Labour who is unique in his success and in his methods of handling this problem, and that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) is indeed a great Minister of Labour.

Labour relations will be dealt with in its many aspects during the sittings of this Legislature. The Minister of Labour will be making a comprehensive statement at a later date. I should

like, however, to make some reference to this important department which has greatly engaged the attention of the Government during the past year.

There are many points which might be referred to, including the effect of the Gale decision, the facts of which are sub judice, the administration of the Act, the Labour Relations Board, Workmen's Compensation and many other things. I shall to-day, however, confine myself to the general objectives of the Act.

As I have said before, Mr. Speaker, in what we do it is after all perhaps about 25% per cent laws, rules and regulations, and about 75 per cent common sense. That is where you get the best results.

The legislation and practice in connection with labour relations have only been the outgrowth of the last nine years. Many of us were in this Chamber in 1943 when the first collective bargaining legislation was introduced and put into effect here. The present Act, Sir, is not the last word, I want to emphasize that we are dealing with a particular and a peculiar subject where the administration of it and the jurisprudence connected with it have to come from experience. As the Throne Speech states, -- "The Labour Relations Act of Ontario was designed to enable labour and management to bargain collectively and to provide an atmosphere in which differences can be composed."

That, Sir, is the purpose of the Act.

It has been the desire of the Government throughout these years that Government intervention in labour relations should be at a minimum. We have desired that our conciliation services should be designed to bring the parties together, but not to dictate. As a result, by and large, a fair degree of success has been achieved. Quite admittedly, what we have done and what we are doing is not perfect, but by care and experience we are constantly endeavouring to perfect our practices in the broad field of labour relations and labour jurisprudence where we have been breaking new ground.

During the past few months there have been four strikes which have attracted wide public attention and comment,- the Timmins Strike, the T.T.C. Strike, the Ford Strikes, and added to this is the Consumers' Gas Settlement. These experiences are fresh in mind. There is one conclusion which stands out and that is that there is no substitute for agreements freely arrived at around the bargaining table, and no artificial manner in dealing with it can substitute for that principle.

From time to time arbitration has been advanced as a solution to labour-management problems. This method when voluntarily arrived at has made its contribution to industrial peace. There is a difference between voluntary and compulsory arbitration.

There are objections to compulsory arbitration from industry and labour. It is not hard to see why. By imposing compulsory arbitration the Government assumes the role of telling both labour and management what they must do. If the Government were able to appoint infallible and all-seeing arbitrators then, of course, all would be well. We, however, have to deal with human beings with all of their human qualities. Let us consider our experience.

In the four disputes which I have mentioned we appointed Boards of Conciliation. Our appointment was limited to the Chairman. We did our very best to appoint chairmen who would conciliate differences and help the parties to arrive at solutions. As a result, in those four cases, we found that in one case the conciliation finding was almost wholly acceptable by labour and unacceptable to the industry and, in another case, the finding was agreeable to industry but unsatisfactory to labour, in the others, the findings were generally unacceptable to either side. All of which demonstrates the impossibility of finding infallible arbitrators. In the end, there is no substitute for agreement arrived at around the bargaining table in an attitude of give-and-take and based upon the wide knowledge of the parties negotiating in connection with the business of which they are a part. In the complicated Ford dispute, what arbitrator could possibly be qualified to tell

the Company what it must do? What arbitrator could possibly be qualified to tell labour what it must do? After all, these people know their business better than anyone else and they have to come together around the table and argue these things out and settle the differences between them in the interests of the industry of which they are a part.

There conceivably are cases where public interest and convenience might necessitate a form of compulsory arbitration. We in this Chamber can see that possibility. It is to be hoped that good sense and moderation will prevent the necessity of action by the Legislature. As a matter of fact, such a situation has never arisen. It would only be in the most extreme case and would depend upon the merits of each individual case. The principle of compulsory arbitration would never be successful in general application, for the reasons I have given.

There is another factor in labour relations which has become manifest over these years, and that is the increasing responsibility which rests on organized Labour. There has been a spectacular growth of labour organizations in the Province over the last nine years. Those of us who have been here have seen that, from those days of small beginnings when the Labour Relations Act was first introduced

nine years ago. With this has come great new responsibilities to labour. Labour has become a very real partner in industry and of course must be interested in the success and the expansion of industry and through it our ability to maintain our high standard of living, and be ; able to do business in the markets of the world. In the development of our Province and our economy the responsibilities of labour and management are very great indeed.

Prominently; in this is the fact that the strike weapon is one which should be very sparingly used. The use of the strike weapon has its effects on the public and the individual and upon public convenience and, therefore, should be used only in the extreme cases. That is the part of good sense and moderation. Remember, the component parts of industry, whether it be labour or management, are dependent upon the opinion of the public, in the end,upon "Old Man Ontario", and it is well that public opinion should be taken into consideration.

With the growth of labour responsibilities is the question of the protection and conservation of property which should be paramount. If strikes become a necessity, they should be orderly. Property should be protected and the laws of the land should be scrupulously observed. Picketing should be peaceful and in accordance with the Criminal Code of

Canada. There is no doubt that the public expects and insists upon this, and remember, we are all servants of the public. It is what the public says that goes. The observance of these things is important from the public standpoint. The observance increases the public confidence in the ability and the stature of the parties concerned to carry out their vast responsibilities with a minimum of Government intervention. And that, Sir, is the way it ought to be. Labour relations must be centred around a table. It is just as simple as that. Non-observance is to forfeit the all-important thing -- public opinion -- because it is a negation of democracy.

Again I say, the plan of our Act in Ontario, which has brought the greatest degree of peace between labour and management in the history of this Province, is to enable labour and management to bargain collectively and to provide an atmosphere in which differences can be composed, and in which both labour and management can carry out their high responsibilities in connection with the development and betterment of our Province. Our constant endeavour will be to strengthen our laws, our practices and our administration to that end.

That, Sir, is a position with which I think my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) can hardly disagree.

I think perhaps he might strike out clause 3 of his amendment and agree with us that our

administration of the law and the success we have achieved is unparalleled in the history of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I should like in conclusion -- because time goes very rapidly -- to say something about our fiscal position, if I may, in a brief sort of way. This is a matter of great importance and great difficulty and one to which hon. members in this House will be wanting to be giving a great deal of attention. As a prelude to what I say, may I refer to two editorials, and perhaps I might entitle this: "The Tale of Two Editorials". Both are taken from my old friend the Toronto Star, which paper I read carefully and diligently. As I said before sometimes, when I find that I am taut with the day's work, I pick up the Star before I go to sleep, in order to relax and get a little sense of humour back into my system.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT: (Cochrane South): Reading the "funnies"?

MR. FROST: , The "Tale of Two Editorials". January 14th, 1952. I read this with great interest:

"QUEBEC'S FINE FISCAL YEAR"

When a provincial treasurer of Ontario announces a surplus, he is speaking in terms of ordinary account only. In Quebec they have a different system. They do announce

an ordinary account surplus, but they also include the over-all result; that is, revenues minus current and capital expenditures combined. The Quebec budget speech for the fiscal year 1952 which will end with March (eight months actual and four months estimated) indicates a surplus of $63,598,000. -- "

that is a lot of money, --

" -- on ordinary account, which is reduced to an over-all surplus of $1,169,000. when capital expenditures are accounted for."

That is, charged against it. That would make the mouths of my hon. friends' the members for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and Grey South (Mr. Oliver) water indeed.

"This is the sixth successive over-all surplus. The ordinary account surplus is certainly an impressive one -- sufficient to meet $62,429,000 of capital expenditures and have well over a million dollars to spare. The province's net debt has been reduced by $52,000,000 since 1945 and now stands at $256,000,000."

Mr. Speaker, I will turn now to the editorial of February 27th -- just yesterday:

"ESTIMATE $166,030,
ACTUAL $15,483,683"

Now this soul-searching question :

"Why does the province tuck away nearly $21,700,000?"

Now remember, Mr. Speaker, in one case $63½ million is tucked away and that is a "Fine Fiscal Year",--

"Why does the province tuck away nearly $21,700,000 into the sinking fund, when less than $7,200,000 was forecast as a reasonable allocation? The obvious answer is that this reduces the shock to the public of a surplus huge beyond all reason; although $15,500,000 is certainly a shock in itself. Subtracting from $37,182,032 the $7,198,000 forecast as a reasonable diversion to sinking fund, it would seem that the province collected nearly $30,000,000 too much in taxes."

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me depart from these two editorials, and
refer my hon. friends here to budget speeches which have been made in the past, certainly over the past eight or nine years and particularly the Budget Speech of 1944, which deals with the great problem of the net debt of the Province. Now, Sir, first

of all -- and this has a relationship to Federal-Provincial relations which have been referred to by two hon. members of this House -- the Budget of 1951 was prepared on the basis of ten months actual experience and two months forecast. The two months forecast took in the all-important month of March, when corporation tax returns are payable -- and I shall come back to this important question in a moment -- with the result that the returns from corporation taxes in the last days of that month were such that the surplus did increase to $15,483,000, a figure which was almost entirely due to the tremendous corporation tax returns which this Province received. That, of course, is an appraisal of Ontario's huge expansion, the development of this Province and the revenues which come from legitimate taxation in connection therewith.

Mr. Speaker, to refer to the figure which my old friend The Star likes to refer to of $37,182,000, is without taking into effect two very important things, first the sinking fund and, secondly, our net debt position, to which I want to refer. In some regards it is like referring to a corporation's profits before depreciation and before provision for Federal taxation. It is the end results, Mr. Speaker, which count.

Let us take the position of our sister Province of Quebec, which I by no means criticize, and our more

moderate position. I read an article in The Financial Post -- some hon. members no doubt read the same article a week or two ago -- in connection with the capitalization with the passing on to posterity of the capital costs of public works.

(Take "E" follows)

The Financial Post argument was that a middle course should be taken, that these things should not all be saddled on the present-day generation. Of course, to bring it into bold relief, the argument between Quebec and ourselves is that Quebec is paying all of its capital costs, highways, buildings, etc., from current revenues. That is a tremendously strong financial position, and not only is it doing that, but it is applying a surplus over and above that, in this case one million dollars, to the reduction of old debt. That is the story of the Quebec financing.

However, Mr. Speaker, to that end the Province of Quebec, and without any criticism from me, in its wisdom, has all of our taxes we have here, has a three percent sales tax, on top of that a direct sales tax, has a meal tax, a tobacco tax, and this so-called capital tax on corporations is double what ours is , and their gasoline tax was recently raised from eleven cents to thirteen cents. It is possible, of course, we might be able to do the same thing as Quebec is doing, but is it the wise thing for us to do? Our policy is a policy very much more moderate than that.

As the first Star Editorial says, we pay all

current expenses from current accounts, including a provision to retire old debt over a period of fifty years. That is where the seven million dollars mentioned, comes from. That is a provision we aim at, paying all our current expenses, our ordinary expenses, plus some seven million dollars and some odd hundred thousand dollars in the retirement of the debt of the province which accrued, some 140 million dollars which accrued while the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) was in office.

In addition to that, we do this. We aim at applying any surplus that we can get in these days of great buoyancy in the reduction of the current capital costs, only carrying to posterity a portion of the costs we incur.

For instance, we may be able to do this: we may have forty million dollars of capital costs for the building of highways and public buildings, and we might have surpluses that may amount to twenty million dollars or twenty-five million dollars. We take that twenty million dollars or twenty-five million dollars and apply it against the current capital expenses, and then we carry the balance into net debt. You can see the great difference between our position and that of Quebec.

In future days it may be different.

I am able to come to this House this afternoon and say that we have the lowest taxation of any province in Canada and we have that intentionally because our people have more burdens; these are days of high costs of living, and with the high costs that we have, costs of government, what would you do? Is it not something to be able to go to the people? Apparently they did commend it. We were able to go to the people and tell them that we have no sales tax in the province, we have no tobacco tax, we have the lowest combined gasoline and license tax in Canada. We are able to say these things to the people, and these are benefits that we are able to pass on to our people.

It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that in Ontario if you do not drink and if you are not the owner of any corporation-taxed shares, and you do not drive a car and you do not go to a theatre, that you do not pay the provincial government any taxes at all. That is the policy we have been following.

There have been a lot of things said about surpluses, and I am sure the hon. members opposite are very much ashamed of what

they said during the election. I am sure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) with his vast experience in this House and with the wise counsel of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) who sits at his side, would know that what he was saying was for political consumption. If we had not followed that policy of applying surplus, and every bit of surplus we could get, to the payment of a portion of the capital costs, to-day the net debt of this Province would be one hundred and thirty million dollars more than it is to-day.

As it is, we have made a very fair degree of success in connection with our net debt position. Unparalleled in the history of this province is the record of these last years. In 1940 the net debt of the province was 507 million dollars; up to the 31st of last March, I am able to tell this House, that all we pass on to posterity to be paid out of taxes is something in the order of fourteen million dollars, which is the amount of my surplus last year that rolled in from corporation taxes. Fourteen million dollars is all that has been accrued in those eleven years, which is, as I say, unparalleled in the history of this Province.

I tell the House that our net debt of 521 million dollars, as it was at the 31st of March last, was all accumulated from the beginning of the century, up to 1940. From 1940 on up to the present time, we have been able to limit this increase to the trifling amount of fourteen million dollars.

I know the hon. members opposite will say that is a great record, it is a record which is unparalled in the history of this Province. Still, it is not as good a record as the Province of Quebec; but, on the other hand, we have very much lower taxation, and we are not going to take their extreme view.

While that has happened, the per capita debt of our people has been in the same period reduced from $136.00 per capita down to $115.00 this last year, and this of course, with a debt of three hundred million dollars,

Now, we are dealing with a different dollar with different assets.

Mr. Speaker, if I may conclude -- the Press sometimes accuses me of saying that many times in the course of a speech, and I will endeavour to say it once on this occasion -- on the matter of our

position in connection with tax rentals, -- and I give you this statement this afternoon as an indication of how difficult a problem that is, how difficult it is to fully appraise the situation, and how difficult it is to judge the potentials of this great province of ours. I must admit that I do not like the subsidy idea; I never did like the subsidy idea.

Not long after my Treasuryship, going back to 1943, when I see the increase we have given to the municipalities from eighteen million dollars up to over one hundred million dollars this last year, and how little satisfaction we seem to have produced in doing it, it makes me fearful of all subsidies. There is not anything that stands in the place of independence for all, and it is very difficult to assess that in terms of dollars and cents.

At the same time, I can assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) that we are most anxious to do a good job for Canada, not only ourselves, but for Canada. On the other hand, I do think he puts a little wrong emphasis on this when he says it is our business to help the Federal Government in these difficult times. I will agree with that in part, but certainly the poor province and the

municipalities can hardly support the administration with all of the taxation powers and all of the revenues. After all, the plight of our municipalities in the province has been difficult, because we have been compressed by the weight of Federal taxation.

On the other hand, I will agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) on this, that it is our desire to be co-operative. We want to be understanding in what we do, and we hope that the Federal administration on their part will be mindful of our problems.

I just prepared this little memo before I came in here. Our discussions with the Government of Canada and Mr. St. Laurent on fiscal arrangements and other matters have been conducted in a spirit of complete frankness and goodwill. I am very glad to come here this afternoon and pay tribute to Mr. St. Laurent's understanding of these problems. I hope he will be able to carry them down the ladder to others with whom he has to deal.

It is recognized that because of the great extent and diversity of our country, problems are varied and complex. What will suit one province will

be unsatisfactory for another. Mr. Speaker, that is true in this country of ours, in this province of ours. Oft-times what we do for one municipality is unsatisfactory for another municipality. The hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) knows how difficult it is to deal with mining districts;what is good for Timmins, is not good for Temiskaming or Whitney or other places. It is a very difficult problem, and Ontario follows the pattern.

I can assure you the attitude of the Prime Minister of Canada has not been one of "take it or leave it". I can assure you that that has not been the attitude of this Government. We have been seeking solutions which are in the best interests of our people.

In my term as Treasurer of the Province since 1943 there have been many changes made in fiscal arrangements between the Federal and Provincial Governments. Back in 1946-47, proposals for renting tax fields from the provinces were made by the Federal Government which were ultimately accepted by eight of the provinces. They became effective on April 1st, 1947, and they expire this coming month. In Ontario, with the future so full of uncertainty, we here on this side of the House were very loath to part

with taxing powers which enable the Government to carry on its vast undertakings. We were, frankly, dealing with tax potentials which were highly uncertain.

It was thought probable that for an initial period of five years, we might obtain more money under a rental agreement than we would receive from the exercise of existing tax rates in our own fields. That is what I thought myself; the fact is, I might have expressed that in the House. It was, however, considered that some loss might reasonably be borne if we retained the full use of our taxing powers. Yet our independence was worth a good deal, and there did not seem to be the carrying-out which would justify a change in our attitude.

I say to the hon. members here that is a problem of the present agreement at the present time; there is the question as to whether a great province such as Ontario should make an arrangement with the Federal Government if it appears that the province can get along under its own steam with its own taxing powers. Now, I am able to make this very striking statement to the House as I did last September, full of some doubt at that time, but I might say, born of optimism, because there was a conflict in view.

I did advise the House of something which I am now able to speak of with more certainty, and that is the way I get back to the heading of taxes that rolled in and have been rolling in since. I budgeted back in 1944 for fifty million dollars corporation tax returns, and I am able to tell you that this year it will run over ninety million dollars. You can see what that potential is, what the future of this great province is. Probably our ability to collect taxes is just a measure of our responsibility, because with increased tax sources, increased responsibility is met at every turn of the road.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) said there was nothing about education and the requirements of our municipalities, but inherently they are there.

Now, I am able to speak with certainty that occupying only a portion of our taxing fields as we are, and with rates which have obtained in succession duties and corporation taxes since 1947, and with no Provincial income tax and no rental with respect to this source from the Federal Government, by next March 31, we shall have received more revenue from our own tax sources in those five years than we would

have received had we rented the fields to the Federal Government. That is a very striking statement. This is due to the phenomenal growth of corporation taxes which was so dramatically illustrated last March. In short, our judgment has not only been vindicated, we have done even better. Without imposing a personal income tax, we have received more revenue than we would have obtained under the agreement for the rental of three of our direct revenue sources. In saying this, I cast no reflection on the Federal Government. In the light of conditions in 1947, I am sure they felt their offer was generous, and I will say personally that I felt that they were making a good offer at that time. It all indicates the care that has to be taken in these matters.

Our experience in the five-year period may be summarized, and , rather than refer to it here, Mr. Speaker, I will table the summary, and hon. members of the House who are interested in this may get it. There are several copies. As a matter of fact, the Federal rental would have produced in those five years, 447 million dollars; we will have collected 455 million dollars. There are certain adjustments of

backlog of taxes and arrears of payments on the Federal subsidy; therefore, we will top the Federal payments by $7,900,000. I have always contended and I think the House unanimously agreed, that the Federal Government really owe us the five percent of income tax collections, and if they were included, we would top it by $79,000,000.

The fact remains that for the last five years we have been able to stand on our own feet without hurting anyone; indeed, having straightened the Federal provision, and having provided greater services for people with our powers undiminished, and ready to go ahead and finance the Seaway, the highways and other great projects. The fact that Ontario has continued to raise its own revenues has been an aid, rather than a detriment to the Federal Government, and the Honourable Mr. Abbott at the last Conference in December, 1950, made generous reference to Ontario's and Quebec's prudence and restraint, which I read before in this House and so will not read it again.

The Province is giving Federal proposals intensive study and consideration. There are many complex factors involved. We have gained a great deal

by not rushing in and suspending our tax powers. We have collected slightly more from our own sources than we would have received under the rental plan, and we are prepared to consider proposals made from time to time in a spirit of understanding and co-operation. I think that is right and proper.

(Take "F" follows)

I think that is right and proper. I have found in my experience that no one has all the answers. The answers probably come from a variety of people and a variety of sources, and the answer is really given by the ability to take all the answers from several sources and combine them. For that reason, we have endeavoured to take a wide-open view in connection with this problem as the background for us all to foster the spirit of understanding and good faith of all governments with the result that it will be possible for the Federal-Provincial governments to achieve very great things indeed.

I know the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) who has had his bitter experiences in that regard, will agree we have done a good job, and when he looks at the Niagara deal, the Old Age Pensions, the Amendment to our Constitution and the arrangements in connection with the Trans-Canada Highway, I think he will agree we are, after all, very fair negotiators.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I come back to this;; the promise I made last Fall I renew at this time. It is a promise of government calculated to give good government, government which is based on co-operation, understanding and good-will of all people, and with all governments. That is our objective.

I again renew, in all humility, the pledge we have made before, that we will do our best to give the people of this grand old province of Ontario that thing which is more important than anything else, just simply good government.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour, I am wondering if the hon. Prime Minister would agree to let me adjourn the debate at this time. I know I cannot finish to-day, and I prefer not to be interrupted in the midst of my address.

MR. FROST: Certainly. Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) move the adjournment of the debate?

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House, and in so doing, may I say that we will meet at 2:00 o'clock to-morrow afternoon and proceed with government Bills and Orders. I expect the Session to-morrow will probably be short.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:30 of the clock, p.m.

- - - - - - - - -

ONTARIO

First Session
of the
Twenty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 21, 1952, et seq.

0

Volume VII

Friday, February 29, 1952.

0

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

R. C. Sturgeon,
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

S E V E N T H D A Y

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

of the

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE, HELD IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21st, 1952, et seq.

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

- - - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Friday, February 29, 1952.

- - - - - - - -

The House having met. 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: We have to-day as guests in the galleries, students from the London Normal School, London, Ontario. I am sure that we, as members, are very, very happy indeed to have these future teachers sitting in with us on our deliberations to-day.

May I suggest to the hon. members the importance of trying to follow through the schedule of photographing. I know that none of us like to have our photographs taken, but it is important we shall have the appointments kept in so far as possible, in order that a complete photographing of the hon. members

may be finished within the appointed time. I think all of us have been notified as to when to go, and I do sincerely hope that this will be followed through.

With regard to Hansard: may I advise the hon. members that, with permission from the Speaker's office, it will be possible for individual hon. members to secure one hundred copies of major speeches. That does not mean that every time an hon. member gets into a little discussion, he will be given one hundred copies of that discussion. But we will be very happy, if you secure the necessary authorization from the Speaker's office, to see that each individual hon. member, giving a major speech,may have one hundred copies of such a speech. They will be delivered within a very few days after the speech is given, and I trust this will meet with the approval of the hon. members.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. W. MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Pringle. I beg leave to present the second report of the Select Committee appointed to select lists of members to compose the Standing Committees of the House, and move its adoption.

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: Mr. Murdoch, in the

absence of Mr. Pringle, from the Select Committee appointed to prepare the list of members to compose the Standing Committees of the House, presents the Committee's second report, as follows:

Your Committee recommends that the Standing Committee on Lands and Forests be composed as follows:

"Messrs. Allen (Middlesex South), Dempsey, Fullerton, Gordon, Grummett, Herbert, Johnston (Parry Sound), Kelly, Lyons, Mapledoram, Myers, Noden, Villeneuve, Wardrope, Wren - 15."

"The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of seven members."

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Reports by Committees.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in presenting to you the motion relative to the appointment of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, may I say that in past years there has been a variation in practice. In some cases, as in the last sittings of the last Legislature of Ontario, an appointment was made for the whole period of time. I think before that, there were cases where the appointment was made year by year, and it is to that practice, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to revert

at this time.

During the last Legislature, the hon. member for Middlesex North (Mr. Patrick) sitting to my right to-day, acted in a very acceptable manner in connection with the Chairmanship of the Committee of the Whole. He rendered great service to the people and to the Legislature. This year he is acting as Chairman of a very important Committee of this House, namely, the Agricultural Committee.

For the period of this Session, I would like to move, seconded by Mr. Porter:

> "That Mr. Downer, Member for the Electoral District of Dufferin-Simcoe, be appointed as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House for the present Session."

I may say the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer) is a former associate of mine, going back to the days of 1937, some fifteen years ago. He has been associated during that period of time with a number of the hon. members who are presently sitting in the House, and on this occasion, we think it is very fitting to nominate his appointment as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, who will preside over the House when we move that you, Mr. Speaker, do now leave the Chair, and we consider certain matters.

Motion agreed to.

The Deputy Speaker in the Chair.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to thank the hon. Prime Minister for this expression of confidence and say to the hon. members of the House that I will, to the utmost of my ability, be fair and impartial. Thank you very much.

Introduction of Bills.

Hon. George H. Dunbar moved first reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act to Repeal the Suburban Area Development Act".

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is an Act which was put in the Statute in 1921. It has not been used very much, in fact, I think only by one council, that of the Township of McKim. It provided that the elected board could instal water mains and sewers, and had jurisdiction over electric lights, police, fire, and things of that nature. The Township of McKim was the only township which took advantage of it.

The Act is now changed. Each township has the power. The elected representatives now have the power to define an area in which the services shall be performed. I think it is better legislation as it is now, because it is conducted by the elected representatives of the townships.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg at this time to table the answers to questions 2 and 3, standing in the names of the hon. members for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand) and Brant (Mr. Nixon), who have expressed some desire to know what the costs were of the committees set up last year in connection with rentals and with the administration of justice.

I table the answers to those questions, and may I point out to the hon. members in Opposition that this year I am beating my record of last year, in starting to answer questions.

MR. OLIVER: Just so long as you keep it up.

MR. FROST: We will keep it up, I can assure you.

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant)These, of course, were very easy questions.

MR. FROST: They are all easy for us.

MR. SALSBERG: You will be reminded of that later on.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): They were not embarrassing questions, although intended as such.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret rising to my feet again, but some of the hon. members may be wondering why the

national flower of Wales has now been placed on my left. To-morrow is the day of our patron saint, and it has been the custom for the last few years for the Welsh Players of Toronto to draw to the attention of the House and myself, the significance of the fact that St.David's Day does fall on March 1st.

That to us, of course, is a very, very significant and important day even more important than St. Patrick's Day when everybody wants to be an Irishman, except a Welshman; with St. George's Day when everybody wants to be an Englishman, except a Welshman and with St. Andrew's Day when everybody wants to be a Scotsman, except a Welshman. The Welsh are the Welsh people, and I am very grateful to the members of the Welsh Players Society for remembering us on the eve of St. David's Day.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to join with you to-day in paying tribute to St. David's Day. It is a little premature as St. David's Day is not until to-morrow, March 1st.

We are very proud of the land of our birth, because we come from a little nation of about two million people who have made a great contribution toward the life of Great Britain. To-morrow night you, sir, myself, and millions of other Welsh people throughout the world will join in singing hymns and songs of Wales, and pay tribute

to that great little country. We are very proud of the land of our birth, and we are also very proud, Mr. Speaker, that we are now Canadians.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may just add a word on behalf of all others in the House. Apparently there are two Welshmen here and I will add a word of congratulation from all of the rest of us.

I saw the basket of flowers going up to your Throne a few moments ago, and I tried to rack my brains as to what conceivably could have taken place on the 29th of February. At first I thought perhaps the flowers were to mark the 29th of February which only occurs on our calendar once every four years. I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, that the matter has been clarified, and I take this opportunity to-day, on behalf of all hon. members of this House, to wish you and your countrymen the very best on the first day of March, St. David's Day.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

THE COUNTY COURTS ACT

Hon. Dana Porter (Attorney-General), moves second reading of Bill No. 57, "An Act to Amend the County Courts Act".

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill was explained

on first reading, and there is nothing very much to add at the present time. The hon. members will recall it establishes the same provisions for working hours as some of the other Bills we have before us and it makes it applicable also to the county court offices.

It also provides certain changes in opening dates for sittings of the county courts, mentioned in Section 2, for the purpose of general convenience.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

(Page B-1 follows)

GENERAL SESSIONS ACT

Hon. Dana Porter (Attorney-General) moved second reading of Bill No. 58, "An Act to Amend the General Sessions Act".

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill merely provides for a change in the opening dates of the sittings of courts of the General Sessions of the Peace in certain named counties.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE SHERIFFS ACT

Hon. Dana Porter (Attorney-General) moved second reading of Bill No. 59, "An Act to Amend the Sheriffs Act".

He said: Mr. Speaker, in addition to making a slight adjustment of the sheriffs' certificate fees, where the number of names are many, this Act also brings the sheriffs' offices into line with the working hours provided in certain other Acts referring to court offices. Finally, there are certain obsolete words that have been deleted from one of the Sections of the Act.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Does that mean that henceforth the sheriff will not be able to

execute evictions on Saturdays? If so, I am very glad.

MR. PORTER: I think, perhaps, if the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) could find a seconder, he would have proposed an amendment to the Act whereby the sheriff would not be able to enforce evictions in any case on any day.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can imagine where eviction would be necessary; for instance, if a Government stays too long in office. I would not want to make it too general.

MR. PORTER: Then, as long as the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) is content that we remain in office on Saturdays, perhaps he will have no objection to that Bill.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not mind the Government being in office on Saturdays if I could get them out of office the rest of the week.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

JUDICATURE ACT

Hon. Dana Porter (Attorney-General) moved second reading of Bill Number 60, "An Act to Amend the Judicature Act".

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill, as well as

some of the others mentioned, provides for a change in the working times and the times at which offices are open in connection with the Supreme Court. The main change, however, that is proposed in this Bill, is the abolition of the Special Jury. As I explained on first reading, the repeal of the sections of the Judicature Act with reference to Special Juries does not in any way affect the jury system fundamentally, it does not touch at all upon the ordinary juries, nor does it touch upon the Grand Juries.This is merely for the purpose of abolishing that special section which provides for Special Juries in civil cases, and as I stated on first reading, I propose that this Bill go before the Legal Bills Committee.

As I said before, the Government has an open mind as to this legislation, and we will welcome discussion, and the viewpoints of any groups who have any views that they wish to bring to bear on this subject. Innovations or changes of this kind might have far-reaching effects, and we want to make sure that any interested groups who might have something to say about it have the fullest opportunity of presenting their case before this step is finally completed. We want to hear them, even if there are not overwhelming

reasons against this legislation, and if there are some reasonable doubts as to the safety of this course at the present time. It may be desirable not to press this legislation forward, but, nevertheless, this Bill does come before the House and in due course before the Legal Bills Committee, and it may be fully discussed then.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE JURORS ACT

Hon. Dana Porter (Attorney-General) moved second reading of Bill No.61, "An Act to Amend the Jurors Act".

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill covers two main points. The first point is that it will permit the local selectors of juries to make use of the Assessment Roll returned in the year in which the selection is being made, instead of referring to the Voters' Lists in the case of where the current voters' list has not been certified or published by the court. This will be not only a convenience, but it will give greater assurance of the most up-to-date possible list being available, from which

juries generally may be selected.

Certain other sections of the Act are in line with the amendment to the Judicature Act which proposes to abolish special Juries.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE SECURITIES ACT

Hon. Dana Porter (Attorney-General) moved second reading of Bill No. 62, "An Act to Amend the Securities Act".

He said: Mr. Speaker, in considering this amendment to the Securities Act, perhaps I should outline very briefly some of the main principles involved in our securities legislation, so that this might be seen in its proper perspective. The Securities Act which is now in the Statute Books is one of a series of statutes which have been passed over a considerable number of years, the main purpose of this legislation, of course, being to give some reasonable protection to the public who are offered securities, especially when these are being sold by way of primary distribution. In other words, the

main provisions of this legislation deal with what we might generally call "promotional securities", securities that are in every sense a new issue and a new undertaking, where in most cases there is a considerable speculative element involved. Although that may not be a complete statement as to the scope of this Act, nevertheless, most of the activities of the Securities Commission to be set up under this legislation deal with that very matter of promotional securities, which may be of a highly speculative nature, or, at least, not by many means in the "gilt-edge" class. It has always been kept in mind in all the legislation which has been passed on this subject in Ontario that we have two aspects of this problem to deal with.

One, of course, is we wish to make it possible in every conceivable way for people who desire to purchase speculative securities, sold for the purpose of raising money for the development of mines or the development of oil wells, or the development of new assets which at the present time may be in a natural state. In all activities of this kind, the gambling element, the speculative element is a very prominent feature.

There are a great many people who desire to invest money in this sort of way, and for those who do that, if the venture is a successful one, they might make a very large profit as the result of the transaction, but, of course, they always take the chance, and most people who invest in this sort of security know that they are taking the chance of losing perhaps all the money that they put in. Nevertheless, if it were not for the fact that a great many people are prepared to take that risk, many of our natural resources in this country, particularly in our mining districts, would never have been developed at all.

Therefore, it is always important in considering legislation of this kind, not to create such prohibitive and such onerous regulations that people, who are quite able to make up their own minds, will be discouraged from entering into transactions of this kind, that what we sometimes term "risk capital" will dry up and perhaps be diverted elsewhere.

Under the present Securities Act which was passed a few years ago, there are various provisions which set forth regulations to be followed in the case of a new enterprise which is to be promoted and

presented to the public. Everyone of these enterprises,as soon as it becomes incorporated, as soon as they are prepared to issue shares to the public, must make a filing of complete information on the statutory forms required before the Securities Commission. The Securities Commission then, if it is satisfied that the regulations have been complied with, accepts the application for filing. It is not the intent of this Act that any Government commission shall or can give any guarantee or absolute protection to every person who may, no matter with what motive, decide to buy shares in an enterprise. It is quite beyond the scope of the functions of the Commission, and I would submit that it is not a sound principle to attempt to pass any opinion on the merits of a speculative enterprise.

So long as the Commission is satisfied that the fullest possible information, the fullest possible disclosure of all material matters is made to the person and is available to the person who is asked to buy the shares, The main principle underlying the present securities legislation is disclosure, and if any person receives information about a new issue of securities then, as long as the disclosure is made, and

as long as no mis-statement of fact is made, or as long as he is not induced by some fraudulent means into that transaction, it is entirely up to him to decide whether he wishes to risk his money on that information, or whether he does not.

That is the principle underlying the proceedings of the Securities Commission.

I do not need to go into great detail in the matter. This legislation has been discussed before in this House many times, and I think, on the whole, the hon. members have a pretty general idea as to the purpose and the functions of the Securities Commission and what the aims and objects of the legislation are intended to be.

The amendment that is before the House to-day deals with sub-section 1 of Section 47 of the Securities Act. A new section is substituted for that.

The present section provides that:

> "Every person or company registered for trading in securities under this Act who receives from any person an order or subscription for a security to which section 38, 39 or 40 is applicable after having solicited such person to purchase such security shall, before entering into a contract for the sale of such security and before accepting payment or receiving any security under any such contract or in anticipation of making such a contract

> deliver or cause to be delivered to such person a copy of the prospectus or amended prospectus, whichever is the last filed with the Commission, together with,
>
> (a) a copy of the last financial statements and reports accepted for filing by the Commission, where financial statements and reports are required to be filed; and
>
> (b) a fair and accurate summary of the report on the property of the company --"

There are certain other sub-sections there, but I do not think I need to deal with them. The main purpose and intent of the section is contained in the words I have read, that before any transaction is completed, a copy of the prospectus of the company and the financial statements, and a fair and accurate report on the property must be delivered to the prospective purchaser.

I might say that the prospectus is a document which is prescribed under this Act, and it contains a great deal of information about the organization of the company, the number of shares outstanding and the properties the company owns, a description of them, and a great deal of information which is relevant in considering the purchase of the securities.

One of the difficulties that occurs is

simply this, that by reason of the fact that this prospectus is delivered, or must be delivered prior to the transaction, it is very often found when people receive this rather complicated document, sometimes with a great deal of legal information in it, all very relevant, perhaps, but to the layman it may be somewhat difficult to follow, one of the difficulties is that most people do not pay a great deal of attention to it, and rather than be bothered with reading it, they limit themselves to the more glowing account of the prospect that is portrayed in the more colourful literature that accompanies it.

This has been cause for some serious consideration for quite a long time by the Commission and by the broker-dealers who are engaged in activities of this kind. I think, in some cases, that instead of sending out the prospectus perhaps in some cases it has been omitted in the literature that is sent out, but very often it is almost impossible to prove that. At any rate, what is now suggested, and what is now put forward is that two things should be done. In the first place, a summary of the prospectus containing material information in a more readable form than in the

formal document should go out with the first circular, pamphlet or letter sent to the prospective purchaser, so that in addition to the material which highlights the merits of the property that is being sold, the purchaser does get something which he can readily follow, and which can assist him in making up his mind. If a prospective purchaser receives that sort of information and throws it into the waste paper basket, I do not know that there is anything that any Government or any Government official can do to protect him very much more, but the most we can hope to do is to make sure that this material information is placed in his hands in a form that he may be able readily to understand, so that he may come to some common-sense judgment as to what he wishes to do.

The sections as amended will provide that with the first pamphlet, circular or letter sent or delivered to a prospective purchaser, there shall be a copy of a summary of the prospectus, financial statements and reports required as set forth in the Act in a form that is acceptable to the Commission, so that before these are sent out, the Commission would have to satisfy itself that it is a fair summary

of the information in the official prospectus, and that it is presented in a way that is in proper perspective, and will give reasonably full information of what the prospectus contains.

It also goes further and says that such summary shall contain a statement at the end in easily legible letters. Very often they use small print in order to discourage people from straining their eyes. This provides that the letters shall not be smaller than the letters in the main portion, and that a copy of the prospectus will be sent on request.

Then, the next section as amended provides:

> "Every person or company registered for trading in securities under this Act who receives from any person an order or subscription for a security to which Section 38, 39 or 40 is applicable shall, at any time not later than the delivery of the written confirmation of the sale of such security, deliver or cause to be delivered to such person a copy of the prospectus or amended prospectus, whichever is the last filed with the Commission."

After the deal is through, after the subscription is offered and accepted by the broker, the broker then comes to the point of sending out a statement confirming the details of the transaction. Therefore, that is another document which

has to be delivered in each case.

The first document that I have mentioned, the summary of the proceedings, covers deals in which the seller has solicited the purchaser, where the broker goes out and solicits the purchaser. This second section I have referred to, where the copy of the prospectus is to be sent out, covers deals in which the seller is not solicited, the purchaser comes into the broker's office, or writes in without being contacted at all. In that case he is entitled to get a copy of the prospectus on confirmation of the deal.

I might say now that in connection with the whole securities administration, a great deal of controversy has taken place in the last few years as to the activities of some of the brokers, some of the broker-dealers operating from the city of Toronto; especially in the United States, a great deal has been said in the Press, a great deal has been said in some of the magazines about activities of some brokers operating from the city of Toronto by long distance telephone and attempting to sell stock across the border.

The Ontario Securities Commission has,

from time to time, been subjected to a great deal of adverse publicity as a result of offerings being made in the United States by local promotional houses through the mails, and usually followed up by long distance telephone calls if an initial sale is made, or if a request is made for additional information. It is true the solicitations are made in most cases where the securities have not been registered under American Statutes, the Statutes of the Security and Exchange Commission, or any of the State Commissions. Very often they have been made in violation of American laws. However, there is no prohibition in our Ontario legislation, which is a Provincial Act, against solicitation by mail outside the Province. I do not think there is very much doubt about it, that it is beyond the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature to legislate against the use of mails or the use of the telephone if other specified requirements of the Securities Act are met. Nevertheless, the Securities Commission, over a period of some twenty-three years, has perhaps suffered to some extent from a lack of continuity, through various changes from time to time

in legislation as we were feeling our way. In addition to this, there has been a lack of centralized records relating to policies and other details essential to the most efficient administration.

(Take "C" follows)

But this has been, in the last few years, to a large extent, overcome and cured by the publication of monthly bulletins by the Securities Commission regarding matters relating to policies and discipline. The facts of and incidental to publicity, which has been given this major problem, should be recorded for future reference.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is true that the utmost co-operation exists between the Ontario Securities Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States, a United States federal body responsible for administration across the international border.

Mr. Speaker, I think it might be useful for me to add something more to that statement on second reading of this Bill, and no doubt there may be some discussion on the Bill. The hon. Prime Minister had in mind adjourning the House at three o'clock this afternoon, to enable the hon. members to get home, and, therefore, I would suggest that this debate be adjourned.

I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I

may say that on Monday we shall proceed with particular reference to Order No. 2, a continuation of the debate on the Parole Act; Order No. 6, second reading of the Vocational Education Act and Order No. 24, second reading of the Auxiliary Classes Act.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3:10 of the clock, p.m.

- - - - - - - - - -

ONTARIO

First Session
of the
Twenty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 21, 1952, et seq.

0

Volume VIII

Monday, March 3, 1952.

0

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

R. C. Sturgeon,
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

E I G H T H D A Y

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE, HELD IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21st, 1952, et seq.

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

- - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Monday, March 3rd, 1952.

- - - - - - -

The House having met. 3 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

MR. S. L. HALL (Halton) moves, in the absence of Mr. Fullerton, first reading of Bill intituled: "An Act respecting the Township of McKim".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. ARTHUR WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

The Annual Report of the Farm Institutions for the year ended March 31, 1951.

The Report of the Minister of Lands and Forests for the Province of Ontario, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1951.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

SECURITIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No.62, "An Act to Amend the Securities Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I was in the course of outlining the position of the Securities Commission operating under the existing legislation, in dealing with some of the problems of securities distribution, and particularly in connection with the problem which has arisen in the last few years whereby a number of brokers have been selling stocks on a large scale across the border, by telephone and by mail.

I would like to summarize the various lines

of activities which are being taken by the Securities Commission, not only to deal with this special problem itself, but generally to protect the public in as reasonable a way as possible in its purchase of securities which are issued for the purpose of primary distribution.

In the first place, the Commission has power to cancel licenses of brokers who offend against the regulations and any of the provisions of the Act. As a matter of fact, the cancellation-of-license power is a very broad one, and if a broker is carrying on in a way that is detrimental to the business, the Securities Commission has wide powers to cancel his license.

Secondly, the Securities Commission has power to institute surprise audits in the offices of brokers who are carrying on a brokerage business where they suspect, or have some reason to believe, that irregularities are being committed. I think it can be readily understood that surprise audits might have a very salutary effect.

In the third place, the Securities Commission is responsible for instituting prosecutions of persons who offend against the Act, and against the

regulations in it, as well as, in some cases, to lay charges which might arise under the Criminal Code.

In the fourth place, the Securities Commission has in recent months been carrying out a concentrated drive against the heavy mailings going out from some brokers' offices, and a number of licenses have been cancelled, when the mailings appear to be out of line.

Fifthly, as I intimated the other day, the principle of full disclosure has been adopted, and as far as possible, is being put into effect.

And in the sixth place, there are certain policies which have been adopted to ensure a sound financial structure of the companies issuing their shares to the public.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are the six points which cover the main operations of the Securities Commission with respect to these matters.

It has been so often said that a very heavy volume of trading has been carried on across the border. As a matter of fact, in recent months, and in the last few years, some newspapers and publications in the United States have gone to very great lengths to attempt to discredit securities of this

country and this province in the United States, and to "show up" some of the activities which they claim are taking place from brokerage offices here. For instance, we see the figure of "52 million dollars" of securities being sold across the border by mail and by telephone, and the inference generally is that all of that is done with fraudulent intent, and any transactions,which are consummated, are consummated as a result of fraudulent mis-statements. As a matter of fact, the Commission has attempted to analyze the amount of securities which conceivably might be sold across the border, and the very best estimate which can be arrived at, based upon a careful analysis, and taking into consideration the initial capitalization of the companies involved, the average offering prices to the public, and various other sources of information, is about a total of ten million dollars a year in securities traded across the border.

Some of these securities -- perhaps a large percentage of them -- are securities which are registered in the United States with the Securities and Exchange Commission, and with the State Commissions,

so it is only a portion of the ten million dollars' worth of securities which might be traded in through the mails and by telephone calls from Toronto offices.

Of course, in many of these cases there has been no actual fraud, in an ordinary sense. There may be some cases where fraudulent statements are made over the telephone; there may be some cases in which fraudulent statements are made in the mails, but for the most part, for all we know, there is nothing of the nature of actual fraud involved. The most that might happen is that in some of these cases there may be some offences against the Securities Act in the United States, or in one of the states, or against a Federal Statute.

As I pointed out the other day, we have no power here to prevent that sort of thing being done, unless some complaints are laid, and we are furnished with the necessary information. Of course, there are many of these people who buy some of these stocks who actually gain as a result of the transaction. It is impossible for us to say, from any information we have, just where profits have been realized, and where losses have been incurred. Many certainly have not involved a

total loss, such as would appear from some of the articles which were published in the United States. From reading some of that literature, you would think that not only was there an enormous amount of stock involved, amounting to a vast sum in a single year, but you would also be led to believe that in every instance the stock was sold illegally, which in every instance it was not, and that in every instance it was sold as a result of some fraudulent misrepresentation which, also, is by no means the case.

(Take "B" follows.)

As to the first point that I mentioned, cancellation of licenses, there are many difficulties in connection with this. We have changed conditions in the country to-day, many newcomers have been attracted to the business of selling securities and changed conditions require larger working capital to-day than for some time before. This calls for larger working capital for those who wish to indulge in extensive mailings and large-scale telephoning. If that is what they intend to do, it makes for substantial resources. Those who do not wish to run the risk involved or who could not obtain a license in their own name muster the services of others to act on their behalf. These are what may be termed as "irresponsible dealers." In other words, a certain registered broker acts as an agent for some person who could not, for some reason or another, obtain a license or for some person whose license would be cancelled and would take orders, and in all respects act in a general way in which he was directed. These are difficult to prove, however, obvious as they may appear to be on the surface.

Furthermore, in our democratic system it is difficult to deny registration for the applicant if he can meet the ordinary requirements of the Act and Regulations, unless something can be found, such as a previous conviction. Despite that fact, the

registration of fifty-three broker-dealers have been cancelled since 1947. The number of registered broker-dealers reached a peak of 212, and the number has now been reduced to 164. The Commission normally acts upon complaints but in the face of this situation, the Commission realizes it has lost an important contact with the industry when the duty of auditing was relegated to the Broker-Dealers' Association under the provisions of the 1947 Act.

The second point I mentioned, the introduction of surprise audits which may be called at the interest of the Securities Commission without notice. As a result of this and other measures, many newcomers have lost their registration before their operations proved profitable and the establishment of a "front" is not as attractive as it formerly was. As a matter, of fact, since the 31st of March, 1951, only four new registrations have been granted to broker-dealers. Ten registrations have been cancelled over the same period. In the meantime, the Broker-Dealers' Association have introduced new regulations in the matter of bonding and previous experience which would tend to keep the future registrations in reasonable bounds.

Then, in the third place, as mentioned, charges are laid against the registrant in certain cases.

In a period of a little over two years, covering the year 1949 and 1950 and two months in 1951, the Commission prosecuted ninety charges laid either under the provisions of the Act or under the Criminal Code. The charges laid against registrants are definitely in the minority. The fact that ninety charges were laid does not by any means imply that registered brokers were involved, except in a few cases. Most of the charges were laid against individuals trading without registration, who in the course of their activities, broke almost every provision of the Securities Act. In some cases, they broke provisions of the Criminal Code. It is gratifying to note that the courts, in many instances, are taking a different view of violations of the Act than they formerly did. Under the Act it is provided in many instances , there are penalties, fines and jail sentences in the alternative, but a magistrate may decide whether a case required a fine or whether it justified a jail sentence. What happened was simply this, that when fines were the order of the day, the magistrates felt that offences under the Securities Act were of a minor nature and a fine was sufficient. The offenders were inclined to look at this as though it were sort of an additional license fee and the profits of their business was sufficient to absorb it

and they went merrily on their way in the hope of not being caught. However, latterly, magistrates have been imposing jail sentences more widely than heretofore and this itself is having a very salutary effect. There is now recorded in our records many fugitives from justice.

In the fourth place, as a result of the complaints the Commission receives and the drive that it is making against "across-the-border dealers", the Securities Commission has been very much concerned about this question, in spite of the fact that technically the Securities Commission, acting under provincial laws, may have little concern from a strictly legalistic point of view in a matter of this kind which is international in its aspects.

As early as March, 1948, the Commission took the stand that registration should not be granted in this province in order to enable a dealer to trade almost exclusively outside Ontario. In September, 1949, a notice was issued to all broker-dealers to the effect that a dealer might go through the motions of making an offering inside Ontario, but at the same time devote almost his entire effort to effecting sales outside Ontario. A further warning was issued in conjunction with the Broker-Dealers' Association in

December, 1950, followed by an intensive drive directed for the most part against the activities of promotional houses who engaged in heavy mailings and telephone solicitations. The cancellations resulting early in 1951 were possibly the heaviest in the history of the Commission. Over-selling American citizens by repeated telephone calls and other high-pressure methods were an important factor throughout.

This scarcely indicates indifference on the part of the Commission. On the contrary, it demonstrates that trading conditions over the Border has been treated as a major problem. The figure of fifty-three cancellations include a very large percentage of dealers who have few customers, if any, but who work through mailing lists which they obtain from one source or another. In less than three years the registration of, at least, twelve promotional houses who used the mails extensively, have been cancelled.

Many American citizens engaged in stock selling moved to Ontario after a Federal Securities Act was enacted in 1933. Some of these have established permanent residences in Ontario. However, many who came to Ontario during the Post War years on the pretext of establishing a permanent residence, have pleaded a shortage of accommodation as an excuse for not moving their

families to Ontario. It is an accepted fact that these individuals, old and new arrivals, as salesmen, are responsible for an extremely high percentage of the high-pressured sales methods used over the long distance telephone. Almost invariably they are employed by promotional houses sponsoring the most questionable issues. "Boycott" is an ugly word, but no independent responsible house would employ some of these individuals after having an opportunity to observe their methods. It is gratifying to note that several of them are included in a long list of unemployed salesmen at the present time. Most of them have been employed by promotional houses which have been subject to Fraud Orders, and issues they have sold have been branded as fraudulent. Consequently, they are part and parcel of the fraud as determined by responsible United States authorities. Why then, when they visit their American homes periodically, when they spend their vacation during the slack seasons with their families in the United States, do not the United States authorities act upon their own findings?

Furthermore, abuses are not confined to this side of the Border. American concerns operating in the United States sell lists of names to Ontario dealers, thus laying the foundation for extensive mailings. According to the American explanation these are merely ordinary commercial lists supplied in the ordinary course

of business. This is not a fact. The Commission has on file a circular issued by a New York concern offering to supply the names of widows and widowers at the rate of 250,000 monthly, who have recently inherited estates. Surely a classification along this line is not in any way related to a commercial enterprise. It is definitely identified with "stockateering" in its most vicious form.

That is an activity which goes on within the borders of the United States, and which is within their jurisdiction and can be dealt with, if they wish to do so.

Then, point five which has to do with the prospectus and a full disclosure. This principle provides the best hedge against paternalism. If the purchaser takes the trouble to read the material supplied for his protection, in many cases he would not speculate, or at least not to the extent that he does. No doubt many securities are sold before the purchasers have read or digested the material. The initial sale, however, is usually a minor consideration. Sales made in response to solicitation through the mails usually range from 100 to 500 shares, at an average initial offering price of thirty cents. It is re-selling over the telephone as many as five or more times which is open to the severest criticism. By this

(Page B-8 follows)

time, the purchaser has had ample time to study the statutory material. There is, of course the possibility that statutory material was never delivered. The Commission is constantly on the alert to guard against this possibility and despite the vigilance of the United States authorities, who are perfectly familiar with the requirements of our Act in this regard, very few complaints have been received charging failure to deliver a prospectus and other statutory material.

The Ontario Act goes further than full disclosure, by providing safeguards against an unconscionable consideration being given for the acquisition of property or for promotional purposes.

The Securities Commission has taken steps -- this was the sixth point I mentioned to-day -- to do everything possible to provide for a sound and equitable corporate financing. What the average citizen wants who purchases a stock of a speculative nature is a fair run for his money.

It follows that in order to ensure this, control must be exercised over corporate financing. Current securities legislation enables the Commission to exercise this control in certain important respects. Recent policies adopted from time to time since the new Act came into force, have improved the situation materially.

These policies have now been consolidated and published in the Bulletin of December, 1951. I'm sure the Monthly Bulletin issued by the Commission which records decisions that have been made, the cancellations of licenses, the reasons for the conclusions which have been arrived at and other matters that are of interest to those who are engaged in the business, has also had a very widespread effect upon keeping the public and those engaged in the business informed as to what is going on.

There are certain definite conditions as to the number of shares which can be obtained in a certain bloc, the amount of shares which can be issued as vendors' shares with reference to the total capitalization of the company.

These policies are the result of deliberations and discussions with the organized industry. In fact a substantial proportion were suggested by the industry. The true function of a Securities Commission is not to devise regulations and policies, but to canvass the opinion of the organized industry and adopt the highest standards acceptable to the best element and to enforce these standards throughout. It is easy indeed to devise policies designed to embarrass and discourage the worst element, but the most difficult

problem confronting any administration is to regulate trading and the persons engaged in trading, without retarding development and expansion by ill-conceived policies. Many policies which may seem advisable in order to curb the activities of consistent offenders, may eventually unduly hamper an honest and constructive endeavour to raise venture or investment capital. Our objective is to have consistent but nevertheless flexible administration in order to deal with financing arrangements, which although they may not comply with the policies in every detail, may, nevertheless, in the over-all result exceed our requirements.

As a result, corporate financing has improved materially over a period of years. Underwritings given by registrants with financial responsibility ranging from $30,000.00 to $200,000.00 and more are now common, in contrast with the days when an issuing company optioned all of its capital stock at prices ranging from five to fifty cents.

Secondly, the placing of corporate financing on a proper basis presents further important considerations. It should, in some measure at least, prove a lasting solution in eliminating undesirables who have been attracted by unreasonable profits and who may fairly be classified as fly-by-night operators. More-

over, there will not be so much easy money to support the continued activities of so-called fringe operators.

Now, before concluding, I would just like to refer for a moment to that which has been suggested by, and appears in the American Press with respect to this whole problem. There is one very illuminating and interesting article that appears in the Saturday Evening Post of January 12, 1952. The title of this article is, "I Sell Phoney Stock to American Chumps". This is by Marcus Verner as told to Earle Beattie:

> "This is the astonishingly candid confession of a confidence man who operates his sucker game just inside Canadian law. And, in spite of his warning, he says, you may fall for his line tonight, when you take that intriguing telephone call."

So, this man who is an acknowledged crook writes an article and it is published in the United States. Just for what purpose it is published, I do not know. I suppose the main purpose of publishing anything in magazines is to sell magazines. I do not intend to read the whole article, although it is quite vivid in many respects, but it says in part:

> "There are about 9,000 men and women in the United States who would like to lay hands on me -- rough hands, with a rope and a handy branch nearby; or maybe an old-fashioned tar barrel with a flock of feathers would satisfy their urge to get justice from my hide. United States Federal police, too, would like to put the heavy hand on me if they could just escort me across the United States-Canadian border from my base of operations

"here in Toronto, Ontario, because likely they have several secret indictments against me on charges of fraud.

You see, for the past fifteen years I've sold gullible Americans $1,500,000. worth of Canadian mining and oil 'securities', and about $1,400,000. of it wasn't worth the gold ink we used to print the gilt edge. That $100,000. worth which made money for a few supremely lucky ones was purely accidental. I never meant to sell anything but "moss pasture" -- phony stock -- to get-rich-quick Yanks, who are the easiest marks in the world because they believe in Santa Claus. Of course, my pals and I also sell to other Canadians, but the big market for mooches is south of the border, where we drag in some $30,000,000. a year.

Last summer we hit our lowest ebb in years because the Ontario government tightened up its regulations and the market was slow, until September, even for good stocks. But for us the heat has been on in more ways than summer and we're soft-pedaling for a while."

(Page C-1 follows.)

Last March the Canadian post office banned mail service to t enty-seven broker-dealers, underwriters and their employees, but the ban was lifted a few months later, after an outcry about "dictatorial methods." And despite what some newspapers say, the Ontario Securities Commission has been steadily driving the bad brokers off Bay Street. In the past two years thirty brokers have "blown their tickets" - lost their licenses - some have surrendered their licenses "voluntarily" and about sixty others have given up. Another fifty have been hauled into court. The Securities and Exchange Commission in Washington has also made it warm for us by getting the United States Post Office Department to ban mail deliveries to and from the stockees through fraud orders and cease-and-desist orders, but we've managed to get around that by changing firm names and addresses. Then this past summer and fall the Ontario legislature's crime committee turned the spotlight on phony-stock operations with a new rash of headlines that didn't do our business any good. But the big est scare of all is extradition. Canadian and U.S. authorities agreed in October to amend the Canadian - U.S. extradition treaty so that we stockees could be taken across the border to stand trial. However, we hear the deal is still pretty vague with plenty of loopholes and red tape, so wealthy stockees can fight it out first through the Canadian courts. This heat is nothing new to us, however, and we're just waiting now for a new gimmick to get back in the boiler rooms full blast."

MR. SALSBERG: "People say " is the next paragraph. I am just trying to help you.

MR. PORTER (Attorney-General): Do you want me to read the next paragraph? That is an example of a very recent article which is very much toned down compared with what some of these former articles have been. There is a recognition there that the policies of Securities Commission have been "whanging them down", in the words of the Minister for Municipal Affairs. Now, there is a recent one in a recent edition of Saturday Night for February 23rd, 1952 entitled " Bay Street and Your Money" by Fraser Robertson, Financial Editor of the Telegram and

one paragraph I would like to read.

> "This money would not be at work in Canada, investment men claim, if they were not busy finding profitable jobs for it to do. A few millions in "sucker money" could be, and is, attracted by high-pressure salesmen specializing in "get-rich-quick" propositions. Despite lurid articles in the United States press and the occasional Canadian journal, dishonest stock promotion is not what the Toronto financial community lives on. The Ontario Securities Commission, under the firm direction of Chairman O.E. Lennox, has closed up crooked operations in the last few years so expeditiously that the con-men with sufficient cash to make them dangerous have not found it profitable to keep on moving round the corner. The Securities Commission also has tightened up regulations on new stock issues.
>
> The Commission has had its recent success in this clean-up chiefly because Bay Street sees the wisdom of it. Members of the Investment Dealers' Association, for example, are not directly affected by shady promotions of mining stocks. They could - and some of them do - stand aside in lofty disdain. But changes in the bond markets have made members of the IDA anxious to cultivate the small investor both in Canada and the U.S. and this cannot be done successfully if Toronto's financial reputation frequently is contaminated. So the IDA, in addition to keeping its own members ethical gives moral support to Chairman Lennox. Similarly, the Toronto Stock Exchange, ranking second only to New York, cannot afford to harbor crooks, or have them touting its prospective customers. Whether its members are fundamentally honest, or merely can better afford now to be honest, it too is a strong influence in the clean-up.
>
> Most of the "Stop, thief" directed at Toronto's financial community concerns operations or promoters. They are the chief distributors of original shares of mining and oil companies, particularly the ventures that so seldom pay off, but without which there would be no mining industry at all in Canada or the U.S. Even when such ventures are conducted with the most meticulous honesty, the chances of ultimate success are slim. There have been dozens of mining claims that looked, at first examination, to be as good or better than Dome, Lake Shore or International looked when first discovered. There are millions of acres of potential oil lands in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. Yet Imperial Oil spent $30,000,000 and drilled more than 120

unsuccessful holes before Imperial Leduc No. 1 proved in 1947, that investment in oil lands could pay off handsomely.

In the last three years, a sociological experiment conducted by Mr. Lennox and the Ontario Securities Commission has shown that Broker-Dealers, given the chance and firm guidance, are just as honest as any other group of businessmen. They have an association, operating under the laws of Ontario, which is rapidly teaching all but the toughest reactionaries that self-discipline is easy. It is also teaching members that old ways of promotion are not, in modern times, the best, and that whether they approve or not, promoters must take into consideration today's lively public interest in protecting widows, orphans and rich men's heirs."

And finally, I might refer to an article in the New York Herald Tribune which appeared on February 25th, 1952, which bears this headline "Fraudulent Share-Pushing Across Borders Has Dropped Sharply in Recent Months- Real Clean-Up Held Effected in Tighter Rules". And there is a very constructive articles showing some of the difficulties with which the Commission is confronted and the gradual improvement that has occurred as a result of the policies that have been carried on and I would just like to say that one of the reasons for the improvement that has been very much apparent over the last two or three years when this high pressure across-the-border selling became most conspicious has been due to the Chairman of the Commission.

I would like to pay a tribute to Mr. Lennox who has acted in that extremely difficult position not only with very great ability and patience but with firmness. Mr. Lennox was originally one of the officials of Supreme Court of Ontario, a Master of the Supreme Court and his

background had never been that of a financial man in any sense of that term. For many years of his life as a lawyer he had been engaged in official work as a civil servant dealing with the legal profession in the Master's Office, and when he was appointed to the Securities Commission he was suddenly asked to tackle a problem which was quite different from anything that had no doubt come before him in previous years. But he has steadily and conscientiously applied himself to working out the best and the soundest policies of which he could conceive, , in the first place to avoid being too much of a bureaucrat and in the second place being sufficiently firm to permit him to control and to keep to the minimum the evils which will always be alive in a business of this kind where the public are being induced by glowing words of future prospects to part with their money, to gamble, and to take a risk.

So that, Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill I have outlined the background of the work of the Commission and the policies lying behind the Act and I think that there is no doubt about it that the general policy is along the right line. The amendment that we are considering to-day is not a new departure from the policy but it is one that will strengthen somewhat further, and make a little more flexible in one respect and a little more tough in another respect, the requirements that are provided for the selling of securities of this nature.

I therefore move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. WREN(Kenora): Mr. Speaker, speaking on the second reading of this Bill, I would like to point out that this group in the House are quite willing to commend the Attorney-General and the Securities Commission for their efforts in this very important field. There are a few things, however, which we would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Attorney-General and over the week-end since his announcement in the House on Friday concerning this present amendment, I have had two or three phone calls and several telegrams from the riding I represent, asking that some representation be made to the House on this subject.

We are also interested in our Party in making some observation. One thing which we are concerned about in the north is the very unfavourable publicity the actions of some of the broker-dealers in this area are bringing on the Province and when they bring an unfavourable attitude towards us it certainly reflects very severely on any financing of properties in the northern parts of the Province. One concern we have is the further imposition that this amendment may make on the prospective developer as against the relationships of the broker-dealers.

, Once the prospect gets beyond the initial prospect stage, and the initial financing stage, there is little, if anything, that the individual prospector, who, after all. found the property,will have to do with it.

His future and the future of his property is almost entirely in the hands of the broker or dealer who takes up the financing of the particular property.

The Securities Act generally is doing a fine job of protecting the average investor but it is in a similiar way doing a certain amount to hinder the activities of the initial discoverer.

I was very interested to learn from the Attorney-General's remark that suprise audits were being made of broker-dealer firms but there is one other field in which we feel the Attorney-General's department and the Securities Commission should act, and that is in the initiating, probably with the co-operation of the hon. Minister of Mines, surprise visits to properties, not only to determine their financial condition but to determine the authenticity of the information which these people are submitting sometimes in a professional sense.

I happen to live in an area which has been recently quite prominent in the mining field and I have seen properties there which the promoters in Toronto have related to be excellent prospects, which were worthy of the investment of a considerable amount of money and I know people in the east who have invested in some instances considerable sums in properties which I and my associates in the mining industries know to be perfectly worthless property.

The effect that has in a relatively unknown area sometimes is that when we do something that is right we have that much more difficulty in making our voices heard and securing the capital we find necessary to proceed with development.

I notice in the Securities Act itself that the qualifications of people who submit these reports concerning the physical characteristics of the property are at the discretion of the Commission, that is to say, the mining, engineering, geologists or prospectors, if acceptable to the Commission can submit reports.

There are an increasingly large number of men going about the northern parts of this Province passing themselves off as mining engineers and reports -- whether all of them go through the Commission I do not know -- are given over their hands which many times are not worth the price of the paper they are written on and I would like to see if it is possible that the Commission do require that any report that is issued over the hand of an engineer, should be that of a professional mining engineer or a professional mine geologist and then, if there are statements made or descriptions circulated which are not true to fact, that man through the Association to which he belongs can be brought to task and made to explain the reasons for making those statements.

registrations of people dealing in this type of securities. I am wondering how many of these licenses have been re-issued after they were cancelled. I sincerely hope there were not too many because I feel again that what we need in the north more than anything else is capital and the more capital we can encourage into the north, the sooner the north is going to develop, and I think that any persons who are dealing with securities -- and I am particularly interested in those trades which have to do with the north -- I think that any firm or any individual who has misrepresented himself or the firm or the property for which he is soliciting these funds, I do not think that that person should be entitled to go back and do business again in this Province.

I do not think there is much else I have to say on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to say in conclusion that we commend the Attorney-General on the fine work of the Securities Commission. We would like to see the hand of the Securities Commission considerably more strengthened than is the case in this amendment.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, this Bill could not be objected to; it is undoubtedly going to be helpful in attaining the end that all of us would like to see achieved. But the Attorney-General went to extreme length in dealing with this legislation and one got the impression that he was giving an exhaustive treatment of the problem which was dealt with by the investigation

committee that occupied so much public attention during last summer.

It would be of interest to know, I am sure to all people in this Province whether this Bill is all that the Attorney-General or the government think is required in order to meet the problems that were revealed during that investigation. There are members who served on that committee; they had an opportunity of listening to many witnesses and the people of the Province believe that as a result of the public hearings of the problems, as a result of the evidence received, that something very important would result, that there would be more fundamental overhauling of the legislation and of the entire machinery that has to do with this problem.

While the Attorney-General has not told us whether it is the intention of the government to re-establish the committee on law enforcement or whatever the title of the committee was. I think it was generally accepted that the committee would be re-constituted after the strange interlude we had and that the committee would pick up from where it left off.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is still in an interlude.

MR. SALSBERG: I am in a very interesting interlude. Now, I think it is correct to say that the public expected the re-establishment of this committee, an extension of the investigation and that the people of this Province would, as a result completing the work of such a committee, receive a report which would be a rounded-out

impartial opinion of a committee, that included members of three groups of the House and that such a report would once and for all establish the facts of the situation in a very clear way, would explode myths, if such existed, about the situation and would also indicate what legislative action was required.

(Take D Follows)

The Committee, as we all know, came to a very untimely death. The Hon. Attorney-General did not know on the day they met for the last time, that was to be the last time they would get together. If he knew, he did not tell the members of the Committee. They are here, and I do feel they should get --

MR. PORTER: They are not all here.

MR. SALSBERG: I thought they would get up to-day and have something to say, but apparently they ere waiting for me to start.

As I say, the Committee came to an untimely end; no report was submitted; the Hon. Attorney-General did not, in his very lengthy and very interesting explanation, refer to that Committee. He did not indicate what the thoughts of the Committee were about this matter, but he presents us with a Bill, which is quite acceptable; it is a step in the right direction, and is one which justifies us in asking, "Is that all that is brought before this House," to the people of this province, to the people of this country -- I almost said "Dominion" -- to, indeed, the people of North America, whose eyes were focussed on this very important Committee, and who were fed with pages of astounding revelations by the Press

of this continent.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we are entitled to ask at this moment whether that is all that was required. If that is all, then the situation could not have been as bad as it was pictured, or as was referred to by some of the witnesses who appeared. I think that this House, and the Province -- and I say this with all sincerity -- are entitled to the opinions of the Government on this question. If there had been no Committee investigation, and in the normal run of things, a Bill of this sort had been brought in, we would have said that it was a satisfactory addition to the legislation; but it is hardly adequate in view of what has taken place.

As I have said on previous occasions in this House, I am no expert on the stock market, or, as the Hon. Attorney-General calls it so dignifiedly, "the securities market". Some of these things can hardly be considered as "security" for anyone except to those who sell them, and some of them seem to have secured themselves very securely for quite a while.

The article the Hon. Attorney-General read is a long one, and when he stopped reading, I suggested

he continue with the next paragraph. I followed him closely as he was reading the article, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will continue by reading a few lines from where the Hon. Attorney-General left off. The following is the paragraph:

> "People say, 'Why aren't the stock crooks arrested for peddling moose pasture?' It isn't hard to find us. We operate right out in the open, in offices on Bay, Adelaide, Queen, Simcoe, King and Richmond in downtown Toronto, and we're registered with the Ontario Commission. The answer is that it's hard to catch us in the act. We obey half the regulations, but we become outlaws on the other half -- mostly the phone calls to mooches, when we make extravagant claims for the stock. The commission can't check easily on phone calls, and even when they do nab us and take our licenses away, we dodge in behind a front. That is, we get some salesman with a clean record to set up as a broker, and we work through him. Most of the big men are now using fronts, and as one front falls they set up another."

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Attorney-General should have continued reading this paragraph, at least, as there is an indictment there of the machinery for enforcing the law.

I am not saying that the Government is guilty of anything. I do not know. But I say in a magazine like this, when they print a paragraph like the one I have read, that is a challenge to the government. They say, "We hide behind the fronts, and as

one front falls, we set up another."

MR. PORTER: Is this man who gives all this information a friend of yours?

MR. SALSBERG: I have no connection with racketeers, stockateers, marketeers, or securities salesmen of any sort.

MR. PORTER: Then I presume the hon.member (Mr. Salsberg) cannot vouch for the accuracy of the statements?

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to ask the Hon. Attorney-General, who labelled the article as "crooked", if he knows who the author is, he should tell us, because it is generally assumed the name given here is a fictitious one.

MR. PORTER: I only know him from what he says.

MR. SALSBERG: If the Hon.Attorney-General knows, I ask him to come out and perform a service to the people of this province by naming the person who authored this article and who, in his opinion, is crooked.

MR. PORTER: I think the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) will find that the person who is responsible for this article, is writing under a fictitious

name, and the real person has no existence whatsoever.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, if you called a non-existent thing a "crook" --

MR. PORTER: There is no slander about that.

MR. SALSBERG: You are simply playing safe. The only thing you are calling a "crook" is a rather nebulous or fictitious "it."

MR. PORTER: At any rate, we understand one another now perfectly.

MR. SALSBERG: The Hon. Minister and I always do.

MR. PORTER: Perhaps the hon. member could name the person.

MR. SALSBERG: The "hon. member" said he did not know, and it is now up to the Attorney-General. The Hon. Attorney-General has at his disposal the whole machinery of the Government. Surely he can ascertain this fact.

MR. PORTER: The hon. member for St.Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) said he thought this was an existing person, and I am sure he would like to assist the Government, and I am also sure if he has some information from some devious channel in which we do not move --

MR. SALSBERG: The Hon. Attorney-General is

implying that his machinery for law enforcement is useless and helpless. If he cannot find out, then I think we should have another Committee set up to investigate the Department. The Hon. Minister is presumed to have at his disposal all the sources of information from trained investigators. In fact, the Securities Commission appointed a retired member of the police force to help them last summer; certainly he can find out who this is. I think the people of this province would like to know. When the Hon.Minister said that the person who wrote this was a "crook", he was giving information which justifies us in concluding that he knows who it is. Whoever it is, this Government is challenged. They say they are evading the law, and they are hiding behind fronts, and when one front is found, they appoint another. What will the Government do about it? That is the point I wanted to make, but it took a little longer than I anticipated, because of the exchange of words between the Hon. Attorney-General and myself, which I enjoy and welcome, and sometimes provoke.

But I wonder, as a number of people are wondering, whether there was not something which re-

quired investigation in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I think the House would welcome a few words from the Hon. Attorney-General, first, as to whether or not the investigation convinced him and his Department that this Bill was all that was required. Secondly, whether he intends to continue the investigation which was launched and conducted as long as the Committee could legally sit, and whether there is other legislation dealing with this very serious problem which he intends to introduce during this Session.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I listened with very great interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren). I believe this is his maiden speech in the House, and I wish to congratulate him for participating in this debate. The remarks he made, I am sure will be very useful to us. He mentioned, in the first place, the prospectors, and the inference was, I believe, that possibly this section might have some effect on the prospectors' activities in connection with the promotion of prospecting units, or syndicates, or whatever they might be.

I can assure the hon. member that this section does not apply at all to the prospecting syndicates section of the Act. It has no bearing

whatsoever upon the section of the Securities Act which deals entirely with prospecting syndicates.

In Part VI of the Securities Act, Section 37, there are provisions which provide for the promotion by a prospector of a small syndicate, with a capitalization not exceeding thirty-five thousand dollars, which enables the prospector to raise some of the initial prospecting expenses. This section has to do with promotions issued to the public under that particular section of the Act, after corporate existence has been brought about under the Companies Act. So I do not think this can in any way affect the position in which prospectors find themselves, for the initial work which they may do.

I think this section is designed in two ways; one, it makes it a little less onerous on the broker who wishes to protect customers. Under the present Act he has to send out the full prospectus before he closes the deal, but in this Bill he only sends out a summary, with the initial literature. Under the present Act, he sends out the literature, and later, when an enquiry or order comes in, he has to send out a separate prospectus. This amendment eliminates that rather onerous and troublesome feature,

which did not accomplish as much as it was intended, and this gives the information contained in the prospectus in the first instance to a person before he has even shown any interest in the stock at all. The hon. member also mentioned the cancellation of a number of licenses and wanted to know how many of those cancelled have been re-instated. I have not the exact figures before me, but I understand there are approximately a dozen over a period of four years who, for various reasons, were re-licensed.

After all, some cancellations are brought about due to a variety of causes; some of them are more serious than others, and where the Commission thinks it is justified, and that they will be fair in their dealings with the public from then on, they are pretty flexible about these matters, and in some cases they have issued licenses which were cancelled probably for some technical defect or default in the past. But, generally speaking, it is very seldom that once a license is cancelled, a person may be re-instated.

The hon. member also mentioned that the engineers whose statements are accepted should be

qualified engineers. The Commission does not rely on a policy of accepting only the statements of engineers who may be members of an engineering association or another professional group of that kind. But it accepts the statements of persons whom the Securities Commission thinks are sufficiently qualified to give the sort of statements they are giving, and in all cases they consult with the Department of Mines to get the fullest information they can as to the qualifications of the persons who sign the statements. It is true they do not confine themselves to any professional engineering group, but, on the other hand, they just do not take anybody's statement; they make certain investigations to satisfy themselves the statements are from men who are reliable and reputable, and who they have reason to know, understands what they are talking about.

Now, coming to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg).

It is true that the legislation introduced here which is now before the House on second reading, is not what the hon. member would consider "block-busting" legislation at all. But if the hon.member followed with any care -- which apparently he did --

the proceedings of the Crime Committee, which appeared in all the newspapers at great length, he will appreciate that the public had adequate opportunity of following from day to day the proceedings of that Committee, and the hon. member will perhaps come to the conclusion that there was very little that was either suggested or could seem desired in the way of any future changes in the Securities Act.

I have outlined the six points -- the underlying points -- of the policy of the Securities Commission, and the main point is full disclosure, which is exactly the same point applied in the Act administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission in Washington, and which has been considered the only sound approach to this problem. As long as we can make sure there is full disclosure of material points, then a person is entitled to buy anything he likes. But as long as there is not full disclosure, but an attempt to conceal, or an attempt to make misrepresentations, that is the point with which we are mainly concerned.

That policy has been adopted. Not only was the Act under consideration by the Committee, but

the policy of the Commission was very, very carefully gone into. It went on for days and days, and I cannot conceive how another day would have added anything in the way of information to the information the Committee already had with respect to the Securities Commission.

MR. SALSBERG: It could have come to a conclusion.

MR. PORTER: Since the Committee no longer exists, it is impossible for it to come to a conclusion. But I may say that the person responsible for recommending to the Government what policies should be pursued, was on the Committee in the capacity of Chairman, although the hon. members opposite objected very strenuously at the time of the appointment. But the people of this Province were apparently satisfied, because on the 22nd of November they expressed complete satisfaction with this Government for almost everything it did. I would say that there was no great feeling of apprehension, on the part of the public, because the Attorney-General was the Chairman of that Committee, and in listening to what went on in the meetings, the questions and cross-examinations, hearing all the witnesses and examining the policies, in which we were helped very materially by the hon.

member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) who contributed a great deal to the work of the Committee, and by the hon. member for Cochrane South who is always a valuable man in work of this kind, we secured a great deal of information, the result of which is the main, fundamental policies which have been carried on. I do not think there is any question about that. There were many details in connection with administration which might have been brought up, and in which some improvements might have been made, but we had all the information, and we took the responsibilities for the policy. It is unfortunate we did not have a voluminous report from the Committee, because it would have been a very fine report, but, on the other hand, not only the Committee, but the public, got all the information available, and this Government did, as all governments have to do, take the responsibility for the policies, no matter what the report might be. There was very useful work done by every member of that Committee, and I can assure the hon. members that it has by no means been lost.

This important question of "full disclosure" was one which engaged a great deal of the time of the Committee, and as a result of the discussions, this

amendment was decided on as being a most satisfactory amendment, and the one which is really necessary at the present time, because there was no suggestion that the Statute in its fundamentals was defective. As a matter of fact, I think it was generally agreed that the Statute itself served a very useful purpose, and there was very little, except in some very minor matters, which could possibly be done to change it.

(Take "E" follows)

This seemed to the government to be one step in the right direction which we should incorporate in the Statutes. I think that answers the question as fully as I am able to give it.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE PAROLE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, resuming a debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 40, "An Act to Amend the Parole Act".

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I moved the adjournment of the debate on this Bill when it was last before the House because I felt that, owing to the lateness of the hour, legislation which dealt with such an important social problem should justify more discussion than was possible at that time. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill to extend the Parole Board and the intention to introduce the parole system in a more extensive way than heretofore, is a progressive step and such legislation deserves the full support of the Legislature. I am particularly pleased with the emphasis given in the lengthy introduction by the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, (Mr. Foote) and the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) on the rehabilitation aspect of the problem. The system that was employed until now really limited the

application of the parole principle to a very shocking degree, in my opinion. I think the rehabilitation aspect was hardly touched upon in the past. My contact with this problem has led me to conclude that in many instances, prisoners who were denied an opportunity of properly presenting their appeals for parole, or who were unjustly denied parole, were, to a very large extent, repeaters. These men were bitter, hostile, and resentful, and certainly society was not much concerned with the detention of such people.

I think we should recognize, and that is the important thing which I think should be emphasized in dealing with this Bill, that although it is a step forward, it is only scratching the surface and is an indication of a piece-meal approach to a major social problem. I think, and I say it quite frankly, that up to very recently, the main theme of our policies was of a penal sort rather than of a reform character, that is, until recently that there was more emphasis on punishing offenders than on reform. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I hasten to add that the present hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) is, in my humble opinion, the best hon. Minister of Reform Institutions we have had in many a long, long year. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) wants to

bring about reform and I think he has made a number of important beginnings, but I think, nevertheless, that he suffers from what many hon. Ministers of the Crown unfortunately suffer, an inescapable responsibility to pressure and tendency to jump to the defence of their Departments, even when they are convinced that criticism is justified and necessary. I suggest that sort of attitude is at no time justified and certainly unworthy of the present hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote). There is a response to criticism, a resentment when matters are made public and while it is common, Mr. Speaker, I think that such criticisms and suggestions are necessary for the more rapid advance in a progressive direction.

I have had some unpleasant experiences with this problem in the last few months. It so happens, that without seeking it, a number of prisoners in Burwash felt the need for complaining about conditions and for reasons they best know, communicated with me. That is what happens when you get a certain reputation, you get letters from people who ask you to raise an issue and fight for it. I received this document from Burwash signed by a fairly large number of prisoners. The complaints are of a serious character, they complain about the fact that there was flogging of prisoners, that

prisoners who are obviously, in their opinion, mentally disturbed, were treated very roughly, and given the lash, that the food situation was very bad, and so on. It is interesting to note, that after some months of attempting to investigate and confirm, if possible, the charges, when I brought this to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) and the public, in the absence of the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) from the city, there was immediately a full denial of all the charges which were made by the prisoners and a white-washing of everything in Burwash. That was during the absence of the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) from the city. I think he had no chance to see the letter I sent him, or read anything about it, but there was an immediate statement issued that everything was all right. That is the sort of attitude which retards development of a progressive character because the fact is that most of the charges were made in handwriting by prisoners in the Institution and it could have been investigated. Not only that, but a little while later I received a petition about the food situation signed by nearly two hundred prisoners at Burwash. That is rather serious when a couple of hundred men will go to the trouble of circulating a petition, signing it, and sending it out. The attitude in the Department was that

all was well. I state here, Mr. Speaker, that the flat rejection of any proposal and the hasty denial of any of the charges can hardly be warranted when we deal with an institution in which there were so many riots, trouble, all sorts of things and difficulties of which almost every hon. member in this House is aware.

The fact is, that the lash was used, or the strap, whichever you call it, corporal punishment was administered in Burwash more than in most other, if not all other penal institutions in this province. I think that is definitely so. It is a fact that there were complaints continuously about the food situation and the signatures of these men in their position would seem to support that. There is no doubt, in my opinion, but that mentally retarded people are sent to Burwash, and I would say, to other institutions, who do not belong there, who have no business being there, who should not be sent there in the first place by the judges in the courts or whoever was responsible.

Mr. Speaker, I was at a terrible disadvantage because when this matter reached the public, there were a number of newspapers who made almost violent attacks on me. In particular, the columns of the Sudbury Star excelled themselves in attacking me and began presenting a series of articles which presented Burwash as

the finest hotel in North America. I was afraid if it was read by many people, there would be a line-up to get in. I was at a disadvantage, and I say that here in the House because the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) and I discussed this matter after the formal exchange of letters. This was an off-the-record conversation, I do not say that the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) agreed with the charges I presented on behalf of these people, but I would have had to resort to an off-the-record conversation in defence of myself when these charges were made by newspapers. I did not know, and it did not matter, insofar as the meeting was concerned, but I am convinced that the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) knows that all was not well, and still is not well. I know he would be the first one to admit it. He is trying to improve it, but we will never improve things if we completely deny charges which are essentially correct. We will not accomplish much by telling the people that criticism is unfounded and unjustified.

I am inclined to think that the publicity given the matter, and the fact that we have an hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) of the type we have in the Department, that the use of the lash was discontinued in Burwash from the time this public issue was raised. I think that is true.

HON. J. W. FOOTE (Minister of Reform Institutions): It had not been used before that.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) says it was not used before that. I am unfortunately obliged to say here that I disagree with him. It was used before that.

MR. FOOTE: The lash? You said the lash was used?

MR. SALSBERG: I sometimes get mixed up between the lash, strap, or the whip, whichever they used--I will say "corporal punishment", and I am on safer ground.

MR. FOOTE: Much safer.

MR. SALSBERG: It was discontinued after this fuss was made and because we have the hon. Minister we now have in the Department. I think the hearing of the situation was constructive and may have influenced the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) to invite authorities from the United States to help his Department bring about these changes which are long overdue in that Department.

I am sorry to say there is still a lingering resistance to this criticism which reached, in my opinion, a level of persecution and vengeance by some in that Department because thirty or so from Burwash were taken out in the darkness of night, chained together and dispersed in local jails of the province and

are being kept in those local jails, to the best of my knowledge, where they do not belong.

(Page F-1 follows)

Some of them think it is because they aired their grievances. I know there was a statement from the Department that this was done in order to do away with troublemakers and the people who interfered with the carrying through of the wholesome program that the right officials are trying to institute. I think that was the statement issued.

While, I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that this does not justify the manner in which this was done, the chaining of the men together. These men were taken out, as I say, as I was later informed by them, and I have been deluged with correspondence. I have here letters -- volumes of them, from these people and their relatives because of the fact that I attempted to air their grievances in public. They were taken out Monday night from a gathering of prisoners without being told where they were going, they were chained and they were sent to North Bay, Sudbury, Toronto and around to a lot of other little jails.

Now, these men were sentenced to reformatories, not local jails, and if they are especially difficult cases, which they may be, certainly our reformatories are for the purpose of handling difficult prisoners. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is wrong to send a prisoner who may have a year or a year and a half left

to serve and let him rot in a local jail which is possibly unequipped for the handling of people for that length of time.

I do not know what happened in the last few weeks because I, too, was intimidated and failed to reply to many of these letters (I have them all) for fear that the exchange of correspondence might bring upon some of them additional punishment. I know that the Minister would not countenance that and I seek no favours from the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) -- I have no need to seek favours; He knows I speak the way I do because I sincerely believe it, and when I say that the hon. Minister would not--I know it to be correct, in my estimation of the Minister--want it.

Even I, as a member of the Legislature, was intimated enough in the interests of the men not to reply to these letters. Some of these letters are the most moving documents you could get.

HON. G. H. DUNLOP (Minister of Education): Where does the intimidation come from?

MR. SALSBERG: The intimidation is that some of the thirty who had been chained together and shipped out at night, think that this was done to them because they sent the information which I later used. They think so. It may not be right and I am not

sure. When some of them landed in the Don Jail, they sent me a batch of letters signed by twenty of them or so or whatever the number of them was. I have it right here -- a letter from the prisoners in the Don Jail who came there from Burwash asking me to come and see them. I went down after proper arrangements. I want to thank the hon. Minister who gave the instructions that I be permitted to see them. He was out of town and I can understand the officials there were hesitant for a moment, and they wanted to consult the hon. Minister. In any case, I went down and saw them. One of the men I saw was immediately transferred to Windsor and was supposed to be sent where the offence was committed by him in the first place. After he was transferred from the Don Jail to Windsor, he fell, and I do not know whether he has recovered now. I have a letter here from his mother with a copy of the letter she sent to the hon. Minister complaining about the conditions down there. After I had spoken to him he was transferred to Windsor and one could perhaps make the comment that the men were punished somewhat for sending out communications.

But I say it is wrong to have men, no matter how difficult they may be, who were sentenced to serve in a reformatory, shipped into local jails some

with fifteen months and more of a term yet to serve. I have a letter here from one person who told me that he was serving a sentence of forty-four months and there were fifteen more to serve and he pleads "Please do something; I do not want to remain in a local jail". I have the letter here from the young man. It is really moving. I am not going to burden the House by reading all of them or even some of them but let me just read part of this letter, which I think is written very intelligently and cannot help but move. I am skipping one paragraph for reasons that the hon. Minister will understand when I show him the letter lateron. It says:

> "In the last few days you have proven yourself to be the only person who is willing to give us any assistance and you are the only one who speaks the truth."

I might say, stopping here, that I have another letter from a prisoner who tells me he wrote an article to the Sudbury Star refuting the charges and he has a copy. Well, the police came to the Don and got the copy of the article he sent to the Sudbury Star --

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Did any of them send an article to the Saturday Evening Post?

MR. SALSBERG: With your influence, you might

arrange that. I also was informed by one of these people about the Sudbury Star Article and that a copy of the Sudbury Star was posted up in Burwash. The prisoners tore it down and pinned up the clippings of the interview I gave to some papers and some papers carried them and put another note underneath, "This is the truth".

However, let us go back to this letter:

> "I cannot tell the reform officials why they have troubles ...

and it ends with:

> "but more sensibly refuses to work".

He is referring to the incident I spoke of in public:

> "There is only one way to describe the library facilities .....recidivism is on the upsurge".

You notice here he uses the word "recidivism", a word not often used and one that applies only to the breaking of the law. Even I had to look it up to see if I was right, in the first place. This young man is obviously a fairly intelligent man. He wrote to a member because this member made statements publicly. He appeals for improvements; he appeals for changes and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that as I said at the outset, that while this Bill is a

step in the right direction, it does not deal specifically with the situation.

I might say that the situation in Burwash is one that drew the attention of the people more than most other instances but it is not the only one. I recall very distincly what difficulties arose quite periodically and quite regularly in the Mercer Institution here -- so much so that there was a riot and trouble for two weeks and after that difficulty, the then Minister made a public statement which was carried in all the newspapers that he was going to tear down Mercer and going to replace it with a modern institution because you could not do very much with the old Mercer.

(Page G-1 follows)

You will note I said, "the then Minister". Well, the old Mercer still stands. It has not been torn down, and has not been replaced, and I am sure that nothing much was done.

I am sure that even in Brampton, which, by and large, to my knowledge is seeking to apply the correct approach to the problem of the younger people in the main, is a very welcome thought. But even yet I think there is much to be done. I am not so sure whether repeaters should be sent there, whether those guilty of certain crimes which they have committed before, should be sent back to Brampton where the younger people are located. However, that was done. There is a difficulty arising there, and I think the Hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) knows what I am talking about.

I want to conclude by saying that what is needed is to quicken the tempo of improvement and reform. I think the Hon. Minister has started to work in the right direction; everything that he has done seems to be an improvement, and is welcomed as such by the people of this Province, but I do not think it is rapid enough, and I do not think it is full enough, and I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary to have an outside look into the

situation.

I suggest, as I did before, that either a Royal Commission or a Select Committee of the House be set up for the purpose of investigating the conditions in our reform institutions. I did not do that implying any lack of confidence or faith in the objectives which the present Hon. Minister has set for himself. But I think the situation does require an examination from the outside, and not just from the members of the staff or the department. I think such an examination would benefit the work which is being done, and I think the Hon. Minister needs a great deal of assistance.

I want to appeal to the Hon. Minister and to the Government right now to agree to the setting-up of the Select Committee to look into the conditions at Burwash and the other institutions, and to report to the Legislature and make its recommendations, which the Government and the Legislature can consider at a later Session. I say to the hon. Minister there is nothing to be lost, but there is everything to be gained. I think there are reforms necessary in the handling and treatment of offenders even before they come under the responsibility of the Minister and the Department. I

think some reforms are necessary in the courts of law. I think that before a sentence is passed by a magistrate or judge, in a great many cases there should be a consultation with social workers and psychologists, before the sentences are passed. If that were done, I think the job of the Department would be easier, and they would not be flooded with people who are mentally disturbed, psychiatric cases, which are thrown into Burwash or into Brampton, where they do not fit, and where they do not belong. They are not reformed there; they are not improved. You get nothing for the money spent on them, speaking in terms of expenditures. Sometimes they are just a drag on the continuance of an otherwise good growth .

What I am suggesting is neither extreme nor novel. There are parts of the United States where this has already been done in some cases, where the cases are discussed, even before a conviction.

I have spoken too long already, but this is a very serious social problem, and it deserves attention, even if it does require a few more minutes.

After I became involved in this, people began calling, and ringing my doorbell, and it was pathetic to see some of these boys who had only been

released perhaps that same morning, and who, unless they were helped in the right direction, would be putting themselves into positions where they might be shipped right back again.

There is one case that comes to my mind of a young fellow who came to my house one night. He had been released from Burwash the day before, and it was astounding the difficulties he got himself into in the first twenty-four hours. That young man should not have been sent to Burwash in the first place; he should have been treated by specialists who understand the problems, and it was uncivilized to attempt to punish a lad like that, when he needed sympathetic treatment. But he was punished and sent to Burwash, and he came back with, to use their own language, a "beef" about everything up there, and if he had been allowed to go about for twenty-four hours, the probabilities are he would again have been before some court. That is wrong. I appeal to the Government to recognize that this is a matter in which we should not be partisan, nor seek to make political capital out of it. I will say to the Hon. Minister that during the election I never spoke about this problem, although it was quite an issue then; frankly, because I felt that this was one matter

out of which we should not try to make a political issue, and also out of regard for the Hon. Minister whom I believe sincerely wants to bring about improvements. But I return to it now that the election is over, and this is the first Session of the new Legislature, and I appeal to the Hon. Minister to agree to the setting-up of a Select Committee to delve into this matter. This is as important as the work of any Committee which will be set up to investigate any matter. It deals with human lives. It is something that in my opinion is extremely important, and if I had my way I would move the Hon. Minister of Reform Institutions from the rear seats to the front, although we in the rear are no less important simply because we are in the rear, but I would focus the attention of the public onto his Department, by moving him forward.

I ask that such a committee be set up and that it be representative of all shades of opinion. Let us have experts; let us go through our institutions to see what changes have taken place, and to recommend further changes where necessary, and let the work in that field be placed entirely into channels of reform, and in an endeavour to heal some of these people, rather

than punish them.

Well I know as long as this system exists, it will create this crop of offenders against the law, because of its very nature, but in the framework of the law, much more can be done, and I believe a Committee of this sort would make an important contribution toward the betterment of conditions.

HON. JOHN FOOTE (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) has gone far afield from the Bill and its title, although that insofar as it deals with the rehabilitation it may be to the point, because the process of rehabilitation begins within the institutions themselves, in the training of the men, not only in their work, but in their thinking and endeavouring to create more constructive and hopeful attitudes toward society when they get out.

I think the hon. member knows from his discussion with me that I have no resentment at all of any criticism that is levelled at the Department. I am not unresponsive to that, nor unappreciative of it.

At the time an enquiry was demanded into the affairs at Burwash, and particularly that a Select Committee of the House be set up, I did not feel the

Department should undertake this on the urging of one hon. member of the House. If it is the wish of the Legislature that such a Committee be set up, I have no objection to it whatever, but I think the hon.member will agree with me that this is the opportunity to discuss the whole question, and I would want to hear from other hon. members who are doubtless interested in this whole subject.

I say that as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I am not at all antagonistic to any suggestions which may be made or any criticisms, but I would say this -- and I am sure the other Hon. Ministers on this side of the House who have had the responsibility for this Department, and indeed also the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) who had it at one time, that it has to be realized that we have a responsibility for maintaining discipline in the institutions, and we are faced with certain situations which we have to tackle, according to our best judgments.

The criticisms which were made originally in response to the correspondence which the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) received, were not true, as I explained to him. No one had been lax in any one of our institutions. The strap is used in accordance with

the law, and no person is given corporal punishment before having received a certificate from the doctor and psychologist or psychiatrist saying that he is mentally responsible for his actions, and he is physically able to stand the punishment. I am not an advocate of corporal punishment any more than the other hon. members. It is not true to say that as a result of the manner of the hon. member for St.Andrews(Mr.Salsberg) handling, that corporal punishment has ceased. It has not. But, as it stands at the present time, no corporal punishment is administered without the permission of the Minister, and I make sure I have all the case before me and the certificates from the psychiatrist or the psychologist and the medical officer.

MR. SALSBERG: That was not the case before.

HON. MR. FOOTE: But it is true that all the people in our institutions are very much loath to resorting to corporal punishment, and it is used only as a last resort.

The hon. member said that some people were strapped who were mentally disturbed. I think at the time the statement was made, the word used was "insane". I can assure the hon. members that has not happened.

No one was punished without a certificate saying he was sane.

What happened, as I explained to the hon. member, in some cases, was that a prisoner who had shown some very unusual behaviour, in the opinion of the superintendent, at times was "putting on a show", and was sent to the Ontario Hospital at Penetang, and one of the reports I read immediately after that enquiry stated that this prisoner had been sent to Penetang for treatment, but when he found that there was no opportunity for escape, and he was not going to have the same facilities for living that he had at Burwash, he went to the Superintendent and said, "I put on a show, but I could not get away with it, so send me back."

MR. SALSBERG: That was not the case of the person I mentioned to you at all. That was another case.

MR. FOOTE: It was one of them. There was one person, as I told the hon. member off the record, but which I will now put on the record, who, after a strapping -- some time after -- was adjudged insane, and was sent to Penetang and was treated there. He

was not sent to Burwash afterwards, but was sent to Mimico, and is there yet, and has benefited greatly by the psychiatric treatment.

It is not easy to get the services of a good psychiatrist in a place like Burwash. Cases have been referred to the Ontario Hospitals, and the Department has used the whole psychiatric facilities in the city of Toronto. However, now there is a very competent psychiatrist in Sudbury working under one of the federal grants, with permission to do private practice to supplement his income, and we have engaged his services, and used them very extensively.

We also have a psychiatrist on the staff at Burwash who interviews everyman who comes in, and tries to adjust his training program in line with his ability, and who deals with the difficult cases, as best he may.

As the hon. members may be fully aware, the fact is that people with whom we have to deal in Burwash are not the easiest in the world to handle. These people are sent there because usually they have been unable to get along in society. They have broken the law repeatedly; they have the wrong attitude toward

life, and I think there is no hon. member in this House who will deny that these people constitute a very great behaviour problem. Those are the people with whom we have to deal. So much for the statement that people were lax. They were not lax. If prisoners were strapped, they were not strapped before we received a certificate from the doctor or the psychiatrist.

Another complaint has been made about food. There is nothing wrong with the food in Burwash. You will see when I introduce the estimates how much money we spend for food in that Institution, and you will find out then how much we grow at the Institution itself. These men have the very best food that is procurable, and it is well-prepared. Of course, we have had complaints. We will always get them. On the same day we have had a complaint that the roast beef was too well-done, and that it was too rare. Trouble like that, is always to be expected. Even in the army, soldiers complained about the food, forgetting that in their own homes many times things went wrong and did not suit them. If any hon. member of this House had the food day by day provided at Burwash, he would feel remarkably well-looked after.

After these criticisms came forward, I told the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) that he was free to go and visit that institution; that he could go at any time. He asked to visit the Don Jail, and after receiving permission to visit the prisoners, which is necessary, he was given every opportunity freely. We have nothing to hide.

I have told the members of the Press Gallery that they are free to go, or to send in a representative from their papers any time they like. I told them they can go to Burwash and visit the Institution, and can talk with the guards, the officials, and with the prisoners themselves. As a result of that, I would say that the observations were all in our favour. I have been there myself. I have not headed this Department very long, but we have inspectors going there steadily, and they are not expected when they go; they go at odd times, very often without any knowledge on the part of the people they are going to see, and I think we can take their word for the fact that the food is good and well-prepared, and I have a number of letters from prisoners who have been there, speaking of the kindness and consideration they have been shown.

With regard to those people who were removed from Burwash; I would say that the removal of that group of twenty-four was rather in line with the thinking I had that we should use corporal punishment only as a last resort, and instead of applying it in this case, these people who were troublemakers were removed. Why should it be a hardship on them? They hated Burwash. There was nothing right about it; "the food was rotten" and "everything was wrong," but the minute they got out, they wanted to go back.

MR. SALSBERG: The local jails are not fit for people to be in for a half-year or a year. There is nothing for them to do, there are no work shops, and all they can do is to lie around.

MR. FOOTE: I realize that. In the United States where corporal punishment has been abolished, in every state except one, they have to find a method of discipline, and what do they do? They put them in segregation, and on a restricted diet, and leave them there until they can behave themselves and go back into the regular institution, and the places where they put them have conditions worse than those which exist in any jail. There has to be some way of disciplining these

people; there has to be some punishment.

In the beginning, it is simple restrictions of certain privileges. For instance, in Burwash, the men have a library which is a good one, and a man may get as many books as he likes. I have gone to the camps and spoken to the chaps up there and asked them if they were getting enough. In one case I was told it was difficult to get the books. They brought down an assortment, but they thought they should have more, and I directed that more be sent up. The turn-over in the Burwash Library is larger than in many of the smaller libraries throughout Ontario.

Then they have the movies, and they have a school. They have a Forestry School up there with a graduate Forester who is in a position to train them along the lines which will be of help to them after they are released. The first punishment may be the withdrawal of the privileges, such as going to the shows, or attending the Library. From there it increases. We may come to the point when we can do nothing with a man. Then what is the punishment? In the United States it is segregation under very unfavourable conditions. In our case, rather than by strapping, they are taken out and put into the County Jails. If my memory serves me

correctly, the gentleman who was removed to Windsor, was removed at his own request, in order that he could be near his family. That is the nearest I have come to retaliation on any man.

MR. SALSBERG: His mother lives in Toronto.

MR. FOOTE: I do not want to deal with this subject in an unsympathetic way, because I am willing to admit the sincerity of the hon. member for St.Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), and of any other hon. member who speaks in the House, but I say again, in regard to certain criticism, that what we are doing is exactly the same thing that is being done in the States, to avoid corporal punishment.

A situation could be created whereby you would either run the department, or a small minority in the Institution would run it for you. We cannot have that, and every hon. member knows it.

I appreciate the kindly remarks made about the progressive program we have formulated, but in justice to those who have had this Department before, Ministers, Deputies, and members of the Staff, I say most sincerely that I am only following along the progressive lines which have been laid down by them.

I have just received a letter from Doctor

Sanford Botes, who was formerly head of the prison system in the United States, in which he says, in a personal letter, that a report will follow shortly, and he also says:

> "I can only say I was deeply impressed with the set-up of your Institutions and the evidence of thoughtful work you have put into the system over these many years."

I do not think the people of the Province know enough of what has been done in these Institutions. In Guelph, for instance, where the industries were built up, not to produce cheap material for the Government, but to provide a training system for the men, it has proved so progressive, that the industrial output at Guelph to-day is larger than all the Federal Prisons in Canada combined.

We feel that in the Ontario system, we have the best training schools of any place in the country.

Speaking of Brampton, which has come under some criticism -- rather veiled, I will admit -- and I think I know what the hon. member is getting at -- may I point out that the class ratio for a period of four years for these jobs was 81%, which is extremely high. I do not think that can be reached anywhere on the continent.

(Take "H" follows)

No boy is sent to Brampton unless he has been screened by a Committee which assesses his intelligence and his aptitude and his ability for co-operation.

While we are on that subject, I would like to say this, just to show the danger of speaking too much about criticism in public that is rather unfounded and irresponsible criticism, that in Brampton we were obliged to dismiss one of the instructors because he was found to be utterly incapable, and because the qualifications that he gave us were not substantiated when we checked on them. That man threatened before he left that school that he would make an expose of this Department through one of the papers that would take it up. I might say there was no responsible paper in Toronto that paid any attention to it.

Here is something that happened after that. I had a request from a mother that her boy should remain in the County Jail, the district jail, rather than be sent down to Brampton, because she had read in this paper, -- people send this news around -- that conditions down there were terrible and she did not want her boy in there. This boy stayed for a considerable time in the district jail. She came down one day to see me,

and I told her to go and see Brampton for herself and see what she thought of it. This boy could have been there in healthful conditions learning a trade, and quite happy while he was restrained in the district jail. After investigation the boy was sent down there. That was where he should have been.

Therefore, there is a danger in getting a broad impression that things are worse than they are by a long shot.

I do not think anyone who has had the responsibility for reform institutions, or any other person, could ever get up and say everything was wonderful in these places. We have to deal with people, we have difficult people as inmates, and sometimes we have difficult people on staffs. We have to do the best with what we have and, on the whole, our intention is good and it works well. I might say that occasionally we have staffs who do not deal very well with the inmates and probably cause a great deal of trouble, but we try to train these men to do better, or get rid of them.

In all penal institutions you will find the kind of things that you do not like, but you will find them in schools or other places. Why on earth are people

always so surprised when something goes wrong in a prison? They seem to be more surprised if it happens in prison, than if it happened in another institution or school in the country. Why are they so amazed about that? I would expect that there would be a good deal of trouble.

I would say at the present time at Burwash we have 600 men who profit by the kind of life we offer in an institution, and I assure the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) and all other hon. members here that we are in this business for one purpose only, and that is to try to rehabilitate these men and women and young people, to train them, encourage them, use them as well as we can, and get them out into civilian life where they are rehabilitated in every sense of the word, well-accepted in the community. That is our intention, and that is the idea of everyone we have working for us.

If the opinion of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) is at all general, and you feel that you can do a better job, you can help us by setting up this Committee. I have no objection to the Committee whatever, but I would prefer to go on in my own way, seeking the assistance of the best men and women in this

field and meeting things as we are able to.

In closing I would say this, that we have too often the idea that we have to go out of this country to learn anything, or to find men who are competent. The expert is usually the ordinary man away from home. There are men in my department who know as much about this business as anyone in the United States, and I think they will tell you that when you go down there. Our people have used a good deal of originality in this field, and I would like to pay tribute to them. I do not believe in running down our home product, our own Canadians. I intend to make use of the services of the best people in this field, and anything that is practicable, we will do.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

MAGISTRATES' ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order, second reading, Bill No.44, "The Magistrates' Act, 1952".

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General) moves second reading of Bill No.44, "The Magistrates' Act , 1952".

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill was fully

explained on first reading, and it would hardly be necessary for me to repeat it at this stage.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

REGISTRY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order, Second Reading, Bill No.45, "An Act to Amend the Registry Act".

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Second Reading of Bill No.45, "An Act to Amend the Registry Act".

He said: Mr. Speaker, I might say we propose to refer this Bill to the Legal Bills Committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

SURROGATE COURTS' ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order, Second Reading, Bill No.46, "An Act to Amend the Surrogate Courts' Act".

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General) moves second reading of Bill No.46, "An Act to Amend the Surrogate Courts' Act".

He said: Mr. Speaker, I propose that this Bill also be referred to the Legal Bills Committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, at this point, I will move the adjournment of the House. In so doing, I might say that to-morrow we will proceed with the Throne Debate, and on Wednesday with second readings of Orders 21 and 22, the Seaway bills.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.35 of the clock, p.m.

- - - - - - - - - -

ONTARIO

First Session
of the
Twenty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 21, 1952, et seq.

0

Volume IX

Tuesday, March 4, 1952.

0

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

R. C. Sturgeon,
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

N I N T H D A Y

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE, HELD IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21st, 1952, et seq.

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

- - - - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Tuesday, March 4th, 1952.

- - - - - - - - -

The House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

CITY OF OSHAWA

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Ontario) moves first reading

of a Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the City of Oshawa."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

CITY OF FORT WILLIAM

Mr. C. Mapledoram (Fort William) moves first reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the City of Fort William".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

TRUSTEES OF MASSEY HALL

Mr. T. L. Patrick (Middlesex North), in the absence of Mr. Roberts, moves first reading of a Bill intituled,"An Act to Incorporate the Trustees of Massey Hall".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

OTTAWA ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCE OF LEARNING

Mr. T. L. Patrick (Middlesex North), in the absence of Mr. Morrow, moves first reading of a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Ottawa Association for the Advancement of Learning".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the day.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order.

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the

motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session, Mr. Frost.

ON SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, before taking part in this debate, I wish to join with the previous speakers who made reference to the death of our gracious and noble King George VI. I am sure it was a great shock to all of us when we learned over the radio that he had passed away. It was a shock to us who live in the Commonwealth of Nations, as he was our King; it was a shock to the world at large because he, as a man, exemplified the highest ideals of family life. I am sure it will be as a family man, and the head of a family, that he will be remembered throughout the world at large. We, in the Commonwealth, mourn him as our King.

King George VI was a comparatively young man when he passed away, being only fifty-six years of age. Usually men may expect a much greater span of life. I believe, if we go back to the reign of King Edward VIII, and up to the present time, the average age at which kings have died has been seventy-two years, therefore, King George VI could have expected to have reigned approximately sixteen or seventeen years more, but

unfortunately, he was cut down.

King George VI will be remembered as one of our greatest kings, a man who, not expecting to assume this high office, stepped into the position, and filled it with dignity.

We wish to extend to all the Royal Family our sincere sympathy in their loss. We wish to extend to his daughter, the lovely Princess who has to assume the role of Queen, our sympathy, for the position which she must fill. Undoubtedly this position will set her apart from her family, and compel her to lead a more or less lonely life. She should have been for years the happy, home-loving girl, whom we knew, and could have expected many years in which to live with her family and her children. But she has been thrust into this great position, and I am sure she will fill it with dignity and honour.

It is rather significant, Mr. Speaker, if we look back over several of the reigns of the past, and go back to the reign of Queen Victoria, we note that she also ascended the Throne at the age of eighteen. The reign of Queen Victoria, I believe, can be known as "The Reign of the Empire". During her reign the nations which comprise the present Commonwealth grew into manhood and became independent, within the Empire

set-up. After the reign of Queen Victoria, in which we saw the "age of Empire" reach its climax, we passed into another era, the era during the reign of four kings.

During the reign of Queen Victoria, the attitude of our people, our statesmen, our writers and our great thinkers might be amply demonstrated by something which Kipling wrote in reference to Canada, where he stated:

> "Daughter I am in my mother's house, but mistress in my own".

That period has passed away, and the separate dominions of the Commonwealth are no longer daughters within their mothers' homes; they are sister nations within the Commonwealth.

Just as Queen Victoria's reign saw the great advancement of the Empire reaching its greatest heights, so I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the reign of Elizabeth II will be known as"the age of the Commonwealth".

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join also with the previous speakers who have referred to the illness of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett). I am sure we all sincerely regret the unfortunate accident last autumn which placed him in the hospital. We hope that in the not too distant future, he will be with us again to lead his very important portfolio, and demonstrate to the House his genuine ability, and we hope, when he

does return, his accident may not have left any permanent disability or scars.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to the recent illness of the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow). We have noticed he has only been in the House on a very few occasions this year. We hope that he has fully recovered, and will soon be able to be back here, leading his department in the government.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry indeed the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) has not been able to be with us on very many occasions this year. He is one whom we all respect and love in this House, and I am sure that each and every one of us hope he will return in the not too distant future.

I wish to extend my congratulations to the two new Ministers, the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas) who has been appointed Minister of Public Works, and the hon. member for Toronto-Eglinton (Mr. Dunlop) who has been appointed Minister of Education. To each of these two new hon. Ministers, I extend my best wishes in their work.

I wish also to congratulate the mover and seconder of the reply to the Address from the Throne. Each of these two newly-elected hon. members made an excellent presentation to this House. Particularly did I like the remarks of the hon.member for

Wellington North (Mr. Root) as he, I believe, has followed a course of action which I myself have followed, and have advocated in the House on many previous occasions, and that is, to refer back to his own riding and tell the House something about the problems of the people who sent him to this Legislature. The hon. member for Wellington North did that in his speech, and I congratulate him on taking that stand.

The hon. member for London (Mr. Robarts) gave an excellent address, with some of which I agree, and with some of which I do not. Perhaps I shall first deal with the portions of his address with which I am not in accord.

He made a statement praising the recent victory of the "Tory" party in England in the recent election. I wonder if the hon. member remembers that in that election, Labor secured one quarter of a million more votes than the victorious Conservative party. Surely, the number of votes secured would indicate that it was not the "great victory" which the hon. member for London believed it to be.

Also, in regard to Ontario, he was very loud in his praises of the recent victory of the present Conservative government. Of course, as we look around and see how small the number of Opposition members is,

perhaps it was a "great victory", but when you take into account the number of votes cast, I think you ought to think again. Fifty-one percent of the votes cast in the election on November 22nd were cast in favour of Opposition members. It was just the circumstance of votes recorded in the different ridings, or perhaps a multiplicity of parties in Opposition, which placed the Conservative government in the position it is in to-day. May I remind the hon. members opposite that perhaps some day the fifty-one percent will catch up with them. They should keep that in mind.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): We always do.

MR. GRUMMETT: I am glad to hear that.

Mr. Speaker, may I refer to some portions of the speech by the hon. member for London (Mr. Robarts) with which I agree?

Firstly, I agree most heartily with him in his remarks about the accidents on our highways. I think it is time we took note of the terrific slaughter that is going on, on our highways. I do not know just what the answer is, or just how the situation can be remedied. The hon. member for London suggested the establishment of additional patrols of highway police officers, under the direction of the Provincial Police.

I am not quite sure that is the solution. I believe we can solve this problem by increasing the penalties, -- increasing the loss of privileges. If a man only loses his driving privileges for thirty days, or two months, or three months, or perhaps a year or two, that is not a severe enough penalty. Let us make the penalty, for instance, the loss of privileges for, say, three or four or five years or more, and you will find that the accidents on the highways will be cut down.

I have another suggestion to offer, and that is one which I believe is used in some of the states in the United States of America, where signs are put up on the highways at the spots where fatal accidents have occurred, just a plain skull and cross-bones. The theory is that a motorist driving along the highway and seeing this skull and cross-bones will automatically lift his foot off the gas pedal, and slow down,and I am sure there are sufficient places where accidents have occurred on our highways so that he would scarcely forget what he has just seen, and again "step on the gas". I think it would be a good idea to indicate on our highways certain spots at which fatal accidents have occurred. That would bring home to our people the fact that a fatal accident has occurred, because, after all, we are far too prone to forget, and to accept them as common,

every-day occurrences. We accept them as something which must happen. We forget that perhaps if one-tenth of the casualties were caused in a battle overseas, it immediately becomes headline news, and we look on it with much greater horror than we look on the weekly slaughter on our highways.

(Page B-1 follows)

I concur in the remarks made by the hon. member for London (Mr. Robarts).

I also agree with the remarks of the hon. member for London (Mr. Robarts) regarding education. I think the new Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) has a big job ahead of him. He has taken over port-folio which for many years has been the subject of criticism both within the House and without. The Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunlop) has a big job ahead, bringing the Department of Education back to the standard which the Province of Ontario deserves and expects. I think also, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) is on the right track when he states that perhaps we ought to get back to the consideration of the three R's. Too many frills, I believe, have been added to our educational curriculae. I can recollect when I entered High School that our classes were continued throughout each and every year -- at that time they called them "years", not "forms".

When I entered Owen Sound Collegiate, there was a certain number of pupils in the first year, practically the same number and the same faces were in the graduating year. We considered it a tragedy if one had to drop out during a year and two or three seemed to

us a distinct loss.

I had occasion to make inquiries two or three years ago regarding my home high school at Iroquois Falls, and I was astounded to find that sixty or seventy pupils entered First Form each year, but only six or seven were graduating from Grade Thirteen. What had happened to the rest along the way? Something is wrong with our educational system when the pupils do not remain in school. I do not know what it is. That is the duty of the Department of Education, and I hope the Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunlop) will be able to find a solution.

Another remark made by the hon. member for London (Mr. Robarts) with which I am inclined to agree to a limited extent, and in a more localized application than perhaps he intended, was when he referred to the terrific amount of taxes collected by the Federal Government, paid into the Federal Treasury. He claims this deprives Ontario of much-needed revenue. In this regard I can give him a local example which will perhaps bolster his ideas along that line. In Northern Ontario, of every tax dollar collected, 88% goes into the Federal Treasury; 8% to the Provincial, and 4% is left to the municipalities. That is the position facing the mining municipalities, and we can appreciate the fact that the Federal

Government collects the lion's share of taxation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have come to the part of my address dealing with the Speech from the Throne, both subjects or matters omitted therefrom, and those mentioned therein.

Firstly, I want to refer to the plight of our unemployed employables. Yes, I know quite well that the Provincial Government will say it is the duty of the Federal Government to look after the unemployed employables. Perhaps it is the duty, but I wonder if there is any distinct agreement setting up that duty, or is it merely that it is a question of "passing the buck". The Federal authorities do not want to assume the responsibility and the Provincial authorities will not, with the result that the municipalities have to, in the end. Municipalities fight it; they send deputations to the Federal Government, deputations to the Provincial Government, but in the end they are the ones having to pay the bill.

The municipalities are closest to the people who are suffering; they cannot see them starve, and must give relief. I think it is time our Provincial Government either had a definite understanding with the Federal Government, or did something about our unemployed employables.

Many thousands to-day in Toronto are unemployed and seeking relief. The municipal officials of the City of Toronto are searching desperately for a way out of the situation, and cannot find it. We, as a wealthy province, should step in and find it.

I would just like to refer to an article that appeared in the Toronto Daily Star of February 28th, 1952:

> "Man Breaks Shop Window to Get Relief for Wife Expecting Second Child:
>
> Police of Court St. station impressed by the story of David Holmes, 30, after he purposely broke the law to get arrested early today, are now trying to help him land a job.
>
> Expecting his wife to be taken any hour to St. Michael's hospital to give birth to her second child, Holmes walked up to the front of Century Motors, Yonge St., and smashed the plate glass window in full view of Constables Lloyd Mac Leod and Donald Arnott who were parked there. Holmes was arrested on a charge of malicious damage.
>
> Holmes told Sergeant Fred Davies he had tried to get work and a home for his wife and child, a year and a half old. He had no money to take care of the hospital bill so he went to the welfare department.
>
> 'They told me that unless I was a cripple and couldn't work or was in police custody they couldn't do anything for me,' said Holmes. He said he decided to break the window which would put him in custody and then his wife would be looked after.
>
> 'We're going to try to do something for

> him,' said Det. Harold Magahey. Holmes had not been drinking and investigation showed his story was genuine.
>
> Today Magistrate Prentice placed Holmes on suspended sentence after Major Jolliffe of the Salvation Army promised to provide food for the family.
>
> Det. Magahey stated: 'The window is valued at $300. It is insured.' "

That is just one of many cases of need in the city, and I think our Provincial Government should attempt to do something, instead of merely saying, "That is not our affair, that is the affair of the Federal Government".

Next, I want to refer to housing. This is a subject that has been mentioned in this House on many occasions. We have had long and, perhaps, bitter arguments and debates on this subject here and still nothing is done. Year after year the Government says they have a new plan, they bring forward some small amendment to an existing statute and hope that it will do something. They are merely waiting for time itself to cure the situation, but time will not cure this situation. Private enterprise will not cure the situation, private enterprise will never build the houses that are required in Ontario to-day.

A recent survey made by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation showed that Ontario to-day needs

450,000 houses or housing units. That is a lot of construction. Private enterprise will not cure that situation, because the returns from housing do not equal the returns from industrial construction. Industrial construction or business construction to-day pays a bigger return or dividend and, therefore, private enterprise will not cure the situation. It is up to this Province to do something to build homes for our people. I know the Government will say, "But, we have not got the money". We can raise money if we want to build the St.Lawrence Seaway, or if we want to undertake the great expansion and conversion program of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission. In those cases money can be obtained for those great undertakings, and, rightly so. I am not criticising them in any way. They are needed. But so is housing, and I hope that this Government will undertake a program of home construction which will give to our people the security they need.

Housing shortages to-day results in many broken homes, young people living with their parents or parents-in-law are not happy. They want homes of their own, and unless we give them, we are just laying up a store of trouble and misery for ourselves in the

future in broken homes and in delinquent children.

On the subject of labour, I am not going to say very much; I am going to leave a little for my colleague who will speak a little later on in the debate. He is fully equipped to deal with that subject. However, I just want to say that in connection with the Workmen's Compensation Act, I hope that the Government will bring in amendments implementing the recommendations of the Roach Commission.

That was a very fine report, and it contained many fine recommendations which should be now implemented, such as safety services and accident prevention. I hope the Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has in mind those recommendations and will now submit them to the House. Last year we heard a long debate on this subject, and a very able debate pointing out the necessity of the improvements which were required. I hope the Government is now prepared to see that those are put on the Statute books.

Regarding mining municipalities, I wonder if the Hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Gemmell) is able to tell us when the report of that special committee set up to study the problem of taxation in mining municipalities will make its report, or when the report will be submitted to the House. I urge the

Government to submit this report as soon as possible, so that we can have sufficient time to study it and so the municipalities affected will also be able to study it. At long last we hope that the disability under which the mining municipalities has suffered will be cured by the recommendations of this Committee, and that the Hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) is prepared to put those recommendations into effect.

It is some considerable time since it was first suggested in this House that a Municipal-Provincial Conference should be held. I believe it was in 1947 that the then hon. member for Fort William, (Mr. Anderson), suggested such a conference. The Government has been promising us the conferences from time to time, but nothing has been done. Every year the burdens of the municipalities get heavier and heavier, and every year those burdens fall on real estate. We have to do something to relieve the burden that is now resting on the home owner alone in municipal taxation systems and schemes of to-day. The home owner bears a disproportionate share of taxation, and a conference of provincial and municipal authorities could do much to relieve this situation.

Now, as to the old-age assistance. The hon.

members who were in the last Legislature will recall that last September when the Act was put into effect, considerable discussion took place as to whether or not the amount provided by the Act was sufficient.

I know the Government cannot increase the amount in the Act, but the Government can pay a supplementary subsidy, or bonus, and grant every assistance to our senior citizens in the age group 65 to 69. The records of the Welfare Councils of different cities show quite clearly that the forty-dollar payment is not sufficient. A clipping taken from the Toronto Telegram -- the Toronto Telegram is a paper favourable to the Government -- will indicate outside thinking in connection with this situation.

I quote now from the Toronto Telegram of February 22, 1952. This is headed:

"Lack of Plan:

Old Folks Age 65-69 Seen 'Goats'.

Were better off when on relief.

Old people are being made the goats of lack of Government planning, welfare workers charged today. Hundreds of Toronto's 65-69 year-old citizens, previously receiving more than $40 per month from city relief, now have been cut back to the $40 a month provincial-federal pension.

'It is just about impossible for an old person with no other income to live

on $40 a month', said Mrs. Jean Good, secretary of the old age division of the Welfare Council. 'And now there is a new group of old folk being forced to do it.'

She explained that while they were on relief the city welfare paid the entire rent, plus a food allowance, for many of these people who are completely unable to work."

(Take "C" follows)

" Average rent for a room would be about $7 a week," Mrs. Good said, " Now the old folk say 'I can pay my rent, perhaps, but what am I going to eat?".

She added that when they phoned the city Welfare Department to ask what could be done they were told they were now provincial responsibilities. And when they phone the provincial department they are told that the $40 is all they can get, that there is no allowance for any extras no matter what their need.

"They just can't believe it," she said. "On no level of government has any planning been done on a personal basis."

Take the case of Mrs. B--, a widow, age 65 and now eligible for the $40 a month maans test pension.

On relief she was allowed this budget per month:

Food	$22.06
Household supplies	1.00
Clothing	1.00
Shelter	19.42
Cooking fuel	2.24
Total	$45.72

None of these can she get along without. Yet now with her pension she receives $5.72 less a month.

Mrs. Good said that those with small outside incomes or with friends or a kind landlady or helpful church connections were managing. But those who had no outside help at all were right up against it.

Welfare Commissioner Rupert estimated that over 700 unemployable persons in this age group were on relief in Toronto. Of these 480 are being granted pensions and the rest of the cases are still pending.

"We are keeping them on relief until they receive

> the pension, of course," said Mr. Rupert. "But the policy of the city is not to supplement Government assistance even though a person will receive less under the pension than he got on relief."
>
> The plight of one couple was drawn to the attention of the Board of Control yesterday. Both husband and wife were receiving the pension -- a total of $80. a month. But previously on relief they had received $94.
>
> Mrs. Good said that the Welfare Council was now making a survey through field workers to get an estimated number of how many people were being oppressed by the pension plan. The council hopes to present a concrete case to the three levels of government as soon as they have the facts before them."

I think that illustrates quite clearly that what was said in this House by members of all the Opposition last summer has been borne out. The pension of $40. a month is not sufficient and surely with all the millions that our Provincial Treasurer can show in his surplus, can we not set aside a few hundred thousand dollars to supplement these pensions for our senior citizens?

Next I want to refer to the problems of the disabled and the pensions which are presumed to be forthcoming in a Bill which we will consider at this Session of the Legislature. Last September when the hon. Minister of Welfare told us that such a Bill would be subsequently

(Page C-3 follows)

introduced, I for one felt a great uplift. I thought, "Now, the time has come when those in dire need and who are not covered by any other legislation are going to receive some consideration". But later on, with a shock, I saw that this pension was limited to those totally and permanently disabled. That is a terribly restrictive provision and I do not think it should be included in the Act. With the means test we can avoid paying to those who are really not in need. With the means test you can see that the person receiving the pension is actually in need of it and the minute that person is able to go back to work or recovers sufficiently, then he can be taken off the pension. With that provision of "totally and permanently disabled", how many are going to receive the pension? How many doctors will certify an applicant "totally and permanently disabled?" A man might suffer a stroke. Is he "totally and permanently disabled?" No. The doctor will undoubtedly say he may recover. He may recover in six months; he may recover in two years, but in the meantime, he gets no assistance -- not under this Act.

Under this Act you may rest assured that very, very few will receive assistance; in other words, the Act is merely an empty shell, an empty promise, and it will not do the work that we expected or which the government promised.

One thing I want to commend the government on is this advancement in the treatment of cancer. The establishment of the clinic in London where the Cobalt Bomb has been demonstrated, is a great step forward and anything we can do to help relieve the suffering of those afflicted by this great scourge, will, I am sure, be approved by all our people.

The government in setting up this Cobalt Bomb in London is following the lead of the Saskatchewan government. Months before the Clinic demonstrated the Cobalt Bomb in London, the Saskatchewan government had already put it into use.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Our bomb was the first.

MR. GRUMMETT: I beg to disagree with the hon. Premier. I am sure that the experiments with the Cobalt Bomb in Regina were in advance of the experiments in London, unless of course they were kept secret at London.

MR. FROST: We beat them by a hair.

MR. GRUMMETT: Well then, all right, follow on in the footsteps of Saskatchewan and make this treatment free to those who need it. Saskatchewan does, in that instance, I believe, lead the province of Ontario.

HON. MR.PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): There

are fewer people ou there.

MR. GRUMMETT: The proportion of taxes is the same. They are doing a wonderful job for a smaller proportion, but they have similar revenues. We have other means here which they have not at their disposal.

We had a discussion yesterday on the amendment to the Parole Act. I know when speaking on the Throne Speech Debate that it is not proper to refer to legislation before the House, but it has been the practice for quite a number of years now to waive that restriction in the Throne Speech Debate.

The hon. Minister, I think, is a man who is endeavouring to handle his Department to the best of his ability and is doing a good job. I wonder if the cause of some of the unrest in some of our jails is the application of the indeterminate sentence. A man may come before a magistrate who has a previous record and be given a sentence determinate and an indeterminate sentence as well. He presumes that because he has been given an indeterminate sentence that when he has finished the determinate sentence, he will automatically be given parole. That is not the case. His whole case is brought before the Parole Board and there considered and perhaps quite rightly the Parole Board will say, "This man is not a fit and proper person to receive a parole". Perhaps

it is because he did not conduct himself in such a manner as to warrant granting him parole. He presumed that at the end of his sentence he would be granted a parole, but he finds that the Parole Board has turned him down. This, I believe, was the cause of a considerable amount of the trouble at Burwash.

Another matter to which I wish to refer is that of civil defence. I know that civil defence is a matter for the Federal government primarily but I wonder if a little prodding from the Provincial government might not get a little more result. Ontario has many vulnerable industries and many vulnerable points such as the Welland canal, the Sault Ste. Marie locks and so on, and great industrial organizations. I am wondering if the Ontario government is waiting, hoping that the lightning will not strike. I think the Ontario government could do much to prod the Federal government to have something done in the way of enlarging the civil defence projects.

Another question which was not referred to in the Throne Speech is that of Dominion-Provincial relations. I wonder if the government cannot tell us exactly what they intend to do in this connection. I think the House is entitled to that information. What

(page C-7 follows.)

is the stand in Ontario and what is the government doing about it?

Now, Mr. Speaker, for a few moments I want to go back to my own riding and refer as did the member for Wellington North (Mr. Root) to some of the problems of my riding. First, I want to speak on highways.

The hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) has done an excellent job in building main highways, and in assisting municipalities in Cochrane South but there are one or two bottlenecks which we would like to see cleared up. One is the connecting link between Matachewan and Swastika. Matachewan is a town situated in the riding of Temiskaming; Swastika is in the southern part of Cochrane South. In order to get to Matachewan you back-track or leave highway 11 at New Liskeard, you travel almost parallel with highway 11 for approximately sixty-five miles. Then, if you want to travel on northward to Cochrane or Timmins, you have to back-track to New Liskeard and then go on up highway 11, whereas a shortcut or cut-off from Matachewan to Swastika would mean only a trip of twenty-five miles, half of which has been constructed and it has been constructed for at least six or seven years.

I believe it was in 1947 the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) promised that this portion of the highway would be completed. At that time he said that the

only hold-up was the necessary steel to erect a bridge over a river, the Blanche River, I believe. If that is the only thing holding up the construction of this highway, why not put in a wooden structure over this river and provide us with this highway. It is a very necessary highway and one long demanded by the people of Matchewan and Swastika.

Another bottle-neck is the Lightning River Road or highway 101. On the extreme end of this highway touching the Quebec boundary remains five miles of uncompleted road. If this five miles were constructed, we would have access to the province of Quebec, the northern part of the province of Quebec, the Malartic-Rouyn area and also tourists would come in from northern Quebec into the northern part of Ontario, as well as business trips which would be made much shorter. I strongly urge the hon. Minister of Highway (Mr. Doucett) to complete this short piece of road which has remained uncompleted for the past three or four years.

Another such road requiring the attention of the hon. Minister is what is known as the Warren Lake road or the Timmins-Chapleau road, connecting the Great Porcupine Camp with the Timmins-Chapleau highway at Chapleau. If this road were constructed, it would open up a great area for tourists and also mining developments

as well as timber and agriculture.

The road from Timmins to Chapleau would mean the construction of a highway over which a person travelling from Timmins to Chapleau could pass in approximately three hours' driving. At the present time it takes nineteen hours from the time you leave Timmins until you reach Chapleau by train. It is only a short section of road and one which would bring in many, many thousands of tourists to northern Ontario. The Porcupine Chamber of Commerce has advocated the completion of this road for some time, and I hope that the hon. Minister will this year decide that this is one of the "musts" on his road-building program.

I now wish to commend the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) for something I believe I mentioned last year and that is the establishment of radio controls. We can appreciate in the north the benefit of Provincial Police officers being equipped with radios in their patrol cars. It means that if anything should happen, these cars can get to wherever the accident occurs or wherever they are needed in a short period of time.

To illustrate to you how quickly radio can move the cars about, I want to tell you of a personal experience I had a few weeks ago. I had a telephone call from the corporal in charge of the police detach-

ment at Matheson telling me of an accident which had occurred on the highway in which a man had been killed by a car, and he wanted me to go down and investigate as Coroner. I told him that it might take me some little time because the car which I usually used for trips, was in the garage and I would have to secure other transportation. He then told me, "Contact your local constable and have him bring you down in the patrol car". I picked up the telephone and immediately rang the local police officer but could not locate him either at his home or in his office. So I then called the corporal back and told him that it would be some time before I could get down as I could not locate the constable. He then informed me, "Call the radio despatcher in Timmins and have him order a car to pick you up". So I called Timmins and explained the situation to the despatcher on duty and he said, "Just a minute". I heard him call the local constable in his patrol car and I heard the constable answer back that he had received the message and was proceeding to carry it out, and about three minutes later that constable was at my office door ready to pick me up. He had been patrolling the highway less than a mile outside the town. We did not know where he was, but the mere fact of having a radio in his car meant that

there was no loss of time in the emergency. I think that has been a great help in policing the north.

During the hearings of the Select Committee appointed to enquire into the administration of Criminal justice in Ontario held last summer, we went thoroughly into the question of salaries paid to provincial officers. We found that in many instances these officers were paid a great deal less than municipal officers.

For instance, an officer starting in the Ontario Provincial Police Force was --

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): They have been raised since, you know.

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr, Speaker, may I say to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) that I am going to refer to that. The salary was $2,140. a year ago for a man starting on the force. While we were sitting on the Committee a report was carried in the Press to the effect that Windsor had taken on a couple of dozen additional officers --"rookie policemen", and their starting salary was set at $3,000. a year.

Now, I felt that there should be no difference between the municipal officers and the Provincial Police Officers. Surely our provincial police are entitled to the same consideration as municipal officers.

As to what the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter)

said about having been increased, I am not certain as to the amount but I think it is $400. -- a general increase, not-across-the-board but in some cases some officers have received an increase of approximately $400. They still are not on a par with municipal police and you cannot police this province unless they are.

MR. PORTER: Of course, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, when the hon. Member talks of municipal police, he just talks of one municipality. Compare them across-the-board. What about the Timmins police?

MR. GRUMMETT: The Timmins police, Mr. Attorney-General, are paid much more than the provincial police in that area.

MR. PORTER: How much?

MR. GRUMMETT: They are paid $400. to $500. more at the present time.

MR. PORTER: I will look into that.

MR. GRUMMETT: In my own little municipality, a little township, the township of Calvert, we are --

MR. PORTER: Our police are paid better than the "Mounties", as a rule, now.

(Page C-13 follows)

MR. GRUMMETT: I will grant you that, but that is no reason why they should be paid less than municipal police.

MR. PORTER: Of course, we have to spend all our money contributing to the municipalities so that they can raise their salaries.

MR. GRUMMETT: Where do you get the money? You get it out of the municipalities. The municipalities have paid it in the way of taxes or their residents have paid it in the way of taxes. Surely they are entitled to the little pittance that you hand them back.

MR. PORTER: $110,000,000.

MR. GRUMMETT: That is nothing for our great and wealthy province.

The fact of what I am stating about the inequality of salaries is borne out by the fact that the investigation last summer showed that almost twenty percent to twenty-five percent of the provincial police resigned each year. That is a terrific turnover.

MR. PORTER: That has changed very much since. There are very few resignations now.

MR. GRUMMETT: Just since we raised the question in June or July last year.

MR. PORTER: It had nothing to do with

that because this was being put forward for some months.

MR. GRUMMETT: Nothing was done about it. The question was rasied here last year in the House by two or three hon. members. As a matter of fact, I raised that question myself.

MR. PORTER: If you look up my statement you will see that I said we were contemplating the entire revision because conditions had changed since the last statutory provision was made.

MR. GRUMMETT: I grant that the hon. Attorney-General did make that statement but when we held our investigation in June I was not aware of anything having been done nor was there any reference by any of the witnesses at that investigation to indicate that there was an increase coming.

MR. PORTER: It was quite proper for them not to mention it, because you could hardly have Civil Servants appearing before a Committee disclosing what the government might or might not do.

(Page D-1 follows)

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes, but these Civil servants, Mr. Attorney-General, were being asked very pertinent questions concerning the situation, and if they had believed at that time there was a movement on foot to remedy the situation, surely they should have told us, " there is no need to go any further: this is being remedied now".

MR. PORTER: I do not think they would have any right to committ the government in any way.

MR. GRUMMETT: The Commissioner himself made the definite statement that he believed the reason why so many men were leaving the force was because their salaries were not adequate, and he stated he believed the force would secure a better type of men if they paid them higher wages. That is recorded in the evidence of the committee.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I come to another point of my speech which I have covered year in and year out for quite a number of years, and I am going to say something again about it. That is the problem of neglected children.

First, I am going to read a few extracts from an article published in a magazine I have here, but before I give you the name of the magazine, let me hasten to explain that I myself did not discover the article. This magazine is entitled "The Chatelaine" , a women's magazine. My daughter-in-law found the article and handed it to me, and I do not want the hon. members to get any false impressions.

I would commend this article to any hon. member who wishes to read it. It is very lengthy, and I will only read a few extracts. It is by Fred Bodsworth, and is entitled "Runaways for Marriage". The first extract I would like to read is as follows:

> A Toronto police official, commenting recently on the increasing number of men reported missing, said: "We used to look immediately for foul play, now we always investigate the home situation first, for domestic trouble is the leading reason now for men being listed as missing."
>
> Authorities blame hasty wartime marriages, wartime separations due to military service, good times and crowded housing - in that order - for today's bumper crop of desertions.
>
> A reconciliation officer in Toronto's family court, who talks to a score or more deserted wives every week, told me: "During the war, when soldiers were leaving for overseas, there were many hasty marriages that would never have occurred if the parties had waited until they knew each other better. Some married after just two weeks acquaintance, then tried to correspond for two years or more about a couple of dances and a one-night honeymoon which were the only experiences they had shared together."

Last year while speaking on this subject, the then hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. McLeod) asked the hon. Minister of welfare if this difficulty to which I am now referring was not a local one, pertaining to my own riding in particular. The hon. Minister nodded his head and indicated that he believed it was. I want to point out that in the extract I have just read, it is shown that the Toronto officials interview a score or more of deserted wives every week. That mounts up to an impressive total over a year.

The next extract from this very illuminating article is as follows:

"Welfare authorities paint a grim picture of the family havoc wrought by desertion. Often the husband is caught and ordered by a court to contribute to his family's maintenance, but usually, whether the family is supported by public relief or by the absent husbands, the income provides only a bare existence. Frequently the wife must do part-time work, and all too often this results in neglected children. Judge Mott told me the biggest cause of child delinquency is the broken home.

"Divorce and death are final, " he said, "and it is easier for a mother and children to adjust to these situations. But desertion leaves an uncertainty hanging over the home. The husband might come back, he might not."

And the embarrassment and inferiority feelings left behind with desertion victims often cause serious personality injuries."

The next extract is one to which I believe hon. members should pay attention, and of which I think they should take note. It says:

"Using mothers' allowance statistics and the records of non-support court cases as a guide, welfare authorities estimate that 2,000 Canadian mothers and some 5,000 children will be left to fight their own battles by vanishing fathers in 1951 - 2,000 families to be added to the already impressive total whose breadwinners have said: "Here, Mr. Taxpayer, you can take care of them from now on."

The number of desertions each year is increasing alarmingly. One of the best gauges of the desertion rate are mothers' allowance statistics. Every province, except Newfoundland, includes desertion as a condition entitling mothers to allowance payments.

In 1946, for example, Ontario was paying allowances to 206 deserted wives: in September, 1950, it had 840. In 1948 6% of mothers' allowances were being paid because of desertion; at present more than 12% are desertion cases. Saskatchewan's mothers' allowance board had 52 deserted wives under its wing in 1946, 162 in 1949.

What financial burden are deserting husbands dumping into the taxpayer's lap? In 1948 mothers' allowance payments to deserted wives

and children in Ontario amounted to about $20,000 a month; by September 1950 it was $53,000 a month."

I wonder what it is to-day. That has been climbing steadily. This is a problem which I think we ought to meet, and meet with firmness now.

Another extract says:

An official of Ontario's Department of Public Welfare told me: "Multiply the mothers' allowance records for desertion by five and you will be somewhere close to the total." At that rate Canada today has about 15,000 deserted mothers.

Court records provide another view of the desertion epidemic -- the deserters who vanish for a time, only to have the law finally catch up with them.

In 1943 Canadian courts convicted 2,271 deserters of non-support; in 1948, it was 4,857.

Most were ordered by courts to contribute to their families' support, but the taxpayer still gets stuck with a share of the burden. Usually the support payments (average: $20 a week) are insufficient to fully provide for the deserted family."

I have stated before in this House that the cases of desertion clearly indicate that we, as a people , consider property rights above personal or humanity rights. If someone breaks into a store and steals a suit of clothes, or runs off with the cash register, our Municipal and Provincial police will follow him from one shore of Canada to the other until he is caught and punished. And quite rightly so. I am not disputing the job done by the police. I commend them for a good job well done.

But, at the same time, why could we not run down the home deserters, the home breakers, in the

same manner, and punish them as we do other offenders? They are just as much criminals as those who have violated our property rights.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): What department of government would you say is failing to perform its duty in that regard?

MR. GRUMMETT: Primarily, it may be the Department of Welfare, but what can the hon. Minister of Welfare do if it is not in the statute? It is up to each and every hon. member in this legislature to do our part to see that these laws are strengthened, and sufficient power is given to the department to trace down and punish these offenders.

This article goes on to say:

"Most provincial desertion acts allow a court to order the husband to pay support to his family, though under some the penalty for non-payment is so light that the deserter can thumb his nose at the whole business, go to jail for a few days and be on his way again.

The catch, however, is that he must be located first. And tracing deserters today is left merely to municipal police in the wife's town where the non-support charge is laid."

And a little further on it goes on to say:

" What is needed," an Ontario government official told me, "is a uniform desertion law for all Canada and a reciprocal agreement that takes in all provinces, all of the British Isles and the U.S. Then, with a law that would really work, there would be a central registry for filing descriptions of deserters so that tracing them could be carried out under a nationwide system."

The Hon. W.A. Goodfellow, Ontario's Minister of Public Welfare, announced last October that his department had launched a province-wide survey into the causes of desertion and the adequacy of laws relating to it. "It has become a matter of major concern. Desertions must be

> halted. If we find the Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act needs more teeth, legislation will be submitted."

Mr. Speaker, I should like to see that legislation brought down, and the sooner the better. This is a problem quarrying for all attention, and I hope that something will be done.

Next I want to read a short editorial from The Timmins Daily Press, dated May 2nd, 1950. This will show you that I have been speaking on this subject on various previous occasions. It is headed "Heartless Criminals", and it reads as follows:

> " Wife desertion is one of the most heartless crimes that a man can commit and we agree with W.J. Grummett, K.C., M.L.A. for Cochrane South, that the time is ripe to deal more severely with those who are convicted of it.
>
> There has been an appalling increase of desertion cases in northern areas during the past two years and it has become a fester on the social life of the community. In this district last year 66 cases of desertion were reported to the authorities, according to figures supplied to the Town Council at last night's meeting by Welfare Administrator George Reid. This is more than three times the number of cases listed in 1945 when there were 21. It is also 21 more than in 1948 when the total was 45.
>
> In his efforts to bring the seriousness of this situation to the attention of the provincial government, Mr. Grummett requested the municipalities to obtain the figures for him so that he could submit a comprehensive report to the legislature on conditions now existing. He believes the Provincial Police should be empowered to hunt down wife deserters. And he wants the Criminal Code amended so as to provide greater punishment for deserting husbands when found.
>
> One of the weaknesses in dealing with wife desertion in the past has been the lightness of the sentence given in such cases. Perhaps there is a hesitation on the part of the court

to inflict further grief and humiliation on the wives and children who have already suffered a great deal under the circumstances, but unless the gravity of the erring husband's offence is brought home to him with greater force and punishment there is no way to curb the increasing number of such cases.

There should be no sympathy for the offender, These men in the great majority of cases leave their families utterly destitute.

The helpless little children whose homes are broken up are the worst sufferers. They are the innocent victims of a domestic tragedy far beyond their understanding. It may be argued that they are better off under the ministrations of the organizations that are regulated by provincial law to provide for them, but it cannot be said that they are happier under such conditions, or that they are in any way compensated for the parental care and love denied them. Efficient and conscientious as welfare organizations are, they can never supply the intimate affection of the family circle which surely these little ones received at some stage of their lives before the break-up of the home occurred, and which they cannot forget.

In 1949 in this district, 146 children were involved in the 47 deserted families assisted. The men responsible for making these or any youngsters wards of the municipality, province or Children's Aid Society, depriving them of a home and family life have committed a crime that will affect these children all the rest of their lives. These men should be made to pay dearly for their action. Such men are lower than animals for even animals will care for their young."

In connection with the same subject, I want to refer to the children of unmarried parents. Last year I told the House of a particular case which occurred in my home town. A young unmarried woman was taken to the hospital to have her baby. Shortly after the baby was born, the supposed father called on her and of course, the poor young girl presumed that perhaps at last he was going to do the right thing and see that a marriage

took place. He went several times, and finally he came in with some female relatives, and he took the baby and told her he was going to have it baptized. An hour or so later he came back and handed the baby to the mother. The mother naturally was thinking, "when I get out of the hospital, there will be a marriage", but when he handed the baby down to the mother, he said " as soon as you get out of the hospital, I want you and this brat to get out of town. I am going to be married and I do not want you around the neighbourhood." I have told that story before. But there is a sequel to it. Not long ago an old lady came in to see me, and told me her grandson had brought a young girl into her home, and the woman would soon be going to the hospital to give birth to a baby. The grandmother thought her grandson was imposing upon her, because they wanted her to take care of the baby, and she wanted to know what to do.

I said, "the only thing to do is to order them out of the house, or have them thrown out". She said she could not do that. She said that the young woman's condition was such that she could not throw her out, and I said "perhaps you feel that way, but if you do not, you will probably be "stung" with the keeping of the baby. However, she said she could not put her out. I said "then why ask me for a solution of your problem? Do you not know madam, that this is the second time your grandson has been in trouble?". He was the same young fellow to whom I referred a moment ago.

The old lady looked at me for a moment or two and she said, "no, Mr. Grummett that is his fourth."

(Take E Follows)

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been longer than I thought, but I have a couple more editorials here, or articles from the Timmins Daily Press, which I wish to read, and then I will be through. They refer to neglect of children again, not those neglected by the desertion of their parents, but to straight neglect.

One is from the Timmins Daily Press of January 22, 1952, and I would like you to listen to the pungent way in which the writer of the article expresses himself:

> "Father in Hospital, Mother in Pub,
> Kiddies in Filth
>
> Four children, aged two to nine, bare from the waist down, huddled on a wet mattress while their mother, drinking beer in a local beverage room, was picked up by police.
>
> There was no fire in the house before police and CAS officials arrived at 10.15 last night. The temperature reading outside was nine degrees below zero.
>
> Three other children, ranging in age from 11 to 15, were 'out'. All were rounded up and taken to the shelter.
>
> The 32-year-old mother, forbidden by law to enter a beverage room, was locked in jail by police.
>
> Pending further investigation by CAS officials, charges may be laid, Donald Van Camp, CAS superintendent, indicated.
>
> According to a letter found in the

littered front room, the father is in a Hamilton hospital with a broken leg received when he rescued an engineer from a fall of heavy rock.

Only food in the house was remnants of $9.00 worth of groceries, bought out of $55 sent to a relative by the father, with instructions to dole it out bit by bit to the mother. The woman was given the remaining $46 in a lump sum, it was learned.

The four-room shack, a converted bakery, sits behind a neat row of homes, its ugliness whitewashed by the pleasant but modest appearances of the houses facing the street.

A hole in the front door window glass was stuffed with rags. Inside was a battered chesterfield, a chesterfield chair, their cushions scattered on the floor among the litter of clothes, blankets and pieces of a cardboard carton.

From atop a broken-down, old model console radio, a newish table model, in working order, blared something about millions of dollars in government spending.

Kitty-cornered across the room were strung clotheslines, one of them sagging under the weight of a urine-soaked blanket.

Following the knock which brought three of the four children into the cold front room, they scampered back onto the filthy bed and tried to hide their nakedness with soiled blankets.

In the garish light from a single unshielded bulb, there was no line of demarcation between the dirt and the shadows. Chesterfield cushoins and unwashed clothing littered the floor.

Other evidence of neglect was found in a second bedroom, presumed to be the mother's.

Beyond the wall in a narrow toilet room about a half a ton of coal impeded passage to a plugged flushbowl, brimming with refuse. Six inches away from the foot of the coal pile was a narrow door which opened into a spacious coalbin.

On the kitchen stove stood food-encrusted pots and pans, one half-filled with water.

Bread, a smashed egg carton and an unopened box of soap flakes stood among more unclean utensils on the table. In a sideboard, close by, was breakfast cereal a five-pound bag of sugar and a near-empty, sticky tin of corn syrup.

Three cans of condensed milk bore heavy axe marks, testifying to the attempts of the children to get at the contents. On the floor the axe lay beside a sharp butcher knife.

Between the sideboard and the table on the floor stood an empty wine bottle -- 'Grandma brought it', one of the children said.

As the children readied themselves for the trip to the CAS shelter, their conversation revealed the conditions under which they have been living.

'I've got shoes for two of them, but I have none for myself and my other brother,' the oldest of the four said. She was capable and self-assured as she dressed her three brothers.

'Momma got $55 to-day', another volunteered.

'She washed the floor before she went out tonight.'

The oldest boy, 8, took pride in relating how his father had broken his leg in saving another man's life.

While CAS officials were helping the oldest girl, 'Barney', a nine-month-old rat terrier greedily lapped up a raw egg which was broken on the floor.

Just after her sister and brothers had been taken to a car, one of the older children of the family, an 11-year-old girl, came in 'from the show'. It was 10.45.

'Where is everybody?' she asked.

When told the others had been taken to the shelter, she asked: 'Do I have to go too?'

'I am afraid so,' Mr. Van Camp answered quietly.

'Have you found momma yet?' she asked him.

He answered: 'Yes.'

'Where is she?'

The CAS official didn't answer. A policeman said she was asleep in an hotel.

In the police station afterwards the CAS superintendent said this situation had been similar since he came here. He said the mother had been charged with neglecting her children late last year but was acquitted by the magistrate.

Another CAS official, Geoffrey Morris, said he had taken food and good clothing to the family quite often previously. He said the conditions had not improved any.

A police sergeant added that to his knowledge similar conditions had existed in this family for the past five years.

'This is only one of many in this town,' he said."

Right here I wish to pay tribute to the Children's Aid Society officials in Cochrane South. Donald Van Camp and Geoffrey Morris are doing an excellent job and deserve to be commended for the work they are doing under very adverse circumstances. They have a terrific job of looking after deserted and neglected children in that area.

I wish now to read the sequel to that last article, and then I am through, Mr. Speaker. It is from the Timmins Daily Press of January 30th, 1952, and it is headed, "Released on $500 Bond, Mother Given Stern Warning:"

> "With a stern warning that if she appears in court again, or is in trouble during the next year, she will be charged with neglect of children and sent to jail, Mrs. Edith Tomiuk was released on $500 bond and ordered to keep the peace for one year when she appeared in police court Tuesday afternoon.
>
> In reaching his decision Magistrate S. Atkinson told the accused she was to keep her house in good shape and look after her children -- seven of them -- ranging in age from three to fifteen.
>
> 'You've out-tired the Children's Aid Society,' the magistrate said. 'Don't try to out-tire me. The next time you will be sent to jail.'
>
> After evidence had been heard in the case, Crown Attorney S.A.Caldbick had asked the court to take the children away from her as bonding her wouldn't do any

good and, he added, sending her to jail won't do any good either.

On being charged with neglect of children, the accused entered a plea of not guilty.

Police Sgt. Rene Belanger told the court that on the night of Jan.21 a call had been received from a local hotel. Upon investigation they arrested the accused who was on the interdicted list. They had then contacted officials of the CAS, and police officials along with CAS officials went to the accused's residence.

D. C. Van Camp, CAS official, then told the court of entering the residence of the accused and finding it in a shambles. 'The three younger children, 3, 6 and 8, were being looked after by their nine-year-old sister.'

About 10.30 p.m., he continued, another of the children came in, and at 11.30 p.m. the other two were located.

According to Mr. Van Camp, when the house was entered broken windows were found, the children were in various stages of undress and huddled in one bedroom, and the kitchen was littered with clothing and pots and pans.

'In a bathroom three-and-a-half or four feet wide,' he said, 'at least a half a ton of coal was piled so that the toilet was inaccessible. The toilet itself was plugged to overflowing. In a second bedroom there was a pile of old clothes and rags behind the door and at the head of the bed there was a little wash-basin (full) used in place of the toilet.'

Telling the court that Mrs. Tomiuk had been receiving $45 a month from the CAS since August of 1951, G. Morris, CAS, added that he had personally taken addi-

> tional clothes to the house. Referring to the state of the house he said that 'it was not an unusual situation' for the Tomiuk household.
>
> It was also revealed to the court by CAS officials that this had been the fifth different house set up for the accused and that each house had ended up in the same condition.
>
> In her defense the accused told the court that she thought someone was looking after her children when she left the house and that she had not been in the beverage room of the hotel any length of time.
>
> She also told the court that she had cleaned the house thoroughly before leaving, and that the children had received a change to clean clothing.
>
> After much deliberation Magistrate Atkinson reached his decision. The CAS will continue supervision."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we in this House will now do something for our neglected and deserted children in this Province. It is a problem that a lot of us do not appreciate. You have got to get out where it is happening. You have got to see it happen. You have got to be in the courts.

Time and again I have heard these cases in court, and time and again I have seen these young children brought up and made wards of the Children's Aid Society, children who were entitled to a home and the care of their parents. Let us do all we can to remedy this situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Thomas (Ontario):

That the Amendment to the Motion for an Address in Reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor now before the House be amended by adding thereto the following:

"And this House further regrets that the Government has failed to supplement the inadequate pensions paid to the recipients of Old Age Assistance, or to provide relief for employable unemployed men and women and their families who are at present in serious need."

(Page E-9 follows)

HON. MACKINNON PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the Debate on the Speech from the Throne, I would first like to congratulate you, sir, first, on the confidence which the people of your riding, Windsor-Walkerville, placed in you last November, when they elected you their representative, and, secondly, on being made again the Speaker of this House. I feel that that is a very, very high honour, and as a matter of fact, it must certainly give you a lot of self-satisfaction to know that each and every hon. member of this House, no matter to what party he belongs, stands behind you and accepts your ruling.

I understand that in the last Session we had no divisions of the House on rulings of Mr. Speaker.

I feel that any expression of appreciation of yourself should include as well your good wife. I think that she must have a very steadying influence on yourself. You always come here with a smile, so I would really like to get to know your good wife a little better.

Next, I want to congratulate the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) on his victory last November. As a matter of fact, to-day when I first received this sheet with all the blue marks on it, I thought that we might be called "Frost Blue Boys", or something. Now

I was just wondering what the two hon. C.C.F. members would think about being in green. However, we will let them reply to that themselves.

In the last two years since the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) took office, he has proven to the people of this Province that this Government can run its business affairs in spite of the present inflation. He has shown them that he understands their problems, the problems of the every-day person, and that is most important, and I think that that is why we have so many representatives in this House behind our Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

I would very much like to congratulate the hon. member for London (Mr. Robarts) and the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. Root) on the very able manner in which they launched this debate. It was certainly very evident to all of us that they are hon. members who will be a great asset to our deliberations both in this and future Sessions.

Then I want to very, very sincerely say to my hon. friend and neighbour, the hon. member for Gray South (Mr. Oliver) -- I can say this with all sincerity -- that I am very happy to see him back in his own as Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition. But I cannot truthfully say that he has too many followers.

However, he has a little band of men full of strong spirit -- I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, I meant to say "a little band of men who are strong in spirit and full of wisdom".

Now, to all our new hon. members I want to extend a very, very warm welcome, and at the outset I would like to tell them that we have in this House a seer, and for those of you who have not read your Bibles too much lately, a seer is a prophet. Last year I remember the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) -- I am very sorry to say that he is ill and cannot attend the Session to-day -- waved his hand toward the then Opposition and say, "After the next election there won't be one of you back here, you will be annihilated."

(Take "F" follows.)

MR. SALSBERG (St.Andrew): He was wrong.

MR. PHILLIPS: I would not say that, by the look of this House. I would say he was a very excellent prophet. I want to say that the two hon. members of the previous opposition that are now sitting in this House have been a great credit to their own ridings, and they have made a real contribution to this House. In other words, when either of these hon. members got up to speak in past years, they had something to say; they had something to offer in the way of constructive criticism. I would certainly like to congratulate them.

A little argument developed during the address of the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) regarding the Cobalt Bomb. I made a very honest effort to see whether the Ontario Bomb was first in Ontario or Saskatchewan. At the official opening at London I was told that both bombs were made at the same time, that both bombs were really put in the two hospitals at the same time, but the bomb at London had given the first therapeutic treatment.

I do not think we should quarrel very much about this for the simple reason that these two bombs started their treatments at or about the same time.

I feel, also, that it is my duty to speak about that 1.1 membership of this House, the hon. member for St. Andrew, (Mr. Salsberg). Let me say that he has lost his nigh horse. As a matter of fact, this team, in the last few Sessions, have been made up of two nigh horses. For those who have not been raised on the farm, a "nigh horse" is the left horse, and both of these gentlemen have gone very far to the left. As a matter of fact, I think they have been known as "leftists".

I cannot believe there is any hon.member in this House who sought election,and who is now sitting here, who ran entirely for selfish reasons. I like to feel that when a person seeks public office, he is really seeking that office because he wants to make a contribution to his fellow men. I would feel very badly if there were any of the hon.members here who were not above selfish motives.

In closing my introductory remarks, I want to congratulate all my cabinet colleagues. I have not time to-day to mention many of the achievements of each cabinet minister, but I think I should mention one, and that is the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley).

In the past few weeks the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) has had to deal with two strikes,

and I feel that each and every hon. member in this House, indeed each and every person in Ontario should thank the Hon. Minister of Labour for the way he brought the parties together. It can truly be said that he is a real peacemaker. I often wonder where he gets his understanding, his patience and good commonsense, whether he was trained for it, whether he is a self-made man, or whether -- and probably this is the fact -- whether he got it from his good wife.

The purpose of my introduction to-day, Mr. Speaker, is to put all hon. members in the right mood to receive a little talk on mental problems. Before I go into that, I would like to mention two or three things. During my first three or four months as Minister of Health in this Province, I received many deputations from municipalities and from individuals who told me what the various States in the Union were doing for their hospitals. Last summer I had the opportunity to visit New York and Pennsylvania, and I found to my surprise, that a few hospitals, chronic and tuberculosis, are the sole responsibility of the municipality. I came back here very happy that I was a citizen of Ontario.

Here we have in the capital grant field, grants from the Federal Government and grants from the Provincial Government. In the T.B. sanitoria, we have

the capital grants plus large maintenance grants which are also paid to our hospitals. In the last ten years the operating costs of our public hospitals have gone up four times, but the grants have gone up, under this present government, since 1936, between six and seven times. Besides that, we under-write the operating deficit of our sanitoria.

Just across the border in those States, they get absolutely no help whatever from their federal government, or their state governments.

When we come to the mental hospitals; they are run practically the same as they are here in Ontario. I found they have the same problems that we have. They have a shortage of highly-trained personnel, etc.

One other question which I would like to deal with very briefly, and that is the question of the hoof and mouth disease. We have all read a great deal in the papers. We have seen a lot of criticism of the Federal Government. I am not giving you this information from the standpoint of criticism, but rather to give you the picture as we see it in the Department of Health.

This condition which is prevalent in some parts of the West was brought there either by immigrants coming into our country, or by straw, hay, or by bringing in beef cattle, etc. This condition is due to a virus, the incubation period of which is very short, only two to seven days. In human beings, I think the most communicable disease is measles, and we find that this condition is just as communicable in animals as measles is in human beings.

This virus does not kill the animals;as a matter of fact, you get about a five percent mortality in cattle, and it is a little higher in sheep and swine. Unless cattle are killed,the way they are doing to-day in order to stop the infection from spreading, these cattle would eventually get better. However, because of the soreness of the mouth, they cannot eat and they get thinner and thinner. This organism known as a virus is very virulent. It will live in clothes or straw for years. It has been known to live in a frozen state for over 100 days.

I think if we are going to attack the federal immigration policy, it should be on three points. The first point is that each and every immigrant that comes into this country should have a proper physical examination, not only by the home doctors, but

also by Canadian doctors.

Secondly, they should be dealt with from the standpoint of whether they are going to be able to stand our climate. These immigrants come into an entirely new environment with different food, etc. We find that they stay pretty well the first year, but later become ill with tuberculosis and many other diseases.

The third thing we should know is, where they have worked in the last five years, in order to find out whether it is possible for them to bring in such a condition as we have just described. I think probably that is the most important thing about bringing in our immigrants.

Each and every one of us is proud of our Mounted Police. They get a great training; they are trained in psychology, and that training assists in finding out how a man thinks. That saying in the Bible of "As a man thinks, so is he", is very true here.

A great number of these people in Central Europe, as well as other parts of Europe, do not live like we do, because they do not think as we do. The moral standards of these people are different altogether, and a great number of them are atheists.

(Page F-7 follows)

Before a Canadian takes an oath, he thinks about it, but these people, -- what does an oath mean to them? They do not believe in the Almighty, they swear to anything. That is why I feel that besides the physical aspect, our immigration policy should be to find out how these people are thinking.

In 1913 we had 400,000 people come into this country, about forty percent of them from the British Isles. That was one of the largest immigration year until last year, when we had 200,000 come in. Only 16% of them were from the British Isles.

these people come in here, the Federal Government is only responsible for fifty percent of the cost of hospitalization in the first year. The Provincial Government pays the other fifty percent. That is, where the patient is an indigent. After the first year, the Federal Government's responsibility ceases, and I feel that is going to leave a big burden on our municipal taxpayers. It is the owner of our farms and our homes that we have tried to relieve by giving more and more subsidies, more and bigger educational grants and hospital grants.

(Take "G" follows)

Now, what is the use of the province doing that if the Federal government is going to bring in these people and after they become disabled with tuberculosis or anything else they are, after the first year, really the responsibility of the home owner.

Dealing with our present medical health program in Ontario. The first Public Health Act was passed in 1882 and for many years the Health Department dealt chiefly with the preventions of communicable diseases, with sewage and garbage disposal and with the water supply to see that it was pure. Over the years the Health Department has grown, until to-day we have thirteen divisions. Our Budget, as you know, is large. Our Budget to-day, as a matter of fact, is almost five times as great as it was only six or seven years ago.

But to deal with our mental health program here we do not deal in preventative medicine only. We deal with prevention, diagnosis, treatment and rehabilitation. In the health records of the citizens of Ontario, control of diphtheria, typhoid, more attention to tuberculosis and other communicable diseases, better medical care, better education, better working conditions, better nutrition, hygiene and sanitation, have all been responsible for a lowered mortality rate,

a greatly increased life expectantcy and a proportionate modification of our population structure -- thus influencing the whole picture of health and disease, and affecting the whole structure of our society.

The whole program of the Department of Health is directed towards pressing and promoting a way of life in Ontario which will have a health objective for each citizen in Ontario of a sound mind in a sound body. It is very evident when one studies the mental health problems of this province that the place for development of robust mental health and preventive measures against mental ill-health must reach the homes in the communities.

Whether we have more mental illness to-day than we had fifty years ago is problematical but we all know that our whole economic structure has changed in the last two decades. We are to-day living in a world which you might say has been speeded up. We have fast expanding industrialization. We have had a great acceleration of transportation and communication and I think probably that that has had something to do with upsetting the stability of our people.

Now, there is one thing that I would like every hon. member to help our Department of Health dispel and that is ignorance. To-day, we are trying to

make our Ontario hospitals the same as any general hospital, that mental illness is absolutely no different from physical illness such as pnuemonia, appendicitis or anything else and I am very happy to say to-day that with our modern treatment and with early diagnosis, that we are going to be able to defeat mental illness the same as we have practically defeated tuberculosis.

When we think that fifty years ago tuberculosis -- in fact, much less than that -- tuberculosis was considered an incurable disease, there was no specific treatment -- all they did was really get rest, sunshine and good food. At that time they had a mortality rate of one hundred per one hundred thousand people. To-day our mortality rate in Ontario is thirteen last year, while that for Canada is around twenty-seven.

Now, I think we aan all be very, very proud of that record. If we are going to attack this mental health program -- and we know, quite technically speaking, it is fifty years behind general medicine development -- if we are going to attack this, we must attack it first at the level of the community with the family doctor being the main person. I am glad to say to you to-day that our universities are realizing this and they are taking up this problem and they are giving

our medical students a great course during the course of their undergraduate course, and then they get an excellent three-year course following graduation.

Now, if we were to ask, "How would you define the normal mental condition?" , and when I say that I would say "a normal mental condition" outside this Legislature rather than probably inside -- but it might be defined as "the ability of an individual to live effectively with him or herself and with others."

Our problem deals with all ages. First we have the problem of school children outside altogether of the problem of our mental defectives. Then, we have the fatigue and general inefficiency in industry and in our factories. Then, later on, we have our geriatric problem and I am certainly not going into that subject to-day but we have got to think of what is going on in the home of that patient who is suffering from emotional or a mental upset, and if there is any friction in his family, the presence of any mental defective in his family, his whole environment ----- If he works, whether his working conditions are satisfactory, whether he is the man for the job he is doing and all those things have to be taken into consideration in order to deal with this great subject.

Last year, for those who were here, I said

that we were very short of highly trained personnel. This year, I am very glad to say, we have added three highly trained research men in psychiatry. We have also taken on about ten other well trained psychiatrists and we have twenty young men who will finish their training about July 1st of this year, and we expect to bring them into our service with us. With these new men, and the old staff, we hope that we can provide modern treatment to more and more people.

Very briefly, this modern treatment consists of physiotherapy, electric shock, insulin and sub-insulin coma. Those are the main things, but what else is very important to these people who are living away from home and in our Ontario hospitals? I would like to mention what we have done in the way of comfort, and general welfare to aid treatment and also to aid our rehabilitation because we have to teach that patient to live again in his own home and in his own community.

The first thing we have pressed this last year or two is occupational therapy. We train these people in as many trades as possible. We try and keep them busy doing the things they like to do. Secondly, we have given them much more recreation -- moving pictures, dances, picnics, parties, et cetera. That all aids in their social behavior. Then, we have placed

beauty parlors in these institutions, we have allowed a great number of patients to choose their own dresses of different patterns. Instead of going into a hospital and seeing fifty in a ward with the same dress on, we give them each a dress of a different pattern.

Next month we hope to introduce nylon stockings. You may not think these things are too important, but they are important both to the comfort of the patient and also it aids in their treatment and does not cost the province really another nickel and that is also very important.

Up until this last year at our Orillia school, we only allowed admission of patients between six and sixteen. Last year we started providing space for two hundred or three hundred children under six years of age. At the present moment, we have sixty of these children at Orillia -- thirty-five girls and twenty-five boys who are under six years of age.

That presents a terrific problem to the superintendent of that Institution. These little tots, in spite of the best nursing care, get measles and dysentery and other communicable diseases, and there are complications where they do not survive. They require one nurse to every two patients. She might take care of three -- while in the older age groups, one nurse could look after

six, ten or twelve patients depending on what condition they are in. But I would like to stress to this House that if any of your constituents have babies who are mentally defective and you come to the Department or to me to have them admitted to our institutions, I want you to realize and tell the parents that even if we gave each one of these babies a nurse -- that would take three nurses a day -- they would still have the same low resistance. There would be the feeding problem, they would more than likely get measles, and with complications, and probably die. That is the big reason why we are not expanding this program too rapidly. We want to find out what that mortality rate is and if it proves fairly good, we hope to have two hundred or three hundred beds at Orillia and another two hundred or three hundred at Smith's Falls.

I may say considering our construction program we now have room for 530 new patients at Smith's Falls. We hope to have room for another 900 by the end of this year. At Port Arthur we are going ahead with a 900-bed hospital. They are pretty well along with the first wing that holds 460 patients. This is going to mean a great thing to the north-western counties, because heretofore all female patients have to be brought from that country down to our New Toronto hospital, and if we get this

hospital completed, we will be able to take care of the women patients as well as the men.

Then, in Brockville, the main building has now been completely renovated, modernized and made fire-proof, and we hope by the end of this year to have another 600 beds. At Queen Street, we are carrying on with fire-proofing and modernization and inside of two or three months we will have eighty-five more beds there.

I just want to deal with one more thing before I conclude and that is psychiatric wards in general hospitals, and, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, since we made the announcement last fall that we were going to give $8,500. a bed, to general hospitals for establishing a community psychiatric unit with out-patients, we have had many congratulatory notes. We have had word from all over Canada -- not only other parts of Canada, but also from the United States, stating that this was the most progressive move that has been taken in the mental health field.

Briefly, what does it mean? It means that a patient can be treated at home, in his own home hospital. He gets early diagnosis and it is just as important to have early diagnosis in mental diseases as it is in tuberculosis, cancer, or anything else.

And the best psychiatrists have told me that thirty-six per cent. of our twenty-thousand patients who are now in our mental hospitals, need never have been there, if they had had early modern treatment.

This program, with $8,500. a bed, will save this province in the future, millions of dollars because of the fact that we are going to save this province from building thirty-six percent more beds.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): What about the maintenance later on of those special wards?

DR. PHILLIPS: I may say as a matter of fact, the one thing we require the hospital to do is this: not more than six per cent. of the total number of beds must be in the psychiatric units, and a personnel team consists of one psychiatrist, one or more psychologists, one or more nurses with special training and several social workers.

We are working on the regulations now, and I cannot today state just what part the government is going to play, but I know we are going to play a large part in connection with the psychiatric units.

MR. SALSBERG: Pardon me; if the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) will permit, I would like to follow up that question. In other words, the government has no definite policy upon financial assistance for the continuation of these psychiatric units?

MR. PHILLIPS: Let me say to the hon. Member (Mr. Salsberg) that it is impossible today to answer his question.

We come now to detention wards. We hope to establish detention wards in public hospitals at certain points throughout Ontario. We will need but a very few of these, only in locations which are some distance from one of our Ontario Hospitals, or, later on, some distance from a psychiatric unit. These detentions wards will be for the sole purpose of having a patient placed there without certification, except the say-so of the family physician. This will mean that very disturbed patients will be the ones who will be taken to the detention wards, and the reason for that is to prevent any mental patient from having to go to a county jail.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is very much more I could say on the subject of "mental health". In fact,

one could speak for hours and then not cover the subject. What I have tried to do today is to give you a picture of the efforts we are making to meet and solve our problems.

Regarding the question by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), I may say that we have been working on these regulations for some time. They are as yet only in draft form, and if I gave out information from the draft, it might be that certain changes would be made, and I think it is better to say at this time that the regulations are in the draft stage, and at some later date the House will be advised exactly as to what we are going to do.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Minister, could I follow that up?

MR. FROST: We are now giving a grant of $8,500. per bed, which is a great deal of money, and which is an indication of the generosity of this government in connection with this problem.

MR. SALSBERG: I am glad the government is doing that, but it will obviously be a very costly matter to maintain these units.

MR. FROST: Not necessarily. From the Pilot case in St. Catherines, it does not appear it will be so expensive. As a matter of fact, it is the training of the general practitioners in the arts of psychiatry which will perhaps provide the remedy.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not think the hon. Prime Minister is following the hon. Minister of Health.

MR. PHILLIPS: May I answer the question asked by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg)? He has been most persistent.

We have only one unit operating, that at St. Catherines, and the personnel are paid by our department. What will be done in the others, as to operating costs and the payment of personnel, we do not know, but we are waiting to see what happens at St. Catherines, and the hon. member will simply have to wait a little longer.

As the hon. Prime Minister has said, this government has been most generous in giving $8,500. per bed as against $1,500. received from the Federal Government.

I thank you very much.

(Page H-4 follows)

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, if it meets with your approval --

MR. FROST: We still have a half-hour, and we can do a great deal in that time.

MR. PORTER: Just compress your speech.

MR. SALSBERG: If it had been agreeable I would have adjourned the debate now, but the hon. Prime Minister shakes his head, and I take that as the signal to go ahead.

Mr. Speaker, in entering the debate on the motion dealing with the reply to the Speech from the Throne, I want to, very genuinely, commence by extending my congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on your re-election to your important position. We have had the opportunity of carrying on, under your guidance and direction, and I believe that the hon. members on all sides of the House agree that you have proven to be impartial, even though there may be moments when an hon. member is not very satisfied. But you have guided the deliberations of this House with even justice and fairness, and we are confident you will continue in the same manner.

I join the hon. Minister of Health in going beyond congratulating yourself, and extend congratulations to your good wife, who contributes so much toward the development of a good spirit amongst all hon. members of the House, and I can assure you it is fully appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first Session of the new Legislature. It follows a general election and at this Session, the government is enjoying an unusually large support from the hon. members here. The government was again endorsed, and came back with a larger majority than it had before. I think we of the opposition should face the fact and acknowledge it, and govern ourselves accordingly. It is said that the result of the last election was a personal triumph for the hon. Prime Minister, and I am inclined to agree that his personality played a great role in the outcome of the election. The role of an individual is not unimportant in politics. Whether the result was because of the strength of the government in the election campaign, or the weaknesses in the opposition parties is something which can be explored profitably; in other words, whether the outcome was due to the good work of the government or to some serious mistakes on the part of the opposition, we cannot say at the moment. I think time will pass judgment on that.

There is one thing I believe the government and its supporters should bear in mind during this Session and in the succeeding Sessions, and that is the fact that despite the very large number of new hon. members, the government does not represent the majority of the popular vote of the people of this province.

I think the government should never forget that fact and should display a certain degree of modesty. The majority of those who voted in the last election is represented by the decimated groups in the opposition.

(Take "I" follows.)

Our electoral system is such that despite the fact that the majority of votes went to the opposition groups, they constitute a very small number in the House.

The outcome of the election has affected many individuals politically and I want to say that the failure of the former hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) to be re-elected, constitutes a loss to this entire Assembly and I would say, Mr. Speaker, to the Province. During the years of his membership in this House he has achieved the highest regard from all sides of the House and his contributions were always of a very high order. In fact he occupied a unique place in this Legislature. I am confident that he will return to this Legislature and will continue to make the contributions of which he is capable. But in the meantime it has left me in a bit of difficulty. You see, aside from the great political contribution that Mr. MacLeod made here, his failure to be back with us robs me of a seconder for motions and Bills, no mean problem when you want to move a lot of motions and have a lot of Bills to propose. I was thinking, Mr. Speaker, whether it would not be possible, with your approval, for the Government, since it has altogether too many hon. members, to set aside a pool from which I could draw seconders. There is nothing outlandish about it.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): They might corrupt you.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, I am not afraid of that.

Some hon. members who sit on this side and that side and all sides who support the Government, may not have an opportunity to second anything anyway and I do not see why they should not be given an opportunity to second a good motion or a good Bill that this humble member would care to introduce. I leave it with the Government and I know that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), who appreciates the importance of the role of opposition to government, will take it under advisement.

However, I want to assure the Government that although remaining for the moment the only one "hon. member" of this political group, I will do my utmost to perform my duties and my tasks as a member of the opposition. I trust that the Government will not find me wanting in that role. I might however suggest something else to the Government and that is that I may be deserving of some special consideration as one in the opposition side, and that is that I am the only non-Tory from the Greater Toronto area in this House, and perhaps the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will agree to grant me special recognition as the Official Opposition for Greater Toronto in this Legislature. After all, there are a million and a quarter people in this area and unfortunately they are saddled with Conservative representatives with the single exception of the member for St. Andrew, and I think I am entitled to some special

consideration.

I want to remind also my hon. friends who come from the Greater Toronto ridings that they too should show some consideration or at least to bear with me when I say things that do not please them. Remember, I am the only voice in opposition from Greater Toronto.

And remember, my hon. friends, that you did not receive the majority of votes, because in Greater Toronto, the Conservatives lost votes in comparison with the votes they received in 1948. As a matter of fact, as far as I am concerned, I too lost votes. But I was speaking for the moment about the hon. Government members who come from Greater Toronto, and I want to remind them that I am the only voice of opposition from this great area and that they lost votes when compared with the Conservative vote in 1948.

Now if it will help to bolster the morale of the Liberals, I am prepared to inform them that their party increased the vote in Greater Toronto in the last election but by only a couple of thousands.

MR. PORTER: What was it before?

MR. SALSBERG: As you see, I give credit where credit is due.

The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) asks what it was before. I would have to put my glasses on and I am not as expert as he is in manipulating them. However, it is enough to know that they have been increased.

I want now to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion on the Address. It is a privilege and an opportunity the Government usually grants to some of its favourite sons and I want to say that the hon. member for London (Mr. Robarts) who moved the motion -- and I am sorry that he is not in the House -- proved himself to be a very fluent speaker. Unfortunately, however, he was in a very unhappy position. You see, the hon. member for London began casting stones at Ottawa for its taxation policy, and I think they were stones that should have been thrown, but he forgot or did not know that he lives in a glass house, and while he was busy enjoying the job of throwing stones at Ottawa for increasing taxes and not sharing them with other levels of government, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) -- unintentionally I am sure -- turned the projector on the glass house by releasing figures of the enormous surplus that he had to report to the people of Ontario.

(Take "J" follows)

MR. W. H. COLLINGS (Beeches): Not through extra taxation.

MR. F. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Why, of course, extra taxation.

MR. FROST: No.

MR. COLLINGS: Not any increased taxation.

MR. FROST: We have been decreasing taxation.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, the hon. member for London was enjoying himself throwing stones, and it was said of him that he was very embarrassed and did not know . that the projector was on him, that the House in which he was, was a glass house, enabling everything to be seen, which was very embarrassing. It was unfair to him, as he tried to do a good job.

As to the seconder of the motion -- and unfortunately he is not in his place -- I want to tender to him my most sincere and heartfelt congratulations for the very fine address which he made to this House. The hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. Root) brought to this House what most of us greatly appreciate and always welcome, and that is, an attitude and experience of the people of the soil. I confess, Mr. Speaker, I always have a weakness for the hon. members who come from the countryside. There

is a genuineness and sincerity in their speeches, which rings true at all times, and I had that feeling while listening to the address by the hon. member for Wellington North.. I hope to have the opportunity of hearing much more from him in this Chamber.

The Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) who has just spoken, delivered a very interesting speech. He always speaks in an interesting manner, but I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker -- and I will very carefully turn the pages of Hansard to-morrow -- that he digressed from a subject upon which he is an authority, and moved into an area where he is obviously not an authority. I was extremely sorry to hear him speak about a section of immigrants, those who came into this country lately, and those who came into the country before the first and second World Wars, in the manner which he did. I am sorry that a man who is scientifically trained, should approach so important a question in such an unscientific manner, where, if I heard him correctly -- and I think I did -- the Hon. Minister cast aspersions on the majority of immigrants who came into this country in 1913, 1914 and later on. I think he used the term "infidel", to whom an oath means nothing, and made other derogatory and offensive insinuations of that nature. I am

extremely sorry he thought it necessary to do that. It would have been far better had he left matters outside of his jurisdiction and his ken, to other hon. members of the Cabinet who are better suited for it, and who have more knowledge of the subject.

I felt I had to make these few remarks, because I thought the statement of the Hon. Minister demanded some refutation, to say the least, before they are more fully digested.

I am now at the end of the preliminaries, Mr. Speaker, and with the consent of the Government, I move the adjournment of the Debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House. Tomorrow we will consider Bills Nos. 68, 69 and 70.

MR. F. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Those are the Hydro Bills?

MR. FROST: That is right.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.55 o'clock p.m.

- - - - - - - -

ONTARIO

First Session
of the
Twenty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 21, 1952, et seq.

0

Volume X

Wednesday, March 5, 1952.

0

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

R. C. Sturgeon,
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

T E N T H D A Y

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE, HELD IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21st, 1952, et seq.

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

- - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Wednesday, March 5th, 1952.

- - - - - - -

The House having met. 3 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

CITY OF TORONTO

Mr. E. L. Weaver (Toronto-St.David), moves

first reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the City of Toronto".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. ARTHUR WELSH (Provincial-Secretary); Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House, the following:

The annual report of the Research Council of Ontario, for the year ended March 31, 1950.

DEVELOPMENT OF POWER IN INTERNATIONAL RAPIDS SECTION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER

AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND ONTARIO RESPECTING GENERATION OF ELECTRICAL POWER

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 20th Order, second reading of Bill No. 69, "An Act respecting the Development of Power in the International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence River", Mr. Challies.

Hon. George H. Challies (Minister without Portfolio); moves second reading of Bill No. 69,"An Act respecting the Development of Power in the International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence River".

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister), moves second reading of Bill No. 68, "An Act to Approve an Agreement between Canada and Ontario respecting the Generation of Electrical Power in the International

Section of the St. Lawrence River".

He said: Mr. Speaker, in order to avoid repetition this afternoon, we are taking a somewhat unusual course in proposing the second readings of Bill No. 68 and Bill No. 69 at the same time.

These Bills are, of course, complementary. In fact, they might have been contained in one Bill, but for purposes of convenience, they were divided into a Bill which ratified the agreement arrived at, I think, on the 3rd of December last year, which is required by the agreement, and it seemed better to prepare a separate Bill on that particular point, so the Bill could be used by the Federal government, as ratifying the agreement, and can be used in negotiations which I understand are taking place with the authorities in the United States.

We decided then to introduce two Bills, separating the agreement between Canada and Ontario, and Ontario and The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, so that as a matter of convenience, in the subsequent dealings, there would not be introduced into the negotiations with the United States, matters which are purely domestic. That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, we decided to adopt that course.

In the debates in the procedure in the

Legislature, it would, or might, result in a good deal of repetition if there were separate debates on these Bills. However, if it appears in the course of the debate on Bill No. 69 -- and I understand the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) will be referring to Bill No. 68 -- if there is something which requires some separate debate in connection with Bill No. 68, we can proceed with that when the Bill is called for the approval of the hon. members of the House. It, of course, will be necessary to call the Order again, because we have departed from that Order, and have proceeded with Order No. 20.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks, you will be glad to know, will be brief. I do not intend to go over the details of these Bills, because the hon. Minister for Hydro (Mr. Challies), the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas, will be dealing with the details of these transactions in particular, and I know there are a large number of hon. members of this House who desire to speak on this, and I do not think it is necessary for me to retard the matter by going into any of the details, beyond giving perhaps some of the general background.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, may I say what a pleasure it has been in the course of this matter, arising sometime last July, to deal with the Right-Hon.

St. Laurent, the Prime Minister of Canada, and with those associated with him in connection with this agreement which we propose will be ratified by the House by Bill No. 69.

As I said to the House last Thursday, I am always looking for areas of agreement. I am not looking for places to disagree, but I am looking for places upon which we can make some progress by agreement. Again may I say that throughout all the negotiations, which were difficult and involved, and which were carried on very largely by Hydro, and subsequently by the government itself, during our conversations directly with Right-Hon. St. Laurent and his Ministers, we received at their hands, nothing but kindness and understanding, and I think the Federal government has taken a strong position in this, and has given the Canadian people a strong lead, one which asserts our self-respect, and asserts our independence, and I think creates a great deal of confidence in our country.

I am indeed glad to take our position as a partner with the Federal government in this great project.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the agreement; you could go back, of course, to the agreements which were made before. My recollection is there were at

least two agreements -- perhaps more than that -- which were made previously, and from which we received no action, due to the fact that those who were called to be partners, apparently did not want to be partners with us. So that brought us up to the position which became apparent last July, that if this job was going to be done, Canada -- and Ontario in particular -- had to do the job alone. That is the position in which matters stand to-day.

If I may refer for a moment to the agreement which is appended to Bill No. 69, may I say that in that agreement there was, of course, a good deal of give and take. There were places where we thought the Dominion government was hard on us, and I have no doubt where the Federal government thought we were a bit hard on them, but we arrived at an arrangement. The arrangement may not be, in all its detail, everything we would like. I suggest to the hon. members that there were places where we would have liked some changes made. The hon. members may be suggesting some of those changes to us. But it takes two parties to make a deal, and there are very great obligations undertaken by Canada, and there are great obligations which Ontario, through The Hydro-Electric Power Commission, is taking. We are dividing up the job of the third person who has shown

reluctance to come into this deal, and we have to apportion that share and do the work ouselves.

I do not wish to transgress on the speech by my hon. friend to my left (Mr. Challies) and by some of the other hon. members of the House,who have given a good deal of time and study to this problem, but I did want to refer to it, in this general way.

Here in this House this afternoon we are engaged in considering a measure which, as I have said before, is a historic measure, and these are very definite and concrete steps in the fulfillment of a project which has been before the people of Ontario, and, indeed, of Canada, for some thirty years. The issues involved are, of course, a partnership between Canada and Ontario permitting the construction of a modern canal on the St. Lawrence, and, incidentally, the development of two and one-half million horsepower which will be divided between Ontario and the State of New York. Our part of this program relates particularly to the power end of it, which runs from a point near Prescott west to the level of Lake Ontario. The issue is not "shall we have a canal?". The fact of the matter is we already have a canal. The issue is the enlargement necessary to meet the needs of modern Canada and of modern America. Coincidentally

with this is the power development which will contribute to the betterment of the way of life of the people on both sides of the imaginary line which divide us, those who live in Canada, and those who live in the United States.

As regards the St. Lawrence end of this great project; the canals on the St. Lawrence go back in their beginnings to the very early days of Canada. The construction of the first canal at Lachine, and running west, was begun by the early French in 1700. Some of our American friends do not seem to realize that the canal is there, but it needs modernizing.

Another canal which extended that at Lachine was commenced in 1783. I think the first Surveyor-general of Canada who possessed the very fine name of "John Collins",a name which has since been perpetuated in another way, was the engineer on that project.

I think it was in 1847, one hundred and five years ago, that the canal was finally extended through to Lake Ontario. It is of interest to note that one hundred and five years ago this little, struggling country even then was big enough to build the canal, with all of the difficulties of those times, from tide water up to Lake Ontario.

Before it was even completed to Lake Ontario,

in 1829, the first Welland canal was constructed, which conveys the information that as early as 1847 ships could sail from tidewater up as far as Sault Ste. Marie.

(Page B-1 follows)

Around that time the early fur traders completed the first canal near the rapids at Sault Ste. Marie which meant the way was open for travel about 2200 miles into the interior of this continent.

It is very interesting to note what Senator Connolly of Texas says about this canal. I might say here that next week, I think on the 11th of March, the Governor of the State of Michigan, Governor Williams, is coming here to pay us a visit in this Chamber. It will be a great pleasure to receive Governor Williams here, a great pleasure to have a near neighbour who knows a great deal about us, as we know a great deal about his people.

I think I shall have to ask Senator Connolly from Texas to come up and see us. Senator Connolly is a great American. He has a knowledge of things relating to the United States, but apparently Senator Connolly has not very much knowledge of the people of this country of ours. He does not know about our strong, confident, resourceful, and visionary Canadians up here. He apparently does not know about our resources, our financial ability, and our equipment to do a job such as this; nor does Senator Connolly know about the importance of these canals which I have mentioned.

Senator Connolly is living down in the State of Texas where apparently the only ice they have, comes from electric refrigerators, and what he does not know about the freezing-up of this country, is that it is merely an incident. The freeze-up for four or five months of the year is not really an overwhelming matter to our people at all. The canals which are frozen up for five months of the year, despite this disability, do a very big job. The Sault Ste. Marie canal last year carried 24,000 ships with 120 million tons of shipping, or a little better, in seven or eight months, which is five times the number of ships accommodated by the Panama Canal, and four times the tonnage. It carried many more, in number of ships, than the total tonnage carried by the Suez Canal and the Panama Canal. Senator Connolly should know what takes place in eight months of the year, and we think that emphasizes the importance of this seaway.

The Welland Canal last year carried more ships, but with half the tonnage of the Panama Canal; the Welland Canal carried 8,122 ships, with 16,200,000 tons of shipping. The Panama Canal carried 5,458 ships with about double the tonnage.

The St. Lawrence Canal, which is really the oldest canal in Canada, small and inadequate as it is, carried last year nearly double the number of ships, but with one-third the tonnage of the Panama Canal. On this little, inadequate St. Lawrence River Canal, was handled 10,147 ships with 10 million tons of shipping, as compared with something over 5400 ships and 32 million tons of shipping in the Panama Canal.

Again I say to Senator Connolly, the story about this canal being frozen up for five months of the year has worn a little threadbare. The fact is that these three canals, together or individually, rank with the greatest of the world's canals from a traffic standpoint.

From a power standpoint, of course, there can be no argument Ontario and New York State need the two and one-half million horsepower. The fact that we have hour after hour great quantities of water pouring down to the ocean, making no contribution in electrical energy to this great part of the continent is something which cannot be explained away. These important developments are needed in Ontario; they are needed in New York State.

As I said before, back in 1937 or 1938

Dr. Hogg, then Chairman of The Hydro-Electric Power Commission, made a very fine statement to one of the Electrical Associations on the power situation in Ontario. Dr. Hogg told about the need for power, the requirements with which we were going to be faced, and he mentioned the fact that the Ottawa River was a river which was difficult because of the water flowage variation in the river. He referred to the St. Lawrence and to Niagara. I well remember that speech. As we are here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, we have turned back to Niagara, and if I wanted to make a political speech, I could refer to the "back to Niagara policy", which was rejected by other people, but carried through by ourselves. I could go on and tell about the development which are taking place there, and the fact that that power is going to be required. 250 million dollars is the amount which is going to be required to complete that development in its first stage, anyway, and we have found the money, and we are going ahead.

To-day all of the Ottawa River that Dr.Hogg mentioned in 1938 is developed, and its power is coming into use in Ontario. However, we are still short, so we have to turn to other sources.

We are looking forward to the possibility of nuclear energy, and, as I said before, we think there is a strong possibility, in co-operation again with the Federal Government, of getting three or four thousand horsepower from the Chalk River Plant, which is a great new development. In the meantime, we need our one and one-quarter million horsepower from the St. Lawrence.

I have had the question asked by some hon. members in this House the other day, " Is there a possibility that with the development of nuclear energy, that some of these developments we are now engaged in, would become unnecessary?" I will leave that to the Hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) who has a great knowledge of electrical energy and the development of it.

One of the statements which appealed to me was made by one of the engineers, and he said, "It is very hard to see where you can get electrical energy that can be developed cheaper than by water running over a rapids."

The other point he made which was very illuminating to me, was that if some other form of energy does come in, then it would pay us to scrap every-

thing else. It really does not matter anyway. However, they all assure me there is no possibility in measurable time that nuclear energy would make any more than a contribution, and certainly not a contribution that would be anything approaching the cheapness of hydro-electric energy, particularly as we have it in the St. Lawrence.

Then, from the standpoint of paying for this, -- and that is always a consideration -- in a few days I will be telling about the strength of Ontario's finances, due to the wise administration of our assets and resources. I will wait and clear that up at that point, but I would say that this project will run us perhaps 250 million dollars. That is a lot of money in the terms of ten or twelve years ago; it is a lot of money in the terms when Dr. Hogg made his speech in 1938; but, Mr. Speaker, in the last half-dozen years we have financed projects involving about 700 million dollars. We have been able to find the money at reasonable terms and rates, and there is nothing that stands in the way of us getting an additional 250 million dollars for this job.

We have the need for the power; we have

engineering ability which is second to none in the world, and we can do the job.

When I was saying that I would like to ask Senator Connolly to come up here, I have no doubt Senator Connolly is a great fellow. I think we could bring him from Texas, and perhaps he would bring a cowboy's hat with him, and we could show him a great country with great possibilities. At that time I would like to invite the Editor of the Saturday Evening Post, in view of some of the articles which have appeared in recent issues of that publication.

I would like to show him the country, also. Some of these people have not raised their vision beyond the horizon of their own country; they do not know all the possibilities of this great country. The Saturday Evening Post quoted the other day in a rather gratuitous manner, mentioning the fact that Canada was prepared to go along without any American assistance"which was remarkable." They inferred that it was the custom of Canada to ask them for money and to ask for assistance.

I might point out here to the Saturday Evening Post,and the American people generally,that we have never asked for, nor received from the United

States a single, solitary thing except the occasional embargo. We have never received anything; we have never asked for anything. Since the commencement of history, we have been prepared to "paddle our own canoe", and go it alone. The attractions of this country are so great that American capital is coming over here, and we are glad to welcome it in the hundreds of millions of dollars. We hope that will continue, and we are sure it will continue because of the conditions that exist in this country now.

We are not asking the Americans for anything. We deal with the people of the United States as partners. Nobody knows better than we do that the Americans are a great people, and we think they should go into this great project, but if they do not want to, we would like them to stand aside and let us go ahead with this job ourselves.

May I point out here that Canada has contributed more per capita to the war-ravaged countries of the world, than has the United States. Our people, through the Government of Canada, have contributed to the re-establishment of the world. We have done it gladly, and with only a population of fourteen and one-half million, we have given more

per capita than has the United States, and we have not talked half as much about it. I just mention that to our friends across the line, and particularly to the Editor of the Saturday Evening Post. I would certainly like to have him visit us here.

As far as the American people are concerned, they are good neighbours, and we would like them to extend to us the good-neighbour policy by not standing in our way in connection with this great project if they do not want to go in as partners themselves.

That is all I have to say on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the second reading of this Bill. As a matter of fact, I have said very little about the Bill itself, and I have done that intentionally. I do not want to transgress upon the time of the other hon. members who have given a great deal of thought to this problem, and particularly the Hon. Minister (Mr. Challies). However, Mr. Speaker, I commend this Bill, and I am sure it is a great and historic step in this Province, toward the progress and development of our country.

I would like to ask the indulgence of the House to have the Hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) follow me, and he will give a detailed explanation of this

Bill. He will explain not only Bill No.68, but also Bill No.69, after which the debate can follow in the usual course.

MR. F. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), in order to have a complete picture before the House, if he can tell the House what the Americans would have to do to facilitate the building of the dam across the river, so that power can be developed. Will that be gone into by the Hon. Minister (Mr. Challies)?

MR. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) who will follow me, will explain that point. Of course, the canal as presently projected, has been altogether a Canadian canal, and it generally follows the course as it is now, -- the present course of the canal. The power project could be carried out quite separate from the canal, I suppose, if that were desired. As a matter of fact, I think some three or four years ago we did approach the International Joint Commission and the New York power authorities, to ask for authority to go ahead with the canal on the international section. That involved a partnership with an American authority.

We were negotiating with the New York State power authorities, but, of course, there are other authorities. I would like to go into that. As the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) knows, there are private interests,and federal interests also,that would be interested in coming into that, in the fashion of the Tennessee Valley Authority, or something along that line in the States. We were not concerned with who our partner was on the other side, as long as there was someone who would go in with us.

(Take "C" follows)

There are at least three competing authorities that want the power. Now, at the time that proposal was made, my recollection is the President intervened and vetoed the project on the ground that power should not be the whole object of the St. Lawrence development and that he felt that it was in the interest of the United States that no project should go on without a development of a canal. Of course, that is where the Canadian government ties into the picture. The Canadian government has taken the very broad and proper view that if that is the condition that would be imposed, they would be glad to pick up the canal at Prescott or wherever the point of division is, and carry it on down to Tidewater. That gives us, therefore, everything that our friends on the other side have. The canal on this side, of course, would be entirely on the Canadian side, plus the power which would be developed by Ontario and by whatever United States authority would be designated.

I think that answers the question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver). Of course, there has to be an authority on the other side, but, as I say, that has never been initiated. There are competing authorities over there which would like to take on the job. The main point is the construction of the

canal and Canada has entered into that picture. Indeed, I think there we have made some quite substantial concessions ourselves in order to get the power -- to assist the building of the canal.

There are certain works on the St. Lawrence such as dredging and so forth that we would do to improve flow which would prove to the benefit of the canal and of the project and we will throw that in for good measure in order to get it through.

MR. OLVER: Well, there would have to be Federal approval before the State of New York would be able to make a deal with Ontario.

MR. FROST (Prime Minister): Well, I imagine so. Here in this Legislature we have confined ourselves to the business of Ontario and we have left the negotiations with other countries and other states to the Federal government, which I think my friend will agree is right and proper.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St.Andrew): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: We have before us a rather unusual situation, to discuss the provisions of two Bills, 68 and 69. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is impossible to deal with Bill No. 69 before we either accept or reject the giving of our sanction to the second reading of Bill No. 68 or refuse to give

second reading to that Bill,because Bill No. 68 deals with the agreement arrived at between the government of Canada and the government of Ontario.

If this House, speaking hypothetically, were to refuse the second reading of this Bill; in other words, reject the agreement, then Bill No. 69 would automatically lapse.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we can assume that Bill No. 68 --

MR. FROST (Prime Minister): Let me point out to my friend (Mr. Salsberg) that we are not assuming anything. What has happened is this: we have called Bill No. 69, that is, the second reading of Bill No.69. The debate has not taken place; the Bill has not passed; the Bill was simply called and placed before the House.

Bill No. 68 is now before the House. As my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg)says, if it is rejected, of course, the whole thing goes down the drain. Of course, that is right.

MR. SALSBERG: Down the St. Lawrence.

MR. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in debating Bill No. 68 reference can be made by agreement to all the principles of 69, and if the hon. members of the House decide in their wisdom to reject Bill 68, why, of course, that ends the matter.

Mr. Speaker, that does not preclude further debate when Bill No. 69 is called again and spoken to, if necessary, by the hon. Minister, the Vice-Chairman of the Hydro Commission. That then can be debated again. In other words, our Order then is this, that we, generally speaking, discuss all of the principles of these two Bills and then Bill No. 68 is either accepted or rejected. If it is accepted, then Bill No. 69 comes up and if necessary, further debate can take place at that time. The principles are the same.

MR. SALSBERG: We are dealing with one Bill, No. 68.

MR. FROST (Prime Minister): And any comments and opinions apply to both.

MR. SPEAKER: I would just like to clarify that, if I may. To me, the two Bills are complementary and I would feel that while it is perfectly all right for us to treat each individual Bill separately and alone, from my understanding of the Bill, there would be a great deal of repetition in discussing each individual Bill. I think the hon. members will agree that while we are here to do the business of the province, we are not particularly interested in each member discussing Bill No. 68 and then repeating the same words in discussing Bill No. 69. I am, of course, prepared to

put it to the House, but I think it is very well agreed to that the two Bills are complementary and this will give a very wide range of discussion.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, following up the point of order I mentioned, we would have to vote on No. 68 first.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, that is quite correct.

MR. OLIVER: I was going to say that the hon. Prime Minister agrees this is an unusual way to put the Bill before the House, and if we were unfavourably disposed as to the principle involved in these Bills, then we would have certainly strongly objected to this procedure. But there is no such opposition to the principle involved, and I agree with the hon. Prime Minister that I think it will avoid, to a degree at least, repetition that would otherwise arise, and I am perfectly willing to have them both considered together.

MR. SALSBERG: Again on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I must rise to disagree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) who assumes that there is no opposition to Bill No. 68. That is what I had in mind.

I, for one, would like to speak on the Bill before us now, but I am not convinced that the Bill as presently worded should be adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: That is perfectly right. Every hon. member has a right to disagree with the Bill. I think there is no attempt at all to stifle any opinion by any member, and if the hon. member for St. Andrew wants to express himself violently against the Bill, that is quite in order.

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, on speaking on the new Bills Nos. 68 and 69, I think this would be an appropriate time for a discussion or a short review of what will be involved if these Bills will be passed, and when the International Joint Commission's consent is received to proceed with the development.

(Page D-1 follows)

The occasion of moving the second Reading of Bill No. 69 entitled - "An Act Respecting the Development of Power in the International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence River" - should be an appropriate time to give a short review of what will be involved after it has been passed and when International consent has been given to proceed with the development as outlined in Bills No. 68 and 69. This consent we are all hopeful will not be further unduly delayed.

There is one important fact well worth recording and it is that, as far as this Legislature is concerned, the major Political Parties are favourable to the project so the task of the Government in getting the Bill passed is one of simply (1) Elaborating on the general aspects of the scheme; (2) Stating the facts as to the necessity of the power that will flow from the development and (3) Showing that the Ontario Hydro, backed by the Government, can afford the capital expenditure necessary.

The Gulf of St. Lawrence, the St. Lawrence River, and the Great Lakes extend some 2,200 miles into the heart of the North American Continent. In fact, half the distance from the Strait of Belle Ile to the Pacific Coast can be travelled over this great inland waterway which has been aptly called the "avenue of civilization" of North America. The

improvement of this water route into the heart of the Continent has been a continuous operation extending through the years since the early 1800's. The obstacles met and overcome in providing the present facilities were many and varied and no doubt in the early years must have seemed at times insurmountable.

The St. Lawrence River has played the role of a collossus in the history of the two nations that share its power and float their traffic upon it in friendly co-operation. To-day we are concerned with the use of the great river as it is at present and as it may be in the future for power and for navigation. The main reason for the Bill is the urgent need for the full development of the potential power in the International Rapids section of the River, a portion of the boundary between the State of New York and the Province of Ontario.

Owing to the immense natural storage of the Great Lakes, the Niagara and the St. Lawrence Rivers have the most uniform flow of any of the world's largest Rivers. Because of this and their proximity to great power-consuming regions, those sections which have rapids and falls have the most valuable water power sites in the whole world. For water power we require both differences in elevation and as large and regular a flow as possible. Nowhere are these factors combined to a greater degree than at the main sites on the rivers within the St. Lawrence Basin. This has been

recognized and acted upon and on both the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers several large power developments have been constructed.

The navigational possibilities of large Rivers were predominant and the power-producing possibilities subordinated until the coming of the electrical transmission of energy about the end of the 19th century. The present scheme for the improvement of the St. Lawrence River is a combined navigation and power project. Much of the discussion respecting this has revolved around the relative importance of navigation and power. In the earlier years of the agitation for the improved waterway, the emphasis was upon navigation. More recently the emphasis has swung to the development of power. This is because nowadays, whether at peace or in war, we use in the home, on the farm, in commerce, and most of all in industry, greater and greater amounts of electrical energy.

On the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River an installation of 2,200,000 H.P. can be made. For each Country this would supply on an average of 6,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year. Engineers have calculated that if this energy had to be replaced by human effort it would require the work of 28,000,000 men because one strong man working for eight hours can produce only three-quarters of 1 kilowatt-hour, or 225 kilowatt-hours for 300 working days in a year.

The productive energy capacity of Ontario's

share of the output of the St. Lawrence development, when completed, would be about 27% of the energy generated and purchased by the Commission for use in Ontario last year. Our Province is primarily interested in the development of power on the International section of the river.

Shortly after World War II a determined effort was made to obtain agreement between the United States and Canada upon the plan known as the Power Priority Plan, by which the Power Authority of the State of of New York and The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario would jointly construct a 2,200,000 horsepower development in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. The two authorities were to make provision for deep water navigation to the extent and in the manner directed by the Federal Governments of the United States and Canada. Once again it appeared that everything possible had been done to present a scheme upon which definite, favourable action could be taken but again frustration followed. The President of the United States decided that the power project could not be detached even temporarily from the navigation project. There is no need for me to review the events of the recent past. They are probably too painfully impressed upon your memories but it is enough to say that Canadian patience finally was exhausted. As matters now stand, unless the Government of the United States is prepared to enter into partnership with the

Federal Government of Canada immediately, Canada will undertake the construction of a deep waterway entirely in Canadian territory, making use of Canada's own great resources. The President of the United States has agreed that if the United States Congress fails to act favourably to the joint project, he will withdraw his opposition to the presentation of the joint New York State-Province of Ontario power development project to the International Joint Commission.

What we must do now is make ourselves ready to proceed with the development of the power possibilities of the St. Lawrence just as soon as our undeniable natural right to do so is established by the International Joint Commission and the Governments of the two Countries concerned. This Bill makes it sure that the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario is already in a position to take swift and decisive action and that not a single kilowatt-hour of potential energy will be wasted through delays caused either by the Commission or the Government of this Province.

Let us consider for a few minutes our power supply situation in Ontario and the future outlook. We have had, as you know, tremendous - yes, phenomenal - increases in load over the past twenty-years.

Ontario Hydro has been faced with tremendous increases in demands during the past 20 years. In December-1931, the primary peak demands for all systems totalled 808,308 kilowatts or 1,083,523 H.P. By

December-1951, those demands had reached 3,067,025 kilowatts or 4,111,294 H.P. That is to say that during two decades Ontario's demands for primary power have increased by 279 per cent. The increase in demands for primary power in 1951 over 1945 - the last year of the war - was over 65%.

During 1951 the Commission generated and purchased 18.8 billion kilowatt-hours for its municipal, rural and direct industrial customers in Ontario. This was more than twice the total generated and purchased in 1931 and almost 75% greater than the total only ten years ago. It is estimated that the demand for energy by 1956 will require all of the 6,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours from the St. Lawrence.

Hydro is able to meet this demand because of the tremendous $900,000,000. expansion programme which was launched shortly after the end of the war in 1945. To date, we have brought in 1,289,000 H.P. and we have spent approximately $600,000,000. The money expended, of course, includes generation, transformation and transmission facilities. This programme will have been completed by the year 1955 - when we shall have added an additional 1,640,500 H.P. Thus, the total amount of power which will have been brought in over the 10-year period, 1945 to 1955, will be 2,929,500 H.P.

Given sufficient water in the right places, we believe that this programme will take care of the

future expansion of this Province and maintain for our people the highest standard of living in the world until the year 1956.

After 1956 and beyond we are greatly concerned. It is for that reason that we, at Hydro, have been pressing for the development of the St. Lawrence to make sure that we are able to get that 1,100,000 H.P. low-cost, dependable power from the 240,000 cubic feet of water rushing down hill each and every second of every day. If International consent is received this year, it will take favourable circumstances to make power available by 1956 or 1957.

We can get from the St. Lawrence power for 2.8 mills per kilowatt-hour. We can deliver that power into the large load centres and thereby into the whole system at a total cost of something like 3.75 mills per kilowatt-hour. Our average overall today for generation, transmission, transformation and putting the power into the system is something like 4.73 mills per kilowatt-hour. Thus, we can take the power out of the St. Lawrence, deliver it, transform it and transmit it, bring it into the system at about one mill cheaper than our overall cost today. If we do not get the St. Lawrence the picture is this:

We shall have to extend our steam plant facilities. To generate the 6,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy that the St. Lawrence will give us, we will need approximately 6,300,000,000 pounds of coal a

year and it will cost almost 7.7 mills at the site itself. We will spend approximately $18,000,000. a year to produce that energy on the St. Lawrence and if we have to produce it from steam, it works out at something like $48,500,000, a difference of about $30,000,000 each and every year to produce that power from steam. That will have to be paid for by the users of power in this Province - that is what we are faced with in this Province and that is why we, at Hydro, have been pressing and pressing for the St. Lawrence Development.

Some have doubted or claimed to doubt that Ontario Hydro can afford the estimated $200 million required to develop Canada's share of the power potential of the International Rapids. They need only to refer to the financial statements of the Commission and the member municipalities to have all their doubts dispelled. The assets of the Commission at December 31, 1951 totalled - $1,033,796,603. after deducting $117 million of accumulated depreciation. The Commission's total long-term debt stood at some $690 million against which accumulated sinking funds exceeded $165 million. Turning to the member municipalities, the returns received thus far indicate that their combined assets have reached a total of approximately $350 million, against which they have total liabilities of about $30 million, of which, perhaps, two-thirds is funded debt. A business enterprise

with ratios of assets to liabilities of that order and built up during forty years on the soundest financial principles does not need to hesitate to undertake a self-liquidating investment even of the size required to develop the St. Lawrence.

The appreciation of the value of the power potentialities of our large rivers is relatively new. As a source of hydro-electric power the Great Lakes System is unsurpassed. Ninety-five thousand square miles of lake surface receives the run-off from nearly three hundred thousand square miles of drainage area -- the greatest drainage area in the world. From an average outflow from Lake Superior of 77,000 cubic feet of water per second the run-off increases to an average of 202,000 cubic feet per second down the Niagara River and to 237,000 cubic feet per second of water from Lake Ontario. The large reservoirs that supply the flow of the St. Lawrence River are so vast that the variation in flow between maximum and minimum amounts of water is only a ratio from 2-1/4 to 1. Compare this with ratios of 100 or even 200 to 1 in other large rivers.

The project proposed for the improvement of the International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence is known as the "Controlled Single Stage Project" and includes not only the provision of a deep waterway but also the development of the power resources of the section. The main features of the project are a

control dam in the river above the Village of Iroquois; a dam in the Long Sioux Rapids at the head of Barnhart Island; two power-houses to be located, one on either side of the International boundary at the foot of Barnhart Island; channel enlargement to effect reduction in velocity sufficient to ensure satisfactory velocities for navigation and safe and economical winter operation in the interest of power; the necessary railway and highway modifications and the necessary deepwater canals and locks to carry navigation around the control dam, main Long Sioux Dam and Barnhart Island power-house to an elevation which will provide an average head available for power of about 81 feet. The combined length of the two power-houses will be approximately 3,500 feet. The proposed installation will total 2,200,000 H.P. divided equally between the two Countries. The construction of the project will flood between 10 and 11 thousand acres of land on the Canadian side of the International boundary. It will result in the complete inundation of the Villages of Iroquois, Aultville, Farran's Point, Dickenson's Landing, Wales, Moulinette and Mille Roches and the eastern section of Morrisburg. It will require the relocation of about 26 miles of Queen's Highway No. 2, between Cornwall and Prescott and 17-1/2 miles of the Canadian National Railway's main line in this area. The raised water surface will provide a lake above the dam of over 40 square miles in the area.

Under this Bill the Ontario Hydro assumes all responsibility for the costs of the work and all that goes with the works as described in this Bill on the Ontario side of the International boundary except what is required for deeper water navigation which is a Federal responsibility.

I referred a moment ago to the impressive financial strength of the Hydro enterprise. May I add that much more than money is needed to ensure the success of vast undertakings like the one we are now considering. The organized skill and experience of engineers and administrators are perhaps even more essential than financial resources. The magnificent generating stations and other plants that have been erected throughout Ontario testify that Ontario Hydro does not lack skill or experience. We shall accept the challenge of the gigantic task before us with full confidence that we shall be adding one more great achievement to a list that every citizen of Ontario can review with pride. In that spirit of confidence, I move the second Reading of Bill No. 69.

(Take "E" follows.)

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls):

Mr. Speaker: There are always occasions in one's life that will continue to stand out. One of these I recall very vividly when some 18 years ago, I made my first speech in this house moving the Speech from the Throne and I am sure to-day, Mr. Speaker, as I speak to this Bill, it will be an occasion that will stay with me for a long time, as we are dealing with a subject of great importance, not only to the welfare, economic and future prosperity of Canada but more important than that, to the great Province of Ontario.

The signing of an agreement between Canada and Ontario at Ottawa last December marked an historic milestone in bringing the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project closer to realization.

Under the terms of that agreement, the Canadian Government entered into a contract with the Ontario Government to develop the Canadian power rights of the international section of the St. Lawrence River with an appropriate authority in the United States.

That agreement was not only historic: it was significant for a number of reasons.

First of all, it revealed very clearly that the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project is an undertaking which men of vision, regardless of their political views, recognize as being vital to the future progress of Ontario and Canada and of fundamental importance to the welfare of the people of this Province and of Canadians generally.

The St. Lawrence Project is, therefore, one which transcends political considerations. It points up the fact that

the public men who have been working untiringly to make it a reality are Canadians first and Liberals and Conservatives second.

The subject of harnessing the power in the St. Lawrence has been a subject of negotiations between Canada, Ontario, United States and New York State for over a half a century. To the average citizen of Ontario and Canada, the St. Lawrence Power Project is a mammoth undertaking that has seemed to have appeared and disappeared from our field of notice, always without finality one way or the other. It is no surprise now, in fact it is a pleasant experience that at this very critical period in Canadian History, when all our best energies are needed for a life or death war, we are called upon to approve of this historical document. We naturally in Ontario have always been interested in power, the development of that power and the power needs of our communities. One needs only to recall that only some thirty years ago, the average household was using a half a horse-power for lighting and one and a half horsepower for electrical appliances and now we find that the average is well over two horsepower for lighting and over twelve horsepower for appliances, and when we consider the gigantic increase in industrial demand for power and that industry in the Province is well over 95 percent electrified, we can well imagine that if something is not done and done at once, that we here in Ontario will face a critical situation.

I know Hydro has always felt, not only the present Commission, but all past Commissions, that their immediate and important concern was not with the surplus of power but it was indeed with the shortage of power. Every citizen in the Province of Ontario should have a deep interest in this project.

The negotiations between Canada and the United States have now been going on for well over a half a century and these negotiations finally terminated in the Treaty of Washington in 1933, which was defeated in the American Senate and the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Development Basin Agreement of 1941, which after ten years, still awaits Congressional approval.

It is a matter of interest to note that to date Canada has spent some $300,000,000 on various sections of the St.Lawrence and the United States approvimately $93,000,000.

Fifty percent of Canada's expenditures were made during the period when her population was less than 75 percent of what it is to-day and when each construction dollar represented at least four of to-day's dollars. It is, therefore, reasonable to say that, in terms of to-day's dollar, Canada's expenditure to date has been about a billion dollars.

The Financial Post in commenting recently on Canada's decision to "go it alone" said it was the important development in Canadian life in 1951.

While the Seaway is of tremendous importance to Ontario and Canada as a whole, the power project is by far a matter of greater urgency -- a matter of immediate urgency -- if the future of this Province is to be protected.

Ontario Hydro officials have made this fact abundantly clear on many occasions. Since the end of the last World War, demands for power have increased at a rate which is without parallel in the history of the Province. This, in itself, is convincing evidence of the unprecedented industrial expansion which has been taking place coupled with the fact that the war

in Korea has made a tremendous impact on all industries engaged in producing materials and equipment for the United Nations's forces.

Just recently, Hydro officials cited some highly significant figures which clearly indicate the tempo of our growth in Ontario. For example, within six years following the war, industrial consumption of power had increased by nearly 25 per cent, domestic use was up by over 97 percent and the use of power by commercial establishments by more than 79 percent, and that is not all; the monthly average farm use of power has increased by more than 100 percent in 12 years.

The way in which the Ontario Hydro has been meeting the combined demands for more and still more power from all classes of customers in Ontario and the challenge of these critical days is a tribute to the skill of hydro engineers. It must be remembered that more than half the industrial output of Canada comes from the factories of Ontario -- factories which are using more and more low-cost power.

There can be little wonder that our Ontario Hydro Commission is deeply concerned about the continued delay in getting action on the St. Lawrence. They realize, as do all thinking people, that as Canada's leading mining, manufacturing and agricultural Province, Ontario must have a new, large source of low-cost power in the next few years if it is to maintain its present phenomenal expansion.

The St. Lawrence is the only answer, apart from highly-expensive steam-generated power or the development of sites which, at present, would be uneconomic because they are far removed from

Ontario's heavy load centres.

The need for additional power in Ontario is apparent when the tremendous growth in load demand is studied. Since July, 1950, about the time when hostilities started in Korea, demands for power have been as much as five times the original, long-term rate of growth. As a result, Ontario Hydro's record-breaking, ten-year expansion program, involving an expenditure in excess of $970 million, designed originally to provide ample power for Ontario for many years to come, will now only keep pace with demands up to 1955 or 1956 at the present rate of increase.

When that program has been completed in 1955, Ontario's dependable resources will have been increased by a little over 120 percent, but even with that tremendous addition, the 1,100,000 horsepower to which Ontario is entitled from the St. Lawrence, will be required by 1956 if the present rate of growth is maintained. In fact, every one of the 6 billion 300 million kilowatt hours a year from the St. Lawrence could be sold right now.

The total potential power between Lake Superior and Montreal based on the average amount of water available, is in excess of 14 Million horsepower. This is greater than the total installed capacity of all the hydro-electric plants in Canada to-day. Of course, the development of the entire St. Lawrence power potential is not economical or practicable. It is believed, however, that a total installation close to 10 million horsepower would be justified.

Of this 10 million, some 4,500,000 horsepower would be at Niagara, 2,200,000 horsepower at the International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence, 2,100,000 horsepower at Beauharnois,

and 1,100,000 horsepower at Lachine, Quebec.

From this total installation available on the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers, some 6,500,000 horsepower would be available to Canada. Breaking this down we find that 2,200,000 horsepower would be at Niagara, 1,100,000 horsepower at the International Rapids Section, 2,100,000 horsepower at Beauharnois and 1,100,000 horsepower at Lachine.

Only about one-third of these total resources have been developed to date. We have, on the Niagara River, 500,000 horsepower from our plant at Queenston -- the Sir Adam Beck-Niagara Generating Station No. 1; 180,000 horsepower at the Ontario Power Plant; 145,000 horsepower at the Toronto Power Plant, and about 100,000 horsepower at the Canadian Niagara Station. At Beauharnois and The Cedars plants in Quebec, approximately 1,200,000 horsepower has been developed.

On the St. Lawrence River itself, as the figures show, about 5,400,000 horsepower would appear to be economically justified at Lachine, Beauharnois and the International Rapids Section. Of this, 4,300,000 horsepower would be in Canada and 1,100,000 horsepower in the United States at the International Section.

I quite well recall the Canada-Ontario Agreement, which was signed in 1932 between the then Premier of Ontario, Mr. Henry and the present Vice-Chairman of the Hydro Commission, with the words that he uttered at that time as he said - "this is one of the proudest moments of my life".

Again, in 1941, when the Ontario Agreement was signed by Mr. Hepburn and the Honourable Member from Brant, and now to-day, we are called upon to approve of this agreement, signed on behalf of the Province, by the Premier himself and again the Vice-Chairman of the Hydro Commission.

We, as members of this 24th Legislature, will have the opportunity I believe, to be able to boast in the future that we all have been a part of this historical agreement. Naturally, all Legislatures have had many important Bills presented to them, but to me this is one of the most important Bills that has ever come before any Legislature.

It is a pity to me that those who take a narrow and selfish view and those who fear that their interests may be adversely affected, have been loud and persistent in their clamour against the St. Lawrence Project. Large sums of money have been spent for ingenious anti-St. Lawrence publicity and fortunately, much of this deceptive propaganda has collapsed like a pricked balloon, when subject to careful study.

During the interval between now and the last two wars, the increase in industrial use of electricity has been enormous. Thousands of factories have been established, technical processes have been developed, personnel has been trained, power equipment installed and a strong, broad industrial base has been laid. On this broad base whole industry is capable of rapid expansion. But for the existence of this industrial foundation and in the last fifteen years, the production of munitions and supplies vital for war, in quantities that would have any significant affect upon the outcome, would have been impossible.

This House will recall that a Treaty was negotiated last year between the Canadian Government and that of the United States, permitting a larger diversion of water for power at Niagara. The Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission lost no time in beginning a development there, which will have harnessed another big block of horsepower before the end of 1954 but we all know from experience that demand cannot wait until 1954.

Future development of power from the St. Lawrence certainly will serve the expansion of industry. That is it's purpose and it's justification. Future demand for power is growing rapidly. It is simply a matter of getting it in the most economical manner. This is particularly important in Ontario where still more steam plants are the only alternative to the International Hydro Development in the St. Lawrence.

Personally I feel that the project is not one of navigation alone, nor of power alone. To achieve this maximum objective, it is obvious that some form of international co-operation is necessary for the successful development of the International Rapids Section. Without a doubt the final solution lies either in the approval of the 1941 Agreement or in the 1909 Treaty between the United States and Canada.

We all know that Canada prefers approval of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Agreement of 1941 with certain acceptable modifications. Certainly the Government of Canada and indeed that of Ontario deserves to be congratulated if approval of Congress is withheld or action further delayed, that these two governments are ready to go ahead with the Seaway and Power Project alone. I think one significant thing that has stood out in all these

negotiations, and that could well serve as an object lesson to all countries, is the splendid co-operation that has existed between the two levels of government, that of the Dominion and that of the Province of Ontario and both the Prime Minister and the Premier are to be congratulated on this splendid spirit of co-operation and on the foresight they have for the future of our Dominion and for the Province.

Ontario and New York already have indicated their willingness to undertake the basic power development in the International Rapids Section, which is estimated would cost something over 4 hundred million dollars and this indeed would be a normal public investment. We believe that it is not only important for economic development but urgent as well for national defence and that the benefits to our Province for the cost of the power project will far outweigh its original cost.

It is hard to visualize the future industrial importance of Ontario but we must look ahead with a vivid picture in our mind, just what this 1 million, 1 hundred thousand unharnessed wild horses could do for the Province of Ontario when this energy is available for the use of industry. One engineer has estimated that the power going to waste in the International Section of the St. Lawrence is equivalent to energy that could be created by 28 million men.

Over the last few years a great deal has been said concerning the decentralization of industry, and I think one thing that worries, especially the Maritime Provinces, concerning both the Seaway and the Power Project, is that it appears to have a strong centralizing influence. I believe both Governments

recognize the importance of carrying out insofar as it is possible, an orderly and economic policy of decentralization of industry, not only of our Country but our Province as well. In the development of these power facilities, the important objective of decentralization of industry must not be forgotten. Steps should be taken to see that this policy is followed in every field in which it can be followed.

In considering this Power Project, we must not lose sight of the old saying that "trade follows the flag". The modern adaptation of this saying is that 'industry follows power'. Ever since the industrial revolution it has been the history that industry developed where there was an adequate source of primary power. I believe it is part of our national responsibility that every power resource that can be developed, must be developed and that it is the prime responsibility of this government or any other government to do so.

Power resources are all a part of our national heritage. They are all part of the vision of development that the Fathers of Confederation had, Unless we are prepared to see that every single bit of natural resources is developed in Canada, we are not going to meet the challenge and to achieve the destiny envisioned by the pioneers - the Fathers of Confederation.

Almost all the opposition that the Seaway Project and the Power Development as well are meeting seems to come from extremely powerful lobbies in the United States. Lobbies that seem to have bushels of money to operate on and seems to be accomplishing what they have set out to do. It is also my firm belief that much of the objection to these developments is coming from selfish big

business interests who care nothing about the Country's welfare as long as they will be well looked after, and another thing, that should stand out prominently in all these negotiations between Canada and the Province of Ontario is that politics have played no part whatsoever. I am rather of the opinion at the present time, and I hope I am wrong, that it will be some time before an agreement in this matter could be reached through the United States Congress.

I quite well recall that some twelve years ago, when I myself was on the Hydro Commission, along with Dr. Hogg and Mr. Smith, my fellow Commissioner, we met the then Senate Committee from Washington in Montreal for three days. After going all over the project we were left with the assurance that it was only a matter of a few months before it would be approved of by Congress and that was now some twelve years ago. Probably no bigger football has ever existed in Washington than the St. Lawrence Project itself.

There are names and personalties which I could cite, who have set themselves up in opposition to this Development and who have been, and still are, able to defy the wishes of both the major political parties in United States, and of every President since President Coolidge.

There is not much reason to believe that their power has diminished in any way. We have seen how successful the lobby has been in the past. They have in the United States, an organization known as the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, the sub-title of which is a nation-wide organization in opposition. There are no less than 250 separate organizations within the

framework of this one organization. Offices are maintained in Washington and the sole purpose is a constant lobby against the Seaway and Power Project in the United States Congress.

In time of Peace, shortage of power is unfortunate. In the event of War, a power shortage is a national disaster. Under no circumstances must this be allowed to occur. The answer to the power shortage is indeed the unanimous passing of this Bill through this Legislature.

There seems to be a feeling in the United States that New York State should not be entitled to the power alone in the St. Lawrence. Governor Dewey's bid to finance the power works from the outset and distribute it by inter-state compact, has been applauded by the State's writers in Congress, but Members of Congress from States whose water power resources are already in the grip of the Federal Government, are not likely to vote independent for the Empire State, even though New York is willing to put up the money.

As the best friend the United States has among the nations, Canada is deserving of better treatment by Washington than she has had in relation to engagements for power developments on rivers in which both countries have a common interest.

Even in spite of the additional power that has been added to the Commission in the last number of years, we still must be eager for new developments, especially on the St. Lawrence, as a further protection against the designs of John L. Lewis, who is the Czar of the American coal miners, who occasionally has put the pinch on Canada. The more water power we can develop, the less coal we will have to buy from American miners. As it is,

we are now developing considerably more electric power from the Niagara than is the United States, but it is understandable that we should seek more and more when we have relatively easy source of development.

There is no argument against our showing impatience of the procedure with Washington over the constant play of politics by the New Deal and the Fair Deal with the St. Lawrence Power Issue. We deserve to be congratulated that we have proceeded to develop power on our rivers independently of the United States. I think the Senate of the United States would do itself great credit by leading the way at once to sign the Agreement.

The question of Federal and Provincial rights as it engaged the attention of the Government at Ontario and Toronto was decided in a recent Conference between Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent and Premier Leslie Frost of Ontario. All power rights were conceded to the Province quite as a matter of course. The people of the State of New York have a sorry spectacle of senators and representatives feuding with each other, urging legislation which would put power development in inter-state service where industry not only in the Niagara Frontier region but other places as well could absorb the whole volume of it, largely needed for the production of materials for national defence. They are certainly playing right into the hands of the Fair Deal administration and if they have their way, more and more electricity of steam plant generation will have to be provided for industry in the Lake Erie end of the State of New York. While Washington manoeuvers wasted very precious time, Ontario has already started to roll up steam shovels on its new Niagara Plant and are ready

to do the same thing with the St. Lawrence Development. I believe that the Hydro Commission will have their plant in Niagara Falls in full operation at least 3 to 5 years before the Project on the other side of the River is completed.

Such a prospect brings into sharp relief, Article 8 of the Niagara Treaty between the United States and Canada, which reads "until such a time as there are facilities in the territory of one party to use its full share of the diversions of water for power purposes agreed upon in this Treaty, the other party may use the portion of that share for the use of which facilities are now available". That is to say, the Ontario Plant, completed as it undoubtedly will be before the plant on the other side of the River, will be free to use the diversion for the United States as well as that allotted to Canada, until such time as the American Plant is ready to begin operations. With so great a shortage of power in Ontario, there can be no doubt that the Hydro Commission would use the available diversions to the limit of its development facilities.

We will have in operation two plants at Queenston and others at Niagara Falls and Decew Falls and the United States Government should hang its head in shame when it sees the Ontario Commission is delivering to industry in the Province, power developed from water allotted to the United States. Water which should be generating electricity for New York industry. This, we should not be blamed for, but it only goes to show that we are aggressive and doing our best to meet the demands for power and industry and domestic use.

As President Truman said in his message to Congress pertaining to the Seaway, and Power Block and I quote "it seems inconceivable to me that the Congress should allow any local or special interest to divest our Country of its rightful place in the joint development of the St. Lawrence River in the interests of all the people in the United States". It was the second time in that week President Truman had urged Congressional action, on the long disputed block. H e reminded Congress again that the Canadian Government has officially proposed if Congress does not approve the 1941 Agreement dealing with the Project, to construct the Seaway at least as a Canadian undertaking alone. This, he said, would be done simultaneously along with the construction of the power phase of the development by Ontario in association with an appropriate agency in the United States. President Truman has continually supported the St. Lawrence proposal since 1935. It is a source of pride to me and perhaps more so than to most of the Members of the House, because I happened to be born and lived in the United States for many years, that this Project alone is further proof that Canada can move more rapidly in many ways than the United States. We in Niagara Falls know that Hydro is working and doing its best in preparation to generate power on a vast scale from the Niagara River. While nothing along that line has been done across the river in New York State there is a fight in progress between those who favour public and private generation of the water of the Niagara for power purposes and at the present time it seems that a complete deadlock has been reached. In Canada the whole thing not only in regard to the Niagara but the St. Lawrence as well, has been arranged by

co-operative negotiations between our Federal and Provincial Government, while across the line, may I again repeat, it seems to have become a political issue and will remain there for a long time, in spite of the urgent need for power and the navigation of the St. Lawrence. Governor Dewey of New York has repeatedly said, that further delay of the St. Lawrence would be a crime. He claims that each year's delay costs New Yorkers at least 50 million dollars extra in their electric bill. He states that New York stands ready, willing and able to develop St. Lawrence power jointly with the Canadian Province of Ontario and this, at no cost to the taxpayer.

He says that to proceed with the power project which is still being blocked, by what he terms, a stubborn group of Empire Builders in the United States Department, all that is needed as far as New York State is concerned, is a license from the Federal Power Commission and approval for the power development.

GREAT ADVANTAGES

Development of the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project would have a profound effect on the economic development of Canada and especially Ontario. The development would:

1. Permit large deposits of high grade iron ore in Labrador and Northern Quebec to be moved economically to the Great Lakes steel centres;

2. Provide a low-cost method of transporting bulk goods to the heart of the North American continent;

3. Enable the well-protected Great Lakes shipyards to build ocean-going vessels and conduct a greater range of repairs;

4. St. Lawrence power would maintain and stimulate industrial growth;

5. Save the heavy expense of extending steam-generating facilities to meet soaring demands in Ontario.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project is an inevitable great and important development in the progress of North America.

I am very happy indeed to say, as my Leader said so well the other day, that we here in Opposition stand ready to support this Bill and complimentary Bill, to the fullest extent. We feel that it is definitely a step in the right direction and when this power is generated, that Ontario will virtually be an arsenal for industry and because of this could and will step ahead by leaps and bounds because of the foresight, the aggressiveness and the faith of our Governments in the future of Canada and Ontario.

Again may I repeat, that we as Honourable Members of this Legislature, should consider it a distinct and high honour that we are part of the 24th Legislature, approving of these two historical bills.

(TAKE "F" FOLLOWS)

MR. C.G. MACODRUM (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Prime Minister, may I as a new member be permitted to digress for a moment in that I wish personally to express to all the older members of this House my personal appreciation for the assistance and the co-operation and, shall I say, the many charitable acts which have been extended to me and perhaps it is not without signifance that those two words "charitable" and "acts" played a very large part in the avalanche which took place in a by-election on January 22nd last.

Mr. Speaker as the representative for the County of Leeds and living, as I do, in the Town of Brockville - also known as the "City of the 1000 Islands", I welcome this early opportunity of speaking in support of the historic legislation presently before the House.

At the outset, I wish to pay tribute to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and assure him, as the good people in the County of Leeds did on November 22nd last, that we who live along the banks of the mighty and majestic St. Lawrence that winds its course 1000 miles to the sea, are not unmindful of the forthright action which the government - under his able and inspired leadership, has given, and is continuing to give, in the matter of the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Development.

The successful man has a plan and the hon. Prime Minister has clearly demonstrated that his government has a plan for the development of the St. Lawrence

project and that he, too, has the vision and faith in this grand and great Province of Ontario to carry through the Hydro project to a successful completion, in spite of adversities which have and will be faced as the plan moves steadily onward.

I am not minimizing the effort which has and is being put forward by the Federal authorities working in close cooperation with the Provincial Government for the building of a greater Canada, yet the facts are that immediately on the rejection of the Seaway plan in July, 1951, by the American Congress, the Ontario Government, under the hon. Prime Minister, proposed an agreement with the Federal Government to go ahead ourselves. An agreement was arrived at almost immediately. Canada and Ontario have indeed served notice on the United States in unequivocal terms of their intention to proceed alone, if necessary. The Seaway, with its vast power and industrial possibilities, staggers one's imagination - but it will become a fact, a reality that we of this generation will see and enjoy.

Our Province is ready for and in need of industry - power brings industry and industry brings people. A striking illustration of lack of industry and retarded growth may be found in taking a brief glance at the history of my own Town of Brockville. When reviewing the growth of population of the Town of Brockville since Confederation, it is noted that in 1871 the Dominion Census indicates 5,102. A fair growth took place up until 1911, when the figure stood at 9,374, but from

1911 to 1951, the growth has only been approximately 2,500, in that the 1951 census indicates 11,843. This strikingly illustrates that the area comprising the Town of Brockville needs the stimulation of industry and there are already signs that industry is itself awaking to the fact that Brockville and the County of Leeds will be in the forefront of this great power development in that at the present time plants representing hundreds of millions of dollars are presently negotiating, and in some instances, actually in the course of construction within a fifteen mile radius of Brockville. The population of Brockville has already soared beyond the figure of 11,843 and will continue to soar.

An example of what industry can do for a municipality or area is illustrated from the results published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for the City of Kingston, which is 50 miles west of the Town of Brockville - a city, which, in my humble opinion, is well and ably represented in this House by my friend of many years, the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickel). In 1871 the population of Kingston was 12,407, and in 1931, 23,489. However, in 1940 the Aluminum Company of Canada established in Kingston, and in 1942 the Canadian Industries Limited Nylon Plant - with the consequence that in 1951 the population was shown at 42,437.

With the great resources of the St. Lawrence Development there is no reason why there should not be

and every indication that there will be a similar extersion along the entire territory from the power site to Prescott, Brockville, Gananoque, and the Bay of Quinte territory, as indeed to all parts of this great Province.

As a stimulus to all this, the recent magnetometer surveys made by the Ontario Department of Mines has revealed large masses of iron are existing at a number of points in Eastern Ontario. One of these is now being developed by the Bethlehem Steel Corporation of the United States, who, it is believed, will transport their ore to a point on the Bay of Quinte near Picton, where boats of deep draught will be able to transport it to steel mills, not only in Canada, but to plants in the United States. I would at this time particularly emphasize that this is but a forerunner of what is to come. The area is large, the minerals are diversified, and if we can have our people concentrate on the value of our natural resources, and their significance to the well-being of the people in Eastern Ontario great strides can be made.

However, I again emphasize with all the power at my command that it must be kept in mind that the first move to be made is an adequate and dependable source of power. Population, as I have stated, cannot be developed except through the medium of industry. Once industry is established, employment will be increased and population will rise. The servicing of homes, etc. of course is secondary - industry is primary, and if the County of Leeds and Eastern Ontario is to assume its

proper place in the general development of Ontario and the Dominion as a whole we, who are privileged to live in that part of the Province must forthwith look toward the development of our minerals, natural resources, manufacturing and agriculture. Through the medium of St. Lawrence Power, this can and will be accomplished.

With the completion of the St. Lawrence Waterway a channel capable of carrying boats with a draught of 27 feet can come to Brockville from all ports of the World. I am reliably informed that a 27 foot draught means that more than 90% of all the commerce of the world could dock at Brockville and in many instances bring in raw materials from all parts of the World that are not produced in Canada for the manufacture of goods by the use of power from the development on the Canadian side, at or near Cornwall, thus giving employment to a vast number of Canadians. An example of this is the aluminum industry at Arvida, where all the raw material is brought in from the Caribbean and South America, using Canadian power to place this country in the foremost position in the entire world, as far as aluminum production is concerned. Is it any wonder that, as the representative for the County of Leeds, I not only commend the Government under the hon. Prime Minister for the dynamic leadership which has already spearheaded this development but which has, in unmistakable words, told our good friends across the border that we are determined that this great power development must and will go forward.

It is true, and I emphasize, that the Towns of Brockville, Gananoque - indeed the County of Leeds - are in a particularly fortunate position with respect to the utilization of the St. Lawrence River Power. This area will be located within reasonable transmission distance, will have deep water to its doors, permitting docks of adequate dimensions, and situated geogra-phically almost midway betwe n the two largest cities in the Dominion. Further, I believe that the Town of Brockville is the nearest Town to New York City, which, when considered that it is backed up by excellent smaller communities within a radius of 40 to 50 miles, together with excellent agriculture - leaves my Town of Brockville and our sister Town of Gananoque in a very enviable position.

When supporting this historic legislation I wish to pay my personal tribute to a man, who in my opinion, has and is rendering a service to the people of Ontario, that only history will give proper credit to, and I refer to the hon. Vice-Chairman of the Ontario Hydro Commission the hon. member from Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies). Beyond peradventure of any honest doubt, I am satisfied that all members of this Honour-able House, regardless of party affiliations, will agree that he has made, and is making a very real contribution to the people of Ontario, particularly in this matter of St. Lawrence Hydro Development.

MR. W. M. NICKLE (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, on the 3rd of June, 1673, Count Frontenac set out from Quebec taking a look at the various posts along the St. Lawrence River. He reached Montreal on the 15th of June. On the 30th, with a force of some 400 French and Indians in 120 canoes and some flat boats, he set out to navigate the River. The rapids involved prodigious labour. On July 12th, Count Frontenac reached the head of the River rounding Cedar Island and saw a sight that was to be historic -- Kingston.

Ever since the days when Frontenac, that intrepid mariner, first pitched his tents on the banks of the St. Lawrence River where Kingston now stands, Kingston has played an important part in the industrial, educational and military development of Ontario. What Frontenac found as an obstacle to progress -- the rapid flow of the St. Lawrence against him -- we, in our time, are turning into an asset for the development of power.

On August 1st, 1951, we had in Kingston what was known as "Diesel Day". It was the occasion on which we celebrated the first diesel engine that had been manufactured by the Canadian Locomotive Company. I suppose that it is fair to say that here was a new

piece of mechanical equipment that was going to take the place of the old locomotive to move in all directions railway equipment across this great dominion. August 1st was a beautiful day -- there was not a cloud in the sky. The ceremony for the new diesel engine took place on the C.P.R. siding in Kingston. The then Prime Minister of Ontario, and still Prime Minister of Ontario,on that day made a short but very important speech. As he rose from his place on the platform, I can understand the thoughts which inspired him as he looked ahead and saw our grand city hall, built many years ago, when those in municipal authority in my riding hoped that Kingston would be the capital of the Dominion. On the Prime Minister's right was Fort Henry, plainly visible to him, with its cannon easily to be seen, which fort was built to defend this country against possible attack by the forces of the United States of America in 1812. Immediately behind the Prime Minister were two Martello towers constructed for the same reason as was Fort Henry and within 100 yards of where the Prime Minister stood was the St. Lawrence River, bounded on the far side by Wolfe, Howe and Amherst Islands. I am sure that as the Prime Minister looked at the Canadian part of

the head of the mighty St. Lawrence River where it commenced its majestic flow to the sea, he thought of the great potential possibilities for power that the St. Lawrence could give to the people of Ontario for on this occasion, he made a great and memorable statement on that bright and famous August afternoon when he said, "The power development of the St. Lawrence is just as certain and definite as the sun that shines above us this afternoon".

Last week there was a meeting in Toronto of the municipal representatives of local Public Utilities Commissions and their managers. Kingston was well represented by Mr. James Halliday, a strictly honourable man, not given to many words, who, with his colleagues, has devoted himself whole-heartedly to the welfare of the citizens of Kingston as a member for a great number of years of the Kingston Public Utilities Commission, always supporting, in and out of season, the power development of the St. Lawrence.

An outstanding physical characteristic, from the water power standpoint, of the St. Lawrence is the dependability and uniformity of its flow. In this respect it undoubtedly ranks as the most important of the larger rivers of the world. You know, Mr.

Speaker, that Lake Ontario empties into the St. Lawrence River at Kingston. Lake Ontario, in itself, is a huge reservoir or regulating basin 7,500 square miles in extent and the drainage area of the St. Lawrence being over 300,000 square miles, places it at once among the large rivers of the world. With respect to its ordinary and low water flows, it ranks among the first and it is probably correct to say that its dependable flow is greater than that of any river in existence which is adapted to power development. It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that the higher speeds of flow do not obtain merely over a period of a few days, weeks or months as in the case of ordinary rivers, but actually obtain at times over a period of successive years.

At this point, may I express the hope that the elected representatives of the people for the State of New York, our enemy in 1812, and now our proven friend, will join with this Province in the overall power development of the St. Lawrence which will mean so much to all hourly paid employees in the State of New York and the Province of Ontario. What was thought to be a sound expenditure of public funds for the building of Fort Henry and the Martello

towers which I mentioned a moment ago, are now, I should tell you, buildings which attract tourists from our friends to the south who, like ourselves, in this day and generation wonder how our forefathers could ever have thought that we could have waged a war against each other.

The City of Kingston had prior to 1940 a moderate growth, which is shown by the Canada Year Book to have populations as indicated:

1871	12,407
1891	19,263
1911	18,873
1931	23,489
1941	30,126
1951	43,437

However, in the year 1940 the Aluminum Company of Canada established at Kingston their plant for the manufacture of sheets, tubes, extrusions, etc., followed in 1942 by the establishment of the Canadian Industries Limited nylon plant. These two organizations have had a very profound effect, not only on Kingston, but on the whole territory lying from Gananoque on the east, to Napanee and Deseronto on the west. An analysis as to this effect may be indicated by the following figures:

	1938	1947
Industries	63	52
Employees	1,236	5,345
Wages and salaries	$1,159,094	$10,043,256
Cost of materials	$2,199,712	$17,469,294
Value of electricity	$ 132,122	$ 1,002,974
Value of products	$4,240,070	$40,881,799

I wish to emphasize particularly the increase in the number of employees between 1938 and 1947, which is the latest year I can get statistics from the Dominion Bureau. This represented an increase of 362%, and an increase in wages paid of 765%. The provincial average during this period is of interest. Employees, 1938, for the whole Province 642,016 - salaries $705,668,589. Employees, 1947 - 1,131,750 - salaries, 1947 - $2,085,923,966. You will note that the number of employees increased during this period by 76% and the salaries and wages increased by 196%, whereas as previously stated, this same picture for Kingston represents many times that of the Provincial average both in employees and in wages paid.

You will note further that the power supplied to industries in Kingston in 1938 only had a value of $132,000., whereas in 1947 this exceeded $1,000,000.

The increase in population I can assure you does not represent the total picture, because at the present time the industries in Kingston are to a great extent being supplied by labour from the small communities all around Kingston who are transported daily

for distances up to 30 miles, which would indicate that in the future the population will naturally rise in Kingston due to labour establishing their homes in this locality.

I wish to emphasize that this could only have been done by having ample supplies of low cost electricity available. While this was accomplished during a period of less than ten years and without the influence of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the future industrial expansion in Kingston together with the Seaway will undoubtedly produce an expansion in this area probably beyond the imagination of most people.

It should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that St. Lawrence water power will be cheaper than steam power and cheaper than Niagara power. We have the engineering ability, construction ability and the financial ability to proceed with the St. Lawrence development and, in my opinion, we should get along with this development at once.

To develop steam power costs three times more than the St. Lawrence power will cost when developed. The financing of this tremendous power project will not cost the taxpayers of the Province a single penny - and will not come out of what I might call the medium of taxes but will be paid for by the users of this power.

Let me give you some information in relation to the hydro-electric situation in Kingston:

	1931	1941
Assets of Plant	$801,281.37	$ 1,207,903.88
Other Assets	264,620.63	335,450.48
Total Assets (Excluding Equity)	1,065,902.00	1,543,354.36
Debentures Outstanding	204,938.50	48,071.00
Average Cost Per K.W.H. Cents		
Domestic	1.975	1.089
Commercial	1.834	1.207
Power	1.209	0.904
Total Number of Customers	6,562	8,205

1950	1951
$ 2,025,462.45	$2,140,091.90
378,446.18	229,357.91
2,404,908.63	2,369,449.81
-	-
0.833	0.856
1,141	1.132
0.878	0.816
11,277	11,883

We must have faith in ourselves, faith in our Province and faith in the elected representatives to this House, plus the courage to take the necessary financial step to develop the St. Lawrence power. The future welfare of this Province should be approached from a non-partisan viewpoint. One million, one hundred

thousand horse power will be developed out of the St. Lawrence project which is more than is presently being developed from the power at Niagara.

The question of atomic power is something that may be used when our grandchildren take our places. Atomic energy is something that may be of great use to all of us in the future. It is one of the good things that have come out of the terrible man power sacrifice of dead, maimed and wounded men in the second great war. At the present rate of demand for power in this Province, no more will be available after 1954. The St. Lawrence development is therefore a "must" which will stabilize to a great extent the cost of electric energy to Eastern Ontario. Industry goes to power, not power to industry. Industry likes to be reasonably close to the source of power and the St. Lawrence development should and will, mean great industrial expansion in the city of Kingston.

Old Man Ontario believed what the Prime Minister of this Province said at Kingston on August 1st. This historic statement has resulted in the legislation now before the House for discussion and is going to become a reality.

During my election campaign in Kingston, I made a promise that I would do my duty as I saw it, proud to represent Kingston which is an historical part of Canada, an outpost of Empire, and recognizing that promise, it is my duty to support this Bill - and I do.

(Take G follows)

MR. R. MACAULAY (Riverdale): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like, if I may, to approach the problem and topic before this House in a slightly different manner, perhaps, than those who have spoken before me. I would, if I might, speak upon this matter from the point of view not of the city in which I live, which is of great importance to me,and which, no doubt, will be spoken of by other hon. members of this House, but rather from the point of view of the Province itself. When doing so, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I may be excused by hon. members of this House when I use the phraseology "Dominion" and "Province". I realize that our Federal Government has expunged the word "Dominion" from all documents of state, and perhaps from our statutes, but I think perhaps I may be given some leeway by virtue of the fact that a gentleman for whom I have the greatest respect, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) has used the word nineteen times, I notice, in his speech the other day, which shows, I think, a certain presence of mind and individuality.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I might indicate to this House that it would appear that Canada has long had the dream of a seaway from the Atlantic coast to the heart of the nation. Water transportation is

at present the cheapest form of transportation, and for a long time was our only form of transportation. Truly I would say, sir, that the St. Lawrence seaway project is to Canada in the twentieth century the challenge of the century, both physically and economically. There are those, and reference has been made to them, who would debase and decry this project, perhaps under the facade of expense or regional reasons. Perhaps, also, those are the same men who are descended from those who read an editorial, which was of interest to me, contained in the Ottawa Morning Journal in 1881:

> "The Canadian Pacific Railway will run, if it is ever finished, through country frost-bound for seven months of the year, and will connect with the western part of the Dominion a province which embraces about as forbidding a country as any on the face of the earth."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope as Canadian citizens and as citizens of this Province, that we may be worthy of our heritage, and that we may not be, sir, a land or a province of myopics. We have, indeed, a great heritage, we boast of our future and our potentialities, and I think we take tremendous pride in our consciousness toward international trade. We do truly, sir, stand upon the sill both of prosperity and posterity. We are on the hearth of economic wealth,

there is an axiom, the source of which I have long since forgotten, which goes, "He who would eat the kernel, must also crack the nut," and I sincerely suggest, sir, that that is equally true of the people of this great nation.

We have in Canada a tremendous net of waterways, to which reference has been made, a large part of which is to be found within the Province of Ontario, and which presents to us, sir, possibilities of immense proportions, both in water communications and power projects. With reference, for a moment, to water communication alone, travelling from Montreal to the Eastern Seaboard, there is a channel approximately 35 feet in depth; travelling from Prescott to the head of the lakes, there is a channel to the depth of 27 feet; but between Montreal, sir, and Prescott, there is a bottleneck which, like most others, has two sides, that is to say, we must circumvent it for water communication, but the bottleneck itself presents tremendous power possibilities which we must learn to harness. Ships of 20,000 tons or more can travel east to the Atlantic from Montreal, and of the same tonnage from Prescott to the heads of the lake district, but unfortunately between Montreal and Prescott only ships of 3,000 tons, or approximately that, may travel.

Now, as has been said by the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies), we can build the water communications so much desired and deserved by this great nation without the help of the United States. We do not need their help, but we do invite it. We cannot, however, build the power projects without their assistance, and we do invite that.

Reference has been made by my leader, the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to the tremendous capacity of the Soo locks, which I think is astounding when one realizes, as was indicated, that 122 million tons of shipping during the short period of time in every year, are carried through those locks, a greater amount, Mr. Speaker, than all that carried in twelve months through the Panama, Suez, Manchester, Kiel, and St. Lawrence--the St. Lawrence channel, actually, not the river itself. Of the 122 million, approximately 92 million tons consists of iron ore from which comes a great part of our economy.

With reference now, Mr. Speaker, to the physical aspects of the canals themselves, ships must be lifted from Montreal to Prescott 226 feet, from Lake Ontario to Lake Erie 326 feet, and from Lake Huron to Lake Superior 21 feet. As has been indicated

by several of my hon. colleagues who have spoken before me, the fourteen-foot canal through the St. Lawrence now carries approximately ten million tons of shipping a year, but it is estimated that if deepened to 28 feet, it would be competent to, and will carry approximately 45 to 50 million tons a year. I think even the most meager imagination can envisage the tremendous expansion, exertion and stimulus that this increased tonnage will bring to the industries and thus to this Province. Perhaps ports will be created where ports do not now exist, small harbours will be broadened to receive the shipping of the world, and in any event I think it incontestable that the economy of this vast and wealthy province will be broadened and strengthened almost beyond imagination. But we also need power, and, apart from shipping water communication, such power is in existence and can be created in fact from the region of the international rapids to the extent was indicated of 2,200,000 horsepower, of which half would belong to this province, and which half, Mr. Speaker, is 45% of the total power available in the Province of Ontario, both by production and by purchase. We must either plan now to turn to the St. Lawrence Seaway for power, or else we must in a few years be forced to turn to other sources which are not now apparent, and nature,

sir, has given us a form of power in the St. Lawrence at a discount, in fact at one-half of the cost, at most, of man-made power by coal.

Against all this, sir, of course must be cast the costs of these generalizations. In the terms of 1952 dollars, equated thereto, the Dominion of Canada has spent approximately a billion dollars on canal development in Canada. Ontario's share with reference to the development of Hydro power, will be approximately $200 to $250 million. But what none of us must forget is that in twenty years the Panama Canal paid for itself, and with the developing, widening and deepening of the Danube River, for example, tonnage and passenger traffic increased to five times what it had been before the development, the length of ship was increased to ten times, and transportation costs were cut by four-fifths.

It has been indicated to us by those much more experienced than myself that we as a Province and as a nation are capable and competent to carry the financial load involved in these projects. The real question, however, sir, is not whether we can afford the projects, but whether we can afford not to carry them out. It has been said by many that

our national defence program will be crimped, but that does not appear to be so. With reference to steel and concrete, or cement alone, if the amount of steel to be consumed in the seaway were to be spread over a period of six years, which it inevitably will be, it would amount in any one year to only three percent of what is normally in this country consumed, and in the case of cement, only five percent.

Therefore, in conclusion, sir, I would just like to say with reference to: "What will all of this produce, both for the Province of Ontario and this nation in which we live?", firstly, transportation costs will be cut because the majority of the transport which will be carried from east to west will be of iron ore, and thus the return cargoes will travel to the east of this nation at a decreased rate. We cannot lessen the cost of transportation of wheat and grain from the Prairies to the Lakehead, but we can, and with the seaway will, reduce the cost of transportation from the Lakehead to the markets of the world, and will thereby decrease the price asked and surely increase the markets available.

Perhaps many of us do not realize it, but B.C. lumber now travels to Montreal through the Panama

Canal, rather than crossing the heart of this nation, and with the decreased cost of transportation from west to east, our lumber from the western border of this nation will find its way to the markets of the world at a decreased cost by travelling extensively and solely through our own nation.

The United States has developed its entire mineral wealth from the Cambrian Shield which is only five percent of its national territory. In Canada the Cambrian Shield lies from coast to coast and provides us with a mineral potentiality nineteen times that of the United States. I would suggest, sir, that when the potentialities of this country emerge from the cocoon stage into reality, the world's markets will be breathless in view of what will be accomplished.

(Take "H" follows)

I really and most sincerely feel that if we are going to think like giants,.

Steel and iron are the two commodities on which the sole greatness of this country depends in the future. Steel may well be the latchkey to prosperity as far as this nation is concerned. There is no doubt that iron ore is the womb out of which steel is born. It has been said with reference to the iron fields around the Great Lakes that they are not diminishing, and therefore, why should be worry about them elsewhere? The fact is, they are not, and that can be admitted, but they are operating at optimum, and it will increase the cost of steel. That is why it is so important to develop the Labrador Iron Fields; these fields, it is estimated, will produce ten million tons of iron ore a year without the seaway, but with the seaway twenty million tons.

We must realize that 75% to 85% of the steel produced in the United States is produced in the Great Lakes area, and that is why it is so fundamental, so cardinal, to produce and develop a water course from the source of supply to the heart of the industry. In addition, the canal facilities will release much shipping, because all ships but the largest

will be able to traverse the length of this communication and trans-shipment will be avoided in grain, lumber and oil.

As has been suggested by the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and others who have preceded me, there is the importance of both power and the seaway to international defence.

Mr. Speaker, the power project and the seaway will affect every community, every municipality within this great province, it does not matter whether they be a township or an urban area, or whether they be adjacent to the line or run of the communication, -- that is the seaway -- or close to the power project. Every municipality will benefit, not only the great industrial cities along the way, but all, no matter how far north they may lie.

In closing, I would like to say that I think we should be very grateful in view of the tremendous ramifications of these great projects, that lie in the capable and responsible hands of the Hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) who long ago proved himself capable of carrying the heavy responsibility.

It has been said, I believe it was Malvoleo who said in Twelfth Night, "Some are born great; some

achieve greatness and some have greatness thrust upon them." No matter what else may be said of us as citizens in a nation and in a province, let it at least be said that we were born great, that we achieved greatness, and that we did not stand idly by while greatness was thrust upon us.

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): Mr.Speaker, I do not know how some of the other hon. members feel, particularly those that come from small places as I do, but some of the figures we have heard this afternoon have made me a little groggy. I would like to say it is a real privilege for me to have the opportunity of discussing this very important project, this St. Lawrence seaway project. I have followed this with great interest during the past several years, and particularly in connection with our Government and our Ontario Hydro. This project has been the subject of many long discussions, and it would appear that now the time has arrived to finalize this thing and get on with the job. To the average man on the street, I do not believe they have a simple explanation of the difference between the navigation part of the project and the hydro-electric section. For the benefit of the fellow that may be thinking as I was, I would like to say that the

Dominion and Provincial Governments have decided between themselves, and very amicably, that they will go on with the Hydro, but the navigation part is strictly up to the Dominion Government, either as an all-Canadian venture, or in co-operation with the United States. It is a mighty fine thing to see the good spirit and the strides that have been made and are being made between our Dominion Government and the Province of Ontario. In my opinion this is due in no small part to the understanding and leadership of our Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). It seems that although we may have different views politically so far as the province and dominion are concerned, when it comes to a showdown on a matter of real importance, then we can get together for the common good of all Canadians.

The Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is to be congratulated on this stand in developing the St. Lawrence.

Ontario has become a terrific user of electric power. The Hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) has certainly given us an explanation of that, and certainly it does not need repeating. However, we are in the fortunate position of having a great natural water-way, and to date no other source of power

has been found to equal the simple flow of water under a bridge or any other way you wish to put it. This power is cheap, it is natural, it will last as long as the world goes on. We are indeed in a very fortunate position to live right here with this great natural water-way. Recently in Toronto, as you know, we erected a steam generating plant which was a big job, at a terrific expense. As I said before, I am not very good on figures, so I will not tell you what it costs, but I do know to generate electric power through the use of coal takes two and one-half times more money than it does to have it the natural way. Consequently we must proceed and look to the future and make every possible use of this heritage of ours, the natural water system.

(Take "I" follows)

According to the very best authorities, if we do not proceed with the further expansion of Hydro insofar as the St. Lawrence is concerned, the experts say that if we do not proceed with this, we are going to be short of power by 1954, and even if we do proceed with it, Mr. Speaker, in all probability by the time 1956 rolls around, we will have to look to other fields. The tremendous growth and development of this rich province of ours is going to necessitate more and more ways and means of locating power, so it is not only a question of proceeding with this project; it is getting on with the job, casting our eyes ahead, and having enough vision and foresight to find other locations where we can get more electric power.

The development in the Toronto area affects all parts of Canada from an economic point of view and although the expenditure is terrific, Mr. Speaker, the influx of people to this area, the many industries large and small, which are locating in the Toronto area -- and, Mr. Speaker, incidentally, when I refer to the "Toronto area", I want my friends in the other twelve municipalities to feel that I am including them, too, and that here we will be just one big happy family---

it shows that the growth of industry has been terrific and it is going to continue to be that way.

Insofar as the seaway project is concerned, it has been definitely stated by the spokesman for the government of Canada that tolls will be charged sufficient to take care of expenditures and to pay operating costs of the development. Canada, recognized by all the world as being on the threshold of a great industrial expansion, with its great natural resources scarcely tapped, will throw open a seaway of over two thousand miles to the commerce of the world, and practically all will be closed to undersea craft in the event of war.

Mr. Speaker, let us give that some serious thought. We have two thousand miles of deep-sea waterway that can be completely closed off in the event of war, and it could supply Canada and the United States, and, after all, this would be, as before, the arsenal of the free world. We could carry on our work of defence and provide that defence without going out into the open ocean. That is one of the most important points, I think, Mr. Speaker.

Incidentally, one-half of all the deep-sea commerce of Canada will come through the Great Lakes system, then the project is completed. One-quarter of

all the deep-sea commerce for the United States -- one-quarter of the United States' deep-sea commerce would come through the Great Lakes system -- something terrific to think about. The St. Lawrence Deep Water and Power Project is inevitable. We are going to have it, we are unanimously agreed, all of us in this House.
Mr. Speaker, for a newcomer, it is a wonderful thing to see the way the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) and his Party get on with this thing and discuss it on a sensible, intelligent, friendly basis for the good of everyone, as I said before.

Speaking of the terrific development in Labrador -- and we have read a great deal, Mr. Speaker, about this development for the past several months -- I have been rather interested in this iron ore proposition from up on the border of Labrador and Quebec. I cut a piece out of the Globe and Mail the other day and I would like to read it now. It is on the financial page. It says:

"Last summer when I went over the district (he is referring to the iron ore district in Labrador)

> and visited some drop-off points as well as the three hundred-mile railroad, four hundred million tons of iron ore were still mentioned as approved, but it was plain that geologist, Dr. Moss and the chief executives, were no longer worried about ore, knowing that as soon

> as transportation and markets were fully assured, they had enormous territorities of likely iron treasure to tap. One can expect eight billion tons over the next century".

Mr. Speaker: -- eight billion tons over the next century. Would we hold back progress like that from Canada and the United States? I do not think so hon. members.

I am very pleased to see that the hon. Prime Minister take time out to read the "Saturday Evening Post" because I had the same article cut out too, and, you know, it is very funny, Mr. Speaker, that often we read about the help we get from the United States and certainly I am a great friend of the American people. I have had an opportunity to travel extensively through the tates and I like them very much, but I do believe that the time has come when we, as Canadians, should grow up and put on the long trousers and proceed to do something on our own. For so many years so many of us have said:

> "Let us get the experts from the United States".

Once again, I refer to Toronto. When we begin to check over some of the City's business, someone always suggests that we ask the experts in from the States, and, Mr. Speaker, I remember just a day or two ago when the

hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) said that an expert is somebody that is with us from out of town and I would like to apply the same thing here.

Certainly we are friendly with the United States; we want their help and co-operation, but we do not need them to come over and tell us how to run our show, and when you read something in an editorial appearing in the Saturday Evening Post of March 1st, 1952, like this:

> "As to Canada's threat to build a seaway alone, there are commentators who say that any time a country wants to spend its own money without any contribution from the United States, this we must see, if strictly from amazement".

Mr. Speaker, we are going to amaze them this time, I feel quite sure.

You will recall reading in the paper some little time ago -- and we get back to the United States again because it makes a good topic of conversation -- about the Senator in Illinois who suggested that possibly they should annex Canada. Well, I do not like to think that that is the general opinion down there, but, believe me, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of people think Canada, and especially Ontario,is just a strip of snow-bound country north of the Great Lakes, and if we proceed with this great seaway project, a lot of people are going to get an idea that we are a

great, big, powerful nation, and that is just exactly what we are.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I was going to say a word about our own government and the Ontario Hydro. I wonder sometimes if the Hydro and possibly the government have done just as good a job of public relations as they might have done. I wonder if the average man on the street has just a simple explanation of what this is all about.

You read the papers and magazines and it is the Great Lakes Seaway Project and the man next door says: "That is fine, I hope it goes through, I do not know what it is all about, but that is it". I think we could do a little more and I like to think we can do a little better public relations job, for the average fellow, for the average man, for the average voter. Tell him what we are actually trying to do in simple terms, show him how it is going to benefit him, how it is going to benefit his children. It is all very well, Mr. Speaker, to say the bond issues are $300,000,000. and $900,000,000. That is fine, but the average man is interested in how he will personally benefit from such a project and I think it would be good business for us to proceed along those lines of telling him what the benefits are.

(Page I-7 follows.)

I have enough faith that our Canadian citizens will think this thing out for themselves if they are given some simple basis from which to start.

Naturally it is a great ocean port -- and I am going to refer to Toronto, Mr. Speaker. There are two or three observations I would like to make there. Naturally, it is a great ocean port here in Toronto, big with the industrial expansion. The greater Toronto area will see a great development. We had a discussion last year concerning the eastern section of our city, Mr. Speaker, and actually concerning the eqstern beaches. My colleague from the beaches will recall that. We have been talking cleaning up the beaches in the eastern section of Toronto for years. Now, here is the opportunity. If the project goes on as it is proposed, and there is no doubt in my mind that it will, the eastern sea-wall will go away down there to the east end of Toronto, and, Mr. Speaker, it will go a long way towards cleaning up that eastern section of the city. It will tie in what we call the "Keating Street Extension" down there around the Woodbine Racetrack and people again will be able to use the beaches and enjoy the recreation they should have.

Mr. Speaker, one other thing is traffic.

We have, as you know, a traffic problem in Toronto particularly in the downtown area. The experts just do not feel that in downtown Toronto we can stand any more industry, heavy or light; in other words, we cannot get the people down to central Toronto to work there -- they cannot bring their cars. It just won't stand it.

When you consider places -- and I refer to North York, for example, and it is well known that North York is an obviously residential municipality. There are a lot of homes up there. Just imagine in North York the great industrial development there could be.

(Page J-1 follows)

Mr. Speaker, the industries we could get into that section of the Greater Toronto area, would do a great deal to help reduce the taxes of the locality, and that is one thing that we want to do. We have a great many areas around Toronto into which industry can go, and it is a plain as the nose on your face that some day we will see Toronto grow into a greater metropolis than New York or Chicago, as they have nothing in those cities which we have not got here, and the St. Lawrence Seaway is one of the things which will bring that about.

When I was preparing my speech, I let my imagination run away with me. I had been speaking to one of the senior hon. members, and he said to me, "Make a few notes and then let your imagination take hold of it." One of the things which I imagined was seeing that great, stately, "Queen Mary", coming into Toronto Harbour, but then I remembered that the draft was only twenty-seven feet, and that the "Queen Mary" was probably a little deeper than that, and it would not be possible for it to get into the harbour. But, the average ocean-going vessel can then come into a port like Toronto, and the people here could hop on her, go down the St.Lawrence, and across to the Old Country for their business or pleasure.

Mr. Speaker, these things are actualities; they can take place, if we proceed with some action on the seaway.

I do not think any hon. member in this House liked the power shortage we had during and after the last war. Every once in a while, Mr. R. H. Saunders, the Chairman of The Hydro Commission, told us that we had to conserve electric power because we did not have enough. We cannot go back to those days; we must proceed; we must go on with this power project. That is the only way. We have been told by the experts that for the present and up until 1956 the St. Lawrence Seaway is a "must". After 1956, we will have to look for other fields.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that possibly the essential benefits from such a project may not affect us too materially, but I am firmly convinced that the necessity for proceeding with the St.Lawrence Seaway and the hydro-electric power system is a very important "must" in the development of this Province of Ontario. I know if we have this development, and proceed with the harbour development in the City of Toronto, and with this hydro development, whether it be all-Canadian or not, that in the years to come we will have the most

prosperous country, economically and industrially, that there is in the world, because it will provide a natural way to reach the western part of Canada and many of the Western States of the Union, and to me, the cheapest way to provide that, is by the development of electric power.

Let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, that whereas this great Province of Ontario will benefit all along the line, from Prescott to the head of the lakes, it will also benefit greatly some six or eight states of the United States, so let us not hesitate in connection with this opportunity; it is a golden opportunity, and I deem it an honour and a privilege to be a member of this House when such an historic event is taking place, and in the years to come, we will all be proud that we had a part in the development of this great project.

MR. SPEAKER: It being six of the clock, I do now leave the Chair.

At six of the clock p.m., the House took recess.

- - - - - - - -

ONTARIO

First Session
of the
Twenty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 21, 1952, et seq.

0

Volume X

Wednesday March 5, 1952.

(Evening Session)

0

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

R. C. Sturgeon,
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

Toronto, Ontario,
Wednesday, March 5th, 1952.

8 o'clock, p.m.

The House resumed.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. PETER MANLEY (Stormont): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the Bill before the House at the present time, I would like to congratulate you on the high honour which you have attained in being chosen as the Speaker of this House. I want to congratulate the people of your constituency for showing the confidence they have in you, in electing you as their representative, and I am sure that it is a pleasure to them when they know you are again selected to lead the House during this Legislature.

At this time, I also want to mention the fact of how sorry I am that we do not see the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) in his seat at the present time. The hon. Minister had the misfortune to have an automobile accident, and I might inform the House that he was on his way to a nomination meeting in my county when the accident occurred. Therefore, I feel a sense of duty to express to the House my sincere sorrow at his not being able to be with us this evening.

I also want to inform the House that it was not my intention to make my maiden speech this evening. I

do want to stick to the subject we are debating, the St. Lawrence Seaways and the power development.

To me, this is a very important Bill before the House. This subject has been agitating public opinion for over a century; it has been the subject of negotiations between Canada and the United States for over half a century. These negotiations began with the Treaty of Washington in 1932, which was defeated in the American Senate.

The Great Lakes St. Lawrence Development Basin agreement of 1941 is still waiting their approval.

You will recall that in December last, the Federal government at Ottawa established an authority for constructing a deep water-way between the port of Montreal and Lake Erie in co-operation with the United States, or, in the event of the United States failing to participate in the agreement, then Canada was prepared to go ahead with the water-ways wholly in Canada.

This time I would like to congratulate the government of the Dominion of Canada for the stand it has taken. I want to congratulate the province of Ontario for having reached such a satisfactory agreement with the Dominion, which ended with the signing of that agreement last December.

I also want to congratulate at this time, the

hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier) whose untiring efforts piloted the Bill through the House at Ottawa.

The present period of international interest in the St. Lawrence began officially about the turn of the century, involving the concepts of a deep water-way with uniform standards from the lakehead to Montreal. This period has been marked by much talk, but no new works in the St. Lawrence, but continued development in the upper lakes.

Canada and the United States have co-operated in a series of investigations, and every report has favoured the development of the St. Lawrence River and recommended a power development in the International Rapids section.

Now, what is the proposed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway? It is a two thousand mile channel, twenty-seven feet in depth, extending from the Atlantic Seaboard to the heart of the North American Continent.

Coupled with this is the large-scale development of power at two sites at least.

The first is the International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence river where it is proposed to develop 2,200,000 horsepower divided equally between Canada and the United States.

The second is in the Soulanges Section where an

ultimate expansion to 2,000,000 horsepower can be accomplished readily.

The projected seaway extends from Montreal west, to Lake Ontario. From the head of the lakes to Prescott we have twenty-five foot channels capable of handling lake vessels, the largest of them carrying over 20,000 tons.

From Montreal to the open gulf, the Federal government has provided the St. Lawrence ship channel. It has been sufficient to make Montreal one of the busiest ocean ports in the world. But between Montreal and Prescott, there remains the 14-foot bottle-neck. The largest vessels that can pass the small locks of the present canals can carry less than 3,000 tons. These canals have served Canada well in their time, but that time is now past.

Why is the project necessary from a power standpoint? I have little occasion to dwell on the need for power.

As a result of the rapid post-war expansion of industry, together with a constantly rising domestic consumption, the province of Ontario has been for the past few years faced with an acute shortage of power to meet demands.

You will recall that Canada negotiated a

treaty with the United States last year permitting a larger diversion of water for power at Niagara. The Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission is progressing with a re-development there at the present time, capable of providing another 600,000 horsepower or so before the end of 1954, but demand cannot wait, we must continue and advance with other developments.

The Financial Post in its issue of November 10th quotes Mr. Saunders, Chairman of The Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission, to the effect that present estimates show demands for power can be met up to the end of 1956 and that after that the Commission stands at the cross-roads if the St. Lawrence power is not available.

(Take BB follows)

Both the power and navigation facilities provided by the project will be important for a number of industries in Ontario and new industries intending to come to Ontario with its wealth of natural resources. This is particularly important in Ontario where more steam plants are the only alternative to an international hydro development in the St. Lawrence. My county of Stormont with its many industries is deeply interested in the project of power, and also in cheaper transportation.

I might say at the present time that we have a number of industries located in Cornwall, one of which I will mention, the Howard Smith Paper Mills, which, at the present time, are employing help while a lot of other industries are laying off men. They have to depend on the forests of this Province to get their pulpwood, and getting a transportation system, such as we are about to obtain, is something that is going to be an asset to the paper industry of this Province.

I am in agreement with the Bill before this House, but I am also interested in rehabilitation as it affects Stormont. I am ever-watchful of the different aspects as it affects our people. I believe this

afternoon the Hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) said that three-quarters of the flooding of land was going to take place in Stormont County, and that is something that is of major importance to me as a representative of Stormont. This is something that is of major importance to the residents of Stormont, of the whole community. We are of the opinion, each and every one of us, that this is a project that should go ahead. I might remind the House that in the County of Stormont we have a beautiful sight in the rapids at the dam which is second only to Niagara Falls. It is a beautiful spot down there, and we are willing to sacrifice the beauty along that river in order to develop the water-way and to get power for the industries which we are sure are going to settle in Eastern Ontario.

I am of the opinion that it is going to be a wonderful asset for unemployment. As you know, there is quite a lot of unemployment in the Province of Ontario to-day, and if we can get a project of this kind going, I am sure it is going to relieve the situation to a great extent over the years ahead.

I would urge upon the hon. members of this House that they should get behind this seaway. I want

to impress upon the Government that we are in favour of the principle of this Bill, but we are going to scrutinize it in every detail, and if we do raise any objection in any respect, it will be for what we consider the betterment of the people back in our own counties.

Mr. Speaker, I know that time is getting on, and there are a number of speakers to-night, but, as I said before, I expect to be on my feet a little later on, and point out to the Government some of the difficulties in my county. That is all I am going to say just now.

(Page BB-4 follows)

MR. W. H. COLLINGS (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great privilege to rise in support of second reading of the bills that are now before us today. In the words of the Premier these are historic bills. It will be a further milestone reached, Mr. Speaker, in the history of hydro development in this great Province.

Hydro's history is by no means a long one in point of years. None-the-less, it is an impressive one, as a tremendous record of accomplishment.

The original Hydro Commission was appointed on June 7, 1906. As it happened, Kitchener, then called Berlin, was the first Ontario municipality where Hydro power was turned on for the first time, the date being October 11th, 1910. It was fitting that this ceremony should occur in this particular Western Ontario City, for it was in this part of the Province at nearby Baden that Adam Beck first saw the light of day.

Here at Berlin, Sir James Whitney, the Ontario premier performed one of his most gracious acts. Reaching for Sir Adam Beck's hand, he said, "Gentlemen, with this hand, tried and true, this hand which has made this project complete, I now turn on the power." Many hundreds of light bulbs then illuminated the hall, and Ontario Hydro was formally launched on its impressive career.

Adam Beck then said: "Niagara power is free

as air. You are not alone. The government is behind you until this power reaches the humblest hamlet and the smallest manufacturer." Today, Sir Adam Beck's vision is approaching a reality. It is near fulfilment. It has, I think, been said, and it is worth repeating, that Hydro's accomplishments in the last five years have exceeded those of the previous 40 years, and actually, this is just about the case.

There are two reasons why this is a logical development. Under another government we had nine years of neglect, and sometimes open hostility to Hydro. Coupled with this we had, unfortunately a complete, a deplorable lack of vision as to our provincial resources and our ability to bring them into development. As a result, the incoming administration of a few years ago found it necessary to launch one of the world's biggest programs of hydro-electric development. A trying, and indeed dangerous situation, Mr. Speaker, was met with efficiency and with courage. But first, let me illustrate some views of the former administration as to Hydro.

Some of you will recall the nine-hour, marathon speech in this House relative to Hydro affairs delivered by the then Attorney-General and Hydro Commissioner. Over the radio and elsewhere he begged our people to please write and tell him what to do with our surplus power. He bewailed our Quebec power contracts and he led the movement that resulted in

their cancellation. He and his colleagues were glad enough to renew them a little later on. However, he displayed just about as much common sense, and won just as much success as in last November, when spearheading the campaign of our hon. friends of the Opposition.

Then, let us look at the attitude of the Premier of that day, Hon. M. F. Hepburn. Here, in part, is what Mr. Hepburn wrote to the late Rt. Hon. W. L. M. King, then Prime Minister of Canada. The St. Lawrence development was under discussion. Mr. Hepburn said:

> ".....In so far as power requirements are concerned, the fact is well known to you that Ontario has an ample supply for many years to come -- indeed a huge surplus -- for which it must pay and receive no benefit. This unsatisfactory condition would not obtain at this moment, had you granted us, when you had the opportunity, the right to export this surplus at a profit that would have enabled us to grant a further reduction in rates to the power consumers of Ontario. It is the responsibility of this administration and not yours to provide the necessary power for our present and future requirements, and in this respect we are fully cognizant of our responsibility.
>
> " Irrespective of any propaganda or squeeze play that might be concocted by you, you may rest assured that this government will resist any effort to force us to expend public funds in such an unwarranted manner or to foist upon the people of Ontario an additional burden of debt and taxation."

So much for Mr. Hepburn's views on the St. Lawrence development. It is unfortunate for him that

his views were included in a Dominion Government publication entitled "Correspondence and Documents relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Development."

Mr. Hepburn left these halls in 1942; in his disastrous attempt in 1945 to recoup the political fortunes of himself and his party he swallowed himself, not very gracefully, as to his views on the St. Lawrence. However, the power shortage had by this time made itself apparent even to Mr. Hepburn's somewhat unpredictable mentality.

Dr. Thomas Hogg, Hydro Chairman at the time, must have been in a somewhat awkward spot. On April 11, 1940, less than two years after Mr. Hepburn's declaration of August 19, 1938, he felt impelled to tell the Empire Club of Toronto that it was important to reach an early decision on the St. Lawrence scheme. He said Hydro's then reserves of 240,000 h.p. would be entirely wiped out by December, 1941. Dr. Hogg saw a shortage coming, but even he had no idea as to the size of it, for here is what he said in the address I have just mentioned:

> "After the war I look for a temporary decrease in power demand, followed in a few years by a more or less normal growth."

Certainly he did not foresee anything like the demand that has actually occurred. Certainly he did not foresee the necessity of such plants as Des Joachims, LaCave, Stewartville and all the rest of them

plus great steam plants at Toronto and Windsor, and with the St. Lawrence power urgently required if we are to keep pace with our industrial, commercial and agricultural development.

Dr. Hogg's "temporary decrease" to follow the war never did come into being. Then as to his so-called "more or less normal increase" let us see what has been done. During the nine years the former government was in office, a small increase in output was effected at DeCew Falls. Increase in development potential was of very little significance. Hydro was allowed to rest on its oars and hope for the best.

Hydro's dependable peak capacity was 2,597,400 h.p. in 1945.

By the end of 1950, it had been increased to 3,659,900 h.p., an increase of well over a million h.p.

By the end of 1955, it will have increased to 5,554,200 h.p. on the basis of the construction already completed or under way, and without taking cognizance of the 1,100,000 h.p. that ultimately will be Ontario's share of the St. Lawrence development.

Let us look at some of the developments under the present administration.

In 1947, 76,400 h.p. was added to the capacity at DeCew Falls near St. Catharines.

At Ear Falls on the English River 8,000 h.p. was added to generating capacity.

In Eastern Ontario an entirely new plant at

Stewartville on the Madawaska River came into operation in 1948, and is delivering 84,500 h.p.

At Aguasabon in the North a new plant opened in 1948 is producing 53,600 h.p. and another new plant at Pine Portage on the Nipigon opened in 1950, is delivering 80,000 h.p. In some degree the necessity for these two latter plants is occasioned by the realistic policies of this government requiring the home manufacture of our abundant forest resources.

The Tunnell Site Plant near Thessalon was opened in 1950, and delivers 56,000 h.p., largely utilized by the enormous mining and smelting industries in the Sudbury area.

The enormous Des Joachims plant on the upper Ottawa River was opened in 1950 and delivers 480,000 h.p. The nearby Cheneaux development provided 160,000 h.p. and came into full production last year. The LaCave plant, also on the Ottawa will deliver 256,000 h.p. on completion this year.

The Windsor steam plant will make available 354,000 h.p. by next year, while the Toronto steam plant will deliver 536,000 h.p.

The enormous revisions at Niagara will give an additional 700,000 h.p. by the end of 1955.

All this along with 30,200 h.p. purchased from the Polymer plant at Sarnia adds up to 2,874,700 h.p., new power, made available under this administration.

Then we come to the St. Lawrence development.

As you all know, Canada may have to handle this project without U.S. aid. As matters stand certain factions at Washington are making a final, eleventh hour effort to have the U.S.A. enter the St. Lawrence development as Canada's partner. As I undertand it, however, if this present effort fails, then Canada will do the job single-handed. And again, as you all know, the hon. the Prime Minister has intimated that Ontario is ready and willing to take care of its share of the power development.

It was heartening, and indeed refreshing, to learn that the Leader of the Opposition is in agreement with us on a matter that is of such grave importance to Ontario and to Canada. Whatever differences of opinion may arise in matters of detail, I think we shall have the support of every member of this House as to the principle of the legislation now before us relating to the St. Lawrence development.

The enormous industrial growth of Toronto and the Toronto suburban area is based in large measure on the availability of cheap and abundant and dependable power. The same is true of Hamilton and London and Peterborough, and indeed every industrial centre in Ontario. A drive around suburban Toronto, for example through East York and Scarborough, indicates the faith of our manufacturers in the future of this great area as a manufacturing centre. New factories are springing up all over the place, some of them such as the Frigidaire and the John Inglis developments out in Scarboro, of

enormous size. The executives behind these projects have faith in Ontario -- they have faith in Hydro -- and I think, I may add, in the general management of provincial affairs as att present constituted.

Industry always moves in directions that present certain factors -- a solid community of working men and women with their respective skills and aptitudes -- good transportatoon facilities -- ready access both to raw materials and to markets -- and finally an area served by cheap and dependable power. All these factors present themselves in this community of greater Toronto. Many of them will increase in magnitude with the development of the deep waterways scheme and power development.

The Sault Ste. Marie canals carry the heaviest volume of traffic anywhere in the world. It is elementary that the St. Lawrence canals when constructed will carry a similar traffic. While it is too much to expect to see great Atlantic passenger liners docking at any of our lake ports in the foreseeable future, it is elementary that the St. Lawrence development will bring an immense volume of foreign and domestic trade to our doors. The enormous upsurge of business that will flow through Canadian ports may well be a life-saver to our system of national railways. There is bound to be created a new community of interest. The upsurge of new business will offset any competition or rivalry as

between water and rail transportation.

I think that the iron ore developments at the Lakehead along with the oil developments in the West, now served by pipe line to Lake Superior both mean great new things for Ontario and for all Canada. We are in a fair way to become one of the world's great sources of iron ore and I suggest that our steel industries at the Soo and at Hamilton, to mention two of them, promise that we shall soon be self-sufficient as to both iron and steel.

Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence deep waterway and power project is inevitable. It must be tackled at once and all petty schemes of mice and men influenced by small selfish interests must be swept away for the greatest good to the greatest number. Ontario is on the march.

(Take CC follows.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will make one reference to a news dispatch from Washington. It is headed: "Just Another Foreign Land out to Milk Us". Mr. Speaker, I must say we have milkers in the House, but not doing milking of the type this article speaks of.

I will finish, Mr. Speaker, by reading part of a letter I received from one of my constituents or, let us say, from the man on the street:

"Dear Sir:-

I was greatly thrilled to learn, through the Press and Radio that, as far as Ontario and Canada are concerned, the St. Lawrence Waterway will be constructed. This is a tremendous job requring years of effort, and entailing the arrangement of a lot of money. May I offer a constructive suggestion for securing part of the money?

During the Second World War, you will recall, the Federal Government issued War Savings Certificates, Income Tax Free, which could be purchased at Banks and Post Offices, repayable in seven and a half years.

I would like to offer the suggestion that some similar arrangement be made to finance, in part at least, the construction of The Great St. Lawrence Waterway. The Certificates could be purchased at the Province of Ontario Savings Offices -- which no doubt would require the opening of many additional branches."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this man is just suggesting that we allow the ordinary man an

opportunity of taking part in this great undertaking, a chance to share in the prosperity of the days to come.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, may I at the outset, assure the House that I intend to confine my remarks to the Bill before us. Several of the hon. members, previous speakers in this debate, have referred to the fact that this is a historic occasion and I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it is a unique occasion in another respect that there have been many debates in this Legislature which have been prolonged well into the night, when, of course, we had a long list of Opposition speakers. But this is the first time in my experience at least that we have had so many government speakers that it is necessary for us to have a night Session.

I think it is hardly necessary, Mr. Speaker, for me to point out that my colleague and myself are supporting these Bills. We may have some criticisms on points of detail when the Bills enter the Committee stage, but we firmly support the principle which it embodies.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and Hydro project is one which we in the C.C.F. have been urging for some time. Just a little over a year ago our own Leader at that time, "Ted" Jolliffe, made a vigorous reference to the

necessity of going into this project and his voice, I believe, was one of the first raised to insist that if the United States could not make up its mind to go into this project, that Canada should "go it" alone.

It seems we have swung the government around to our way of thinking. We, in the C.C.F, will give these Bills our heartiest support. I would like to issue one word of caution, however, Mr. Speaker, to the government. There have been indications in the Press recently that some of the opponents of the seaway in the United States have had a change of heart and are beginning to support the project. It may be that these people may tempt this government and the government at Ottawa to hold back our own plans in the hope that the United States may yet come in.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we strongly urge the government not to follow any such will-o'-the-wisp. We have waited all along for the United States, too long already. We should not let anything that they may do hold us up for another day, and I would remind the government that this is election year in the United States and if we delay our start too long, we may find that they have elected a new President, one who is not too friendly to the project, even as one to be undertaken by Canada alone, as the present administration of Mr. Truman.

Mr. Speaker, let us prove to our southern neighbours that we can get along without them in this matter. For Canada to undertake this great project entirely on her own initiative would be a salutory lesson to those who are inclined to belittle the strenth and capabilites of this country. Such a lesson might be of value, not only to our American cousins but to some people in this country who at times believe that any great development of our natural resources cannot take place without American capital or without American leadership.

I was very much interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck), especially in his comparison of the speed with which great publicly-owned hydro systems are developing the newly available sources of power at the Falls,as against the delays across the river where the question of public versus private ownership has become a contentious political issue. That is one issue which has been settled once and for all in this province, at least where Hydro development is concerned.

The province of Ontario has given the world an outstanding example of the great achievements which are possible when we

accepted the principle of public ownership in those periods of our economy which are too complex or too vital to the whole community to be entrusted to private hands.

I do not think there is an hon. member of this House, Mr. Speaker, who would suggest that a project of this magnititude in importance as the St. Lawrence development, should be turned over to private interests. It is an endorsation in that area of the principles which we in the C.C.F.have been preaching for the past twenty years and one which in years to come I trust may be extended to many other equally vital areas of our economy.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that we, my colleague, the hon. member for South Cochrane (Mr. Grummett) and myself, heartily endorse these two Bills before us.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St.Andrew): Mr. Speaker, thanks for the applause, my very good friends. Save it for another day; it will be necessary then.

Mr. Speaker, I a sure you that I would not enter this debate if I could bring myself to agree fully with the principle of the Bills, especially Bill No. 68, and with the speeches made up until now. It is all very nice to find such unanimity and sweetness as witnessed and experienced in the last few hours.

(Take DD-1 follows)

Even the slight partisan note struck by a good friend of mine from one of the Toronto ridings was overlooked and taken very lightly, but in the midst of this enthusiasm I am obliged because of my firm conviction to sound a note that will be slightly different from that which was sounded by all others.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want beforehand to make it abundantly clear, first that I am in favour of the project for the development of power through the Hydro Commission on the Lower St. Lawrence. In that sense there is no difference between the view I hold and those expressed by the Government and the spokesmen for other parties. To me the problem that stands before the people of this country not only in Ontario at the moment is, first, power, the development of Hydro electric power with a maximum of possibility for the need of industry and the needs of the farms and the homes, of the citizens throughout the province of Ontario.

MR. SALSBERG: I doubt whether it is an important item in defence, I must say to the hon. member. The question of the seaway to me is a secondary question. I am not saying I am opposed to the seaway but I think we must place it as a secondary matter. But whether you relegate it somewhat or not, there is throughout the discussion and in the Bill itself a haste in my opinion to facilitate the efforts of certain interests in the United States

to carry out of the country much faster and cheaper than they were able to do until now the natural resources of this country. As a number of hon. members informed the House already, this is a long-standing issue and the objection to the development of the deep-sea waterway from the United States is an opposition that has many, many years of record. During the last few years, however, there has arisen in the United States a degree of support for the long-standing request coming from Canada, a support that has its roots entirely in very selfish interests of the United States. The House has heared that the President of the United States has intervened and s id that he would not like to see the development of hydro power without a deep sea waterway , he would like to see the projectsdeveloped as one. Also there are other interests in the United States now taking the same view. Let us face the fact, Mr. Speaker and hon. members of this House, that the interests who have suddenly become favourable to the idea of the sea way are those connected with the steel industry of the United States who are anxious to take out the millions and millions of tons of iron ore from Canada to feed the great steel mills of the United States. It is known that is the motive and because that is so I think we ought to approach this question from the point of view of retaining natural resources for the development of industry in this country, that that be

our first consideration when approaching the question of a deep sea waterway.

Hon. members spoke to-night, and I am sure they meant well, of the great need for hastening the waterway so that iron and ore may be shipped to the great lakes steel mills. Well, what are you so happy about and so anxious about? Great American interests have already divided up the iron and ore of northern Quebec for which they are paying one cent a pound. They have divided it among themselves. One gets 23%, another firm gets 16% of the iron and ore, and the smaller steel mills get smaller percentages. Ships are already being built to rush the iron and ore on the the Atlantic towards the American seaboard and bypass the most natural area for the development of steel mills in Canada, Nova Scotia where you have all the coal that is required for the purpose together with the rich iron and ore deposits for the development of a great steel industry, not only for the use of this country but for export as well, to provide employment for labourers and skilled workmen and graduates of our universities who now go and offer their brains and their talents below the line.

Why should we be in such terrible haste as is displayed in some speeches to facilitate them in getting the ore out in a hurry? They are removing it already very fast from Steep Rock in our own Province. There should be a steel mill at the head of the lakes, not importing fabricatated steel from the United States.

and selling it in the hardware stores and the building supply depots at the head of the lakes. It is because of that that I cannot see the point of view of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) who suggested that he would like to see Senator Conolly up here. What do we want him up here for? To show him what wonderful ore deposits we have? He knows that. The stock market of the United States knows that, my very good friend the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling) read part of an article by the financial editor of the Globe & Mail but unfortunately he did not read the whole article. Whenever an hon. member across reads an article I pick it out too because I have most of them, and watch where they stop. I would suggest to the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling) that he read down to the end of that article written by Wellington Jeffers where he quotes The Wall Street Journal as follows, as reported by Mr. Jeffers and I will just take one or two parts of it.

MR. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Why don't you read from the Tribune? You are more familiar with it.

MR. SALSBERG: I do read the Tribune and it would do the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts) -

MR. ROBERTS: What do they say about this?

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when my hon. member friend (Mr. Salsberg) mentions the Tribune, I have here a fly sheet I suppose you would call it, from that paper published at the time

of the election last fall and I see it has this under caption of "Re-elect A.A. MacLeod and J.B. Salsberg".

MR. SALSBERG: And very good candidates they were.

MR. FROST (Prime Minister): Yes, of course. I should like to read what it says and ask the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) if he still believes this is true:

> "Let us construct great public works like an all-Canadian St. Lawrence sea way to be carried out under Canadian control and with Canadian money."

Is that not what this Bill provides? Is my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) for or against it?

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I will come to that before I sit down, and I hope to win the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to my point of view. What I wanted to do before he rose to ask that question was to tell you what the Wall Street Journal says:

"Hanna -- " --

that is one of the "big shots" who will get 23% of the iron ore for which they will pay a penny a ton provided they take so many tens of thousands of tons; the contract with Mr. Duplessis provides that if they exceed that quantity they pay only a half a cent a ton, --

> "Hanna seriously thinking about setting up a big terminal at Contrecoeur twenty-five miles down from Montreal on the south side of the river where ore can be trans-shipped but what it really wants is the much-argued St. Lawrence seaway."

Of course, that is what Mr. Hanna wants. We want a seaway too, we all agree we want the seaway, although I place the development of electrical power as the major and the immediate concern. I fully agree with Bill No. 69, Mr. Speaker, that is why I wanted a discussion on Bill No. 68 where we deal with the principle of the thing. But I would not want Senator Conolly to come up. The people of the Wall Street Journal know the number on his door, but there are different groups in there of course and we do not want them to come here and be shown the great natural wealth we have and told: "Gentlemen, please help build the seaway so you can cart them away faster and cheaper." What for?

I think it is below the dignity of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) of this great province to tell Senator Conolly: "Come up and see you are making a mistake."

They are hanging an iron curtain with the ore they are taking out of this country and they have been shipping it back to us at $80.00 a ton and depriving the Canadian people of many opportunities. I do not think

(Page DD-7 follows.)

we should enlighten them and I do not think we should be in such terrible haste to accomodate the gentlemen who operate the great steel mills there. I would rather see steel mills in Cape Breton and Nova Scotia, Gaspe, Quebec, around the Great Lakes and at the head of the lakes where jobs would be provided for our people, both for those who work with hand and with brain.

I have in my hand a very well prepared brief that was sent out by the Dominion Joint Committee of the Railway Brothers dealing with this question. Some hon. members might think, Mr. Speaker, that the railroad unions are pursuing a sectional interest and that they are thinking in terms of jobs.

(Take EE Follows)

These men have a stake in every community across this country. They are not thinking in the simple terms of jobs for the locomotive engineers or firemen or trainmen; they are the backbones of hundreds of small communities, as all hon. members know. It is interesting to note that they supply a large percentage of the members of our various parliaments, and their brief points out exactly the arguments I have attempted to "put across". They show that, far from bettering the circumstances of Canadians, they will only be impoverishing the natural resources of this country without providing the compensation they were led to believe would be forthcoming.

I want to say, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I think it was the Hon. Minister, the Vice-Chairman of the Hydro Commission (Mr. Challies) who, when speaking today, traced the very interesting history of the past -- or was it the Hon Prime Minister in his remarks? At any rate, there was a great deal of history brought out here to-day, and I would suggest that some hon. member of the House, who has the time, take the very interesting memoranda of history as it affects hydro, and collate them.

It would make a fine brochure for the hon. members, for every citizen of the Province, and, indeed, for our schools.

I think there was a great deal brought out by the hon. members who have spoken today. It was brought to our attention that the canals have a history dating back over one hundred years, that they were started by the early French settlers, and it was forwarded by those who came from Scotland, from Great Britain, and in fact from every part of the world. Until now this has been a Canadian development, in the main. I believe it should continue to be. I believe we should proceed at once with the development of electric power. That is the first thing. Secondly, we should approach the deep-sea waterway from the point of view of the interests of the Canadian people, of all the provinces, who are directly concerned with it.

The Hon. Prime Minister will doubtless say, "If the Americans want to come in and help, let them come in. If they can help us, by my inviting Senator Connolly, I will do that." The point of view I am trying to present to this House

(Page EE-3 follows.)

is that we do not want it. Even if President Truman should succeed, we should insist on an all-Canadian seaway, developed by the people of this country, through their governments, federal and provincial; to be utilized as we see fit for the full development of our resources, iron ore, pulpwood, and other products. The canals should not become speedways for carrying out our national wealth, but should be used for the development of Ontario and of Canada.

Without joking, Mr. Speaker, if I had a seconder, I would move the motion that Bill 68 be not given second reading at this time, but that the Bill be re-written to guarantee that inasmuch as this agreement signed between the Province of Ontario and Canada is based, in a large measure, upon the development of the seaway, that it be guaranteed that the seaway be all-Canadian, and then have the Bill brought back to the House. In other words, if that idea were to prevail, I would say to the United States, "Canada is building its own seaway, regardless of how you feel about it." Do not say that in defiance, not in a spirit of provocation, but as a matter of national importance, decided upon and proceeded with by the Canadian people through their own governments.

I doubt if the Hon. Prime Minister has had time to consider the request I made yesterday for setting aside a pool of the hon. members from which I might draw a seconder.

MR. FROST: I would be very glad to do that, Mr. Speaker, there are ten hon. members opposite in Opposition, and he can draw from that pool any time he likes.

MR. SALSBERG: You have members to burn -- I mean politically burn. But not having a seconder, I am unable to present my motion, but I serve notice now that when this Bill comes to Committee stage, I will move an amendment along the lines I have mentioned here.

(Page EE-5 follows)

MR. W. K. WARRENDER (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, this is not to be considered a maiden speech; as a matter of fact, it may not even be considered a speech, but nevertheless, because of the importance to the City of Hamilton and the County of Wentworth in the economy of the Province of Ontario, I want to say a few words in support of these two very important bills which are now before the House. I think it is realized by every hon. member present that all of the four ridings in and around the City of Hamilton, in part, face on the Hamilton Harbour. The Hamilton Harbour, as I think every hon. member knows, is under the jurisdiction of the Hamilton Harbour Commission, which has done a tremendous task in making it one of the greatest inland and landlocked harbours in the Dominion of Canada, if not on the whole American continent. The tonnage going through is tremendous, and already the Harbour Commission, after what has been expressed about the water-way and power development, has taken steps to build more docks, and is looking forward to the future when more docks will be needed.

It is true, also, that the Hamilton Industrial Commission is alert to the benefits to be derived from the St. Lawrence water-way system, and

also from the power development, and they already have had requests from Europe, the United Kingdom, and from all parts of the world -- except, perhaps, Russia, -- for tracts of land in the vicinity of Hamilton, because these people know that Hamilton will be a great force in this Province and in our country.

I think it is important to realize that this has been going on for a long while, and the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) says "there is no haste." When the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) says there is no haste, it seems to me that is ridiculous, because everyone for some time has been built up with hopes that this matter would be proceeded with as soon as possible, and eventually the plans would be finalized, and the St. Lawrence Waterway System would be a reality.

I was greatly pleased to hear, and would like to commend, the Hon. Prime Minister and the Hon. Vice-Chairman of the Hydro Commission for the speed with which they acted last August when it became apparent once again that the St. Lawrence Waterway System had bogged down in the United States Senate.

Just recently I noticed in the Press that

a committee had been set up to go into this matter, and one of the members of that committee said he thought the result in the committee would be 7/6 in favour of the St. Lawrence Waterway and the Hydro project. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, we are taking the right attitude when we say we will proceed forthwith, if necessary, "on our own". It does not seem right to me, because if one person in that Senate Committee in the United States votes the other way, the result would then be 7/6 against the whole project, and we would again be back where we were before, relying on that committee for its help, and not getting it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Government has taken the attitude it has. We are prepared to go on, alone if necessary, but, nevertheless, being diplomatic, and with a friendly feeling toward our neighbours, we have said, "The door is open; if you wish to come and help us, all right." Living as close together as we do, I can see no reason why we should not work these projects out jointly, and share the costs as equally as possible.

There was one other comment made by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) upon which I would

like to comment, and that is his concern about the railroadmen who have left a brochure with each hon. member in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I worked on the railroad as a young chap; as a matter of fact, I still carry the card of the union with which I was associated at that time, and I cannot agree with many of the articles set out in the brochure before the hon. members.

When we go back to 1816, when the Burlington canal was opened, between Lake Ontario and Burlington Bay, as it was then popularly known, we learn that right after that, Hamilton, as such -- it was not even a town at that time -- got its start, because even in those days the pioneers recognized the importance of its strategic position at the head of Lake Ontario.

Then, later, in 1829, when the Welland canal was opened, it gave an additional impetus to Hamilton, which was incorporated as a town in 1833. From that time on, Hamilton has grown by leaps and bounds, and has become recognized as the leading heavy industrial city in the whole of the Dominion of Canada.

My reply to the railroadmen is this: that after the opening of the Welland canal -- and even then there was some opposition to it -- the railroads

themselves have progressed; the railroads have had more and more business, and I think it stands to reason that if the impetus given to business and to the City of Hamilton, or other municipalities in the Province, the railroads will again gain, and it is apparent, if the St. Lawrence Waterway System goes through that they, too, will benefit in the long run, and they have nothing to be concerned about.

That is my answer, briefly, Mr. Chairman, to the brochure which is before us.

Mr. Speaker, I now would like to give a few excerpts from a little brief prepared by Mr. Jamieson, the Planning Commissioner of Hamilton, who has set out certain features which he thinks are important. I would like to read them into the record, on behalf of the Bills now before us. Mr. Jamieson is quoting Dr. Faludi, and here is what Dr. Faludi says:

> "It is of interest to note that the air-brake industry was attracted by the city's now excellent transportation facilities, which at all times appear to have been the dominant asset of the city, without which its later assets could not have been exploited."

And Mr. Jamieson goes on to say:

> "To-day, one-half of all those employed in Hamilton are employed in industry. Hamilton is predominantly a heavy industrial city, and particularly in the production of primary metals, and the users of primary metals. The

important thing to realize with this type of an industrial economy, is that there is a world-wide market. The Steel Company of Canada, for example, has not exported at all, since the year 1939, but they do supply the greater part of the steel requirements of their next-door neighbour, the International Harvester Company, who have a world-wide export market.

A large volume of the business is with South America and South Africa, to say nothing of the very great volume to the United States. The same with the Canadian Westinghouse Company, which also exports to most of the countries of the world.

To summarize, Hamilton's past development and economic welfare, have followed improvements to transportation systems, whether by water, rail or road.

The second phase of this development is the fact that we are a heavy industrial town which requires in the first instance large shipments of raw materials, which, from their very nature, must be carried by the bulk carriers. These include ores, coal, limestone, and so forth.

The finished product, in many cases, also wishes to take advantage of water transport and the fact is, that many of these industries would not be in Hamilton at all, if it were not for one thing -- good transportation by road, rail and water."

Mr. Speaker, that just about sums it up. When I say on behalf of those who come from the City of Hamilton, and that area that we are very, very emphatically behind these two Bills, that is true, Mr. Speaker. We like the haste with which the Government is proceeding with these matters. We

think too much time has been lost in the past, but we do not blame the Government for that. We like the haste now with which the Government is co-operating with the Government of Canada, and we would like to know that in the near future, when the agreements are executed, that we will be well on the way to having this great dream become a reality.

(Take "FF" follows)

MR. S. F. LEAVINE (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, there being only one dissenter, I presume we are speaking for posterity. The hon. member for Hamilton-Centre (Mr. Warrender) mentions many industries for which Hamilton is noted, but, I notice he overlooked mentioning unsolved mysteries.

We have had many very high types of oratory from hon. members representing constituencies who are the primary beneficiaries of the St. Lawrence development. I would like to speak shortly and simply of a constituency that is inland and is not a primary beneficiary. We support this project on three points; one, that anything that contributes to the well-being of Canada directly, indirectly contributes to the well-being of every other portion of Canada. Two, that it is a sign of our having reached maturity, our ability to make decisions and to go it alone. We are not dependent for talent or for ingenuity or for money upon other people. May I point out that our American cousins individually are grand, but collectively, that is another matter.

This will be a source of much-needed power, to the rapidly expanding industrial and agricultural communities of this province. I represent a riding,

Waterloo North, which is primarily an agricultural and industrial community of some importance. We know the need of power, we appreciate its uses, therefore we are very much in favour of this power development. I feel I would be breaking faith with Detweiler and Snider who were the prime individuals in initiating the ideas of Sir Adam Beck, if I did not mention them here. I might conclude by saying that when Sir James Whitney reached for the hand of Sir Adam Beck, Sir Adam Beck in simple justice could have taken the hands of Snider and Detweiler and turned the button.

MR. E. P. MORNINGSTAR (Welland): Mr. Speaker, I do feel that I would be remiss in my duties to my constituents of Welland County if I did not say a few words in support of these Bills.

As you know, the Welland Ship Canal does go through my riding. This canal is 22 miles long. We are very highly industrialized in that community, we have the International Nickel plant at the south end, the John Deer company, supplying tubing to tap our oil resources and gas resources from Alberta east, and also the Ontario Paper Mills at the other end of the canal. Millions of dollars have been spent on this Welland canal, and it would not be worth two

cents unless the development of the St. Lawrence seaway is proceeded with. I would like to congratulate the Government on the good work they are doing, in looking after not only the industries, but the rural and domestic users of my riding. The good Province of Ontario is doing a wonderful job, and they are looking to the future. As you know, a few years ago our industries were slack because of lack of power, but to-day that does not happen. We are looking to the future.

I am pleased to be an hon. member of this Legislature when such an historic piece of legislation is presented. I do not think there is any doubt but that even the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) is in support of this.

I am very proud to be here to say these few words.

MR. A. J. REAUME (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, I think that we all have a right to be proud, and I think we are doing a fine job in agreeing on both sides of the House to put these Bills through as quickly as we can. I want to say a word about iron ore that has been mentioned and my own personal thoughts about that.

The people of the United States and our own

people in World Ward I and II fought side by side, and we might as well make it clear that in the event of World War III, and we pray we will not have one, but certainly if we had, I feel certain that we will find ourselves on the same side again, in the interests of holding onto the things that we have.

If we have iron ore, and we have it, and if it is going to be of any help to a friendly people, and particularly to an ally of ours, then certainly we should do everything possible in order to help them. Make no mistake about it, I think we have not a better friend in the world than the people of the United States, and anything that we can do in the way of helping and promoting a good feeling among our people and the people over there, certainly we should do.

Windsor, of course, is concerned with this, and we have been speaking about it for a long time. There is one thing we can feel certain about when we see such Bills as this taking form, it makes us feel as though the second half of the twentieth century belongs to Canada.

I want to congratulate the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) for his efforts, but I think we should not

overlook the fact that it was Ottawa, where there happens to be a different party in power, who took the lead in this whole matter. Certainly I think we should "go it alone" in the event that the people of the United States are slow, but I think you will find that the people of the United States will join with us. I cannot conceive of such a good deal getting by those businesslike people, and I think before we have started, we shall find that they will join us.

MR. ROBERT HERBERT (Temiskaming): Mr. Speaker, in endorsing the Bills before the House at the present time, I am speaking for the constituency of Temiskaming. In our constituency we have a great mining district and also farming. We have there some five power developments at the present time, and for a great number of years most of the power came down to the industrial centres. It is only through the last two administrations that our rural districts have been nearly completely electrified. We still have a great amount of work to do along that line, but to-day, most of our farming communities have power. I am some 350 miles north of this great development, but I do feel that the effect of it will be felt in the areas all the way back to our district in Northern Ontario. We have

the natural resources, and with the power we can develop them and become one of the greatest provinces, as we are, in this country, and we will continue to have our place as one of the greatest industrial centres in Canada.

(Take GG follows)

MR. W. E. BRANDON (York West): Mr. Speaker, representing West York, one of the suburban municipalities of the Toronto area, we in this constituency, likewise are very much interested in the Bill which is at hand and to say the least, we more than heartily endorse it.

We have heard much to-day relative to the history of Hydro which has proven very interesting. We have also heard a lot of figures proving the advancement of Hydro over the many years since its inception but beyond that fact, and speaking from an industrial standpoint, we can all recall that industry had its origin basically along our fast-flowing rivers and they were powered by the old-fashioned waterwheels and you will all recall along with me that it was from the idea of the value of the old waterwheel in industry that Hydro had its inception and reached its development, as at the present time.

The matter of Hydro development is extremely important in this day and age. The hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume)mentioned a moment ago, something about a World War III and in our Press, from day to day, we are being continually reminded of the possibilities of a World War III and there is absolutely no reason why we should not prepare ourselves and indeed, our Federal and Provincial governments are quite

aware of any danger which may exist in that regard, and are suggesting to the municipalities throughout this land from sea to sea, that a civil defence program should be prepared and set up.

The matter of Hydro development is something which will have much to do with a civil defence program, the development of industry for war production and war purposes, and in addition it will provide for and enable industries to spread itself throughout the depth of this province of Ontario and indeed throughout the whole of the Dominion, rather than to be centralized in one industrial centre.

We have all heard from time to time of the danger of centralization of industry, where, if a bomb fell in one area, all industry in that area might be suppressed, whereas, if industry was diversified -- and it can be diversified through electrical power -- and that is in the best interests of the people of this country.

As far as the contract itself is concerned, the hon. Premier of this province is to be congratulated upon having entered into a contract as is represented in part of the Bill before us here to-day, and I know that it will certainly be in the best interests of the people, not only of Ontario, but throughout Canada

and potentially along the neighbouring states in the United States.

To-day we also have an unemployment problem in the province of Ontario and throughout the whole of Canada. Hydro, through the expansion of industry which can be expanded through increased power, will increase employment. It will take care of a greater industrial Canada, a greater industrial Ontario, and I know that it will act in the best interests of the people of this province, and although it has been said by one of the hon. members here to-day that he is opposing the Bill in principle, I know that even he and his Party will be glad to approve the effects of an increase labor unification in industry.

Thank you very much.

MR. J. ROOT (Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, this evening I do not want to take too much time of the House. I want to express my approval of the Bill and I think I am expressing the approval of rural Ontario of Bills 68 and 69.

I will not deal with anything regarding finance and engineering. We have heard a lot of figures relating to engineering costs and I would like to compliment the different speakers who have addressed the House this afternoon and this evening.

When the first hon. member spoke, I thought that perhaps Brockville would be the most important part of Ontario and then I thought Kingston, and then Toronto. I thought at one time that Toronto was going to become a suburb of Hamilton. However, seriously, the St. Lawrence Seaway is something that for many years people have dreamed of, people have talked about. Plans have been made for the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway, agreements have been drawn and then too often, not ratified. It has been well said that these two Bills are historic. This agreement between the province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada in all probability will make the Seaway and the power development a reality. It will bring the dreams of those who have gone before us into an actual fact.

We have in Canada and in Ontario four major forms of transportation. We have water transportation, road or highway transportation, railway transportation, and we have air transportation. I feel that every form of transportation should be developed to the highest possible degree. They all play a part in the economy of the country and none of them should be overlooked and with that in mind, I think we should not [illegible] these Bills [illegible] see to it that this great water transportation is developed to its highest possible

degree.

The development of the Seaway will mean much to western farmers in moving their products to export markets. With the great oil development in the west any means of transportation that will make it possible to place their products on the export market at a lower cost, should benefit the people of Canada and of this province. The development of the Seaway should benefit Ontario not only industrially, but the rural people. Much of our rural produce goes to the export market.

I think perhaps one of the main features that we should consider in the Bill is Ontario's need for power. We all realize that water is the cheapest known source of power. Power generated on our rivers is almost like perpetual motion -- nothing is lost and we do lose some of our natural resources when we burn coal or fuel, or oil. Nothing is lost when we utilize water power. Nature deposits water in the form of snow and rain on our highlands. This water flows down to sea-level and again nature returns it to the highlands to start all over and in the development of the St. Lawrence we are just fitting into a scheme of perpetual motion, we are utilizing a great source of energy that to-day is going to waste.

I feel that the development of the St. Lawrence

will benefit all parts of our province. The Seaway development will remove a barrier to navigation and make our cities become ocean ports. They will bring us in closer and more direct contact with world markets. It should reduce the cost of moving goods and that should benefit both the producer and the consumer. The power development may have to solve many problems. Cheap power will make possible further expansion of industry. This industrial expansion will provide employment, as has been mentioned before here to-night. With cheap power we will have more industry and more employment.

I understand that our share of energy that will be developed from the St. Lawrence is equal to the energy of twenty-eight million men. It is hard to realize that up until now we have allowed that energy to flow past our doors, going to waste. I think the farm people realize that their greatest problem is the problem of transportation and markets. The development of the Seaway will give a more direct route to our export markets. We can benefit from that. Lowered transportation costs will be shared by both the producer and consumer at the other end.

Rural people realize that the surest market they can have is the home market and any industrial

development that may come because of the development of power on the St. Lawrence, we know is going to develop a greater home market where we have consumer dealing in the very same currency that we deal in. It is one of the problems of agriculture to-day that a great market overseas financial difficulties and because of those financial difficulties, we are unable to produce goods and place them in that market at a price that will give a fair return to the producer.

So, we are naturally interested and would want to support any project that would develop the industrial parts of Canada giving to the labouring man a full pay envelope so that he is ready to pay us a fair return for the effort we are making to produce the products of the farm.

Canada is growing up. The other afternoon the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) said that he and I had something in common in that we both earned our living from the top six inches of the soil and I found out, listening to his address, that we had more than one thing in common. I noticed how freely the words "Dominion of Canada" dropped from his lips. I do not think we have gained anything by trying to drop that word. I think that in these two Bills, we

have a better way of showing that Canada is growing up than by dropping such words as the "Dominion of Canada", and doing such other acts which I think irritates and divides our people.

In these two Bills we have an opportunity to show the world that we are willing to co-operate with other governments. We are also willing to show the world that if necessary we are big enough to stand alone, and I think that this House should be unanimous in supporting the principle and in supporting these two Bills that are before the House for second reading to-day, and I think the government of Ontario and the hon. members who represent the government on the Hydro can be congratulated that through their efforts and by a spirt of co-operation, they have been able to have these two agreements signed by the province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada and I would suggest that I would like to see every member of this House endorse these Bills and show the world that Canada is growing up.

MR. P. T. KELLY (Cochrane North): Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about the Seaway. Nobody seems to be in opposition to the Bill and I certainly have no opposition to offer. However, while we are talking about seaways, iron ore and so forth, there is

a possible alternative if you turn it down. On Bolcher's Island in Hudson Bay, we have steel, seventy miles north of Cochrane we have coal and on the Albany River we have power, so if this Seaway does not suit the hon. members, you have in the far-distant riding pf Cochrane North, everything you have to off. in the Seaway.

I think I would like to take real issue with the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume) for his statement to the effect that this Bill was at the outset pressed forward by the Federal government. I think it is a matter of record, that the hon. Prime Minister himself came out flat-footed in every newspaper in the country when they could not agree in the United States and said that we have the money here and that we would build this Seaway if need be, alone.

In connection with the building of a Seaway, it is quite obvious that the transportation costs will be lowered throughout the country. As everyone knows, the cheapest form of transportation is by water and if this water transportation ultimately resolves to the benefit of all industry in Ontario and in Canada, then all minor industries, or rather, should I say, one particular industry, should not govern, but whether industry, as a whole is benefitted, and in that way I think we

can dispose in the main of this brochure which has been submitted to each and every hon. member of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I was totally unprepared for this subject and I have given you the best I can think of.

Thank you.

MR. W. G. Noden (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, coming from one of the furthest west districts of our good province, Rainy River, I would like to say a few words in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway since the other hon. members from Port Arthur and Fort William are not here. We up there have always felt that the development of Hydro was very vital to the welfare of that part of our country. Also the St. Lawrence Seaway means a great deal to the advancement of our people in that area in creating new industry and furthering the development of the north-west end of the district or the province of Ontario and you have heard so much of the iron ore development which we have at Steep Rock. To-day it is a large industry and means a considerable tonnage using the water-way route.

I might say last year it took one hundred and seventy-two boats to transport the iron ore. Also our Hydro development up in that area has been extended to a great extent in the last few years and our people are

very conversant with its benefits, and that we do appreciate it and we do feel that we should support Bills 68 and 69.

(Page HH-1 follows)

Motion agreed to; second reading of Bill number 68.

Motion agreed to; second reading of Bill number 69.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, may I say that tomorrow we will proceed with the debates on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and, if necessary, continue with the debate for a portion of Friday, at least.

I would like to say at this time that never before have I had the opportunity of listening to so many new hon. members, as on this occasion. They spoke from all sides of the House, and they all made very worthy and excellent contributions, indded, and I would like to take this opportunity of congratulating them.

Tomorrow, I am sorry to say, I will have to be away for at least a part of the afternoon, owing to the death of an old friend, and, therefore, will have to miss hearing some of the debates. This I regret, as I think all hon. members value the contributions made by private members. Their speeches are always good and well worth listening to.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that in a valiant hockey

match this evening, the local team was leading 3-0, at the end of the end of the second period. That probably is due to the fact that so many of the hon. members are sitting in the Assembly this evening, and are not attending the game. Personally, I have not had the pleasure of seeing the Toronto team win this year, so perhaps their leading tonight may be because I was not present.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9:50 o'clock, p.m.

- - - - - -

ONTARIO

First Session
of the
Twenty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 21, 1952, et seq.

0

Volume XI

Thursday, March 6, 1952.

0

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

R. C. Sturgeon,
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

E L E V E N T H D A Y

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE, HELD IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21st, 1952, et seq.

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

- - - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Thursday, March 6th, 1952.

- - - - - - - -

The House having met. 3 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. G. W. PARRY (Kent West): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg leave to present the second report by the standing committee on standing orders, and move its adoption.

THE CLERK-ASSISTANT: Mr. Parry, from the

Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presents the Committee's second report as follows:

"Your Committee has carefully considered the following petitions and finds the notices as published in each case sufficient:

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Stratford praying that an Act may pass authorizing a municipally-operated bus service.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Sault Ste. Marie, praying that an Act may pass increasing the membership of Sault Ste. Marie Public Utilities Commission from three to five.

Petition of the Corporation of J. L. Thompson Supply Limited, praying that an Act may pass vesting in the company that portion of the old cemetery on Plan 257 for the Town of Wallaceburg, at present occupied by the company.

Petition of the Corporation of the Municipality of Neebing, praying that an Act may pass ratifying the re-division of the wards of the municipality, providing for the election of an additional councillor, and for other purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the Young Men's Christian Association of Belleville, praying that an Act may pass exempting the lands and other assets of the Association from taxation.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass, authorizing the Corporation to pass by-laws fixing a standard of fitness of dwellings for human habitation, and for other purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Barrie, praying that an Act may pass vesting in the Corporation the land known as the Market Block in the said town.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Kingston, praying that an Act may pass validating orders of the Municipal Board, authorizing the Corporation to impose sewer rental charges, and for other purposes.

All of which is respectfully submitted."

Motion agreed to.

MR. G. W. PARRY (Kent West): Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Nickle, I beg leave to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills, and move its adoption.

THE CLERK-ASSISTANT: In the absence of Mr. Nickle, Mr. Parry, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presents the Committee's first report as follows:

"Your Committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:

Bill No.1 - An Act respecting the Town of New Toronto.

Bill No. 19 - An Act respecting St.Patrick's Home of Ottawa.

Bill No.28 - An Act respecting the Canadian National Exhibition Association.

Bill No.31 - An Act respecting Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien.

Your Committee begs to report the following Bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 2 - An Act respecting the City of Sarnia Separate School Board.

Your Committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of

printing be remitted on Bill No. 2, An Act respecting the City of Sarnia Separate School Board; and on Bill No.19, An Act respecting St. Patrick's Home of Ottawa.

All of which is respectfully submitted."

Motion agreed to.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

J. L. THOMPSON SUPPLY LIMITED

MR. G. W. PARRY (Kent West) moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the J. L. Thompson Supply Limited".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

HON. ARTHUR WELSH (Provincial Secretary) moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Public Service Act".

He said: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the main purpose of this Bill is to set up a fund to which temporary civil servants will contribute five percent or six percent of their salaries. When the temporary civil servant is made permanent, his contributions will then be transferred to the Public Service Superannuation Fund, and he will receive credit for his temporary services. If he should leave the service, his con-

tributions will be refunded.

This provision has been requested by the Civil Servants. In effect, it is a savings plan which will enable employees to make payments into the superannuation fund more easily in respect to their temporary service, and dispense with the need of making such collections afterwards.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE

MR. ROBERT MACAULAY (Riverdale), in the absence of Mr. Lyons, moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE CITY OF OTTAWA

MR. D. H. MORROW (Carleton) moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

CITY OF STRATFORD

MR. J.F. EDWARDS (Perth) moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Stratford".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE MUNICIPALITY OF NEEBING

MR. B. L. CATHCART (Lambton West), in the absence of Mr. Mapledoram, moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting Municipality of Neebing".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

BELLEVILLE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

MR. E. SANDERCOCK (Hastings West) moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Young Men's Christian Association of Belleville".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE TOWN OF BARRIE

MR. G. G. JOHNSTON (Simcoe Centre) moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Town of Barrie".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE CITY OF KINGSTON

MR. G. W. PARRY (Kent West), in the absence of Mr. Nickle, moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Kingston".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

(Take "B" follows)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St.Andrew): Mr. Deputy Speaker, having dealt with the preliminary matters that usually precede participation in this debate, I would ask the indulgence of the House for a little while during which I shall try to deal with a number of questions that, in my opinion, have a very profound bearing on the matters which come before this Legislature.

We who have an eye for developments in this country are witnessing now alarming evidence of the maturing effects of contradictions in our life, contradictions which place the country as a whole at the cross-roads. I submit that the economic and social as well as the national future of this country is involved in these developments. Underneath the surface of prosperity -- I would call it "unhealthy prosperity" -- there lies a very unhappy state of affairs expressed in a deterioriationof the economic conditions. At the moment, when to all appearances, Canada desires to attain full nationhood, we are, in my opinion, rapidly losing

our national independence. While the official index shows increased production, we are at the same time experiencing an increasing shortage of commodities and things we require in our daily life. While it is generally assumed that the democratic and civil rights are sound and safe, I suggest that we are experiencing a curtailment of civil and labour rights on a national level, as well as on a provincial level. I have only to remind you of the Garson amendment recently adopted in the Federal House; the declaration of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister of Canada about the government's responsibility to the House of Commons and a number of important labour decisions rendered by various government boards, to illustrate the point I am trying to make.

In the midst of a high industrial development in the country, we see, if we look, alarming signals which warn of the danger of perfecting full industrial development of this country. In my opinion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the immense developments are due to policies which result in the surrendering of Canadian independence on the international and national levels. In my opinion, the roots of these critical developments are to be found in a surrendering to United States pressure which drives this country into an impoverishing armament race and into the dangers of war.

The big interests of the United States are driving relentlessly to make Canada into a hinterland for the United States and the use of Canadian people as hewers of wood and drawers of water for the profit and to the glory of Wall Street.

Hon. members may say, "What has all this to do with the Speech from the Throne which we are now discussing and with provincial matters which are our exclusive jurisdiction?". I suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that these problems that I have enumerated have everything to do with provincial matters and with the problems arising before this Legislature.

May I for a moment quote from the remarks of the hon.Prime Minister of Saskatchewan, who was recently interviewed by a delegation of citizens. The hon. Mr. Douglas said,

> "Some people might say international relations are not in the jurisdiction of the province but anything that affects the welfare of the people is their concern. If the people of the world can bring sufficient pressure on their governments and if those governments can sit down and find common ground, a third World War can be averted."

I concur with those sentiments of the hon.Premier of Saskatchewan.

In opening the debate on the Speech from the Throne, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) referred

to international matters. I might say I do not fully agree with the general approach that he made to these questions, but, that is beside the point. I think it was correct and it was good of him to open his very important remarks with reference to the international situation.

I want to say at this time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that even though I should find it impossible to deal with a number of important specific problems dealt with in the Speech from the Throne, I think the general welfare of the people of this province will be served if we deal with the general questions. As for myself, I shall seek opportunities to deal with these questions during the Session and emphasize the primary, general problems.

Now, what are our problems? We are confronted in this province, and in every province, with the acute problem of unemployment. Almost one hundred thousand citizens of this province are totally unemployed, all of them suffering varying degrees of want and some are suffering more than anyone should suffer in this country. I am referring to the section of the unemployed who are receiving no assistance whatever. We have the problem of housing which has been dealt with in this Legislature; we are confronted with a number of agricultural problems. The hon. members of this House

who come from agricultural areas, especially from areas where the dairy industry is predominant, are fully aware of the crisis facing those who rely upon the export of cheese. Yesterday the Press informed us of a convention of the Ontario Hog Producers Association where their leader warned :

> "Farmers are losing between $12. and $15. per hog because of an over-supplied market and lack of export."

The heading of this report says, "Financial Ruin Soon Facing Hog Producers".

We are all in this country faced with the horrible effects of inflation; it undermines the living standards of the majority of the people and aggravates conditions, especially of an organized section of workers, white-collared and professional people, Civil Servants and others who are unable to rapidly catch up with skyrocketing prices. We are confronted with what is truly a crisis in municipal financing, and an alarming rise in municipal taxes, an increasing burden on home-owners which, in many instances, we are unable to bear and which places municipal governments in a helpless position. We are also confronted with the problem of taxation on our own level of government.

These, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are but a few of the general problems with which this government and this

Legislature is confronted. I suggest to the hon. members of this House that all these problems are inseparable from the national and international problems that beset us. I suggest, however, to the hon. members that, try as we may, we will not be able to solve any of these major problems fundamentally and radically, without some solution being found to the over-all issue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said before that under the pressure of the United States, this country is driven into an armament race. I want to say at this time that I am fully aware of the fact that there are profound differences of opinion in this House and outside this House on the causes for the present international tension and the danger of War. It is not my desire, on this occasion, to defend one section, or to attack another; it is not my desire to try to convince you of one position or another, but, it is my desire to appeal that we approach the problem with an open mind. I ask, at least, that you follow me with an open mind and that you not be swayed by fictions which have been fostered, in my opinion, and drummed into the heads of people to a point where they are unable to see some of the developments in their true light and prospective.

I have been told that I frequently quote from daily papers. Well, I do quote from the daily papers.

Let me say now that during this humble address of mine, I shall refer to various publications. However, I selected quite deliberately, extracts from conservative minded -- I use "conservative" with a small "c" -- even reactionary spokesmen and leaders, to make the point. If I were to resort to authorities that I fully accept, hon. members would say that I was quoting the "Reds" or Communists. I am deliberately quoting authorities which cannot be considered to be by any stretch of the imagination radical, pro-labour, socialist or communist.

(Page C-1 follows)

What I said about the international situation I want to strengthen by quoting Dorothy Thompson who writes in the Globe and Mail. She is quite conservative as you know. She had a column in the Globe and Mail and in all the syndicated papers entitled, "Dream-like Diplomacy", and she said:

> " It is strange that in Paris, France, the United Nations should be discussing disarmament, while from Rocquencourt, France, Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Powers, it should be announced that the NATO countries have agreed that West Germany should be allowed a tactical air force of 1,000 planes by midsummer 1954.
>
> It is strange that this should be announced to the world (including the USSR) before the West German Parliament has even voted to join the European army, after the East German Government has repeatedly predicted that the rearmament of West Germany would lead directly to war, and two and a half years before it can become actual."

and she continued:

> " It is strange that while all this Western rearmament, including an American military budget of $85. to $90 billion, should be occasioned by the fear and conviction that the Soviets are planning a military attack, the West should act as though the Soviets could, in fact, be trusted to co-operate with Western plans.
>
> It is strange that in a time when international tensions have reached the pitch of war, but without the engagement of the chief armies, one adversary should tell the other in the utmost publicity, "We are not yet ready to

repel your attack. But before this year is out we shall be stronger; in 1953 we shall be mightier still; and by 1954 we shall have a German army mobilized, with a mighty air force, after which, if you attack you will be destroyed. Therefore" (for such is the logic) "postpone your attack until such time as it cannot succeed. Postpone it until we shall be ready for you. Then we shall make peace."

I end the quotation here, but she goes on.

I quote her because she does, in a very succinct way, reveal the dreamlike diplomacy forced upon us. It is ridiculous to suggest that we are threatened by an alleged enemy that is mightier than we are, and then say, "Well, we are too weak, but in three years we will be strong enough". "If he meant to attack, he would not wait until we got stronger than we are," says Mrs. Thompson, and she is right.

Then, she ends up by saying:

"'We must arm against the agressor.'

'For war?'

'No, to make him make peace.'

'Why doesn't he aggress now?'

'Because he means war.'"

Then, she says:

"Perhaps we shall all wake up, and in bed.

I hope so."

The danger is that hundreds of millions

may not wake up in their beds.

I quoted Mrs. Thompson in order to win your consideration in this discussion to a degree where you will not pre-judge and will not be guided by prejudice. The fact of the matter is that the United States is driving the western world to economic bankruptcy and suffering. What the United States desires is a vast European army generalled by American officers. To achieve that we are asked to release some of the world's worst criminals. I draw your attention to a headline in the Telegram printed a few hours ago where a Canadian ex-soldier protests against the intended release of a man who shot Canadian soldiers overseas and who threatened him during the war.

The fact is that the Lisbon agreement was a further attempt to bring this about. May I, as an aside, Mr. Speaker, say that the head of the Portugese government, the head of a dictatorship, took exception to the preamble of NATO although he is now a partner, a defender of democracy. He took exception because he said the preamble spoke of democracy and he does not believe in democracy.

May I also, as an aside, mention the fact that when the Lisbon decisions were brought to Greece another member of the NATO group, the members of the Greek parliament who voted against it were immediately

arrested. That finished them. The fact is that France is now in a terrific crisis because of its forced re-armament race, the fact is that Britain is in a crisis, the fact is that Italy is in a crisis, the fact is that party-lines are being eradicated because of this alarming development.

There are many leading figures in the Conservative party of Britain who violently disagree with it. You can trace them from Lord Beaverbrook down to members of the British House of Commons. It divided the British labour force, and has divided people everywhere. It cannot but divide them in the face of this crisis.

The fact is that the C.C.F. in Canada has now altered its position, and I am very glad that it has.

I regretted all along that the C.C.F. national leadership trailed behind the leadership of the two old line parties on international affairs and I welcome the change that was announced from the headquarters of the C.C.F. They speak now of the Lisbon decision and of the NATO objectives as being "irresponsible" and "disastrous." I think they are right, and I hope they will go further to help combat this danger.

Canada is now spending, Mr. Speaker, one billion, nine hundred million dollars on rearmament. We are in a position at the moment where everything is for the killing industry and little or nothing for

peace time industries and welfare. The fact is that the government has deliberately placed prohibitive taxation and credit restrictions which are threatening entire industries with destruction. One example is the tobacco industry. Our tobacco growers in this province are obliged to reduce their acreage. The electrical goods industry, automobiles, textiles, furs, are suffering as a result of this deliberate taxation policy to restrict consumer goods production. Yes, the government policy is leading to a deliberate sacrificing of peace-time industry. It is a horrible waste ,aside from the danger.

These billions are spent on matters that do not enrich the life of the people of this country. It does not add anything. It is a total wastage at best because if we would save ourselve from the danger of war, we must destroy it, and we will. The worst difficulty is that use may be made of it. The fact is that as a result of the policy now pursued, the United States is turning Canada into military bases in accordance with their overall plan.

Another very important thing to remember in all our deliberations is tha fact also that there is a great deal of development in the country which is not as promising as the average person imagines. The average person hears about the opening of mines, the

development of natural resources and he is interested. He is naturally and understandably very happy. He thinks that this means the beginning of a new era of industrial expansion and growth in this country. It does not mean that.

That fact is that United States monopolies are systematically robbing this country of its natural resources and, by so doing, of its future greatness. The oil in the West is pretty well in the hands of American corporations, and it is to our shame that great natural product is siphoned not to tanks at the head of the lakes in our province, but to a United States outlet. The iron ore is pretty well in the hands of American monopoly. That applies to Steep Rock. That applies to the new developments in Ungava - Labrador, on which I spoke last night. It is astounding to people to realize the essential facts, Mr. Speaker. We hon. members of the Legislature must always bear that in mind, that on an actual investment of not more than $14,000. by an American group, they managed to get hold of the Steep Rock development and are making a fabulous fortune out of it.

The fact is that the Canadian government invested about $5,000,000 in preparatory work. The American government loaned them $10,000,000 and the group headed

by Cyrus Eaton procured over 100,00 shares at one cent apiece and those shares are now worth over $10,000,000.

It is a fact, as I mentioned in passing last night, that the iron ore of Ungava is divided amongst a cartel of big American steel mills and their contract with the Duplessis government calls for the payment of one cent a ton. May I say that when two professors of a very important Quebec university present a plan for the utilization for the great iron ore deposits of Quebec for the opening of steel mills on the Quebec side of the St. Lawrence, which we should do -- and when a prominent spokesman of the church in Quebec demanded that steel mills be opened, the hon. Prime Minister of Quebec said:

> "The Professors do not know what they are talking about and as for the Monseigneur, he means well".

and yet the Professors of a Quebec university and the spokesman for the church really expressed the interests of French Canada and of the country as a whole.

The fact is our nickel and other metals are pretty well apportioned by the United States, and may I, Mr. Speaker, remind you that all these are irreplaceable possessions of the people of this country. Once taken out, they will never be there again. If we fail to utilize them for the industrial expansion

of this country, we are missing a great opportunity because we will never get them back again.

I want at this time to express my full endorsation of the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Mines last night. The hon. Minister of Mines (Mr.Gemmell) spoke before the Kiwanis Club and he is reported in this morning's Globe and Mail as having said:

> "Shall we always have to depend on our neighbours' eagerness to capitalize on our lack of imagination and daring, to develop our country's treasures, or shall we, as Canadians, decide once and for all, that we can do this job all by ourselves and reap a greater share of the benefits to be derived from the exploitation of this most promising country on earth?"

I congratulate the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Gemmell) for having said that, and, in saying that, he expressed the feelings of all people in this province. What is necessary is that the government pursue a policy in line with the wonderful sentiments he has expressed. I say it is astounding that we are depleting our forests for paper that is being shipped to the United States and we are shipping the bulk of it, then finding that literally the world gathers at Washington for newsprint and Washington apportions the newsprint that comes from Canadian forests, produced in Canadian mills and shipped south of the border. I think if any apportionment is to be done, it should

be done by the Canadian government.

I could continue on this point and quote a number of authorities, what I call "bourgeois authorities," or "capitalist authorities," to substantiate this point.

But because I want to be more brief than I otherwise would have been, I wish to remind this House, in which there are a large majority of Conservative members, that the national Leader of the Conservative Party also raised this cry about the alienation of Canadian natural resources, but he has not done much about it.

May I, however, quote one authority who is an official of this government. I am referring to F. J. Lyle, Director of Ontario Trade and Industry Branch, who, in an address which was quoted from coast to coast, said some very profound truths and I am happy that this government has a person of that calibre and breadth of view on its staff.

(Page D-1 follows.)

He said:

"A ton of iron ore, mined in Canada and sold to a foreign steel company, brings Canada a revenue of about $10.00. When the same ton of ore is smelted in Canada and turned into a wide range of steel products - as a great deal is - it makes about half a ton of such common household products as nails, screws, coathangers, etc.

So used, this ton of Canadian ore becomes Canadian manufactured products with a retail value ranging from $80.00 to $90.00. It takes no wide stretch of the imagination to calculate the benefits to Canadians from the translation of our raw materials into end-use products."

"In the simple illustration just mentioned, the gain is at least $70 per ton of ore - a sum that finds its way into a great many pockets and benefits Canadian workmen, wholesalers, retailers and consumers. With iron ore, as with all our treasure in materials, it will probably be necessary to go on, - "

And I skip a part of the citation here, and then proceed:

"And we will be doing less than our duty to ourselves and our sons if we fail to press vigorously a program of more complete manufacture - right across the board."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is absolutely correct. And it is because of this development, which is now assuming a very rapid pace, that of taking our natural resources out of this country cheaply, that certain forces in the United States changed their view on the deep waterway in the St. Lawrence. That is why last night, in the discussion on the Bills on second readings, I insisted that if we are going to have a deep waterway, it should be entirely an all-Canadian waterway, operated by and for the Canadian people.

It is certainly a known fact, that the United

States is dominating a whole series of vital basic industries in this country. That is true in the automobile industry, and to almost the same extent in the electrical industry, largely so in the rubber industry, and in the pulp and paper industry, and so on. The fact is that American investments in Canada reached a staggering total of almost $7,000,000.00, in natural resources and in bonds. Some people are very happy about that. I am not. These increased investments simply mean we are selling ourselves into bondage to the United States bankers for the future. I do not think the Government benches can question the fact that the interest and dividends which American investors take out of our Province annually is more than twice the amount we spend on all the social services in Ontario for the aged, the widows, the orphans, the sick, and for hospitalization. I suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is an incontrovertible truth. It is a shocking thing sometimes as we sit here and argue whether we can afford another $100,000.00 for a social service, to realize that twice that total expenditure leaves this Province in dividend payments every year. This blocks Canadian industrial development. It is preventing the growth of Ontario and the expansion of job opportunities. That is why there is this contradiction in this country, that hundreds of thousands of immigrants come in, and almost that many go out. That is why there is a feeling of insecurity, even amongst sections of the big business

men in this country. Many prominent Canadian business men have raised this question and tried to make a public issue of it. What I said in the last half hour has been said, although perhaps in different words, by many such prominent Canadian industrialists. The head of the Canadian Steel Wares gave an address which was almost word for word what Mr. Lyle said in the speech, from which I quoted.

We also have this contradication; that where the people of the country are made to feel happy that the Canadian dollar is on a parity with the United States dollar and have a feeling of pride in the fact that the dollar is no longer cheaper, we, as legislators, have to realize that it is as a result of the tremendous increase in American investments in this country during the past few years.

The Financial Post, which certainly can not be looked upon as a radical publication, had an editorial on this question a couple of weeks ago, in which it was said, under the caption "Crisis Averted", as follows:

> "Foreign capital pouring into Canada has saved us from some most unpleasant consequences. Without this inflow we would have been getting dangerously short of credit in the United States and elsewhere. We would have been in a worse predicament even than four years ago when we had to curb buying and travelling in the United States and generally pull in our belts.
>
> That crisis was brought on by buying far more from Uncle Sam than we were selling him."

That is the trouble. We avoided the dangerous

situation in which we found ourselves four years ago by the influx of American millions, and those were the millions which went into natural resources, which they want to dig up or cut down and cart away.

I submit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that what we should be concerned with, if we really look below the surface, is the task of recapturing independence for this country; we should be concerned with the task of regaining and primarily establishing Canadian sovereignty on all fronts, international as well as domestic. Regaining that independence, this country could speak out for peace, rather than trailing behind the leadership of Washington. Regaining the independence of expression, this country could dispense with a great deal of its armament program. May I say to the hon.members that I am not suggesting the disarmament of all our forces; I am not suggesting that at all. I think we should have a defence force in accordance with our size and the requirements of this country. I am not suggesting any international agreement, but I do say that, being aware of these things, and regaining our independence, Canada could play a great role in bringing together the big powers, and assisting to arrive at a peaceful understanding, to save the economy and the future welfare of the people of this

country and of others.

There is a slogan being spread amongst the people to the effect that "We will achieve peace through strength". That is not true, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Never was peace achieved through strength, or through a lack of harmony of the people. Rather, strength can be achieved through peace. That is an elementary truth -- strength through peace.

It is sometimes suggested the world is divided in such a manner that we cannot have peaceful relations one with the other, but if you stop to analyze that suggestion, you will realize how catastrophic it is. The fact is, we will either exist, regardless of economic or political differences in the systems of the regime of the people, or we will not exist at all. Miss Thompson touched on that in the column from which I quoted.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that Canada should follow that path, and that this province, this Government and this Legislature can and should make a great contribution toward that end. I think it will be for the improved interests of the people; I think it will enable us to solve the problem of unemployment. I think the present restrictions in regard to trade will be removed and the door will be opened wide to

enable other countries to buy everything we produce, for the next century. We could divert some of the funds now going into armaments, to take care of unemployment, and to make possible the extension of a building program; we could assure our agricultural industry of prosperity for a long, long time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not proposing this as a partisan matter. I would say to the hon.members of this House that it matters not what differences we have or what our estimations of the basic quarrels are; it matters not what division there may be between us in striving for the ultimate goal. I believe in socialist economics; most hon. members of this House do not, but I feel we can get together in a non-partisan way on the issues which are basically fundamental, and upon the solution of which everything else will depend.

I think this Government could bring pressure to bear, and set an example by the way we handle our own natural resources. They can bring pressure to bear on Ottawa. Let us not be afraid of that situation. The Globe and Mail had an editorial, after the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne commenced, urging this Government to "put the screws on Ottawa". I am not in favour of "putting the screws

on Ottawa" for partisan reasons, but I am in favour of all of us getting together and "putting the screws on Ottawa" for the policies which I have suggested. I think that each hon. member, in his heart, will recognize that as being fully acceptable. I think if we can get together on that, we can accomplish a great deal.

What I am suggesting is tantamount to a new type of unity, a unity of the people, based on a particular agreement. I think that is possible. I think there are forces in this country, and even in this House, which will agree with that.

This House opened, and quite appropriately took note of the death of the late King George the Sixth. There were the appropriate expressions of sympathy from this House; there have been remarks made in this debate about the great personality of the late King. May I quote from a speech made by the late King George the Sixth? In 1945, in his Christmas message, he used these words:

> "You have known the world only as a world of strife and fear, bring now all that fine spirit of service to make it one of joyous adventure, a home where men and women can live together in mutual trust, and walk together as friends."

And I suggest that might constitute a rallying

point for people in these times, when we are concerned with such serious challenges.

May I also be permitted to refer to a statement made by the Queen Mother, on January 17th last, when she was appealing to the people of Great Britain to give support to the new Queen, and she pleaded for His wisdom to guide her safely to her true destiny of peace and good will.

For myself, I most sincerely hope that the years during which the new Queen reigns, will be years of peace. I think we, as legislators, can make a great contribution to the province by trying to make the world one in which we can walk together, despite differences, and in which we can be friends despite fundamental disagreements.

If we do that, there is no limit to what this country can achieve, and it will be enabled to take its place among the nations of the world.

(Take "E" follows)

MR. W. J. STEWART (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate you most sincerely on your re-election as Speaker and upon the well-merited high degree of respect that you enjoy at the hands of every hon. member in this House.

The Speech from the Throne expressed our deep, profound sorrow in the passing of His Majesty, King George VI, and our sorrow, loyalty, devotion and affection to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth.

I wish to congratulate the hon. member for London (Mr. Robarts) and the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. Root) on their addresses in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and to all other hon. members who have made contributions in this House. We all rejoice that the Hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) has regained his health and has been continuing to ably discharge his duties. We look forward to the early return of the Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett), an able Minister, who is greatly missed. We all quite sincerely regret his suffering.

Mr. Speaker, for a period of time I have been absent from this House, and the reason is no great secret, it was due entirely to the fact that I did not get enough votes. However, why I did not was quite another question. When I look around the House,

I can see there are only nine other hon. members who were here when I entered the House in a by-election in 1938. Of these, six are on the Government side, four of whom are hon. Ministers, one an able Minister of the Gospel and our Deputy Speaker (Mr. Downer), and myself. I wish to congratulate the Deputy Speaker on his elevation to such a high office.

There are three hon. members in the Liberal Party; I refer to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), and the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck). I know you will all agree with me that the hon. members to whom I have referred, have always been held in very high respect and esteem, and justly so. I am not unmindful of the contributions made down through the years of a number of other hon. members who are not with us to-day. Some faces are missing. There are many new faces, and it is my sincere hope that it will be my privilege to get to know them, and I say that, regardless of party. It is our duty to view everything with a clear vision, and each pursue our course in keeping with the dignity of our individual and collective responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I know I should hesitate about

mentioning the word Toronto, but I hope you will bear with me when I say that to-day is a very historic day in the life of this great city.

118 years ago, on March 6th, 1834, York was incorporated, and Toronto became a city and held its first election on March 27th.

The Conservative Party to which I am very happy and proud to be a member by tradition and by personal conviction, went to the polls last November with a leader who, like many other hon. members of this House, served His Majesty in the First Great War. We went to the people with a leader with sound judgment, great personality, ability, and a keen sense of fairness and respect for all others with different political views. I am sure you will agree that down through the years in this House he has earned for himself the respect and affection of hon. members of his own party, as well as of hon. members of the Opposition.

A matter of major importance not only to Ontario, but to the Dominion of Canada, is the relations existing between all governments, and the Government of this Province of Ontario. This Government went to the people in November last, with an outstanding record of social legislation, human relations, labour relations

and with a splendid record of assistance to municipalities, education, welfare, major health and hospital advancement, highway development and eight consecutive surpluses that were used to assist the municipalities and to avoid new taxation.

In concluding my tribute to my leader, I wish to say that the party went to the people with a leader who truly leads. It has been rightly said there is a penalty for leadership; he who leads must live in the white light of publicity and criticism. Envy, fear, greed and the desire to surpass, are all as old as the human race but if a leader truly leads, he remains the leader. The Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is still our leader.

I believe this Government has been given a mandate by the people of Ontario on a record of accomplishment, of good government, and a good deal of trust has been placed in this Government on account of a very simple, yet profound promise made by the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). He said:

> "I shall endeavour to give the people of Ontario good government."

The people believed him. Mr. Speaker, I know in his heart he intends to make good that promise, and I believe he will by leadership and wise counsel.

However, in order to make good that promise, it imposes upon us an individual responsibility to support him and to take our duty seriously, to enable him to fulfil that promise. The numerical strength, I am sure you will agree, is without precedent, but that, to my mind, is not alone a matter for rejoicing. There is definitely an increased responsibility resting upon each and every individual hon. member of this House. My conception of the functions of opposition may differ with some, but I do not believe it is the function of the Opposition to obstruct by following a policy of destruction, nor, do I believe they think so. I believe by opposing arguments, working together on sound principles, hearing both sides of the question, truth will emerge. Therefore, it is the duty of each and every one of us to preserve our treasures of freedom and our Canadian way of life. We have treasures, Mr. Speaker, that are unsurpassed anywhere in this world. Ontario is richly endowed with resources, but our greatest resources are perishable, that is, our human resources. Their value cannot be measured.

The leadership by this Government in pioneering the rehabilitation of alcoholics is indeed most commendable, and I also believe, successful.

Also, the efforts made toward rehabilitation in reform institutionshave been successful. Yes, they are penal institutions, but I know at the same time, they are extending the helping hand, exemplifying that adage that "while the lamp holds out to burn, there is hope."

I would like to congratulate the Hon.Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) upon his splendid leadership and the sound policy he is pursuing.

Disease takes its daily toll of our human resources; therefore, I believe the Government is well worthy of commendation for its attack upon cancer, in the creation of the Cancer Institute and the building it is erecting at the Wellesley Hospital. and also the creation of the Cancer Research Institute with well-qualified, public spirited citizens to sit on its Board. I would like to make a suggestion to the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips), and that is that I sincerely hope the Government will direct its attention to some research to combat heart disease. May I respectfully suggest that should be the next course for the Health Department to take, because I think it is well worthy of the serious consideration of this Government.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with education; while the cost of education is a major factor in civic taxation in all large areas, Toronto and other centres, I am sure every hon. member will agree that society would not enjoy freedom, nor security, nor progress, without education. I believe the public of this Province want equal opportunities. That is their desire, and I believe also the objective of the Government. This province is indeed very fortunate in having as Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop), a man with such a background of academic qualifications and experience. We have had many excellent Ministers of Education, but the present Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunlop) is regarded province-wide as a man among men.

Shortly after coming into this House, I raised a question. This was over a decade ago when another Government was in power, and from our text-books they had deleted a number of patriotic poems, and had issued a new series of textbooks. Some of the poems deleted were, "Scots Wha Hae", "Ye Mariners of England", "The Private of the Buffs", "The Fighting Temeraire", "Love of Country", "Kipling's Recessional", "Farewell", "The Canadian", "Ode to Canadian Confederacy", "Vitai Lampada", "Canada's Call", "Charge of the Light Brigade", and "In Flanders Fields". These

inspirational and patriotic poems did not appear in the new issue of the textbooks, and while sitting in the Opposition, I brought this matter to the attention of the House. I have since learned the reason given for deleting these poems in part was some public tendency to disparage expressed patriotism. In 1942 the same Government prepared and issued to all schools an insert for textbooks which included twelve of the poems that had been deleted. I believe 55 had been deleted, but 12 went back, and when reprints were made of the textbooks, these twelve poems were included. In all, there were 54 new patriotic poems in the new textbooks. Among these poems are, "Scots Wha Hae", "Kipling's Recessional", "In Flanders Fields", "Dunkirk", "Little Boats of Britain", "Hymn for the Nations".

MR. Speaker, I sincerely urge that we continue to teach Democracy and all that it means in our schools and to encourage the holding of class elections among our junior pupils so they will become familiar with nominating, the use of the ballot, and learning to abide by the will of the majority.

Let us keep on telling the story in our schools, the story of the Empire; some may call it the Commonwealth, but to me it is the Empire, the British Empire. We

should tell the story of the Empire, tell the story of the Motherland, the founding and the building of this Dominion, love of country, and all the men and women who served and sacrificed and gave their all in the cause of freedom. Tell them the story of the days when Britain stood alone, honoured with the burden, burdened with the honour of the stewardship of humanity. Tell them the story of England, the creditor who always waits, England the debtor who always pays.

Education, to my mind, is the solution of many of our problems, but with changed present-day conditions due to abnormal prosperity, some homes have not changed for the better. That is a condition, I believe, that imposes a greater responsibility upon our schoolteachers who are doing a splendid job in character-building with the rising generation.

To-day we instill in their minds that liberty comes from discipline and self-restraint, that you have to sow to reap, that life is serving, giving, and not getting, and that with privilege there is definitely responsibility. Teach them Democracy in the schools, but also teach them something of temperance, temperance not alone in the handling of liquor, but temperance in all things. Education is equally

as important as legislation, and I regret, Mr. Speaker, that has not been given enough consideration in the minds of some people. We are getting to the stage where we depend too much on legislation. Why does the Government not do this, and show that there is still such a thing as individual responsibility and the value of education. Let us say to-day that we teach the fundamentals of good citizenship to prevent a collapse of our moral foundations.

We should teach and stress what we have owed the Motherland down through the years, and that we are only bound by a silken cord.

On Sunday, February 24th, I listened to a broadcast from New York. On this broadcast the question was asked, "Do Canadians pay a fixed sum of taxes to England, or on a per capita basis?" That came over the radio on Sunday, February 24th. Mr. Speaker, let us do all we can to stimulate in the hearts of our people, pride in citizenship, so every boy, girl, man and woman will stand up with pride and say, "I am a Canadian". You hear the Americans say with pride, "I am an American". Let us say, "I am a Canadian."

Our teachers are doing a splendid job, and

I suggest a supplementary textbook, telling the story of Empire and the service of coronation, be prepared and given to every school, to every pupil. Mr. Speaker, you said when you were a private member sitting over here in a particularly telling speech,

that "Democracy or dictatorship? Freedom or slavery? God or mammon"?

When the coronation ceremony is on, it will bring before the eyes and ears of the world the foundation upon which the British Empire has been built. Queen Victoria said the secret of success of the Empire was keeping the Bible open. When the new Monarch is crowned, the Archbishop of Canterbury will place in the hand of Her Majesty the Queen the volume of the Sacred Law and say, "Here is wisdom; this is the Royal law; these are the lively oracles of God."

Why not tell that story in a textbook to the pupils now that the coronation is approaching? Give the pupils the true story of Empire, tell them what the Crown and the Throne are the symbol of and the significance of the coronation. Tell them the story of the Confederation; of this province, the conditions and the terms under which we are free and willing partners in the partnership of the British Empire.

Tell them of the life, of the national resources of the Province of Ontario.

Now, Mr. Speaker, regarding our hospitals. The public to-day, I believe, are hospital-minded people. Hospitals were very thoroughly discussed in the last election. I think you will agree there has been a great change in the public mind towards going to the hospital. Years ago, people were not willing to go, but there has been a great change.

I was very happy to note that the Government had added 5600 new beds. I think, however, this can only be the beginning, if we are going to meet the needs. We have Blue Cross and other health and welfare plans. There is bound to be a further increasing demand for hospitalization. People with medical plans who heretofore would not consider going to a hospital, now feel they are paying for them, and they are entitled to a bed, and they are going to demand that bed, and if they do not get it, they are going to blame the Government.

I submit that what the Government has done, is only the beginning; it will go on and provide better accommodation.

The riding which I represent, Parkdale, has

three great hospitals, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital -- what a timely name -- some years ago it was called the Home for Incurables -- we have St. Joseph's Hospital and the Mercy Hospital, both at Queen and Sunnyside, and they, together with other hospitals in this Province, are giving a great humanitarian service.

The people of this Province have placed their confidence in this Government, and I am sure the Government will continue its policy of expansion in hospital accommodation. The Government has a great record of achievement in public health which has not been confined to hospitals alone. The Department of Health has to its credit a record of great achievement and has, I know, a very comprehensive program.

(Take "F" follows.)

The Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, forecast legislation to care for persons between the ages of eighteen and sixty-five totally and permanently disabled. Therefore, many unemployables will be given assistance. The Speech also forecast legislation to assist our elder, needy citizens, our elder citizens between the ages of sixty-five and seventy years, also legislation to improve the Workmen's Compensation Act. The legislation enacted and the legislation forecast in the Speech from the Throne is entitled to the appellations which you hear from day to day, "A people's government", "A people's party","A government legislating for the masses and not for a few favoured classes."

In care for the aged, Mr. Speaker, Ontario has done a splendid service in caring for these people through benevolent and fraternal organizations. Much has been done for our older citizens which, to my mind, is highly desirable and commendable.

May I say that as we all approach the sunset and eventide of life, and as the shadow of evening lengthens about us, and as we reach the sere and yellow leaf of age, let us remember in studying our economy what is material. The wealth of this life you cannot take with you, but if wisely used to assist mankind in this life, it will give you entrance to the realms of happiness. Material wealth

won't pay your passage, as you well know, across the Jordan. I believe the only deposit we have to make, Mr. Speaker, the good-will in this life, such as good deeds, charitable deeds, human kindness, help to the less fortunate, will give us a net balance upon which we may write a cheque to secure our passage in life's greatest adventure. Money given for the care of the aged should not be regarded as an expenditure, but should be termed as an investment, paying the greatest reward.

The government's assistance to the aged has wholehearted public approval. I sincerely hope that legislation we may bring in from time to time will mean that every person who needs it in life will have that security and happiness, to which everyone is entitled. And I say, as did Sir William Mulock on his retirement:

> "The testimony I bear is this; that the castle of enchantment is not behind me. It is before me still and daily I catch glimpses of its battlements and towers. The rich spoils of memory are mine. Mine too are the previous thing of to-day -- books, flowers, nature and sport. The 1st of May is still an enchanted day for me. The last thing of all is friends. The best of life is always further on. Its real lure is hidden from our eyes, somewhere beyond the hills of time".

Mr. Speaker, care of the aged by government assistance is indeed most commendable and I congratulate a government that continues to lead the way towards the

betterment of humanity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I near conclusion I would like to say a word or two on housing. Housing, to my mind, continues to be a number one priority. The Speech from the Throne recognizes that the home is the backbone of the nation and, therefore, we as members, should do all we can to assist the individual, to encourage young people to buy or build a building in which to create and maintain a home. The forecast of legislation regarding down-payments will give relief and encouragement to many.

On present-day conditions of housing, we should support the leadership of this government, and I submit we should have a study of the tax structure, the taxes on real properties, and assistance to municipalities. It is highly important and extremely urgent. We must attack builders and investment capital. We must maintain real estate as a sound investment rather than have real estate become a liability upon the owners.

The Speech from the Throne informed us that the intention of the government was directed to the solution of fiscal and other problems of the municipalities. This timely consideration is greatly needed, and rates a very high priority.

Toronto and York members of this House met the

other day with the Mayor, Board of Control, and members of the Toronto City Council and in due course you will hear their recommendations and the presentation of their Bill, together with the submissions of the Mayor, and the Reeves of the various municipalities throughout Ontario. But might I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that to my mind, grants and subsidies to municipalities is only a palliative but not the solution. Re-alignment of the tax structure and taxing powers, and the study or re-alignment of civic and provincial responsibilities is immediately required.

I have been reliably informed that the building of homes is retarded and in some places, stopped not only by a lessening of cash purchases, but for other reasons. I have been told that some municipalities require a builder who is building on a large scale, to pay for all the services before building. Then, in addition to that, he has to provide a lump sum of cash towards school buildings and these charges are added to the purchase price of the home, and young people have to assume them, so the building permits are not being issued as freely to builders as they might be. Why? -- because some of these municipalities fear two things. They fear the immediate demand for school accommodation and the potentials of welfare and relief

costs. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the government will go on considering the problem, encourage home building and protect and enrich family life.

The St. Lawrence power development has been adequately dealt with in this House. It was well presented, construtively debated and I think it will mean further employment and we are all agreed that employment depends on industrial progress and expansion, and to progress we must have power. The Speech from the Throne informed us that we would. We were called on to ratify and confirm the agreement. Well, you know what has happened to that. The Federal government and this government are in agreement regarding the water-way and power rights. That is indeed good news. I sincerely hope that the Federal government will see its way clear to go on with the seaway. This major development together with the power development will tend to provide work in great measure for our people. The building of the seaway will greatly increase the demand for labour. I sincerely hope that it will go on. When the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) made his statement on the comprehensive program he is considering for buildings such as the Osgoode Hall addition to the East Block, Liquor Control Building, bridges and underpasses, as and when the restrictions are removed

by the Federal government, that was indeed good and heartening news. Such vision gives our people great encouragement.

Mr. Speaker, the last thing I wish to mention is the preservation of our democratic rights. Many individuals in this province of Ontario -- I think you have all had the same experience when elections come around, rely upon officials or somebody else to put their name on the voters' list, and then when they find their name is not on, what a disappointment. I know it is an individual responsibility, but let us see that we do everything we possibly can to safeguard their democratic rights and protect them to the greatest measure we possibly can, and I most respectfully submit that some study should be made of the system for obtaining enumeration and for paying for it. Also, the increasing of penalties for the destruction of posted voters' lists.

The City of Toronto mails every voter a postcard officially telling him or her where the polling booth is located and the number of the division in which he or she votes, if his or her name is on the list. But in a provincial election, this responsibility rests upon the candidate, and where there are two or three candidates running, there is literature coming from

(Page F-7 follows.)

two or three sources, each at the expense of the candidate to say nothing of the fact that if it is not well done, the voter is not instructed where his polling booth is.

In passing, I would like to express my appreciation to the Chief Election Officer, and the D.R.O. and R.O.'s who assisted in the election campaign. I am sure that the Chief Election Officer would agree with me that improvement could be made and I would respectfully suggest that some consideration be given to a means for insuring that voters' names are on the lists without relying on their individual responsibility.

It has been well said that citizens are the city. I would like to pay my tribute to the Toronto Board of Education and their Mr. Monkman, for the splendid service they are rendering for the province and this country. They are doing a splended service for this country; they are teaching basic English to new Canadians and I think there are something like 6000 attending these night classes. Ontario is developing at about of rate of 15,000 a month and the last Federal figures I had showed the population has gone up nearly two and one-half million in the last decade. We are having imposed upon us a duty which I fear many are not assuming to the full, so if we are going to invite new

Canadians to come to our land and be citizens of this country, if we are getting these people in, then our duty is to welcome them, to assimilate them and encourage them to become good citizens and encourage them to preserve the very best of their native culture, to be sure, but also it is your responsibility and mine to teach new Canadians our ideals of citizenship and democracy and do so not only by word-of-mouth, but by example. Extend mutual friendship and that means an individual responsibility. It is your duty and it is mine to meet the new Canadians, invite them into our social life, to intermingle and ask them to assist us in building and developing Ontario.

In Parkdale riding, there are a goodly number of people who have by choice made this province their new homeland. I have many in my riding. Some of them have been there for two or three generations and some have just arrived on this soil, and I find they are all, or a large majority, contributing splendidly to our daily life.

In Parkdale riding, they are good home makers, they have purchased good homes. Homes are well furnished, well-kept, and I find the new Canadians intensely interested in learning the language and the principles of good citizenship. Even in greater measure than some of our own people.

Parkdale riding has a large number of homes bordering on the east border of High Park. It has its professional offices, retail districts, churches, libraries, and a body of people whom I am delighted to have the privilege of representing. May I say through you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I am eternally grateful for the confidence they have reposed in me, and it will be my constant endeavour to be worthy of their confidence. I say whether they voted Conservative or whether they did not, I want to be their faithful representative and do all I can to advance the welfare of the public, regardless of Party politics. I believe in a policy of government by principle and not alone by Party.

With a large influx of capital from the United States investing in the resources of this province, with nature so bountiful to us in the agricultural world, industrious and law-abiding people, of Ontario -- yes, of the Dominion of Canada, I say the future is great. Let us face it with confidence.

MR. A. WREN (Kenora): Mr. Deputy Speaker, in rising to continue the debate on the reply to the address on the Speech from the Throne, I want to say that I am honoured to represent the Kenora constituency in this Legislature, and I must confess that I came here

with some misgivings about the reception I would receive both from the hon. members of the House and the hon. Ministers of the Cabinet, but I must say that I have been very well received, and I am looking forward to meeting each and every individual hon. member of the House, and I look forward to seeing the various Cabinet Ministers in their capacities, and I know that if I am as well received as I have been, our relationships will be most amicable.

I think there must have been some premonition in the appointment of the new Lieutenant-Governor because it was just a short time ago that a township in my riding was named for His Honour and we are honoured now to know that there is a connection between the township and the present Lieutenant-Governor of the province.

I was rather interested the other day when the seconder of the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. Root) said that we had not been elected on the policies of the Liberal Party. I wondered then if the hon. member for Wellington North was perhaps better informed than some of us, but I do want to say this to the House; we are a small island and it may be that there will have to be difficulties and obstacles removed to make our Party as effective as it should be in a healthy two-Party

system. If those obstacles have to be removed, we will have to take steps to remove them.

While reference is being made to the small island in this House, I would remind you of another small island in this world which was also beseigrd and which emerged victorious. However, I am a young man and I hope I will not in a few years be too disillusioned.

I look on this House as being composed of men elected to represent their respective ridings and the hon.member who was speaking before me, I think, had the same idea. I have been connected with my riding for quite a number of years, in public affairs, and I know how easy it is to criticize public men and I know sometimes how unfairly they can be criticized for doing what they know, through full knowledge of the facts, is right as against the criticism they receive from persons who have little knowledge of the facts, and I want to say this to the government that as far as I am concerned -- and I think it runs right through the Liberal opposition in this House -- I hope, and I sincerely hope, that our Opposition in this Legislature at all times will be constructively critical and that when we do criticize something we will not do it for the mere sake of opposition nor for the mere opportunity

to make a noise, but that we will be able to offer along with it, some sensible alternatives.

I want to make one suggestion and I know it may sound a bit unreal coming from this side of the House, but I do want to make, respectfully, one suggestion to the government and especially since it is apparent that the development of the deep water-way will soon become a fact. With the deepening of the waterway, northwestern Ontario will become more and more important as an economic section and an economic factor in this province. I do not think that I can emphasize too strongly how our people -- and I mean by that, northwestern Ontario -- how those people are looking forward to that development. It is something that we have dreamed about for years and never supposed that it would take place. But with this development in addition to those things which we already have to deal with, may I make this suggestion to the government?

(Page G-1 follows)

I feel that the Government should be duty-bound due both to our geographical position and our population and to our economical importance, to appoint a Cabinet Minister from North-western Ontario whenever the opportunity presents itself. In the last Legislature I realize you had only one Progressive-Conservative member from North-western Ontario; this time you have three. You have the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden), the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Mapledoram) and the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Wardrope). I know that all people in North-western Ontario, and certainly all of the people in my riding, would be very much pleased and gratified if an hon. member from North-western Ontario were to take a seat in the Cabinet councils of this Province.

Our difficulties and our representations are very real indeed and sometimes when we speak it might sound as if our problems are very minute in comparison to the discussions which take place and have to do with matters pertaining to Southern Ontario, an area to which we refer as "The Banana Belt". Nevertheless, our problems are real and while we may talk in thousands of dollars to solve our problems while you people talk in millions and sometimes hundreds of millions, nevertheless our problems are just as real, and I think it has become an established fact, despite criticism of both political parties

across this country that, wherever they happen to be in government, Cabinets take upon themselves too much of government, nevertheless it is a fact that Cabinet councils do run the Province and do run the Dominion when the House is not in session. Therefore I think we are justly entitled to, and, I again respectfully hope that the Government will give serious consideration to the appointment of one of the hon. Progressive Conservative members from North-western Ontario to membership in the Cabinet.

We are particularly observant of your highway development, and just last week-end I had the opportunity of travelling in the northern part of the southern part of the Province, up around Barrie, Orillia, etc., and had an opportunity to look at your new super-highway now under construction. It is certainly a fine piece of construction and I think will certainly serve a great need in that area. But we too are in need of considerable highway development. Despite the years that have passed, we still have only one main road through our country. We do have a very large number of secondary roads which are vital to us and which are in very bad condition. I know and I think all fair-minded people up our way realize that had it not been for the war there would have been more extensive developments along those lines. We were quite willing to set aside our needs in the interests of the war effort, we knew that

materials, men and machinery were needed to pursue the war effort, but since the war I say in all sincerity that I do not think enough has been done in highway development in our area. I know too that we cannot produce figures and statistics to prove that we are taking in a large volume of money for the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) in the way of gasoline taxes, etc., simply because we have not yet a sufficiently large population to produce those revenues, but I think an investment in the north country is an investment upon which the Province will never fail to make gains, and our main consideration is not that we are asking for super-highways, we do not ask even that we be given the very best type of gravel road, but we are lacking in this area roadsthat will bear the type of traffic existent there today. Our secondary roads were built for horse-and-buggy travel in the days when the settlers were opening up the country, and we have a situation where those roads will not stand the present tourist, contract and industrial traffic which they are required to carry in this present day. Our culverts, our bridges, our drainage, everything that has to do with those roads is in a very sad state of disrepair in a general way and there are very few townships and very few rural areas which can afford even to match the grants which are available from the Government for highway-improvement purposes.

Again I do not suggest for one minute that the Government has been unfair or unreasonable in the matter of grants for highway improvement in the north, because in some cases the grants extend from sixty-five to eighty per cent depending on the type of township road on which it applies, but those communities, some of which are very small, have passing through them the type of traffic which requires a high standard of road grading, and the extra 35% which the township would have to raise is beyond their financial capacity. I know the point has been raised before but I want to raise it again, that something should be done to put those roads into a condition where they will carry the traffic required and where it will then be within the means of those people to maintain.

We need too, outlet roads, and we need them quite badly at the present time. There is the projected road in the Rainy River and Thunder Bay districts from Atikokan to the lakehead areas. There are other communities too which require outlets. I could give a number of examples. We have one area for instance in Minaki which in the summer is a tourist community of two thousand to three thousand people. This community requires a secondary road or something of that nature about fifteen miles in length. Successive governments and successive political parties have promised these people for over fifteen years that they would get an outlet. It is that type of delay and procrastination which is holding up the development of a good many

communities like this one.

Something which also was hindered by the war was the development of rural hydro throughout north-western Ontario. Plans were prepared prior to the war, and in the early war years, but the need for men and material in the war effort again was of paramount importance. Since the war the Hydro Commission and this government have made a commendable effort to expand rural hydro and that development is continuing but again we think the pace of construction should be accelerated. One thing that is causing some difficulty there and which again resolves itself into an investment in the future is the fact that in some of our rural areas which often are not so thickly populated as are yours in the south, we find it difficult to meet hydro requirements of three consumers to the mile and we are hopeful that this government and the Hydro Commission will consider reducing the requirements possibly to two or even to a point between two and three over an average distance and in addition giving area managers and local managers some flexibility and authority to adjust these rules to local conditions.

HON. G.H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member (Mr. Wren) knows that that is not a deterrent. By guaranteed contracts they can get their service.

MR. WREN: If the consumers are less than three to a mile, sir?

MR. CHALLIES: Yes, in order to get the density they can give a guaranteed contract which makes up the difference.

MR. WREN: Well, they certainly have not been able to, to date, and I would certainly like to discuss that with the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) with a view to clearing up whatever misunderstanding may have occurred.

Again in the hydro field there are several communities such as Nes Tor Falls, Sioux Narrows, Minaki - which I mentioned a little while ago - Dyment, and Ignace, which are communities deserving of hydro service but for varying reasons, some again do to lack of material and men, some through technicalities and regulations, have not been able to enjoy hydro privileges. I sincerely hope that these, too, will receive the attention we think they deserve.

Another pressing problem in the north which was dealt with in the Speech From The Throne and which has been dealt with by several hon. members who spoke before me, is the problem of financing education. This to us is a particularly serious problem and again, while we know you have that problem in the south, it becomes more serious to us because we do not have the density of industrial assessment which you enjoy in the southern part of the Province. Government grants to us, therefore, are all-important and we feel most strongly and certainly hope the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) will take under advisement

a new formula of assistance for judicial districts. In your counties here, as hon. members know, you have first of all your county government working in conjunction with your municipal government and through both to the Provincial Government of course, but you have a well defined local authority that can take care of a wide-spread problem such as education in scattered areas. We do not have this. Every municipality in northwestern Ontario is more or less on its own. Then too, we have a large part of the area which is not organized at all and which has to rely entirely on local boards. We hope that some new formula for the assistance of education can be worked out, particularly with regard to our judicial districts.

Another serious problem in education which I wish to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunlop) is the capital financing of new schools. As the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) knows through discussion and through his vast knowledge of municipal affairs in this Province the financing of any type of capital expenditure in the municipalities is becoming increasingly difficult and in some cases impossible. Nevertheless our population in the north, as is yours here, is steadily increasing and we are faced with the steadily increasing need of providing educational facilities and staff to teach our children. Both capital costs and maintence costs are continually rising as they are everywhere else,

but our problem in capital financing is that, especially in these days of difficult general financing we are required to raise the total amount of money required to build a new school, that is to say, the municipality is required if a school was to cost $250,000.00, to float a debenture issue for that amount of money; the Board, of course, through their annual approved costs, recover the approved grant on that debt charge each year during the life of those debentures, but there is that initial need to finance the total cost in organized municipalities of that project. We have two or three municipalities who need new schools badly and have to set aside consideration of these projects until some more favourable financing method comes to light or until some other means of building the instituations becomes possible.

I have two suggestions which have been placed before me to make to the Government in this regard, particularly with reference to capital financing and that is, first of all to widen the scope of the Ontario Municipal Corporation to permit the purchase of debentures by the Corporation after a period of sixty of ninety days; in other words, it would give a municipality or a school section, as the case may be, sixty to ninety days to market the debentures, provided or course that the project first must be approved by the Department of Education and others concerned. If, after that time, the broker-dealers and others are

not able to dispose of the debentures, then the Municipal Improvement Corporation would be permitted to purchase. Another matter which is very important to us, and which we recommend also, is that the grants which the Department makes on these annual debt charges in debentures for school purposes should be fixed over the life of the debentures and that the grant payable in any year by percentage is not less than the grant payable in the year the debentures were issued.

I want to impress upon hon. members of the House that in northwestern Ontario we do not have university facilties. We hope some day we will, but that is something which is not in our foreseeable future, therefore the training of our young people is necessarily done to a large extent in our public, separate, continuation and high schools. We are not able, save in rare instances, to get our children away to university and therefore we feel that it is all the more important that we have good schools and good teaching staffs on the elementary and secondary level. We need good school buildings and good staffs.

Another feature of the regulations which presently are quite severe on some of our municipalities and on some of our school sections is the applying of the regulations to populations of 2,500 where, after the population exceeds that number, the grants fall off quite sharply. Another thing which concerns

us, as it concerns the whole Province, is some form of interim aid to our municipalties. I notice the Toronto Members have met with the Council of the City of Toronto with the view in mind of presenting to the Government a petition to produce what they call "A Fair Deal For Toronto." I sincerely hope the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the Government will not entertain special consideration for any particular manicipality until those special forms of assistance extend to all of us. We are in precisely the same position as is the city of Toronto and many other municipalities in Ontario, the cost of financing our municipal operations is becoming more and more difficult and in some cases reaching a point of impossibility. Particularly do we find this to be true in the field of social services with regard to unemployment relief and Children's Aid. These two features of our municipal organizations in particular are becoming extremely costly.

Hospitalization is another matter which is causing a great deal of concern in our communities and at this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to digress for a few moments in order to pay tribute to the late Minister of Health, the hon. Mr. Kelley. The hon. Mr. Kelley was in the north on ocassion and we have met him here on several ocassions with regard to hospitalization, and I do not think I ever met a Cabinet Minister in any government or of any political party who was more sincerely and genuinely

interested in hospitals and in public health generally. To us in the north he was a great man and we sincerely regret his passing.

I want to say too of the present hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips), that he is equally interested and I am sure is going to make an equally valuable contribution to the Department of Health in this Province.

In hospitalization again we are faced with serious costs which directly affect our municipalities. Generally, in the north, hospitals are operated by independent Boards. In rare instances they are operated by municipalities but whichever is the case, there are annual "Raids" of necessity by those hospitals on the municipalities to reimburse them for unpaid accounts particuarly, and, again for the sharply increasing costs of operation. We do not know what the answer is but we do feel there should be a concerted attempt made to place hospital financing on a sound basis.

(Take H Follows)

What I have in mind,when I say that,is this particular problem. Right through the north-west, in Port Arthur, Fort William, Fort Francis, Rainy River, Kenora, Red Lake, Sioux Lookout, and in Dryden, these hospitals are situated in particular communities, but the hospital services have vastly larger numbers of people than contained in the communities in which those hospitals are located. We recommend that in all of these areas -- in the judicial districts again -- hospital districts be located for the areas which the hospitals serve. It is a bit unreasonable at times to find a hospital becoming a direct burden on one community, while at the same time serving a large area, while the people in the larger, and in most cases unorganized areas, have no direct responsibility to bear, for the institution which is serving them.

HON. MR. FROST (Prime Minister): May I ask the hon. member (Mr. Wren) if we did not recognize that at Sioux Lookout?

MR. WREN: Oh, yes, Mr. Prime Minister. I am speaking in general terms of all the hospitals. What we are suggesting now is the annual maintenance costs of hospitals should be borne by all the people whom the hospitals serve, rather than by any isolated

community in which the hospital is situated. I am not speaking particularly of Sioux Lookout. We have the problem right through the north-west, and in the places where the hospital facilities are adequate, the costs of maintenance constitute a very pressing problem.

Another matter which has been discussed in the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and which is vital to a great many of us, is housing. It is particularly important to us, and presents some difficulties, inasmuch as my understanding of the present regulations is that communities with under five thousand population cannot gain assistance for housing. The larger proportion of our communities have a population of under five thousand, and the housing problem in these communities is just as serious if not in some cases more serious, than it is in the larger communities, particularly when we have regard to the climate in which we live.

The town in which I live, and every town in my riding, is faced with a difficult housing problem, and we hope some means can be worked out by the Government, with the assistance of the municipalities, to provide adequate housing for people in communities

with a population of less than five thousand.

In regard to our labour legislation, we have one or two suggestions to make: first of all, in nearly all the ridings in the north-west, we have a large number of railroad employees. I know in my own riding, of several instances where injuries have been sustained by young men engaged by the railway, and making student trips for the purpose of determining whether they are fit to be engine-men or trainmen, or other members of the train crews. Under the present compensation act, these men, if injured while undergoing this training, are not eligible for compensation. It is true they are, in a sense, apprentices, but frequently the period of training is very short -- in some cases as few as five trips, and we feel they should be covered and protected by the compensation laws of this province.

There is another matter in connection with the labour legislation having to do with compensation, which I would like briefly to mention. We feel that some adjustment should be made in the pension scheme for widows, and so forth, of workmen who were killed during their employment in previous years. Some of these people are now finding it very difficult to exist,

in the face of the rising cost of living. I realize it is not the responsibility of this Government to control the cost of living, but I feel that an adjustment in our pension scheme might be made, to better meet the present-day conditions.

There is one other matter I would like to mention. Surprise was expressed the other day when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) made some reference to labour laws and labour relations. I do not think there was any thought in the mind of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition -- indeed, of any hon. member -- but what the present Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) is a man vitally interested in his job. What we are interested in suggesting is that the work of this Department and this Hon. Minister be enlarged in its scope, to include the appointment of officers who could be "on the job", perhaps as free agents, to, shall we say, forestall possible strikes by gathering information beforehand, which may lead toan avoidance of a strike before it takes place.

I think in this connection some of our labour people are failing in their responsibilities. Let us

consider the strike in Windsor, -- not the last one, but the one which caused considerable damage and trouble. And may I say that I speak with a little authority on labour matters. I think that strike reached its proportion and its difficult stage from the fact that the union heads themselves did not know a strike was called. Some of them were too busy with party politics to pay much attention to their jobs as heads of the union.

I think if a conciliation officer, or whatever term you would like to attach to him, could so act as to be aware of the feeling of the men, and the feeling of the industry, it might be possible to forestall any drastic action, before a difficult and expensive shut-down takes place.

In the field of mining there is something which is also very important to us. Red Lake, as the hon. members know, is one of the most important mining camps in Ontario, if not in the whole Dominion. We have hopes of further development there.

One thing which is causing some concern throughout my riding, and something upon which we are seeking further information, is the matter of the holding of mining claims. I was interested to note

an article in the Toronto Daily Star of March 5th, where it says: "Mining land patents will be an issue at the forthcoming prospectors' meeting". I think that is a matter which has been of interest and some concern to many mining people and many potential investors for a long time, and the system of allowing people to hold claims without developing them, to the detriment of the area, is something which should be corrected.

I think it is worth noting that in this article to which I have referred, Mr. Rickaby, the Deputy Minister of Mines, said he would not give the attitude of the Government, but he would give information on dormant mining lands, and it will be left for the prospectors and developers, if they wish, to get together and submit proposals to the Government.

It is my hope that out of this situation will arise some new suggestions for a formula which will effect a more effective development of mining properties than has been the case before.

In the mining communities in the north, one of their great difficulties is in the field of transportation. In the Red Lake District we have the responsibility for the maintenance of roads going to

the various mining properties.

In one area, the Red Lake Road was constructed, according to my information, by the Department of Mines, and that road simply remains there to-day without any maintenance and without any attention, because the Department of Highway officers in that area stated that the Department of Mines had built the road, therefore it was not a responsibility of the Department of Highways to maintain it.

(Take "I" follows)

Nevertheless, it costs many thousands of dollars to build and that asset certainly should not be permitted to go to waste, whichever department should bear the responsibility.

HON. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): What highway is that please?

MR. WREN: From Red Lake down, sir, to the Matson Mine.

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is only about seven miles.

MR. WREN: The Department of Lands and Forests is another department in which all people in the north are vitally interested, indeed it is a department which is of interest to the whole Province. The timber in the north is actually the only real sustaining asset that we have. We have mines, it is true, we have gold mines and now we enjoy the fruits of effort put into the Steep Rock area. Nevertheless, the hard rock mines are wasting assets and sooner or later the ore bodies will peter out. In timber, however, we have an asset which if properly managed will be sustained for many years to come and we are watching very carefully - and when I say "we" I mean every thinking cirizen in the north regardless of his politics and regardless of who he might be - are watching very carefully any proposals which might be made for the management of timber resources in the Province. There is need for very very careful management because in the past, and I am not going to

point a finger at any political party when I say this, there has been very delibreate mismanagement in many instances and we are looking forward to the time when we can put this sustaining resource under careful management within the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this government and succeeding governments regardless of their political party will see the day when trading in assets belonging to the Crown will cease. I think that rights to timber, that vital resource which is so important to us, should only be allocated to a person on the assumption, yes, on the known fact that they are going to produce from those areas some permanent industry and when the time comes that those limits or those licenses of occupation or whatever else they might be called are not intended to be carried on any longer, the improvements made by those people in the form of roads etc. should be paid for by the Crown and the interest in them returned to the Crown until some other person is interested in taking them up for the production of new wealth in that area.

I know there are some people who may not agree with a statement of that kind and I am certainly not directing any attack on the Department of Lands and Forests. What I am doing is suggesting to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) that if his policy of timber management is sound and real and designed to foster the interests of the northwestern part of the Province, and of the Province of Ontario as a whole

then he will find us and every right thinking person in the Province right behind him. If there is going to be "horse trading" in these vital resources of ours, we are going to fight.

In the matter of public safety I am inclined to support the opinion of the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) in his remarks concerning the pay of Provincial police officers and I am going to go a little bit farther and apply that to all enforcement officers. It is a tragedy that our men, and particularly our promising young men, in our law enforcement agencies, are actually being starved out of their jobs in some cases, men who have a keen interest and have showed definite promise in a police career are forced to leave it. I have several capable men among my personal friends who feel they will have to leave the force because it is impossible to maintain a decent home and a decent standard of living on the salary which they are paid. I hope some definite approach can be made to placing these men on a standard of pay which is in line with the responsibilities they bear and the respect they are entitled to from other citizens of the Province.

There is one other matter in connection with our police which is very important although it might not sound like much to some hon. members of the House. We have instances of men going from southern Ontario to the north and, as I mentioned in my remarks earlier, housing is almost impossible to obtain for the

people who live there and it is even less possible for men who move into the area to carry out the necessary functions of government. There should be constructed without delay adequate housing or barracks or whatever you want to call them in the northern part of Ontario for our law enforcement agencies. These men are compelled to live under most trying conditions, in fact I have had Provincial police officers and their families living in my garage at the back of my lot, which was the only place they could get to live. I do not think it is fair and I do not think they can do a good job under conditions of that kind.

Another matter I should like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote), if it comes under his department - and if it does not, I stand subject to correction - in the town of Dryden, which many hon. members of this House have visited, we have an area served by the Ontario Provincial police both within and without the town, where all prisoners under the charge of the constables necessarily are brought to Dryden to be locked up and held for trial. The conditions under which those prisoners are kept is abominable. The cells are in a terrible state and I strongly recommend that something be done to erect in that community a Provincial police administrative building in which could be contained proper police offices and adequate, safe rooms for prisoners.

I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by repeating that I am honoured to be a member of this legislature for Kenora and I hope and trust, as I said at the outset of my address that the cooperation of the government with our riding will continue. I find it an honour indeed to be named among the 90 people who represent this banner Province of ours. I feel there are great days ahead of us. On some issues no doubt we will have to quarrel at times, but I think on the vital issues, as was mentioned by several hon. members in the debate on the seaway, on the vital issues that concern us most, we are first, we are last and we are always Canadians and I think that in the north the hon. members for Rainy River (Mr. Noden), Fort William (Mr. Mapledoram) and Port Arthur (Mr. Wardrope) who will agree with me that you will find in those of us who have come from there now, and who will in future come to this Legislature, the true north, strong and free.

MR. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, I could not possibly finish in ten minutes and I therefore move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House I think my friend the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) has something to tell the House.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. S Speaker, I think probably it is of public interest that

after more than two weeks of negotiations which extended well into many nights and until four o'clock this morning, as a matter of fact, I can announce that a basis of settlement has been arrived at between the C.C.M. and the local union concerned.

(Take J. Follows)

HON. MR. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, to-morrow I would like to proceed with the Debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. We may take a few Bills at the conclusion of the Debate, and if we do, I will advise the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) as to what Bills will be considered, and I can assure him there will be no contentious Bills proceeded with. Possibly we might have two hon. members make their contributions to the Debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

To-morrow afternoon, of course, we meet at two o'clock.

I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

- - - - - - - -