Volume 25.

P R O C E E D I N G S .

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS TWENTY-SECOND DAY OF MARCH, A. D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT TWO O'CLOCK, P. M.

- - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario
Wednesday, March 22, 1950
2.00 o'clock, p. m.

- - - - - -

2.00 O'CLOCK, P. M.

And the House having met.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

AUTHORITY FOR RAISING MONEY ON THE CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is the ordinary borrowing Bill which is introduced at each Session of the Legislature. I would not want the hon. members to be startled by the amount in the Bill, $100 million, but it has been thought desirable to place that amount in the borrowing Bill, but, as in past years, that is an amount probably in excess of anything that may be required, but it gives leeway in the matter of refunding, and things of that sort.

THE DIVISION COURT ACT

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

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill was drawn on recommendations made by a committee which was appointed in 1949, by the Attorney General, to study and revise the Division Court

tariffs, and rules and forms which are substantially unchanged since 1914.

Also to consider any amendments to the present Act which might be advisable.

The Committee comprised persons who, because of their wealth of experience, have special knowledge of Division Court practice and procedure, together with counsel from the Department of the Attorney General, and a number of county judges who have had considerable experience with Division Court procedure, some certain Division Court clerks, and two solicitors who have been active in Division Court practice.

After some investigation and study, the Committee concluded that in the interests of the proper functioning of the Division Courts, certain amendments to the Act, as well as the rules, forms and tariffs, were needed, and accordingly, the Committee has spent a very substantial portion of its time at its meetings studying the Act and the amendments with a view to the public being better served.

The principal amendments recommended by the Committee, and included in this Bill are:

(1) A revision and shortening and simplification of that part of the Act relating to garnishee proceedings.

(2) The making of consolidation orders, with a view to assisting a judgment debtor who has several Division Court judgments against him, and his creditors.

(3) The provisions of the Act relating to the examination of judgment debtors, so as to regularize and standardize the practice, as well as rendering the provisions more effective, having regard to their manifest purpose.

There is nothing further I need to say about this Bill at the present time.

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

"(1) The Annual Report of the Inspector of Legal Offices, for the year ended December 31, 1949."

"(2) Report of the Ontario Provincial Police for the year ended December 31, 1949."

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. R. A. McEWING (Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to bring to the attention of the House and particularly to the attention of the hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Challies), the vice-chairman of the Hydro Board, a matter which is of great importance, concerning a very serious situation, which is of great concern to the rural users of Hydro.

We had in our community a fire recently in a farm home and barn, the contents being completely destroyed. Apparently this was caused by a lack of proper safeguards between a power line and the buildings. What happened was that a pole at the road was broken, and one wire -- a neutral wire, carrying about 2,000 volts, I believe -- contacted the other line, and went in past the usual safeguard, and set fire to both the house and the barn, and both were burned down.

I think it is of great importance. We had a committee which spent most of the summer studying conservation of our resources, and every fire we have is a distinct loss to the province of Ontario, whether it be insured or not, and we want to conserve all our resources, in every way.

I would like it, if the Hydro authority would thoroughly investigate this, and see if some further safeguards cannot be given, because our people up there are very uneasy. We felt assured there were sufficient safeguards to protect us, but

evidently there are not. I understand the same thing might happen at any time again. I can assure the hon. members of this House that our people locally are very much disturbed about this very same thing happening to them.

I would like it, if the hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Challies), the vice-chairman of the Hydro, could look into this and have it thoroughly investigated, and tell us if there are sufficient plans being made to safeguard against a recurrence of such a thing.

HON. GEO. H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who spoke (Mr. McEwing) did not give me any intimation that he was going to ask this question, until last week. He did not give me the name of the farmer, nor the address. He simply said it was in his riding.

I contacted our rural operating office at Shelbourne and Orangeville, and asked them if they knew of any farmer who had lost his farm by fire, and they said they had no record of it.

I can assure the hon. member (Mr. McEwing) if he will let me know the name of the farmer, I will have a thorough investigation made, and get a report on the whole matter.

There may be some reason why it was not sufficiently protected. At the same time, I can assure the House, and the hon. member (Mr. McEwing) that all our rural installations are installed and inspected according to the Canadian Standards Association, and adequate protection, as far as past experiences are concerned, has always been accorded. There may be a special case here, and if the hon. member (Mr. McEwing) will let me have the name, I will be glad to secure and give him all the particulars.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to questions 34, 40, 65, 76, 93, 94, and 96.

Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I say we have learned in the House with great regret of the sudden and serious illness of the genial hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters), who was taken ill with pneumonia on Sunday night, and has been quite seriously ill. I am sure we all wish him a speedy recovery, and we express our regret at his illness.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to inform the hon. members of the House that the latest reports on the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) is that he is somewhat improved.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister); Mr. Speaker, in calling the Orders of the Day, I would like to give to the hon. members of the House a little outline of what I would like to accomplish this afternoon.

At five o'clock -- or perhaps a quarter to five, if it can be arranged -- I would like to start dealing with the public Bills of private hon. members. This is according to a discussion which I had with the hon. Leaders of the Opposition groups yesterday. I would prefer to set this time at a quarter to five, and if possible we will deal with the three Bills in the Order Paper, in the order in which they are, namely, Bills No. 54 and 56, both Bills dealing with labour practices, and Bill No. 104, which deals with hours of work and vacations with pay.

The arrangement yesterday, Mr. Speaker, followed somewhat the Ottawa practice, although not in its entirety. We proposed that the sponsors of these Bills should be given fifteen minutes, with ten minutes to reply.

I think, due to the fact that I am going to call, in a

the Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, we shall be discussing some of the subjects of these first Bills, No. 54 and No. 56, and I think we should follow the order of having the sponsor of, perhaps, Bill No. 54, speak, and then adjourn the debate on that, and call Bill No. 56, following which I would like to say a few words in relation to general government policy.

If we are able to start at a quarter to five, I would be agreeable to giving the sponsors of these Bills an additional five minutes, giving them twenty minutes in each case, instead of fifteen and cutting down the reply in each case to an average of five minutes, that is, ten minutes on the first two Bills, and five minutes for the last Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think if we follow that practicein the next two weeks, we can give all the sponsors of private members Bills, and all of the sponsors of the resolutions, the opportunity of speaking to the resolution or the Bill which they have sponsored.

There may be some variation in that, but I will discusss that with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the hon. leaders of the other groups here.

Mr. Speaker, in giving that outline, may I say that this afternoon I would like to deal with three Bills on the Order Paper, Order No. 46, "The Marriage Act", Order No. 47, "The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act", and Order No. 48, "The Highway Traffic Act". If we have any additional time before, a quarter to five, I would like to deal with purely routine items, third readings, and matters of that sort, and advance the business along on the order paper.

MR. SPEAKER: May I ask for information on the ruline which the Speaker may have to give during the debate on public Bills. I would like to make that clear. The suggestion is

the proposer of the Bill is allowed ten minutes.

MR. FROST: No, Mr. Speaker, fifteen minutes for the third Bill, and twenty minutes for the first two Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: Therefore, it will be my ruling, at the end of the twenty minutes, that I shall have to call the hon. member to order. I take it that is mutually agreed upon between the hon. Leaders.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I do not want any misunderstanding about this. I understand the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said just before I came in, that he proposed to call Bill No. 54 first.

MR. FROST: I took them in the order in which they appear on the Order Paper.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is not what I understood last night. As far as procedure is concerned, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is anxious to find a way of working out this matter, and he made a certain suggestion last night, but when he suggested a certain time for the mover, and a certain time for those who may speak in Opposition to the Bill, I pointed out that other hon. members may want to speak on these Bills, and may think it quite essential to state their position.

On the other hand, there may not be such hon. members wishing to speak.

I would rather suspect -- as I pointed out to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that many of these Bills -- for example, one perhaps moved by the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) may be a bill upon which the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Oliver) might want to say what he thought about it, and whether he was for or against it. I think that is a privilege we cannot take away, by agreement or otherwise, from the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Oliver). And so on, all along

the line.

I did not hear all the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) had to say, but I must say that as the hon. Leader of the House, he has, of course, to find some way of getting through its business, which is public business. I would suggest he not be too precise about what was agreed --

MR. FROST: I agree with that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I may say that actually I did not agree to anything, but I told the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) my preference, the order in which our Bills should be called, and I said we would see how the plan worked out. I wanted to make that clear.

MR. FROST: That is all right. Under the past practice, I think we have dealt with these Bills rather summarily. I recognize that hon. members who sponsor Bills or resolutions do so because they have convictions on the matters,which they want to place before the House. I would like to give the sponsors the opportunity of doing that, but we all know it is impossible to go through all these Bills and have formal votes, and, following the Ottawa practice, there are many Bills which are introduced which are never reached at all, but just die on the Order Paper.

This is an effort to deal with that particular situation, and I think we can do this by a bit of trial and error. If it does not work out satisfactorily, the hon. Leaders can convene again, and we will see what can be worked out.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious that when there are a great many of these Bills on the Order Paper, as well as a great many resolutions, some co-operative agreement must be reached between the parties, to facilitate the progress of these Bills through the House. The

old way, of course, was to brush them off. I do not think that the political knife should be used on these one after the other, without some intelligent discussion. I think it is far better if we use some time in discussing these Bills, putting their contents before the House, and allowing the government, for their part, to make their observations relative to the merit, or lack of merit contained in the Bills.

The other part of the picture which appeals to me is this; if you allow indiscriminate discussion -- if we went back and forth across this chamber on these various Bills -- we would be here until the middle of summer. It seems to me we must effect a compromise, and the compromise set out by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is agreeable to me, with this reservation; in the first place, there cannot be too much rigidity about it. We may reach a position in regard to some of these Bills where we will have to step over the line a little bit, but I think even with this situation, if we try to follow, in the main, the general rule laid down, we will make very good progress indeed.

I am quite agreeable as far as we are concerned, to try and facilitate the discussions on these Bills in the House.

(Take B-1 follows)

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I understood from what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said last night that he would ask us our preference as to the presentation of the Bills. We will indicate to him our preference. I think we have already . I understood him to say that first would be called the Bill suggested by the Opposition, and then one by the Liberal group, and then one by the Labour Progressive group.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I am, myself, guilty of that today. I did take Bill No. 54, Bill No. 56, and Bill No. 104, and I advised the hon. members accordingly. After this, we will take the Bills in the official order.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Why not today?

MR. FROST: If the House wants to reverse it, I am satisfied. The first of the Bills I will call in a moment is the Conveyancing and the Law of Progerty Act. These two Bills are almost similar, the Bill by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) and the one by the hon. friend for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) who, unfortunately, is not here. But, in his absence, we will not raise any technical points, and the Bill can be moved into second reading.

These two Bills are all subject to the government Bill which will be dealt with shortly. There does not seem to be any difference in the order of priority; the two Opposition Bills will be called first. In this instance, I do not think that any difference will be made. I will take them in their order on the Order Paper.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD: (Bellwoods): I thought we had reached a sensible agreement, and so far as we are concerned, we believe that the request was made, and we would like to

have them called in their order. There are three Bills dealing with similar matters. I would like to go back to what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said, that the hon. members who introduced these Bills did so because they believed in them, and desired to havetheir Bills placed before the House. In connection with the speech made on Bill No. 54, I think it should be postponed because the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) did introduce such a Bill here a couple of years ago. It is not a new subject for him and he withdrew the Bill on that occasion because of certain statements that were made by the then hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Drew). He has re-introduced it this year, and I think in view of the fact that it deals with a matter that he brought before the hon. members before, his Bill should have precedence.

MR. FROST: I unwittingly followed the Orders on the Order Paper, that is why I made the announcement. Would it be satisfactory today to take Bill No. 54, I will not have any comments to make on Bill No. 54. I would adjourn that debate and move onto Bill No. 56, and then I will speak on Bill No. 56. After this I will follow the practice.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): As an impartial observer, if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in subsequent sittings is going to call the Bills according to the membership in the House, I think he should not start off today by doing it wrongly.

I agree that we have to arrange some formula by which these Bills will be called according to the groups in the House. The only logical formula I can see is to give precedence to the Official Opposition, and then to the next group, then to the next group. They will start at the tail end.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: We are setting a precedent.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): We are also the middle man.

MR. FROST: Allow me to proceed with the Orders of the Day and give that consideration to see if we can straighten it out. There will be no precedent to this. Today, there is this situation; I would like to call, for the purpose of saving time, Bill No. 54 and Bill No. 56, no matter what the order, so I might reply to them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I have some knowledge of the circumstances under which the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) introduced his Bill. Yesterday I listened to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) on the Bill upon which the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) spoke, and I am sure the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) was present, and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said he was going to proceed in order along the Opposition benches, and I heard no opposition.

The hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) for whom I can speak, regards this matter as very important, and so do I.

If I thought yesterday there was any doubt about it, I would have made my opposition clear and I would not have agreed to that, if there was any doubt about it.

I would ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to make a change to correspond to what was said yesterday, to which, I think, none of us objected. Perhaps we agreed by acquiesence.

MR. FROST: I will see what I can do.

We will proceed with Order No. 46.

THE MARRIAGE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-sixth Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 87, "The Marriage Act, 1950", Mr. Welsh.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Nixon, seconded by Mr. McEwing, that the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word "That" and substituting therefor the following:

> "That this House does not approve of civil marriage, and should not give second reading to Bill No. 87, "The Marriage Act, 1950", unless and until the government agrees to strike out section 25."

MR. R. A. McEWING (Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, before we proceed any further, as far as voting on this amendment, I would like to say a few words with regard to this Bill. I was disappointed when the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) moved the adjournment, I thought he would continue the debate, and give us the benefit of his views. However, there is no one poissbly who has had more experience in the fundamentals of married life than I, and I might be able to contribute something towards this.

In the first place, we have looked upon the vows and the sacredness of the marriage ties, and all that is wrapped up in it, as something fundamental in our married life. I think possibly this is the very cornerstone of the set-up of family life, and family life as we see it in Ontario, and in the Dominion of Canada -- it is something that we prize very highly, and we do not feel like making light of it. Marriage was something instituted long, long ago, something that has been looked upon as a plan of our Creator, and I think that it should be carried out in all its fullness to reap the greatest benefit. I think we all believe in the Christian home, and I cannot understand how it is we have some people who do not believe in it.

I am very reluctant to relax my beliefs in this respect, to satisfy those who do not believe in it. I think the very future of this country depends a great deal upon how close we stay to that belief.

I think we should, in all seriousness, keep all the traditions that have been wrapped up on this sacred ceremony, something that cleaves to any persons who have gone through it, a sacred memory, and when we come to the time we pass over it rapidly, and find we have ways and means of not taking it seriously, then I think we are destroying the corner stone of our home life and our way of life in this country.

There may be some individuals who have some reason for asking for some changes, as are brought in in section 25, which this amendment asks to be deleted, but I cannot see any good, sound reasons for any changes. There is no sound reason for it, whatsoever. I do not think that our ministers, who, on the whole, believe in Christianity and all its phases, and who go out and preach the Gospel, and go out and spread their message, could believe in it. I do not believe, at all, that they consider they should be exempted from performing marriages. There might be an odd individual who has some special feelings, but those are not the ones who are striving for a better and greater Christian Canada. I do not think there is any time that a clergyman has a better opportunity, than when he has two people before him, who are non-believers, where they might want a civil marriage. No minister has such a grand opportunity to place before these people something stable regarding the future life.

I do not think there is any better time, or has a better opportuntiy for a minister to be so close to these people. They will listen to him at that particular time. I think that

any missionary, who is a true missionary, and who wishes to spread the Gospel, is missing a grand opportunity when he passes up certain individuals because they may not be in conformity with everything he thought they should be. Instead of lifting them to a higher level, then he is isolating them.

Speaking of discrimination; there is an example of discrimination, and I do not think we should allow it. And I say again, I do not think many ministers, or true missionaries, are asking for such a thing; and certainly not the magistrates and the judges. I believe our judges and magistrates are sufficiently busy at the present time, so they will not ask to take it on, and if it is done, it will be done as an "hour job", and will not be in the best interests of the whole people.

I discussed this matter with a judge recently, and he thought they were too busy now, to take on such a thing as that. Moreover, they do not want to take on what the preachers have cast off. If the minister is not going to do the marriage, do you think the judge is going to relish being the second choice?

In speaking about ministers: I have a letter here from a minister of a well-known denominational creed, who has expressed his views on the matter, and I would like to read a short portion of it, if I may, relevant to this, and I think it would show what I have been trying to tell the House regarding this matter. I will quote from the letter:

> "The marriage ceremony is always an opportunity for a minister to speak to a couple, of things spiritual and eternal, and among the many couples I have married there have been men and women of every race and creed but none objected to a kind word of advice to make their family

life Christian and give God a place in their home. Many of us ministers take the opportunity of presenting the newly-wed couple with a New Testament or Bible. If they are non-believers there is more reason for doing so. Here again I have never found a couple refusing the Word of God and never resenting advice to make the Bible their daily rule for faith and practice.

"Marrying Divorced Persons. I am absolutely opposed to divorce, but when a couple comes to a minister, either one or both being divorced, the minister must make a choice. He can say "I will not marry you, go on living the way you did in sin as common-law husband and wife" or he can say, as our Lord and Master Jesus Christ said, "Go and sin no more" and marry the couple. I have always chosen to deal with the question as Jesus Christ himself would havedone. The ministers themselves are the first to complain about the tendency of secularization and we have the sad spectacle of some vociferous clergy throwing away another opportunity to evangelize and acquaint unbelievers with the Christian way of living, and they deliberately spurn this opportunity and as much as tell them to go into the world and secularize their home life, and to stay secularized. I believe that such clergy will have to account to their Lord for their attitudes and actions."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table this letter, dealing with this matter.

I would ask the House if we are considering which way this province of Ontario is going in this matter. Are we making a backward step, or a forward step? I say if we include this section 25, we are making a backward step, and I would like to see Ontario retain the highest approval of our good people,

which it has held for so many years, and we can do so if we support this amendment.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Mr. Speaker, as an unbiased observer of marriage I will say just a few words on section 25.

I support the Bill in its entirety, including section 25. I do not think that many will want civil marriages. If they do want civil marriages, I do not see why they cannot have them. Great Britain has had civil marriages for a long time, and they seem to be working out very well. I think that if a husband would continue to treat his wife as an equal, there would be a lot less divorces. When the husband says, "With all my wordly goods I thee endow", he often breaks away from it. I do not think that the wife has an equal break. Although I have great respect for the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and I have always had a great respect for him, and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McEwing) also, I do not think they offer any solution. If the contracting parties wish a civil marriage, then they should have that privilege.

In Great Britain, I think the home life is as fine as ours. I do not know the percentage of civil marriages there, but their home life seems to be all right. I do not think this is a backward step; I do not think it has anything to do with marriage. People who are married in churches make vows, and then break them.

MR. J. W. FOOTE (Durham): I do not think there is any necessity for my speaking after having heard our hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail). I did not speak on this before, I understood that the bachelors were to speak first. Since our hon. friend for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing) listens to us so attentively, I decided to give my views. I hope my

present job has not neutralized all the influence I had as a minister.

I appreciate the views expressed by the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing), and I think that all the clergymen in this province will appreciate very much the hope, that he has emphasized so well.

I would venture to point out two other considerations that may not have occurred to him.

The first is this: that clergymen of the Roman Catholic Church and clergymen of the Church of England are not permitted to marry divorced persons. The question is, whether those contemplating marriage should be sent to a Presbyterian minister, or a Baptist minister, or to a minister of the United Church.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): It would not hurt them.

MR. FOOTE: I do not think it would do any harm, either. There is also the factor that if a couple were sent from the Church of England to the Presbyterian Church, they might take umbrage with their own church, and will not deal with them, and remain with us.

It would be terrible for the Church of England, and although I am not arguing the case for the Presbyterians, I have a great interest in the Church of England, and I can see the difficulty.

The Bill will help that. The question is whether these people will marry and go back and remain with their own church. That is one consideration. There is another one.

I do not think this Bill will affect the people of Ontario very much. Even if there are a dozen or two people in Ontario who are not Christians and who would subscribe to this kind of marriage, I do not think that it will hurt to give them that opportunity.

There is a further consideration, and I think that this might be of some help. We have a form for the blessing of a civil marriage. There is a form of blessing in the Church of Scotland for the blessing of civil marriages. They get married by the magistrate or registrar, and then come to the church for the blessing of the marriage. Very often something happens in their lives which changes their ways of living. If they have trouble in normally attending Sunday School, and so on, and want a closer relationship to the church, they can go to the ministers and have a blessing on this civil marriage.

I think in some provinces, in British Columbia, there is a tendency for the number of civil marriages to increase as time goes on. I do not think it will make very much difference to any of us in Ontario. The ministers know their own people, and most of them will go to their own ministers to be married. In the eventuality of a divorce, the parties would usually go to their minister and talk it over. I appreciate what the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing) and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) have said, that we should continue to encourage religious marriages, not to encroach on the clergymen. But I think that anyone would say what I have said, that this Bill does not offer any great problem at all to the religious family life of our province.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prolong the debate, except that I think with regard to this Bill that it is a step forward. I would agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Temple) when he spoke at the opening of the debate, when he raised the question of possibly a further section to the Bill, and I hope that the government will do something concerning a pre-marital blood

test. We should respect the rights of these people who might want a civil marriage, and for that reason I think that those persons who wish a civil marriage should be able to get a civil marriage.

And then there is the other side of the story, and that is the minister who regards the vows he has taken as a religious clergyman, and is confronted with the problem of marrying people who do not look at it in the same way as he does. I think it would be better for both of them if the minister was not asked to set aside his vows to accommodate the persons who do not hold his same views.

The other question is a question of the position of the children, and the question of inheritance, with those people who do not agree to a religious ceremony because of their point of view, and they feel the need of a civil marriage. They are entitled to the protection of inheritance, and the position of their children must be protected, and certainly a civil marriage is the thing that will accomplish it.

There is another section to the Bill, and that is the form that comes out of section 28 of the Bill, and since we have been discussing the question of racial discrimination, I thought it should be brought in now. In the marriage form we are raising a racial question which should be removed completely from the form. I think steps should be taken to removed that from the Bill. Even if it is not removed, I will vote for it. I believe the Bill, as a whole, should be supported, and I will vote for it.

MR. B. E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on this question -- I think this is a step which is long overdue. I want to go on record of being in support of the Bill.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid in this case I will have to be judged among those who are old fashioned. I am looking not only at this Bill, I am looking at a series of Bills and Acts which we are taking up in this province. It seems to me we are drifting away from those things contained in our prayers which we say every day, and which we all, I think, subscribe to. We want to live in a Canada where marriage is solemnized.

Under section 5, ministers will be sending couples to be married by magistrates and judges. There are no people in the country better able to solemnize marriage than the ministers, in their own respective denominations.

With respect for the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Foote), and others in the same position, while they are not allowed to marry people legally divorced, they are quite prepared to see that other people do so, in their stead, so they send to other officers or judges the couple to be married, and they then say, "I will bless it".

It does not seem logical. I appeal to the hon. members of this House that this is only one of the bars we appear to be letting down a little. We let down on the marriage ceremony, and then the question of Sunday sports, and then on liquor. It seems to me we are weakening all the time, a shade here and a shade there. We are weakening the morel fibre of our whole society. The very language of this section is doing that, in asking a magistrate to solemnize a wedding.

Suppose a good Anglican or a good Roman Catholic is a magistrate or a judge, and you pass a couple along to him who say, "We want to marry", he has very great scruples with regard to marrying people who are divorced, but he has an obligation to marrying them under this particular section.

I do not have strong feelings one way or the other, but it does appear to me that this is just another nibble at the moral fibre of our society, and we are getting away from those things which we always regarded as important occasions. I assure that every hon. member in this House, particularly those who are married, that marriage is the high point of our lives. It is the moment when we take unto ourselves either a husband or a wife, whom we expect to cherish and to create a home and bring children into this world. If you take away a psychological experience of an action such as that, and put it into a secular act or legal act, then it seems to me we are weakening in some way. If we take the attitude, "Let those who wish to be married by the civil ceremoney be married that way; let those who want to drink on Sunday, do that", --

HON. G. A. WELSH: Do you see any signs of that?

MR. MILLARD: We are stepping that way. We are moving in the direction of it.

And this, in my opinion, is the place to disagree. I felt obliged to get up here and make these observations, because I cannot bring myself to agree with these and other things, that we are doing which will not be for the ultimate benefit of our people.

I want to refer to the small minority of people who seek the civil ceremony. I am not so sure that those who seek it, do so because of religious conviction , or lack of it. I think it might be a matter of convenience. It might be a matter of some reluctance on the part of either party to go through this particular ceremony. There might be a case such as an Anglican and a Presbyterian who cannot agree, so they go to someone that is neutral.

And I say to you that the number who have asked is

comparatively small.

(Take C follows)

MR. MILLARD: What representations have been made to the government requesting this particular section in this Bill? The rest of the Bill, I think, is an improvement over the other Bill, but I just cannot see why this particular section is included unless there has been a strong representation made to that end. If there has not been, it seems to me we are just going out of our way to make unnecessary changes to those things to which we have clung in the past, and to which I believe personally we ought to cling in the future.

MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are a great many hon. members in this House, on both sides, who were very much in sympathy with what the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) had to say, when he outlined the fact that he had been the hon. Provincial Treasurer in '36, and that the question that we are debating this afternoon was presented then before the House, and has been discussed many times since.

I am sure had I been in his position in 1936, my background being the same as that of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), I probably would have been very much of the same mind as he.

But we are not living in 1936; we are living in 1950, and I think the argument that was most conclusive as far as I was concerned, and as far as the officials of my Department were concerned, when we decided to bring forward this Bill which provides for civil marriage, was as was so ably said by the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) when he said "we have to consider the children". We have that coming to our attention a great many times in the course of the year, that the children must be considered, and in my opinion it is very much better for the province of Ontario to have provision made for this very small minority group, who will take advantage of a civil marriage, so these children can be

protected and be enabled to hold up their heads in after-life. That to me was the conclusive argument in regard to this question.

The hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing) seemed to be in some doubt as to whether we had canvassed the opinion of religious denominations adequately on this subject, and he implied that civil marriage was going to entirely replace marriage by clergymen. I know that is not what he meant, but that is what he said --

MR. McEWING: Mr. Speaker, I never intimated any such a thing at all. The hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) is putting words there, which I did not use.

MR. WELSH: All right, I am satisfied to take the word of the hon. member (Mr. McEwing) for it, but I will be interested in reading the record tomorrow inthat regard. I know that is what he meant, and I am sure it is clear to every hon. member of this House that no such thing was intended.

We contacted the heads of the Church of England, the Roman Catholic Church, the Presbyterian Church, the United Church, the Baptist Church, the Salvation Army, the Lutherans Congregation, the Churches of Christ, and the Pentecostal Temple, and several Hebrew congregations, and we had no objection at all except from one or two of the Hebrew organizations which were autonomous. Some of the Rabbis were in favour, and some were opposed.

The point the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) brought out in regard to the forms; there was no question of any discrimination, racial or otherwise --

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Would the hon. Minister (Mr.Welsh) mind an objection? I did not get what he said a moment ago about the "objection by certain Hebrews".

It was because they were -- what?

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Autonomous.

MR. MacLEOD: Oh, I thought he said they were "communists".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WELSH: I would like to say to the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) that the form has been in use for a great many years, and the reason for it eliciting the racial background is requisite for the statistics; it has nothing to do with racial discrimination at all. In fact, for years, the statistics we obtained from these forms have proven very valuable.

MR. PARK: What does the word "racial" mean in that form?

MR. WELSH: The hon. member for High Park (Mr. Temple) brought up another point the other day. I know there is a Bill before the House concerning pre-marital blood tests. I do not want to go into any lengthy explanation at the present time, because I hope to have an opportunity to speak on this when the Bill comes up, but I do want to assure the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing) that there is absolutely no compulsion about people having to resort to a civil marriage.

MR. McEWING: I did not intimate there was.

MR. WELSH: As a matter of fact, we have made it considerably more difficult to be married by a judge or magistrate, than to be married by a clergyman. I feel myself, and I know I am expressing the sentiments of every hon. member -- on this side of the House at least -- when I say we are sincerely satisfied that this is not going to affect any religious denomination, or any individual. They will normally go to their own clergymen, and be married in their own churches, in

the same way as they always have, but this Bill does give the opportunity to those people, who, for various reasons, cannot be married in a church, to be married, above all, it gives protection which their children need, and should have, in this country of ours.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) a question? Did I understand him to say that the leaders of these various churches indicated to the government their approval of a civil marriage, the Catholic church and these other churches, with the exception of the Hebrew?

MR. WELSH: Yes.

MR. NIXON: In what way did they indicate that? In a written letter?

MR. WELSH: Yes.

MR. NIXON: Have you the letters?

MR. WELSH: Yes.

MR. NIXON: Will you table them?

MR. FROST: That is hardly fair. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) can easily see them.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I have one suggestion to make to the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) before we pass second reading. In one of the forms, in the back of the Bill, they give the information that a person is not allowed to marry his grandmother, or his aunt and so on. In addition there are some particulars that no one may marry a person who is mentally defective, mentally ill, or under the influence of liquor. That is in the Act. It seems to me that the hon. Minister (Mr.Welsh) should also include those sections in the forms, because while very few people who are married ever read the Act, they do see the forms, and I think this should be put

in the forms.

I would like to make that suggestion, before the Bill comes up for discussion . .

MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) brought up as to whether a man may marry his grandmother and so on, is purely a federal matter. It has nothing to do with the province, and the province has no jurisdiction.

I see no objection to it --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WELSH: The point is, Mr. Speaker, that it does appear in the form. --

MR. SPEAKER: I think that is definitely not something which has to do with the principle of the Bill. The question has been called for.

It has been moved by Mr.Welsh that Bill No. 87, "The Marriage Act, 1950", be read the second time.

An amendment was moved by Mr. Nixon, seconded by Mr. McEwing, that the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word "that", and that the following be substituted therefor:

> "That this House does not approve of Civil Marriage and should not give second reading to Bill No. 87, 'The Marriage Act, 1950', unless and until the government agrees to strike out the section 25".

The vote will be on the amendment. Call in the members.

The motion negatived on division.

For: 16

Against: 63

MR. SPEAKER: I declare second reading of the Bill.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This has to be put to the House.

Some hon. members might not necessarily vote the same way on the two motions. I had occasion to argue that in the House last year, and if necessary I will do it all over again.

There are two separate questions, no matter what the amendment said. In this instance, I do not think it matters a great deal, but I am concerned about the precedent.

There are many reasons I can give, but probably the simplest is that some hon. members may wish to vote one way on the amendment, and another way on the motion.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may the motion be put, and we will find out if the House wants to decide the motion on the same basis.

MR. SPEAKER: I gave a ruling on this last year, but if it is the request of the House that the main motion be put -- while I think it is out of order, and I will be glad to repeat my ruling later -- we will have a vote on the original motion.

Call in the members.

Motion agreed to on division.

For: 79

Against: Nil

Second reading of the Bill.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 47.

CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 47th Order, second reading of Bill No. 78, "An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act", Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 78, "An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act".

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is very simple in its terms, and the intention is very clear. There is very little for me to say in addition to the brief explanation I gave of this Bill

on first reading.

The purpose of this Bill is to render void covenants that run with the land restricting the sale, ownership, occupation or use of land, because of the race, or creed of any person.

It has been drawn to my attentionby a number of persons including some of the hon. members opposite that there might be some question as to whether the words "race or creed" are sufficiently specific to cover situations which might arise, and which are intended to be dealt with by this Bill, and in order to make certain that the wording of this Bill will cover the situation, I propose to introduce, in Committee stage, an amendment whereby instead of the words "race and creed", the Bill will be amended to read:

> "Race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry, or place of origin".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: Although I am advised that the words "race and creed" are sufficiently broad, nevertheless, we do not wish to have any doubt in anybody's mind as to the meaning of the Bill.

In the second place, I propose to introduce an amendment in Committee stage, adding a section to the Bill which will provide that this Act shall come into force on the day it receives Royal Assent.

I do not think it is necessary for me to give any further explanation of this Bill. The meaning of it, and the intent of it is very clear. I think it should appeal to the hon. members of this House, and meet with their approval, and I hope the hon. members will vote accordingly.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to delay the passage of the Bill for any length of time,

and I would like to say immediately that I, for one, am very pleased that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) has seen fit to widen the wording of the Bill.

Without taking up too much time, I could give two very good examples of why "race and creed" are not sufficiently wide to cover what is intended.

It would not be expected that a Norwegian, or one from Norway, might find himself discriminated against in this province, and I am sure there is no such thing as a "Norwegian race", nor a"Norwegian creed", therefore, it would be possible after the passage of this Bill to place a covenant running with the land restricting its use against Norwegians. And so I think that "nationality, ancestry and place or origin" is sort of an additional safe-guard to see that such discrimination does not take place.

I could give other illustrations now existing in this province, if I had the time, which would indicate how much more difficult that is.

But I am mainly concerned in a deeper way with this Bill, having had some experience in the work of trying to reduce prejudice and discrimination within the population.

When I read in the Speech from the Throne there would be legislation brought down to ban the restrictive covenants which run with land, I was more than pleased, but when I read the Bill I was not so pleased, and I draw to the attention of the hon. members of the House that it only has one real section in it, and this says:

> "Every covenant made after this section comes into force, "

Which means that all the restrictive covenants now in effect will not be touched by this legislation. At least, that seems

to me to be the case.

If we are of opinion -- and it is the belief I think on all sides of the House -- that the restrictive covenant is a bad thing and no longer in line with public policy, then it seems to me we are in error, to say the least, if we attempt to limit the effect of this Bill, which I think is what we are doing. In other words, I would like to say it this way, Mr. Speaker; in 1945, the learned Justice, Mr. Keiler McKay --

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): "Retroactive" is the word, and we are not in favour of retroactive legislation.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Just listen to the hon. member (Mr. Wismer), now.

MR. WISMER: Mr. Justice McKay made a decision in a trial in this province in the case of a restricted covenant, and he ruled it was null and void, and of no effect.

I will rest there. I have the decision here recorded, but I do not think I want to take a lot of time to read it all this afternoon, in order to refresh the memories of the hon. members as to the reasons for his decision.

(Take D-1 follows)

They were in my opinion, very valid reasons, and he ruled that restrictive covenants nulland void. What is important, I think, from my own point of view, Mr.Speaker, in dealing with this legislation now before the House is that Mr. McKay was one of the senior judges of the trial division of the Supreme Court of Ontario, and, if I may go further, he is now sufficiently respected -- he has been promoted and is now a member of the appeal section, and his decision setting aside the restrictive covenant before the court was hailed in this province as one of the great progressive decisions. Newspapers like the Globe and Mail, the Ottawa Journal, Saturday Night, Today, Evening Review in Niagara Falls, the Times Gazette of Oshawa and so on; all made subject matter of this for editorial comment as one of the great progressive decisions of our time, in fact one of the great progressive decisions of the whole British Commonwealth of Nations.

How much further it went is indicative of this, that Tom Clark, Attorney-General of the United States, in making his submission before the Supreme Court of the United States, to have restrictive covenants ruled nulland void in the great Republic to the south, quoted the decision of Mr. Justice McKay as one of the ones on which he based his case, one of the great progressive decisions. And it was, I think, believed by most people in the province of Ontario and in other parts of Canada and throughout this continent that by the decision of Mr. Justice McKay restrictive covenants were really outlawed in this country, because, Mr. Speaker, there was no appeal ever taken from that decision.

I am not going to read all these things, but you can find it discussed in the United Nations, you can find it discussed by people throughout the world who talk in terms

of a better set of relations between people in the interests of humanity and peace.

I know there have been certain other decisions made in the Supreme Court of Canada. There was one made by Mr. Justice Chevrier at about the same time Mr. McKay was giving his decision.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): The Supreme Court of Ontario.

MR. WISMER: It was the Supreme Court of Ontario, in which all that happened was that Mr. Chevrier found it difficult to base a decision on the only legislation in this regard which we have, the Racial Discrimination Act of 1944. It was in no way concerned with the decision of Mr. McKay.

Then in 1948, there came another case before the Supreme Court of Ontario dealing with a restrictive covenant, and this case was heard by Mr. Justice Schroeder, who decided in this summer resort case near Sarnia that what covenant had been made was valid. But I think the important thing is this, and I would like to have the government and all hon. members take this very seriously, Mr. Speaker -- I do not have to be an advocate or a lawyer, and I do not belong to a union, but if the English language means anything at all, Mr. Justice Schroeder made it very clear that he was not attempting to set aside the McKay decision, that he was making a very separate decision under very different circumstances. In other words, the decision of Mr. McKay and the decision of Mr. Schroeder could sit side by side.

I think it is most significant that the McKay decision has never been appealed. The Schroeder decision was appealed against, and I have here, too, the Dominion Law Reports of the Appeal, taken in the Supreme Court of Ontario, and when

the Chief Justice of Ontario was rendering his decision, he made it very clear that in upholding the decision of the trial judge, they were not setting aside the McKay decision, that it was an entirely different set of circumstances. In other words, it amounted, if I can understand the language of the Reports of the Chief Justice of Ontario, and I think I can, Mr. Speaker --

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Oh, yes.

MR.WISMER: -- what really is involved is this, that the case before Mr. McKay was a case of a restrictive covenant running with land and he ruled that nulland of no effect, and from that decision no appeal has ever been taken. The case before Mr. Justice Schroeder was a case, as the court suggests in its own language, of what might be called a "club", and the internal by-laws of the club, who shall be a member and on what terms. Therefore, any decisions which have been made subsequent to the McKay decision have not been decisions to set aside the McKay decisions, in other words, restrictive covenants. If I understand the development of our type of law, restrictive covenants running with land in the province of Ontario have really been nulland of no effect since 1925.

However, there are, I understand, many people, or some people, and some legal people, who would take exception to what I have to say. I believe the real principle of any Bill introduced into this hon. Legislature in regard to restrictive covenants running with land should really have been one of quieting the confusion. Unfortunately, I do not believe this Bill does anything of the kind, it rather creates a sort of "limbo". In other words, Mr. Speaker, we are definitely saying that all the restrictive covenants which anyone may wish to place on land and that run with land, after

this Bill receives the Royal Assent, shall be void and of no effect. But the McKay decision had already, in my opinion, done all that.

It seems to me the legislation which should have been placed before this House should have been one of indicating for sure and for certain what the public policy on this matter is in the province of Ontario, and it needed only in that respect to, in effect, confirm the decision of Mr. Justice McKay in 1945. I am not quite sure what it does to the McKay decision now in the period between 1945 and today, or when this Bill receives the Royal Assent. It seems to have created five years of apparent limbo.

I say again, and I will finish on this note, that you cannot, even if a legislature, limit propriety. The public policy of the province of Ontario in regard to restrictive covenants, to my mind, must be an over-all policy, a quieting policy, not something which raises further and further doubts, especially in the minds of those ethicaland religious groups and colour groups who are the greatest victims of this type of thing.

I am a little sorry the Bill before the House has not taken all those things into consideration, and perhaps as the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) has indicated some changes which will be made in Committee, it may be possible to make some further slight changes in the language of the section in order that the great progress that has already been made in the province of Ontario in this regard can carry it on as a public policy, enunciated and enacted in this hon. Legislature.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in connection with this Bill and the principle which it involves ,

the feeling of the government, and I am sure of hon. members of this House and of the people of the Province, is that restrictive covenants, discriminatory covenants of the nature dealt with in this Bill, under present conditions have no place in our life in Ontario. We must remember we are living in a province which is growing, which is altering, and town or community planning of the future might be tremendously affected by restrictive covenants.

I mentioned this before, once before, I think, to some hon. members of this House: in the old days, the land in the vicinity of Spadina Avenue was owned by Robert Baldwin who took a great part in the life of this province in his day. If Robert Baldwin had inserted in his day restrictive covenants of the nature we are trying to avoid, obviously the life of Toronto would have been affected to this very day, had Mr. Baldwin done any such thing. Or indeed, if the handful of men who owned the centre of Toronto 125 years ago had done such a thing, of course, the whole life and being of Toronto today would be altered.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think any individual owning property can sit down in the year 1950 and alter the course of things 75 years from now as regards the rights of people to settle upon land. I think that idea is thoroughly bad, and I do not think it can be worked out in a province such as ours. Therefore, we have felt after studying this matter of what we may term "racial discrimination", putting it on a broad basis, that such a thing should have no relation to the sales of land and to the restrictions placed upon land in days to come. If that happens, as I say, it may affect the whole course of community planning in this province which after all must rest in the hands of the people and their representatives and the various legislative bodies in the province.

May I say in relation to the reference of my hon. friend (Mr. Wismer) opposite to the effect of this Bill, it of course comes into effect, according to the amendment which the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) mentioned just a moment ago, on the day upon which it receives Royal Assent. My hon. friend (Mr. Wismer) argues the Bill should be retroactive in effect. We have had a lot of talk in this House about the effect of retroactive legislation, and my own feeling is that I would not say what hon. members said in this House. I do not want to be controversial today, I am very peaceful today.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN hon. MEMBER: For a change.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Would you say there was retroactive legislation in that Bill?

MR. FROST: I would say that some people argued that, but I would not argue this, that everything that was ever said in this House was nonsense, but sometimes people do talk nonsense about retroactive legislation.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: If I felt there was a certain convenant or something of that sort that could be specifically dealt with and which we knew about and knew could be dealt with by legislation, if it was against the public's interest I would have no hesitation in dealing with it. I think we have to be sensible about these things, and I would not have the slightest hesitation in dealing with it if I felt it existed and was something against the great interests of the people of Ontario. In such a case I would deal with it. I would say to my friend (Mr. Wismer): "This is one of the great difficulties with this particular situation". He has quoted the judgments of two very eminent judges, Mr. Justice McKay and Mr. Justice Schroeder.

Those judgments are dealing with particular matters. Our great problem is that we have in this province probably 100 registry offices. We have tens of thousands of deeds buried away, going back to antiquity, going back to 1792, I suppose. We do not know in general legislation what we would be dealing with, and that is the great problem, what would we be dealing with, what would be the effect of legislation which we might consider advisable to affect the deeds and conveyances that were made perhaps 75 or 100 years ago. The fact of the matter is, we do not know. All we know is that restrictive covenants in this province, and I say this as a lawyer practising many years, restrictive covenants of this nature to date are not very general in the province. They could become very general, that is the purpose of this legislation; if they became general, it might have a terrific effect on the province. At the present time, I do not think that such is the case.

I suppose there are all sorts of little reservations that have been put in deeds over a period of 150 years about which we have not any knowledge in this House, and therefore we would be taking a very drastic step. The situation I think is that the great majority of the present restrictions will die out themselves in the course of time, and those which do not die out, if they are opposed to public interest and become apparent in days to come, then legislators sitting here inthis Chamber in days to come can deal with those problems, and I have no doubt they will deal with them if it is necessary in the public interest.

I was quite interested in an editorial in Toronto Saturday Night last February 28th, the concluding paragraph of which is:

"Public opinion is, we think, quite prepared to accept any such limitation on property rights as may be involved in enacting that a man may not sell or bequeath a piece of real estate subject to the condition that it shall never be owned or occupied by a person born on the wrong side of a certain degree of longitude or latitude. Whether the new legislation will invalidate already existing covenants of this kind we do not yet know, and the question is not important. If they are to be invalidated at all, we should prefer to see it done by a judicial decision that they are contrary to public policy -- "

And of course it may be that courts may in the course of time deal with subjects of that sort, --

"--and were therefore never valid. Failing such a decision, there is perhaps as much to be said for allowing them to stand as for legislating retroactively to abolish them."

In other words, they say it is "flip" of the coin, whether you leave them there or have retroactive legislation to abolish them.

"The main principle is attained when the Legislature shows by its actions that it now considers them sufficiently contrary to public policy to be no longer permissible."

Mr. Speaker, that I think sums up our position in a nutshell. We feel this legislation is sound and practical and if there are undesirable positions in this province, they can be taken care of in days to come. They will be taken care of in most

cases by lapse of time, and if not, they can be dealt with by the people who sit in the Chamber in days to come.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, trying to put our position in another nutshell, may I say that we regret very much the government has made so limited an attack upon this general problem of racial discrimination. However, on this one sector, they have made an advance, and we hail that cheerfully.

MR. FROST: Hear, hear.

MR. CALDER: With regard to the suggestion as to the law being made retroactive, I was very pleased to hear the hon. Premier (Mr.Frost) leave open the door for specific cases of which we may yet have detailed knowledge, and which we could later specifically attack, on the principle, Mr. Speaker --

MR. FROST: Does my hon. friend (Mr. Calder) agree with my views as regards the retroactive effect of the legislation?

AN hon. MEMBER: He is just coming to that.

MR. CALDER: When you speak, Mr. Speaker, of generally restrictive legislation,then so vicious are the ensuing effects that we do agree you should not in a general way now try to solve past difficulties. That is why we are so glad the door is left open for specific cures in the future.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I also think this legislation is sound as far as it goes, and I am certainly in favour of the principle of the Bill and am certainly going to vote for it. However, there is a very interesting legal point which has been touched upon by the hon. member for London (Mr.Calder) and which was raised by my hon. friend, the member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer). I would like to put it in this way, because I think it is of interest and significance to both laymen and members of the legal profession. I will reduce it to perhaps the simplest terms

so that it will be perfectly clear what I am limiting my remarks to.

This Act presumably will go on the Statute Books sometime during this Session, and it declares what the statutory law is with reference to this subject from here on out. But we had also another expression of the law from Mr. Justice McKay in 1945. He was then declaring what the law was as at that day with reference to the case before him at that time. Let us suppose that another case, after the passing of this Bill, another case comes before the courts and let us suppose for the sake of argument it is precisely on all fours with the case decided by Mr. Justice McKay. I then foresee a very interesting argument.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): There always is.

MR. JOLLIFFE: On the one hand, the argument that this case is on all fours with case decided by Mr. Justice McKay in 1945, that his decision was good law, that it has never been set aside, it has never even been questioned in subsequent cases; all that has been discussed, and the argument would therefore be that notwithstanding the fact that this particular covenant antedates 1950 and antedates 1945, shall we say, nevertheless, you should follow Mr. Justice McKay's decision and hold it to be null and void and to have always been null and void.

The possible argument on the other side, at least a point which may be raised, is that the hon. Legislature in 1950 found it necessary to pass a new Act which applied only to covenants made after sometime in March, 1950, and therefore by implication the law previous to March 1950 was quite different from what was indicated in Mr. Justice McKay's judgment.

There is that difficulty and I think a very interesting point which may have to be resolved by some court in the future. In other words, there is the possibility, as the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) has suggested, that it may at some future time be held that rather than validating and confirming Mr. Justice McKay's view of the law, the fact that the hon. Legislature found it necessary to pass this Bill in 1950 implied thatMr. Justice McKay's view of the law in certain circumstances was perhaps not correct, so that the point here and the point which has been raised by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) is not a question of retroactive legislation, it is this: Are we in any way changing or interfering with the law which Mr. Justice McKay declared to be the law in 1945, and which he declared to have been the law for some time previous to the time of his decision? After all, the courts are frequently called upon to decide the validity of certain language used in instruments made perhaps long ago, and they make their decisions on the basis of both the statutory law which may be applicable and the law as it has been determined in a great many decisions during past years.

I think that on balance the government is right in introducing this legislation at this time, because it does clarify a matter which has been subject to difference of opinion, certainly within the legal profession, and for that reason I think the Bill ought to be passed and I am glad it has come at this time because, without doubt, in view of the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Porter) amendment to which he gave notice today it will remove many of the questions which have been asked during recent years, particularly I think as a result of the decisions of Mr. Justice Schroeder and of Mr. Justice Chevrier.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, there is undoubtedly room for legal argument about matters that are of importance to this Bill. Not being a lawyer, I want to limit

my brief remarks rather to the social aspect of this Bill and only in passing deal with the legal implications.

(E-1 follows)

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): From the social aspect I think that this legislation, which is long overdue, will stand to the credit of the government much longer, and in brighter colour than many other items that were carried in this House.

I sent a note to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) when he first introduced the Bill, to tell him he was fortunate to have his name attached to this Bill. And, even with its shortcomings, -- and I hope they will be remedied before final approval -- this will be acknowledged throughout the length and breadth of the continent, not merely the province, and will be to the credit of the government. I am very glad to be able to congratulate the government, in bringing it in, on acknowledging the faults and shortcomings of the legislation.

I will add that in at least one other province, a Bill of a similar nature is now being prepared, so the press reported, in Manitoba. It will be studied carefully and efforts will be made to duplicate it in this province and in the United States.

The Bill seeks to do away with an evil bit of wickedness that cannot be justified in the light of day by any self-respecting person. There are a lot of evils that we have not shed. This is one of them. Only the Nazis and the basest, attempt to justify discrimination of this sort. But while it is true only a Fascist-minded people would do that, there are ther people who, nevertheless, contribute to what is part of a philosophy in their own light, in their relationship with other people. I might say that while it merely offends one certain specific group, it is not necessarily restricted to one group or another. They may be singled out and affected by it.

There were times when old country people from England

also found it hard to get certain equalities for themselves, and it is also true, -- I think it is true today -- that people find discriminatory practices, because of religious persuasion. None of that, of course, is justified, and this Bill seeks to outlaw it, and it is a Bill of great importance. To that extent, I think it is a step forward.

Having said that, I do want to draw to the attention of the House some ofits shortcomings and suggest that they be met while the Bill is still before the House. First, is the question of retroactivity. For myself, I say that I am not opposed, and I do not see how anyone can be opposed on grounds of princeiple, to retroactivity. You cannot make a fetish out of that. I can visualize other governments who will nullify many restrictions and inconveniences, and other legal barriers, placed by them, to perpetuate what they considered to be the law. In the Star case I voted against the law because I thought it was not for the general good. In this case it is. It is wrong to make a principle out of a thing like that. In this Bill, the retroactive clause would really give the Bill an essence, because recognizing an existing evil , as the government and all groups in the House do, we can morally ggree that the evil done before today should not be perpetuated into the morrow.

Those covenants that have been arrived at are in perpetuity and continue until the end of time. I suggest that the government cannot possibly fail to see the specific aspect of the retroactive factors in this case, and furthermore, may I say that the Bill, as now worded,though unwittingly and indirectly, lends a stamp of approval, . The words "every convenant made after this section comes into force" I suggest would have been .better to have left out these

The Bill would then read, "every covenant made which". That would make the position of this legislation crystal clear, and impose upon the doers of evil the task to come and question the legality of the law, whereas today they are protected and can say, "This does not govern us", and we, or the Government, or individuals, would be obliged to take action to test the validity of past actions. I suggest that this be given thought, and if the government removes these six words, it would be clear that the principle of such covenants is wrong, wrong from now on, and certainly condemned for the past.

Now then, that is item number one. On the question raised by the hon. Leader of the official Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), as to whether he will question Mr. Justice McKay's decision, I am not in a position to enter that argument. That is for lawyers, and if the hon. Leader of the official Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) is right, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) and the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) should adopt measures on that.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE: I did not express any opinion.

MR. FROST: He is too good a lawyer.

MR. SALSBERG: There is one other thing that is ommitted and that is the restriction on conveyancing land and property. In considering an anti-discrimination Bill, I suggest that another form should have been added, and could still be added. I refer to the rental problem of land and property. You may say this requires a legal paper, but I suggest that it is in the same category as the problem we are dealing with today. Restrictions, not raised in any law form, exist today against individuals, when they try to rent property, only because of their racial, religious, or national origin. I think I mentioned this

in the House some years ago, and for the new hon. members I might repeat it. I have had experience of discrimination, as have others of my people. I have been refused the use of rented property on Ward's Island, only after I told them that I was Jewish, and that happened in more than one case. We had inspected an apartment for the summer, and we completed agreements with the landlord on price and accommodations, and all that was left was to give the deposit, and then I would say to the landlord, "Perhaps I should tell you before we complete these arrangements, that I am Jewish. Would that make any difference?" And then I would be told in a blustering and apologetic fashion, "I'm sorry, sir, it makes no difference to me, but the group on the island do not approve the rental of apartments to certain people", and then I would go to another place and would experience the same thing.

I suggest that the right of people to select those who will live in their house is a right that I do not question. What I do question is the discrimination, without rhyme or reason, against a person solely because he is Jewish or Catholic or Irish or English. That is where the evil is.

I do not question the right of the individual to decide who will be allowed under his roof, but when there is a discrimination because of religion or racial origin, that should be prevented. I know that education is very important, but I think that legislation would go a long way in the removing of this discrimination against a minority group. Many of the people on Ward's Island I would not care to visit -- on Saturday nights they can be heard for blocks, on Ward's Island. But that is my choice . It is not a question of discrimination; and so, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the government that in addition to everything else, they should consider the possibility

of fashioning the Bill so as to also outlaw the discriminatory practice in renting property, land, buildings, or housing accommodation. I think it would really give the Bill that grandeur that all forward-looking people would like to see it have, and if the government should see fit to do this, they will have done a good job in an excellent fashion. If they should not, I shall vote for the Bill, and consider it a step forward, in the battle against discrimination, and an important contribution which will stand to the credit of the government, and I am very glad to do everything I can to make known that fine act of the government.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 47.

THE CONVEYANCING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fofty-seventh Order, second reading of Bill No. 78, "An Act to amend the Conveyancing and Law of Property Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 78, "An Act to amend the Conveyancing and Law of Property Act".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before calling Order No. 58, I have to be out of the House for a few minutes, and I have made arrangements with the hon. member to my right (Mr. Doucett) to take care of the Orders in my absence. We are anxious to advance on a number of Bills in other stages, If it is possible we would like to go to the private Orders, which would give an additional five minutes to the hon. members opposite. To straighten out the difficulty which we had at the opening of the day, I have taken it up with some of the hon. members opposite, and I have

this solution, which I think probably is the Solomon solution.

I am indebted to the generosity of the Liberal group and of the Labour-Progressive group. It is proposed to call first, Bill No. 56, that is the Bill sponsored by the Opposition group. That will be followed by the Bill sponsored by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), Bill No. 54, and then the two Bills are at similar stages.

The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) was very reasonable in his agreeing to that. I unwittingly had advised the hon. members that it would be in the opposite order, and he rescued me. I will follow that by the Bill sponsored by the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown):

HON. GEO. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Order No. 58.

THE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifty-eighth Order; second reading of Bill No. 118, "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act", Mr. Doucett.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 118, "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act".

MR. J. L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, is it the intention to introduce this Bill to offset the condition of the highway between Hamilton and Grimsby, where certain people erected signs advertising restaurants, and there were members of the Department of Highways who were involved to the extent of pulling down some signs and erecting trees, at public expense, in order to hide the approaches to a restaurant from the travelling public? I believe there were one or two court cases on this matter, people who went to court against the Department and who won their cases. I am wondering, in the event that this legislation is passed, whether it will stand

up in the courts. There are also other features in the Act I would like to discuss further. In restricting the sale of fruits and other articles on the highway, if you are going to put highways through sections of the country like Niagara, where the most luscious fruit in the world is grown, are we going to prevent tourists from seeing these, and say, "You can see this, and you cannot see that, you can see the fruits, but you cannot buy them".

It does not seem reasonable, nor should be deprive the farmers from disposing of their products. I think it would be more sensible if, in certain sections along the highway, we set aside something like a cut-off, like a railway cut-off, a siding where the farmers can bring their fruits and put them on display, Instead of having them spread along the highway, have them spread along the highway, have them at one spot with plenty of signs. If the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) would accept some of these suggestions during the debate, I would be prepared now to acquiesce to the passing of the Bill.

MR. DOUCETT: In connection with this Bill, this amendment clarifies and develops the provisions of the existing sections 27 and 28 of the Highway Improvement Act.

(Page E-8 follows)

The amendment enacted by sections 2 and 3 of the Bill. This amendment clarifies and develops the provisions of the existing sections 27 and 28 of the Highway Improvement Act in order to make them workable in practice. The provisions relate to agreements which may be entered into by the council of a local municipality with the council of the county or with a suburban roads commission for extra work on a county or suburban road in a local municipality. In the present form the provisions are so vague and indefinite that the parties find great difficulty in reaching satisfactory agreements on the matters involved.

In their new form the provisions establish minimum proportions of the cost of the work which shall be borne by the county or suburban roads commission, confer power on the local municipality to carry out its obligations under the agreement, ensure that the local municipality will receive the highway subsidy on its share of the cost and clarifies the position of the parties with respect to public liability.

The amendment enacted by sections 6, 7, 8 and 9 of the Bill. The new sections 79b, 79c, and 80 cover the same field as the parts of the Highway Improvement Act which are repealed namely subsection 5 of section 71, subsections 2 and 3 of section 79a and the present section 80. The repealed provisions control by way of regulations made by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council the use of controlled access highways and adjoining lands and the use of the King's Highways and adjoining lands generally. Control is exercised over the erection or alteration of buildings, fences, gasoline pumps, signs, etc.; the planting of trees and hedges upon or adjacent to the highways; the opening of private roads or entranceways onto controlled access highways, and the offering or exposing for sale of fruit, produce, etc. on or adjacent to controlled access highways.

As the experience of the department that the present provisions do not provide an adequate degree of control particularly in the case of controlled access highways. Great sums of public money are being expended and will be expended on these highways. It is therefore in the public interest that an adequate degree of control be exercised so that their usefulness to the travelling public will not impaired and that the plans for their construction and improvement can be carried out as economically as possible.

Briefly under the new provisions the land over which control is to be exercised are defined in the Act and it is provided that no person shall place, erect or alter the things mentioned upon the controlled lands without a permit therefor from the Minister. This allows exceptions to be made in certain cases where a too rigid enforcement might cause great hardship. This could not be done under the old provisions which allowed of no exceptions from the regulations. On the other hand, power is given to the Minister to require the owner or occupant of the controlled land to remove or alter any of the tings mentioned which do not comply with the requirements and in his discretion do order that any of the provisions shall apply within the limits of any city, town or village.

(page E-10 follows)

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, on the matter that the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Easton) brought up, this is a case of a lady who had an eating-house between Grimsby and St. Catherines. What was done -- I do not say that it was done in spite -- as I understand the case, there had been some pressure in regard to this very fine eating-place forced on this woman, and finally the case was presented in court and the Department lost the case.

I noticed, in passing by the other day, that now there have been planted some one hundred trees there, blocking off the view to this eating-house. These hundreds of trees blocked off the view in the direction of the restaurant. I do not like to think that it was done in spite, but it looks like that.

MR. DOUCETT: In reply, I am well aware of the concessions which are mentioned. I was not aware of them at the time. The Minister cannot be aware of every action that is carried out on the King's highways in Ontario. It is not the policy of this government to condone things of that nature, and I assure you that that will not be the case. As soon as this came to my attention, I ordered that it be discontinued, and it will be corrected.

It is not my intention, nor the intention of this government to plant trees so as to hide any business.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. GEO. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Order No. 34.

THE CITY OF LONDON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-fourth Order, second reading of Bill No. 7, "An Act respecting the City of London", Mr. Patrick.

MR. WM. MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, in the absence

of Mr. Patrick, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 7, "An Act respecting the City of London".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. GEO H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Order No. 35.

THE VILLAGE OF LONG BRANCH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-fifth Order, second reading of Bill No. 14, "An Act respecting the Village of Long Branch", Mr. Millard.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 14, "An Act respecting the Village of Long Branch".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. GEO . H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): rder No. 36.

THE CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-sixth Order, second reading of Bill No. 33, "An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie," Mr. Harvey (Sault Ste. Marie).

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Harvey (Sault Ste. Marie) I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 33, "An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. GEO H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Order No. 37.

THE CITY OF OTTAWA SEPARATE SCHOOL BOARD

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-seventh Order, second reading of Bill No. 34, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa Separate School Board", Mr. Chartrand.

MR. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Chartrand, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 34, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa Separate School Board".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. GEO H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Order No. 48.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-eighth Order, second reading of Bill No. 107, "An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act", Mr. Doucett.

HON. GEO. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 107, "An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

(Take F follows)

MR. DENNIS N: I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) has anything to say regarding this Bill?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned the other day, will make several minor changes and one perhaps of a major character.

In the larger urban centres, cross walks for pedestrians are now provided between street intersections, and at some places, between blocks. Cross-walk, signal-light controlled systems have been installed, which are necessary so that the vehicular traffic will stop when the light so indicates, before entering the cross walk.

There is another amendment regarding the mudguards on vehicles. That is obvious, for the reason that mudguards or fenders are attached to the vehicle, and made a part of the body, and they are permitted to go from the place of manufacture with the mudguards installed.

Another is in connection with the cab over the engine of a tractor with a short wheel-base, with a trailer which, together, do not exceed 50 feet in length. The over-all length of the single vehicle when operated alone, or a combination of vehicles, is not increased. It increases the length of one, but not the over-all.

There have been a number of cases where farmers have tractors, or other vehicles for use in their agricultural husbandry, and we recommend that the second attachment be the same as on a motor vehicle.

Then there is a change, in section 2. This amendment is necessary to facilitate the safe passage of pedestrians between blocks of streets where vehicular traffic is heavy. That is just a slight change.

There is one regarding drunken drivers, where we have increased the penalties fromthree months to six, from six months to twelve months and from twelve months to two

years, where there is an accident where a person is injured or property damage occurs.

MR. DENNISON: I wonder if the government is not allowing a weight of these trucks on the highways that is beyond the ability of the highway to properly sustain? I think a great deal of damage is done on our highways by allowing trucks of 14 tons or over to travel on them. I think that should be reduced; we should reduce the weight of the trucks and trailers and their loads, that travel on our highways.

It seems to me when you get up into that class of traffic it should be sent by railway and not be allowed on our highways.

Up in North York, Spring before last, there were sections of the cement highway which were broken, and there were holes a foot deep caused by the heavy trucks which were allowed to travel on the highways.

MR. FROST: Would you mind letting it stand, until it gets to Committee?

MR. J. D. BAXTER (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, in regard to that section, concerning the I. C. C. 28,000 pounds or over; what is the law at the present time for semi-trailers with two axles?

MR. SPEAKER: Could that not be threshed out in Committee?

MR. NIXON: Has the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) any idea of what he is doing to the farmers who are unfortunate enough to be living on a highway, when he says that every vehicle of that sort must have a second connection?

MR. DOUCETT: A second hitch.

MR. NIXON: That is a terrific thing to put on. Does the incidence of accident justify such a provision as that?

MR. DOUCETT: That is a matter to which I have given a lot of consideration, and is now put before the House for its consideration. We have had several accidents where people were seriously injured, some maimed for life, where a vehicle or wagon dropped from a tractor, and caused an accident with an on-coming automobile. We compel people drawing trailers with any kind of a motor vehicle to have a second hitch, and that is why it is included in this Bill.

(Page F-4 follows)

If you think it is not a good thing, we will be happy to discuss it with you. We do not want to put any undue burden on agriculture if at all. It is simply as a matter of safety to the travelling public, we have brought this in.

MR. R. A. McEWING (Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, take a waggon; what "second hitch" would you ask for? Put a second tongue on it, or what?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: May I say to the hon. member (Mr.McEwing) that if this Bill goes into Committee, we will regard that as being without prejudice. If there are points to be raised, they can be considered there.

MR. DOUCETT: I can assure the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing) that we will not ask him to put a second tongue on his waggon.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 13.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 13th Order, second reading of Bill No. 56, "The Fair Employment Practices Act, 1950", Mr. Walters.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): In the absence of Mr. Walters, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 56, "An Act respecting Fair Employment Practices".

Mr. Speaker, in presenting this Bill to the legislature, I think it should be first stated that we did not approach it in any sort of political partisanship, because I am quite sure all of us, on all sides of this House, recognize that there is discrimination, and that every reasonable person in this House, and outside of it, is anxious to see that discrimination ended. The very fact that at this time there are on the Order Paper no less than three Bills from all groups in the Opposition, is indicative, I think, of the fact that

this is a measure which is far beyond mere partisan politics.

It is in that spirit I want to approach the Bill, and it is in that spirit that I am quite sure the government will give consideration to it.

We have made this afternoon a step in the direction of legislation to meet discrimination. In the past it was argued that this question of discrimination could be met by education. I think we are now coming to the conclusion that education must continue; that there was a great need for education in the field of -- I do not like the words "racial tolerance"; I do not like them at all -- but, shall we say in the field of "equality and understanding". There is need for education in regard to that sort of thing.

This Bill provides for the continuation of education in that field.

No one suggests that this Legislature, as such, can uproot prejudice, but what legislation can do -- and what we did earlier this afternoon -- was to stop specific overt acts of prejudice, and that is what this Bill proposes to do. It proposes to put an end to the practice of racial, religious and national discrimination in employment. It is a fact that since we have already accepted the principle of legislation to meet discrimination, I think we ought now to take this further step on this occasion, and put on the Statute Books of the province of Ontario a Fair Employment Practice Act. I think the fact of a decision of that kind by this Legislature would be to give encouragement to people of all races, creeds and colours in this country, in the knowledge that we, in Ontario, were stating flatly and clearly that we are opposed to the continuation of discrimination in employment.

I would like to suggest this to the hon. members, that I

think discrimination in jobs is the worst kind of discrimination of all, because there you deny a man or a woman the right to employment for no other reason than the colour of their skins, their religion, or their racial background, and there is no place where discrimination does greater damage,

(Page F-7 follows

either to the individual affected, or to the community at large. I am quite sure that this policy of discrimination in employment, where it is practised by some of our employers, has the effect of losing to that employer the benefit of very able and well-fitted employees, for no other reason than their race or creed.

In the schools we teach our children that all Canadians are equal before the law, and that all Canadians are equal in every place in our democracy, but I think it is a fact that when our children leave the schools, and come face to face with the reality of seekking a situation, they find a situation just a little bit at odds with what they have been told it would be while they are at school.

There was an article published in the Toronto Daily Star not long ago relating to the situation, as the students in one of the Toronto vocational schools found it, when they made application for employment. I think their views, and their findings are worth placing before this Legislature. They had complained to their instructor that they were having difficulty with the employment forms which were offered to them, and so the instructor wrote to 50 firms in the city of Toronto, and asked for their application forms.

The firms who replied were banks, insurance companies, factories, department stores, wholesale houses, retail stores, stocks and bond firms---almost a complete cross-section of the employing firms in this city.

The students tabulated the questions asked on the forms, in the order of the frequency with which they appeared, and I was amazed at the questions which appeared in that form. For example,

the place of birth was asked in 82% of the forms; the religious denomination was asked in 71% of these application forms; nati n-ality was asked in 51%; membersnip in clubs and other organizations was asked in 25% of the application forms; the color of the hair and of the eyes, and so forth, was asked in 11% of the application forms received from these 50 firms by the students at a Tor nto vocational school.

One of the strangest things to me was that the group in the school, in tabulating these application forms ,discarded any questions which had less than 10% contained on the application forms. One of the interesting things which was discarded appears to be the question, "What experience have you? What training have you? What skills have you? "

Evidently, in thatcross-section, the question of your birth place, your religion and your nationality rated higher than your capacity to perform the job.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thin it is necessary for us to recognize that this is a real problem.

I have in my hand the application forms of a large number of firms in the city of Toronto. I will not name them; I do not thin it isnecessary to do so, but I would like to table the forms, so they will be available to the hon. members of the House, so they can see just what this legisl tion tends to eliminate.

For instance, the Civic Liberties organization, with a large number of other organizations, approached the Cabinet and asked that there should be enacted into legislatioh a Fair Employment Practise Act. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) and the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity (Mr. Cecile), I think, met that deputation and heard the representations which were made and I think they were impressed by the size of the deputation . .

and the cross-section of Ontario's opinion, which was represented there, and that they spoke for Ontario, -- and for Canada, for that matter, -- is perhaps tabulated in the result of the Gallup Poll, taken sometime ago. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) need have no fear that in accepting a Fair Employment Act, he is not doing the kind of thing that the people of Ontario want done.

The Gallup Poll makes this report, and here is the question which was asked:

> "In some parts of the United States, it is against the law to refuse a man a job because of his race, colour or religion. Some people approve of this because it ensures equality for all; others disapprove, claiming it interferes with employers. Would you approve or disapprove of such a regulation in this province?"

And the question was answered by Canada as a whole, that 64 percent. approved the law, 23 percent disapproved, and 13 percent. were undecided.

In the province, 62 percent. approved, 26 percent. disapproved and 12 were undecided.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the survey was reported on June 19th, 1947, and I think there has been since that time an even greater number of people who have become persuaded of the need for a Fair Employment Practice Act.

So I appeal to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that he will give serious consideration to the proposals we are laying before the House in this Bill.

One of the motions, for exa ple, or resolution of the Canadian Legion, reported in the Globe and Mail of September 30th, 1947, of a meeting of the Ontario Command of the Canadian Legion, specifically called for a halt to the discrimination in employment, which is shown in various intensities in different

parts of the country. In fact, the Legion asked for legislation on all levels of government in the Dominion, to outlaw all discrimination on the ground of race, colour or creed.

> "Part of the resolution read that such legislation would aid in the establishment of 'the democratic principles of equality of opportunity for which our fighting men and women of all races and creeds sacrificed their lives'."

With that view I think all of us can agree. Certainly it is the view of organized labour movement in this country that there should be enacted a Fair Employment Practice law. That has been expressed by the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, and by the Canadian Congress of Labour.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are not venturing into new fields when we propose that Ontario ought to adopt a Fair Employment Practice Act. A Fair Employment Practice Act has been in force in some states of the American Union for sometime. New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Connecticut all have Fair Employment Practice Acts, and this last year, based on the experience of New York State, Rhode Island, New Mexico, Oregon and Washington added a Fair Employment Practice law.

Certainly the experience in New York has been such that there has been general applause for the Bill from all sides,

(Page F-11 follows)

even though we had to decide, with some misgivings whether it was good or not, to embark on this legislation.

I willnot take up the time of the House to read it, but I have an editorial from the New York Tribune of March 8th 1949, and that editorial commends the legislation in practise in New York State and it is a model which I think we in this province could very well afford to consider following.

There have been statements made by religious leaders of all sorts. James (Cardinal) McGuigan, of the Catholic faith, the Anglican Council of the Federated Church of Christ, and spokesmen for the Jewish faith have all at various times expressed their view that it was necessary we have legislation to stop the vicious practise of discrimination in employment.

Mr. Speaker, one of the strangest things is that those businessmen who at first felt it might be an imposition upon them, and who were inclined to be opposed to it, when they had the opportunity of thinking of their experiences under this law, have found it has not interfered with them at all.

Business Week, for the week of February 28th of this year has a very interesting article on the subject. It says:

"Does State Fair Employment Practise Hamper You?" I want to quote one or two of the sections which deal with the views of businessmen on the question:

> "Employers agree that the F. E. P. C. laws have not caused near the fuss that opponents predicted. Disgruntled job seekers have not swamped Commissions with complaints. Personal friction has not been at all serious. Some employers still think there isno need for a law. But even those who

"opposed an F E P C are not actively hostile now."

So I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in those places where they have had experience with this law, the experience has been such that we might well consider adopting similar legislation in this country.

I do not want to take the time of the House to read a large number of editorials which have appeared. Hon. members of this House have received a list of some of these editorials supporting the view I have expressed, and which has been expressed in the brief submitted by the Civil Liberties Association, and I hope that the government may see its way clear to accept this legislation. I think it is a great moral issue, which faces our democracy. If we are able to tackle this problem, if we are able to say that in jobs, as in other places, there shall be no discrimination because of race, creed or color, then I think we can fairly proclaim our democracy to be a democracy.

I would end my remarks on this occasion by quoting from a speech made by the hon. George Drew, in this Legislature, on March 7th, 1944, in which he said:

> "If you discriminate against any person because of race or creed in respect to their ordinary rights as a citizen, you deny that equality which is part and parcel of the very freedom we are fighting to preserve. Equality is the very foundation of our social structure. I fully recognize prejudices are difficult to avoid. But it should be our purpose to attempt in every way we can to remove all causes of such prejudice and to make unity, equality and freedom real and living words."

I commend this to the government and I ask for an Act of this sort in this Legislature.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Does the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Oliver) want to go ahead on this subject?

MR. F. OLIVER (Grey South): Your "hon. friend" is not very particular. Go ahead.

MR. FROST: According to our arrangement, I was going to ask for the adjournment of the Debate on this subject, and then call Order No. 11, which deals with the same subject, but from a different point of view.

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

Motion agreed to.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 11.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 11th Order, Second reading of Bill No. 54, "An Act respecting Fair Employment Practices", Mr. Salsberg.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 54, "An Act respecting Fair Employment Practices."

Mr. Speaker, my task is made much easier by the very eloquent appeal made to the House by the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) who spoke just before me, and I am glad we have reached the stage where the appreciation of the needs for legislation of this character is recognized by every section of the House.

I think it is well remembered by most hon. members of the House, who have been here for some time, that this question was before the Legislature, since the year 1944. I have on it at every Session of the Legislature, and in fact, had a Bill, the Fair Employment Practice Bill, prepared at least five or six years ago. I was in this dilemma, and, speaking very frankly now, -- it is a case of "now it can be told" -- I had a Bill, but I knew that unless the government introduced

it, it would not carry, and I was very anxious to avoid the defeat of a Bill of such a character. I handed the Bill to the government of the day and asked them to please introduce it, and I was very anxious to avoid anything which might be construed as placing the party in power as not being in favour of such legislation.

I knew it was only a question of time, and today's Bill, which received second reading earlier this afternoon, is an indication of the progress that is being made.

I agree with the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) that we must not deal with this legislation in a partisan manner, and that, by rights, it should be legislation introduced by the government, as this guarantees its passage through all stages of the House.

Today there are three Bills, one by the Opposition group, one by the Liberal group, and one by our group, and we are pleading with the government and asking them to enact legislation of this sort, and I am still very hopeful that even at this Session the government may see fit to change its attitude and introduce any one of these three Bills, or to bring in an entirely new Bill of their own, which will achieve the desired result, namely the outlawing of discriminatory practices in employment.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be stated at this time perhaps, it would come best from me than from any other member, both because I have spoken on this question every year, and, secondly, because I am from a minority group, that there is a very distinct improvement in regard to this matter. I well remember in the village of St. George where the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) chaired a meeting, on a question the merit of which I am really not concerned with, but here was a community rising in defence of a teacher who came from a minority group.

(Take G-1 follows)

I think it was a fine expression of understanding and of the democratic feeling of that community.

We had the example of a speech delivered by the Deputy-Minister of Travel and Publicity of our own government, a speech which I think should be mentioned on this occasion as an indication of the improvement that is taking place in the province. I refer to the speech that Mr. Tom McCall delivered at a gathering of representatives from the various government travel and publicity departments. He said at that meeting, and because he was speaking for our government I want to put it on the record:

> "Another thing tourists don't like, and that is advertising material which says a place takes restricted or selected clientele. It is my job to see we do not insult people who come to visit this province. That type of literature is out, we won't distribute it."

I pay tribute to the Deputy-Minister of the Department of Travel and Publicity for the speech he has made.

Then we have the fine example the city of Windsor gave us in appointing a negro solicitor as city solicitor for that city. I think these are excellent developments and we should note them when we are also pointing out the darker side of the picture.

What is the fact, Mr. Speaker? The fact is that there is still, unfortunately, discrimination directed against people when seeking employment, and as the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) said---and I want to put it in my own words---there isnot a worse type of discrimination than that which denies a person the right to work at his calling, at his trade, at his occupation, solely because of his racial or national origin or his religious belief. There could be no worse treatment given a person than that and, unfortunately, a minority does practise that and legislation is required to stop the minority from continuing that type

of discrimination.

There is plenty of material to bring to the attention of hon. members; we have an agreement not to exceed a time limit and I have no intention of doing so, but let me just assure this House that I know of enough cases that came to my attention to keep me speaking here for hours. I could tell you of an incident where a young Jewish veteran of Canada's Air Force came back, and while stillin uniform, applied for a job at a firm on Yonge Street and was told they would not employ a Jew. He told them, in order to convince himself of the situation: "Well, I am not Jewish." They said thenthey would employ him,"but," said the owner, "if I should find that you are, you will be summarily dismissed."

I had a very pleasant experience in the hallway just outside the Chamber a couple of weeks ago. I came across a young lad who is working for the government. I did not know he was here -- and in this connection I want to say the government of this province has shown many, many examples which should be emulated by private employers, by industry; I think there are more people employed now without asking questions about their racial or religious origin than ever before. As I say, I saw this young man here and asked him: "What are you doing?" He said: "I work for the government." Well, that was very nice, but that young man came to me less than a year ago in a most disturbed condition, Mr. Speaker, and told me he had answered an advertisement in the daily paper---and this lad, by the way, was born and raised here---he applied, gave his name, itsounded Jewish and he was told the job was filled. The lad went around the corner, picked up the telephone and telephoned the same establishment, told them he wanted to apply and gave another name, and he was asked to please come over at once because the job was still open.

I ask you to think what effect that would have on young people, aside from the question of earning a livelihood, what mental effect has it, what disturbance does it cause in the mind

of a young person like that?

We read in the papers a couple of days ago about what promises to be very important discoveries made by two young men, one in the University of Toronto and the other in the University of McGill. They are supposed to be revolutionary in content, these discoveries. One is a displaced person who came here to this country recently, by name Kavis, the other is named Newman. Both are making, evidently, a very worthwhile contribution to the life of the country in their research work, and yet there are altogether too many cases where educational institutions and employers deny the country and their industry the opportunity of gaining the service and contributions which such young men can make, solely because of their name or their national origin, and I suggest that is not only harmful to the individuals affected, it is a crime against them of course, but it is also a disservice to the country and a stab at the very heart of what we call democracy.

There is room for differences of interpretation of what constitutes democracy. Democracy as conceived by one group may differ from what another group may think of it, but we all agree that this is an undemocratic act, that such acts are undemocratic in every respect and we should seek to remove them, both in the interests of the minorities affected and of the country as a whole, industry and government.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I wind up this brief remark on a subject that, as I have said, I have spoken about every year in the House with this appeal to the government: The existence of this evil has been recognized by the government in the Bill which they introduced regarding the restrictions of property ownership. I suggest they should agree to broaden their Bill. I suggest that a Fair Employment Practises Act is as important as the other Bill from some points of view and from some respects far more important. The press of this city and of this country

---and again I do not want to burden the House with reading, but I have the editorial from the Telegram and the editorial from the Star, both asking the government to bring in Fair Employment Practises Acts. All opposition parties are asking the same thing and I suggest it would be one of the most laudable things the government can do in this mid-century Session, if it were to bring in a Bill on its own or take over one of the Bills proposed---I do not care which one they select, mine happens to be the first one in order on the Order Paper. Take any one, bring oneof your own and let that also be carried, and you will have earned a place in the history of the province that will forever stand to your credit by enacting two such Bills, one which you have introduced and one that we are suggesting that you introduce. I think the province will welcome it and will be thankful and you will have done the thing which should be done, and I am sure the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) will give this proposal most sincere and serious consideration.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we have listened to two very thoughtful contributions by hon. members of this House in relation to a matter which is undoubtedly of importance. I want to say the position of the government here and my personal position is one of strong opposition to racial discrimination of any kind.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are living in a world that is constantly getting smaller, we are living in a very difficult world, we are living in a world where we have to live at peace with people, because that I think is one of the fundamentals of the age we live in. We have to get along withother people, and I say one of the difficult problems the world faces today is the matter of discrimination, which exists in many countries of the world.

We have the case of the unfortunate African chief and his

wife, I think in this country here and in this hon. Legislature we are all for that couple. I am myself, anyway, and I imagine the British Government is. I imagine the British Government is for that couple. On the other hand, we must realize they have a very difficult problem to meet there and probably they are doing the best they can to negotiate around some of the rocks and reefs that there are in the handling of that particular problem.

I think that background might express the views of those of us who are here. I should like to read the balance of the article in Toronto Saturday Night. It is not often I am able to quote Toronto Saturday Night approvingly. Sometimes they have "spanked" me soundly for things I have done and said, but it may be either I am improving or the paper is improving, I do not know which.

AN hon. MEMBER: Maybe you are both improving.

MR. FROST: Maybe, but, Mr. Speaker, I will read the first part of the editorial. I may say there are words there with which I do not agree, and I will tell you what they are in a moment, but I do say Mr. Sandwell is very well known in his advocacy of the objectives of the Civil Liberties League. Mr. Sandwell says, and again this is from the editorial of February 28th last:

> "The announcement of Premier Frost that his Government will introduce legislation prohibiting certain forms of discriminatory restriction in deeds and covenants is exceedingly welcome, and we are not disposed to criticize the Government for not going further inthe matter of anti-discrimination legislation at this moment, provided only that the legislation actually in view is so drafted as to be effective in its particular sphere. The whole

"subject of discrimination on grounds of race and religion is one in which public opinion and legislation must proceed closely together,----"

I must say there are parts of this next sentence I do not concur with entirely:

"---and there is much educational work to be done before public opinion in Ontario reaches the required level of intelligence and humanity."

I do not agree with those last words. I agree with my hon. friend opposite. I think our people in this province do not want discrimination, they do not like it and do not want it. What we have done might be put in the "Thou shalt not" class rather than in the class that "Thou must do certain things." Our legislation to date has been of the "Thou shalt not do" certain things class; for instance, put up offensive advertising relating to matters of race and creed, any place, hotels or any place else. We barred that back in 1944. We now have this legislation preventing misguided persons from putting discriminatory covenants in deeds, for reasons we discussed here. We are putting in, certainly as an indication of policy and opinion, the provision in the Labor Relations Act that collective bargaining agreements must not contain provisions which discriminate on grounds of race and creed.

Those are positive declarations of public policy and I think they are declarations which have a profound effect in their own way.

Mr. Speaker, after all in this province of ours I think it is wise to go along, to guide public opinion and to go along with it without perhaps doing things which may, if we are not careful, do more harm than good. I would not say either of these Bills might do more harm than good, but on the other hand remember the background of our people. In this province here I do think our people are an enlightened, broad-minded people,

we have learned to get along with other people, with other races. I think one of the great examples in this world is the relationship between the French and English races in Canada. We have shown the world it is notnecessary for races to quarrel and fight, that they can get along together and can cooperate in partnership and do great things. I think myself that is Canada's greatest contribution to date in the world, the fact we have been able to do that.

If we go back 100 years or a little more than 100 years to Lord Durham's famous report, we shall find he was very sorrowful about the situation in Canada. He referred to "two nations warring in the bosom of a single state" and he advocated certain things in his report which now, in the light of 1950, seem to be far removed from what should have been done in those days.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by saying we have learned to live together, we have given a great example of toleration to the world, and I believe we are on the right track. There are many things in this legislation I do not disagree with, nevertheless I think perhaps we had better go along with public opinion the way we are going.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of this debate.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): May I say a word or two at this point?

MR. FROST: Yes. I may say my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) could take five minutes at this time if he would prefer, because I think we are running a little ahead of time, in order to get the hon. member for--

MR. OLIVER: Well, that is very generous of my hon. friend (Mr. Frost). I was under the impression that the hon. leader of the government (Mr. Frost) was going to call the three Bills and then he and I speak--

MR. FROST: Oh, I am sorry.

MR. OLIVER: --at the conclusion, that is why I did not rise before.

In regard to the two Bills that have been promoted by the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) and the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), I want to say at once that with the general purpose of those Bills I am in agreement and I think perhaps every hon. member of the House is.

I think we might as well agree now that no matter how many laws we pass or how many speeches we make, we will never be able to outlaw discrimination entirely. Our efforts must tend as legislators to diminish as much as we can those discriminatory practices. The fact that three Bills are on the Order Paper today is an indication that the hon. members of this House are thinking seriously about this very perplexing problem. I think personally the time has come in our province when we should put on the statute books an Act similar to that which they have in New York and in several States in the United States. It seems to me that in Canada today we welcome people from many lands. They come here to make their home in Canada and it seems to me further that we as legislators should make the laws so stringent that these newcomers will not be discriminated against in the matter of employment in their new-found land and home. To me, that is one of the most important factors that should move us on this occasion to prepare for the introduction and the implementation of legislation to assure fair employment and no discrimination therein.

So far as we in this particular group are concerned, we have a Bill on the Order Paper which differs from the two Bills we have discussed to a very important degree, and that has to do with the method of administration. That can be discussed when the Bill is before the House, but I just wanted to say on behalf of our hon. members that, speaking generally, we are in

agreement and we believe the day is at hand in Ontario when we should prepare and put into effect a law such as is set forth in these Bills this afternoon.

I am not so hopeful that I expect the government at this Session to do the job, but I am hopeful to this degree, that these three Bills and the discussions that have taken place upon them will lay the framework that we can reasonably expect in an ensuing Session thatlegislation will be based on the premise of the three Bills that are to be discussed in relation to this matter.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. C. DALEY (Minister of Labor): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 26.

HOURS OF WORK AND VACATIONS WITH PAY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order number 26, second reading of Bill number 104, "An Act to amend the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, 1944," Mr. Brown.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill number 104, "An Act to amend the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, 1944."

Mr. Speaker, to very briefly explain this Bill, it has four very distinct and important features. Firstly, that each employee shall be entitled to one week's vacation with pay after the first full year of employment and two weeks vacation with pay after the second full year's employment and for each year thereafter.

Secondly, that the employer shall determine as to when the employee shall take these holidays, provided that it shall not be more than ten months after the termination of the year.

Thirdly, that the amount of remuneration which shall be granted to the employee during the period in which he is on vaca-

tion shall be on the basis of 2% for the first full year of employment and 4% on the second and subsequent years of employment.

Fourthly, in the event of retirement from the employ of the employer, he shall, subject to the regulation of the Act with respect to the minimum requirements of time, be paid on the basis of 2% for the first year and 4% for subsequent years for the broken period.

Mr. Speaker, we all can recall, and it is not so many years ago, that the employees in factories or evenmany employees in commercial shops, received no vacation whatsoever. As a matter of fact, those who did get statutory holidays did not receive pay for them. The result was in many cases that families were called upon, to pay for their Christmas turkey twice; they paid it to the grocer and they paid it also in that they did not receive their wages on Christmas Day.

Now, thanks to the energetic efforts of the trade unions and the cooperation which now appears to exist between them and the employers and also with the government, we now have a vacation with pay to the extent of one full week. It ismy opinion this is not sufficient. I have always felt that I have not been entitled or should not be entitled to anything or any advantages that anyone else is not entitled to. Some people do argue that ordinary workmen who are working on an hourly rate get time and a half or possibly double time for overtime, and that should be considered in lieu of holidays. I do not go along with that idea. As a matter of fact I maintain that is all the more reason, if they have to work overtime, that they should be given a decent period of vacation.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BROWN: I think under present labor regulations it must be evident to all of the people in this House that the mere fact a factory is closed down for two weeks or for one week

or for any broken period does not mean that is going to interfere to any great extent with production. I think it has now become a proven fact that these men who work hard in factories are just as much entitled to rest as are the machines on which they work, and that they get much more valuable work and over a period of a year show as much by way of production by having two weeks rest as they could if they were there for the full 52 weeks of the year.

I do not under any circumstances advocate that employees should be paid remuneration in lieu of vacations, but this group feels that every employee in every factory, after he has spent one full year in the plant, is entitled to one week's holidays with pay and after he has beeninthe employ of the company for two years and thereafter, entitled to two weeks holidays.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to discuss this matter at this time, but as we all know, there are a number of Bills dealing with the same subject whichwillbe offered, and I would prefer to withhold my remarks until they have been called, so I will simply move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

(Take H follows)

MR. SPEAKER: I believe it was more or less mutually agreed between the hon. leaders in the House that the introducer would speak for 20 minutes and a reply would be given. That was agreed by the hon. leaders, I am sure. Perhaps the hon. member (Mr. Fell) was not in the House when that announcement was made.

HON. D. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we have a few minutes, and I would like to take the third readings in the Order Paper.

Order number 1.

THE MILK CONTROL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 1st order, third reading of Bill number 86, "An Act to amend the Milk Control Act, 1948," Mr. Kennedy.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy, I moved third reading of Bill number 86, "An Act to amend the Milk Control Act, 1948."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 3.

THE CITY OF TORONTO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 3rd order, third reading of Bill number 17, "An Act respecting the city of Toronto," Mr. Rea.

MR. STEWART (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Rea, I move third reading of Bill number 17, "An Act respecting the city of Toronto."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as inthe motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 4.

INCORPORATED SYNOD OF THE DIOCESE OF OTTAWA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 4th order, third reading of

Bill number 20, "An Act respecting the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ottawa, " Mr. Morrow.

MR. O. S. VILLENEUVE (Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Morrow, I move third reading of Bill number 20, "An Act respecting the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ottawa."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do nowpass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 5.

KNOX COLLEGE LIBRARY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 5th order, third reading of Bill number 22, "An Act respecting Knox College Library and certain Archives," Mr. Mackenzie.

MR. A. MACKENZIE (York North): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill number 22, "An Act respecting Knox College Library and certain Archives."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 6.

THE TOWN OF RIVERSIDE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 6th order, third reading of Bill number 26, "An Act respecting the town of Riverside," Mr. Murdoch.

MR. T. PRYDE (Huron): Mr. Speaker, inthe absence of Mr. Murdoch, I move third reading of Bill number 36.

Motionagreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, to clear off the Order Paper, there are three or four Private Bills we might dispose of and I move that you do now leave the chair

and the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to;

Hou e in Committee; Mr. Stewart in the chair.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime): Order number 30.

THE CITY OF WINDSOR

CLERKOF THE HOUSE: 30th order, House in Committee on Bill number 16, "An Act respecting the city of Windsor," Mr. Ellis.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to; the preamble agreed to; Bill number 16 reported.

(Page H-4 follows)

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 31.

THE TOWN OF LEAMINGTON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-first Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 24, "An Act respecting the Town of Leamington", Mr. Murdoch.

Sections 1 to 7 agreed to; schedule A agreed to; the preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 24 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 32.

THE TOWN OF ALEXANDRIA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-second Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 25, "An Act respecting the Town of Alexandria" Mr. Villeneuve.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to; the preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 25 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 33.

THE TOWNSHIP OF NORTH YORK

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-third Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 28, "An Act respecting the Township of North York," Mr. Mackenzie.

Sections 1 to 7 inclusive agreed to; schedule agreed to; preamble agreed to.

Bill Nol 28 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 41. I may say, Mr. Speaker, if there are any points here which the hon. members have any doubt about, I will hold this over.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-first Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 101, "An Act to amend the Public Schools Act", Mr.

Porter.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 5.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Does this section mean the running parallel to correspond with the Municipal Act? Is that the purpose?

MR. PORTER: That is the purpose, yes.

Sections 5 to 12 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 101 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 43.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-third Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 103, "An Act to amend the Ontario Municipal Board Act", Mr. Dunbar.

On Section 1.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar), as far as the present Act is concerned, how many vacancies there are at the present time.

MR. DUNBAR: One.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I understand the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) to say he proposes to fill that vacancy in the near future.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I assume the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) may have noticed -- or he may not; it is so recent -- a recommendation in the report of the Conservation Committee which relates to an appointment which ought to be made to that board, in the event another part of the report is adopted, namely, the one referring to a drainage referee.

I do not know whether the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar)

has had time to consider the matter, but I am wondering if he will say that he will consider that, before a permanent appointment is made, because the appointment of such a person qualified in the agricultural sciences, and in land use, was regarded by the committee as being a very important one, linked with the other recommendation, that the Municipal Board should be the sole referee in drainage cases.

Now, if you fill that one vacancy, that means that for another year at least it will not be possible to make another appointment. I am sure that the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) appreciates what I am talking about.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Will it be considered at the proper time?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, it will be. We have two of our men on the Municipal Board at the present time, one a land surveyor and the other an engineer, who has much experience in drainage work. So I think we have men who are qualified in that way, but I will bear that in mind, because we do want a well-qualified man, and I was endeavouring to get an experienced engineer. I had one in my office to whom I was speaking this morning, but he is a little over the age --

MR. JOLLIFFE: What is wrong with age?

MR. DUNBAR: You would not want to get a man started in a board like that when he is up around 69 or 68 years of age. We like to get them in their 50's, so we do not have to change them so often. You will appreciate that. You are not like old port; you do not improve with age. I can speak from experience in that way.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I would not agree with the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) about that, but I would like to add that we are aware of the presence on the board now, of legal talent, and

also engineering talent, and we know it includes people who have had experience in drainage matters, but it is not quite the point, as we see it.

(Page H-8 follows)

Some of us were very anxious that the Board should include a pe son who was not only qualified to practise in engineering matters, but qualified in the agricultural sciences by reason of the fact, as we know now, that drainage projects affect lands and agricultural questions which are not, strictly speaking, engineering questions. In other words, we were proceeding on the basis that a lawyer hashis place, of course, and an engineer has his place, too, but neither of them are particularly well posted on this kind of land use, or in the modern developments in the agricultural sciences and that is what we were concerned about, as the hon. member for Grey Sotth (Mr. Oliver) will confirm.

You may get the best qualified engineer in the country, who can tell you all you ought to know about drainage end of it and you might get a good counsel to tell you about the legal end of it, but neither of those men are cognizant of drainage questions, which have turned out to be very important.

MR. DUNBAR: I agree with you. We had a man there who had spent 25 years on assessments, and we wanted an expert on assesments.

I agree with you, however, that we should endeavor to get some person who will be able to fill that position, as you state.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, on that point I quite agree with the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) appreciates this; that we need on the Board not a mam who knows how to run a ditch, or a assess the costs, but rather a man who knows where the drain should be run in the first place. We want a man who can go and referee and analyze any dispute, which is far more important. We do not want another fiasco, like the Luther swamp, which should never have been drained in the

first place, but should have been allowed to remain as a storage basin. We want men on the board who can draw proper conclusions for the benefit of all concerned.

Sections 1 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

Bill number 103 reported.

MR. DUNBAR: What is the mater with the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg)? He did not object.

MR. OLIVER: His resistance islowered.

MR. SALSBERG: I will wait untilthird reading and catch you on the rebound.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report certain bills.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. H. A. STEWART (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs leave to report six Bills without amendment and moves the adoption of the report.

Motionagreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House I will remind the hon. members that the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) and the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) were interested in certain explanations relative to the Audit Act, and I think that Mr. Cotnam, the auditor, has beenin touch with the hon. members and I believe they are meeting tomorrow morning, or at some other convenient time. If any of the other hon. members are interested in that matter, if they willget in touch with the hon. members opposite, or with Mr. Cotnam and arrange to meet him in hisoffice, I believe at 9.30 tomorrow morning, matters then can be discussed.

Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, we will proceed with government orders on the Order Paper. We probably will not reach all of the estimates, but we will get them in this order, "Attorney General, Insurance, Labour, Planning and Development, Reform Institutions, Travel and Publicity".

I quite realize that would be a big order in itself, but we will take them up in that order.

MR. OLIVER: Are you proceeding with the Budget debate?

MR. FROST: No, not tomorrow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will be in touch with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the hon. Leaders of the other groups, relative to private members public Bills. If they will give me a little preference, I would like to work in at least an hour tomorrow, because we are having a night sitting -- if possible, we might take two hours.

There may be some change which will be required in the procedure, but I think it is infinitely better than the procedure we are following now. I will be in touch with the hon. Leaders opposite, and they can give me , perhaps, a little panel.

We have a number of Bills on similar subjects, and I would say there is something to be gained, if possible, in having the subject of the various Bills similar in nature, because it allows more time for the hon. members opposite to speak, and probably one reply on one Bill would cover the general position from the government standpoint.

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

MR. JOLLIFFE: Before we adjourn; we appreciate the information just given by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and in the absence of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) I would like to direct a question about Friday, I received an anonymous notice about something which concerns me.

A film was taken during our trip to the north country last summer, and it will be shown on Friday at one o'clock. I wonder if this picture has passed the board of censorship, because from the information I have, and what I have heard of the journey, it may need censoring.

MR. FROST: I will assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that I will have that censored tonight.

MR. MacLEOD: Deal with that when you are dealing with Stromboli.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.10 of the clock, p. m.

- - - - - - -

Volume 26.

P R O C E E D I N G S .

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS TWENTY-THIRD DAY OF MARCH, A. D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT TWO O'CLOCK, P. M.

- - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario
Thursday, March 23, 1950
2.00 o'clock, p. m.

- - - - - -

2.00 O'CLOCK, P. M.

And the House having met.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting reports by Committees.

MR. B. L. CATHCART (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the Sixth Report of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, and move its adoption.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills begs leave to present the following as its Sixth Report:

Your Committee begs to report the following Bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 21 - An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Bill No. 32 - An Act respecting the City of Kingston.

Your Committee would recommend that Bill No. 5, "An Act to Incorporate the Town of Malton"; and Bill No. 29, "An Act to Incorporate the Improvement District of Ojibway Islands", be not reported.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed) Bryan L. Cathcart
Chairman

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTANCY IN ONTARIO

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to regulate the Profession of Public Accountancy in Ontario", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to. First reading of the Bill.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): This Bill is the result of a series of conferences held between the several bodies of accountants, operating in this province, and to some extent, is the result, following a statement of a year ago, of an attempt to enquire into the whole question of public accounting, to make it satisfactory to all concerned, and protect the public interests. As the hon. members will recall there was a private Bill before the Legislature, presented by one group of accountants, who were carrying on business in Ontario, and provision is made in this Bill for other groups of that kind, in addition to the main bodies.

I think this Bill will meet with the approval of all concerned.

HON. G.A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Department of Municipal Affairs for the year ending December 31st, 1949.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to question 66, 73, and 82.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 2.

THE CITY OF WINDSOR

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, third reading of Bill No. 16, "An Act respecting the City of Windsor," Mr. Ellis.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 16, "An Act respecting the City of Windsor".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 3

THE TOWN OF LEAMINGTON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, third reading of Bill No. 24, "An Act respecting the Town of Leamington", Mr. Murdoch.

MR. J. F. EDWARDS (Perth): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Murdoch, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 24, "An Act respecting the Town of Leamington".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 4

THE TOWN OF ALEXANDRIA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order, third reading of Bill No. 25, "An Act respecting the Town of Alexandria", Mr. Villeneuve.

MR. O. F. VILLENEUVE (Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 25, "An Act respecting the Town of Alexandria".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 5.

THE TOWNSHIP OF NORTH YORK

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order, third reading of Bill No. 28, "An Act respecting the Township of North York", Mr. Mackenzie.

MR. A. MACKENZIE (North York): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 28, "An Act respecting the Township of North York".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 6

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order, third reading of Bill No. 101, "An Act to amend the Public Schools Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 101, "An Act to amend the Public Schools Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion,

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 7.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order, third reading of Bill No. 103, "An Act to amend the Ontario Municipal Board Act", Mr. Dunbar.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 103, "An Act to amend the Ontario Municipal Board Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 19.

THE DRUGLESS PRACTITIONERS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Nineteenth Order, second reading of Bill No. 84, "An Act to amend the Drugless Practitioners Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of Bill No. 109,

"An Act to amend the Drugless Practitioners Act".

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Could we have an explanation?

HON. WM. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): There is no change. The amendment is to clarify the Act in respect to the regulations under which it has been operating.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 20.

THE VENEREAL DISEASES PREVENTION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twentieth Order, second reading of Bill No. 111, "An Act to amend the Venereal Diseases Prevention Act, 1942", Mr. Goodfellow.

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 111, "An Act to amend the Venereal Diseases Prevention Act, 1942."

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. David): Will the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) please give me some information. Some people, particularly Dr. Hutton at Brantford, have tried to get some typewritten information. Apparently that Bill does not go as far as they request.

MR. GOODFELLOW: The amendment to this Act -- it is the same as the former Bill -- simply qualifies the Act with respect to the regulations under which it has been operating since 1942.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 21.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-first Order, second reading of Bill No. 112, "An Act to amend the Municipal Act", Mr. Dunbar.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 112, "An Act to

amend the Municipal Act".

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. David): I notice in one of the sections of this Act, it would give the authority to pay bus or transportation organizations for losses they might sustain. In view of the fact this was not done last year, and the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) was against doing it, I wonder if the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) should at this time allow the municipalities to make compensation.

MR. DUNBAR: We learn by experience. Last year when that Bill was brought in, I must admit that I did not think it would be a good thing, but this, added to other private Bills, should work out well, and it should provide for annexation in the future.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 22.

THE LAND TRANSFER TAX ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-second Order, second reading of Bill No. 113, "An Act to amend the Land Transfer Tax Act", Mr. Frost.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 113, "An Act to amend the Land Transfer Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

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

THE CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT, 1946

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-seventh Order, second reading of Bill No. 119, "An Act to amend the Conservation Authorities Act, 1946", Mr. Griesinger.

HON. WM. GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 119, "An Act

to amend the Conservation Authorities Act, 1946".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

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

THE PLANNING ACT, 1946

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-eighth Order, second reading of Bill No. 120, "An Act to amend the Planning Act", Mr. Griesinger.

HON. WM. GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 120, "An Act to amend the Planning Act, 1946".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 29.

THE FIRE DEPARTMENTS ACT, 1949

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-ninth Order, second reading of Bill No. 121, "An Act to amend the Fire Departments Act, 1949", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 121, "An Act to amend the Fire Departments Act, 1949".

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. David): May we hear from the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) on this Bill.

MR. PORTER: This Bill makes certain amendments to the Fire Departments Act of last year. The changes are set forth in the notes, and I explained them on the first reading.

Section 1 provides for the repeal of certain subsections.

Section 2 provides that the approval of the superintendent of insurance is no longer necessary, as it was in the original subsection.

Subsection 2 of section 2 provides that the cost of the normal operation and maintenance of fire department premises are added to fire department costs eligible for grants.

Section 3, subsection 1, provides that the former provision respecting pension plans did not meet the needs of all municipalities, and the new clause is more flexible.

In subsection 2, provision is made for claims in 1949. The existing subsection provided for certain claims, and this has now been sensed, and is repealed.

Section 4 provides for the re-wording of sections 14, 15 and 16, to provide for the payment of grants to the Department of Municipal Affairs, rather than through the Attorney General. Otherwise there is no change, in principle, of this section.

Section 15 provides for the payment of grants after the first day of November of each year. Its repeals allows the payments any time after the municipal statement of cost is certified.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): I understand that the Firefighters' Association, who supported this Bill, are concerned with subsection 1. I think we should get an explanation. It hampers them in their negotiations.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): I understand that the Fire Fighters' Association of Ontario, the Ontario Fire Fighters' Association have not got a copy of this Bill before them, and I want to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) whether he would agree that the Bill be not brought to the Committee stage until they look at the Bill, and express an opinion, if they find it necessary.

I am advised they did not see the Bill, and were wondering what it was. I understand that arrangements were made to forward copies of the Bill to the Ontario Fire Fighters' Association, as well as to the Toronto Association.

I think we should agree to that. If we could do that, I think it would be the right thing.

MR. PORTER: I have no objections to that.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

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

THE POLICE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirtieth Order, second reading of Bill No. 122, "An Act to amend the Police Act, 1949", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): I move second reading of Bill No. 122, "An Act to amend the Police Act, 1949".

MR. SPEAKER: I think we must abide by the rule. If there is an error in printing, the Bill should not be introduced at this time.

Bill No. 122 stands.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 34.

THE LEGITIMATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-fourth Order, second reading of Bill No. 126, "An Act to amend the Legitimation Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 126, "An Act to amend the Legitimation Act".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 25

THE LORD'S DAY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-fifth Order, second reading of Bill No. 116, "An Act to provide for Certain Exceptions to the Lord's Day Act,(Canada), Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 116, "An Act to provide for Certain Exceptions to the Lord's Day Act (Canada)".

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): I am objecting to this being on the Orders today. On Tuesday this

Bill was introduced without proper notice. We allowed it to be read for the first time. I have not seen the Bill. It was put on my desk, but not in the book in my office. I did not see the Bill until after two o'clock. I would ask that it be delayed.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I may say this, this Bill was, of course, introduced on Tuesday, The Act is a short Act, and full explanation was given -- much more fully than is usually given on the first reading of a Bill. The Bill was printed and on the Order Paper, and in the books yesterday.

I must say, if my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) has not read the Bill, he takes very little interest in political affairs, but perhaps he is more naive than I think.

(Take B follows)

MR. JOLLIFFE: I cannot let that pass --

MR. FROST: I think he should have read it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I have a Bill book in my office, and it is filled by the same page who fills the books in the House. I follow the Bill book in my office. The Bill was not in it. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is not justified in making a statement of that kind.

MR. FROST: The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) should have enough interest in the public's business to go and get the Bill affecting the people of this province, and read it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: After a five-week delay in introducing the Bill --

MR. FROST: Would you expect it before?

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, but the newspapers did. I expect nothing from this government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. FROST: The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe is not diligent enough in his public duties, not as diligent as I thought he would be. I would have thought he would have got this Bill and read it carefully. He could almost have read it in the newspapers. As far as we are concerned, we try to be decent and honourable with the hon. members of this House, and if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has not read this Bill, I will not call it. I think that is fair.

I make this suggestion; I am most anxious to get ahead with the business of the House. We are going to sit tonight, and I suggest we consider this Bill at eight o'clock. Would that meet with the convenience of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe)?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I think eight o'clock tonight would be satisfactory. My own personal view is it is a little remarkable introducing this Bill along with a procession of after-thoughts, in the fifth or sixth week of the Session. However, eight o'clock is all right.

MR. FROST: I have no desire to rush anything. I want the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) to have the opportunity of consulting his Bill book and reading the Bills and orders which are there, and if he finds there is anything in this Bill that is unfair, I would be most happy to accede to his request.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, eight o'clock tonight is satisfactory.

The reason I said what I said this afternoon is that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) did not say to me earlier what he says now.

MR. FROST: I hope the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) will be entirely satisfied. I spend a lot of time trying to satisfy the hon. members opposite.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. FROST: Probably I had just better withdraw the Order, and call it again tonight.

Bill No. stands.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 26.

THE K.V.P. COMPANY LIMITED

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-sixth Order, second reading of Bill No. 117, "An Act respecting the K.V.P. Company Limited", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 117, "An Act respecting the K.V.P. Company Limited".

MR. C. W. COX (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I presume this

Bill refers to the Kalamazoo Paper Company. It was described the other day by the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) as manufacturing pulp.

I hope, in the passing of this Bill, it is not to be interpreted or understood that there is no way of rectifying this pollution, and I think it should be brought before the hon. members of this House, as well as to other places, that a way has been found.

Let me tell you of some similar circumstances at the head of the lakes. We have there four paper mills whose refuse is going out into Lake Superior. You can see it, sometimes, out for as far as fifteen miles, and the fishermen in that locality have been seriously affected. It is as obvious as the Gulf Stream, and as easy to see.

There is a remedy for pollution, and they are using it, in other places. May I refer to one, the State of Wisconsin, where there are more paper mills within a radius of 25 miles, than there are in all of Ontario. The same situation exists there on what is known as the Fox River. Incidentally, as I have said before, the hon. members of this House have an invitation to go down there and inspect the situation, and I ask that you make that trip, and you will see that Wisconsin has 25 paper mills, most of them working on wood from Ontario.

I want to point out that they had the same difficulty in the state of Wisconsin, with respect to pollution in the Fox River, flowing into Lake Michigan. The state of Wisconsin has given these people until the end of 1950 to correct the situation. I have with me a rather comprehensive report issued by the Manager of one of the paper mills there, in which he points out it is entirely feasible to solve the pollution problem , with respect to pulp and paper mills.

So I hope this is not considered as a matter which is not subject to rectification. They are doing it in Wisconsin, and I think those who are fishing are entitled to some protection in this regard.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, this can be remedied. It has been done in Wisconsin, and I think steps should be taken to rectify the pollution of the streams in the province of Ontario.

MR. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) replies, may I ask him to explain to the House his position with regard to the proposal I put before him the other day.

MR. PORTER: Will you explain it again, for the benefit of the hon. members?

MR. CALDER: It was reported in the newspaper about three days ago that the plaintiffs who had been successful in obtaining an injunction, and whose opposition has been upheld by the Privy Council, are reported to have said that if the government would undertake a full-scale study of the problem mentioned in the subject of the Bill in this Province, they would be prepared to waive their rights to enforce the injunction. I have not spoken to these people. But I am suggesting to the government to see if they cannot take advantage of Resolution No. 22, in the Order Paper, which is a resolution calling for a full-scale investigation by a Committee of this House into the question of pollution i Ontario. If they were to implement that, that would be a sensible and useful way of getting around a very, very unpleasant present condition. That will tend to solve the difficulty, and now that they have brought in the Bill which is, without doubt, retroactive -- and no one will fly into a temper over that one word "retroactive" -- here is one specific case

on which there is a good deal to be said, seeking a logical solution in regard to this pollution problem. Is there not available to the government a much less drastic solution, of which I think they should take advantage. I quite agree with the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) that as a matter of actual, practical position, we should have the necessary leverage -- if leverage is to be needed. This Bill should be enacted, but certainly some of its terms might be changed. It should not go into force on the day it receives Royal Assent. If we were to have a committee appointed to investigate this, then the Bill could become operative when proclaimed.

I was rather surprised to hear that the Research Council has authority to try and discover a method of lessening the pollution. If that is so, let us not have another delayed Commissions report. If you are going to appoint the Council for any of this work, let us fix a date for them to report, say, on the first of July, so that we will know from independent authority just how far the company is going to meet its obligations.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, as I said last year when this Bill was being debated here, that the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr.Scott) asked me, when I criticized him for not discussing this with the people concerned, before the Bill was introduced -- he asked me if I would close this mill down I told him "no", and I said I thought it was the duty of the government of Ontario and the wish of the people of Ontario that the pollution in this river and in other rivers in Ontario should be brought to a stop at the earliest possible time. I suggested the company be given five, or even ten years, to work a solution of this problem.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to what

is being done in the United States on this question of pollution, even such vicious pollution, which is worse than the pulp mill pollution. I am referring there to such pollution as waste and liquors and acids and oils and so on, from the electroplating rooms of firms in various kinds of manufacturing establishments.

In the United States they have now passed public law 845, which became law on the first of July, 1948. They have sat up a national board to stop pollution on a nation-wide basis, and in that national board set-up, in the United States, the states of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio and one or two others have sat up state boards to stop pollution.

I think this Legislature should, of course, take action so that not only one particular manufacturing establishment will be affected. I think we have the responsibility of seeing that this stopping of pollution should apply to all the pulp and paper companies in the north and not just the one.

I think it is also our responsibility to give help and to provide funds, and to collect funds from these companies, and amalgamate the research into these problems, and arrive at a solution, so that the results of that research may be made available to all companies, and pollution in our streams in new Ontario brought to an end.

I was amazed to see, in the case of these companies -- I remember up at Dryden, and Kapuskasing, Ontario, where a huge sewer, two and one-half or three feet in diameter, was simply pouring waste acids and pulp wood liquor and fibres into the streams of this province. I am sure Ontario wants that to be stopped.

At the same time I am sure this Legislature wants to prevent any one mill from being penalized. I think we want to

protect the livelihood of the people of Espanola, and I think the Research Council of Ontario is the proper body to initiate this research, and I suggest to the government that this not only affects the K.V.P., -- and this one company alone should not be made responsible for reimbursing the Research Council for the cost of this, but I think all the paper and pulp companies in the north should be asked to pay and should share the cost of solving this problem.

In the last three years in the United States there has been a project under way under the chairmanship of Professor Farnham F. Dodge, at Yale University, a project which has had a good deal of money placed behind it.

They are studying pollution, particularly pollution caused by the waste from plate rooms, which include acids, metals and cyanides, in various quantities.

They have already discovered ways and means where cyanide waste is able to be reduced, and according to Professor Dodge, they can reduce cyanide waste now to 100 units per million, or to one unit per million gallons of water, or to any degree they wish. In other words, the problem of cyanide pollution of streams has already been solved, as far as the technical details are concerned. The cost was another question in the United States, and now at least ten of the large plate plants, the most vicious examples of pollution in the country, have already been required to have established their own disposal plants. They are putting back into the streams now clear water. They are spending the money and are doing the job. Some of them were required to do it by the state, but a great number of them initiated this project themselves, and they have been successful.

I would make this suggestion in connection with this Bill, that the government approach this matter from the standpoint of the public interest of the whole of Ontario, particularly

the whole of new Ontario. It is not a matter of just one pulp company; it is a matter affecting the whole of the north country, and all the companies I think should be required to become associated with this plan to eliminate pollution.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I agree with most of the remarks which have been made, and I think I can sympathize with the government in the position they have taken on this Bill. I think that is about the wisest thing they could have done, under the circumstances.

But I would like to raise my voice to join with the others in this House in saying that I do not think this problem has been given proper consideration, for the reason that there has not been any real effort to study it over a period of time.

I do not think any attempt has been made to talk this over with the companies, and tell them that within a certain period of time they will have to desist, and it is time for them to get down to business and decide how best they can put an end to it.

I think most of the paper mills in my part of the country are not very much concerned about emptying the waste into a body of water as large as Lake Superior. They seem to feel that can go on indefinitely, and I think in that circumstance, is where the best work can be done, and I think it should be made clear that it will not be allowed to continue indefinitely, that is, they will not be permitted to dump their waste into this body of water indefinitely.

I would ask the government to make it clear to these various companies that they are going to be called upon to desist, and they should make a very definite study of their position, and draw their plans, so that they may discontinue the pollution.

I would like to ask the government whether or not they are satisfied that everything possible of a practical nature

has been done to end the pollution in this particular instance, and if they are not satisifed they have reached that position, then how long will they give the company to right it?

If the government feels that the degree of pollution is still too great, even after what the company has done, I think they could set a time limit within which they must have that situation cleared up to the greatest possible extent.

MR. J. G. WHITE:(Kenora): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the remarks of the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison), and the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr.Robinson), and I agree with them wholeheartedly with regard to the Research Council's part in this pollution program.

I do not entirely agree that the pulp and paper companies should bear too great a burden in connection with the Research Council.

I think when the ultimate solution is found, the pulp and paper companies will have spent considerable money putting in new equipment to help solve this problem.

The hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) referred to a plant in my particular riding. I do not want the House to get the idea that pollution from that mill is the problem in that particular instance. It is not. At Dryden, the waste enters into a fast-moving stream, and it is not from the mill at all, but from the sewage of the town, and I hope through the Bill that we recently put through this House at this Session, they will be one of the towns which will take advantage of the legislation, and have an up-to-date sewage disposal plant.

I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) will be well satisfied with the results which will come out of this particular problem at the K.V.P. at Espanola, and they should be enlarged upon and made available to the pulp and paper industry as a whole, in regard to pollution.

One other thing, Mr. Speaker; the particular instance I have given to this House as regards one mill. While it is not general all over Ontario, the hon. members for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) and for Fort William (Mr. Cox) know perfectly well there is a problem at the Head of the Lakes which must also be solved.

Generally, throughout Ontario, the pollution is oxygenated from the fast-moving streams, both at the Head of the Lakes, and at Fort Frances, and even at Dryden. I listened to the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Foster) a few days back, when he spoke of erosion which you have here in some parts of southern Ontario, and I think, if, instead of paying too much attention to these particular Bills which are not causing any great trouble in northern Ontario, if you paid more attention to solving the erosion problem in southern Ontario, and then came up north in regard to the other problem, you would be doing more for the province, and I do not want the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) nor the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) to think I am referring particularly to their problems, when I say that. I am referring more to the problem at Dryden and that at Espanola and at Fort Francis, where they are not nearly as great as they are at other points.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) is going to speak on this Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, yes, This is one of the rather exceptionally difficult problems with which a government is faced, where we have on the one side a whole town dependent upon the operations of one pulp mill, and, on the other hand, we have the rights of the individuals, and also the public interest that is involved in the minimization of the pollution of streams.

The question of pollution is one of a very highl

technical nature. It is one which can only be dealt with by persons with expert knowledge, scientific experience, and practical experience as well, and it was for that reason that in considering this whole matter, the government decided the Research Council of Ontario was the best qualified body at their disposal to make a study of this problem, and make recommendations to this particular company, and, indeed, to make recommendations of a general character.

This Bill, of course, deals with only the one company, but I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the whole problem of pollution is a matter with which the Research Council are concerned, and in the studies they have made of various aspects of their work to date, the problem of pollution has been under consideration. As to this particular Bill, the Research Council has already had the problem referred to it, and it has been referred to it in the widest possible terms. They are entitled to get the benefit of any information which might throw any light upon this problem, from any other country in the world. If they think there is something useful to be gained from Sweden or from the United States, or other places, they are at liberty to seek that, and the hon. member for Fort William -- I never can remember which city the hon. member (Mr. Cox)-- represents --

MR. MacLEOD:(Bellwoods): Both of them. He has a split personality.

MR. PORTER: The gold dust twins, as it were.

I am entirely in agreement with the sentiment expressed by the hon. members who have spoken on this Bill. We must make every effort to minimize pollution, and the Research Council have the fullest powers to retain experts of any kind they think are necessary to make inquiries as to what is being done elsewhere, and to recommend methods which have been tested

which shall regulate or accomplish the purpose expected in this case.

I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that this particular company has already spent very large sums of money during the last year, since the amendment to the Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act was introduced last Session, and have already spent substantial sums of money in re-organizing their plant, and installing such equipment there as is required for the purpose of improvement.

I suppose it will be open to question as to how effective these methods have been, but there will be people -- particularly the plaintiffs involved in this action -- who think that pollution has not been reduced as much as it should be, and there are other people who say it has been materially reduced, as a result of the steps taken in the last year.

As to the suggestion of the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) that this be dealt with by a committee of the Legislature; our feeling is that this is a very highly technical subject, and the Research Council will be the more effective in dealing with the question of pollution.

(Page B-13 follows)

There is the only answer to the problem. We have pollution of many different kinds, and it affects rivers and lakes, affects the land, and affects the air in some places in many different ways, and a council composed of this kind of men who have expert experience and know where to go to get the expert advice they need, whenever they need any particular bit, are the best qualified body we have for this purpose.

I may say also that we discussed this with the plaintiffs in this action, and we fully discussed the possibility of reduced pollution. On the whole question, the Research Council was consulted, and there was simply no suggestion on their part that there was any body better qualified to handle this, than the Research Council itself.

In addition to the pollution of these rivers, the Research Council has power to make broader investigations, and, indeed, what may be learned from this particular instance no doubt will result in recommendations which will be applicable to other cases of a similar kind.

Sometimes we learn more by making special studies of one particular problem and to concentrate on that as the first step, rather than to make a too general survey, first. At any rate, we are prepared to take guidance from the Council on technical questions of this kind, in view of the high standing in scientific and industrial circles, of the men who form the Council, and we expect they will have access to the very latest and best information which can be brought to bear.

I might also remind the hon. members of this; that this Bill is not for the protection of any one company. This Bill is for the survival of the community, and we sometimes have to balance the difficulties arising out of the interests of an industry, and all that that means, in providing employment and good living conditions for several thousands of people, and the

ill effects which almost always follow when you have a civilized community living in a town or city.

As to whether or not pollution can be completely overcome is something that only time will tell from the results of the information that is brought to light by the studies to be made, and tell us it all.

On the other hand, the development of the north country depends upon industry, and we cannot allow industry to close down, but, on the other hand, we have to take measures of an extreme character in certain cases, to make sure that the ill results of industry are brought within due bounds.

I think the result of this Bill, and the result of the work which will be done by the Council, will have much farther reaching effects than simply to assist in the solution of this one particular problem.

MR. CALDER: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) be good enough to circularize the hon. members of the House with the interim reports of the Research Council, as they may be received? If they are highly technical I think one to each group would be enough, but if they are not, then one to each hon. member of the House.

MR. PORTER: Yes, we will arrange to do that.

MR. COX: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak again, may I say that by my remarks I did not imply the government is doing the wrong thing. I think under the circumstances they are doing about all they can. Down in Wisconsin where there are more paper mills than anywhere else, there is a definite statement made by responsible people that this can be corrected. So I thought I would give you the benefit of the information which indicates there is a solution.

MR. PORTER: We will be pleased to have that information, and inquiries will be made at those places which the hon. member

(Mr. Cox) has in mind.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 24.

ONTARIO RACING COMMISSION

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 24th Order, second reading of Bill No. 115, "An Act to establish the Ontario Racing Commission ", Mr. Frost.

MR. F . Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill number 115, and once again I want to express our regrets that the illness of the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) who showed particular interest in this legislation.

As I indicated in the Budget speech last Friday, the matter of race tracks is very much of a divided jurisdiction. The practise of operating pari-mutuel machines, and conducting race track betting is purely Federal. It is in accordance with a section of the Criminal Code of Canada, which permits betting, under certain circumstances, on what we may call the "thoroughbred tracks."

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that we take our "cut" of the betting to the extent, at the present time, of 10%. Following the passage of the Billit will be 12½%. That is not an excessive tax. Up to 1943, we received a 5% tax, and then the Dominion came in with a 5% tax, and subsequently we increased our tax, I think it was in 1944, to 10%, making a total 15% tax.

That tax was reduced in the Budget of 1947 or 1948---I think it was 1948---to 10%. The purpose of the reduction at that time was this; the Dominion took off their tax. We did not alter our tax, due to the fact that there was at that time considerable difficulty in racing circles, and the

hon. members of the House will recall that at that time I made an arrangement concerning the tax which gave assistance to the tracks. I think the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) will recollect that arrangement.

Subsequently, under the Criminal Code, the percentage allowed to operators of the tracks was raised from 7% to 9%, with the result that it left the way open for an increase of the percentage which could be charged.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this House has no jurisdiction at all in relation to race track betting. "Race track betting"---that is what it is called in the Criminal Code---or anything in relation to that matter. Our jurisdiction is purely limited to the conduct of persons and the conduct of the tracks themselves and there is perhaps some constitutional difficulty as to how far we can go, because the Dominion in undoubtedly supreme in the field of criminal law.

We are faced with various interests at the present time, of which I think the hon. members of this House are fairly well informed, from the comments which have been made.

First of all, we have these interests; the paramount interest is, of course, the interest of the people of Ontario, the four and one-half million people of this province. And we have, of course, the interest of the people who go to race tracks, and I may say they go there in very considerable numbers indeed. These people, and the people of Ontario are the particular interests with which we are concerned at the present time.

We have in the other interests, this division; first of all, the breeders of thoroughbred horses. The hon. members of the House will recollect the other night we passed an estimate for $20,000 in connection with the I. R. C. A.---the International Racing Association---which regulates the practices in the thoroughbred end of the business. So we have them, the breeders of horses.

Then we have---what is it? The Horsemen's Benevolent Protective Association, which is a very live organization. The hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) knows about these people. They are the people who breed horses, own them, and race them.

Then you have the owners of the tracks. Some of the tracks, I believe, are virtually owned by one or two people; others, like the Ont r o Jockey Club, are quite widely owned.

Now, there is another factor which comes into this picture. Some of us from the rural parts have neither the time nor the money to attend these thorough-bred races; that is, for the people who live in Toronto, Fort Erie and a lot of other places. For ourselves, we do not get the opportunity to attend these races, at least not as much as the people of the larger centres.

(Page B-18 follows)

But the rural people have been interested in another class of racing; that is, harness racing, about which we are having considerable difficulty at the present time.

You have the breeders of horses racing on those tracks, and there are very many in the province of Ontario, and then you have the tracks themselves, where the races are conducted. I know, Mr. Speaker, there will be some comments in connection with a certain statement which I made recently. I may say that I am interested in the breeding of harness horses. I would do anything that is possible or reasonable to promote the interest of harness-racing. But I am faced with this situation; there are certain interests in this province who are anxious to promote night harness racing. I suspect that the interest of some of these people with whom I have been dealing now for a couple of years, is more in line with permitting mass gambling, than it is in the breeding of harness horses, and while we have no control over gambling in itself, perhaps some of us may feel that when the people of Ontario are betting about $38,000,000. a year, that is plenty. I do not think that any high pressure additional type of racing is altogether in the public interest. Therefore, for the past year or two, I must admit, I have been standing a bit in the way of the extension of that type of racing.

I think there is a great deal to be said for harness racing from this standpoint; they, at the present time, are being pretty well pushed off the map by the thorough-bred fellows, and there is not much space left for them, without increasing very largely the number of racing days or introducing an entirely new type of racetrack with provision for

the introduction of night racing.

This problem is complicated again by another matter. I mentioned that the thorough-bred racetrackers were permitted, under the Criminal Code, to operate pari-mutuel machines, and I am bound to say that I can assure the hon. members that it is a most satisfactory method and the easiest way of getting the 10 percent. or 12½ percent. tax.

(Take C-1 follows)

In the other classes of racing, harness racing, books are permitted, and I can tell my hon. friends that bookmaking is the cause of more trouble and more difficulty in the determination of the law of this province than anything I know of. I remember, when I was sitting opposite, when we were faced with a series of clubs in the suburbs of this city. At that time action was taken to close them up. Now it is reported they are in the Windsor area, and I s ppose in this area, and trying to prevent them it present some difficulties. I would not attempt to tell the hon. members what should be done, because I don't know. I have been trying to handle this matter through the tax collection branch for five or six years. I think there is a lot of house-cleaning to be done. The only way that I can see that it could be done is by the intorudction of a Bill such as this, to establish a Racing Commission and to have that Commission impartially operated in the broad interests of the people of Ontario.

The Bill provides for the appointment of a Commission o not less than three or more than seven members. It is not my intention to appoint seven members to the Commission unless it is necessary and desirable in the course of the administration of this Act. I think that three or four are sufficient. It will be noted that the Chairman would be paid, there is a provision in there for provision to pay the others by way of an honorarium. We will have to work that out. I can say to the hon. members of the House, in looking over the field to get a man who can handle the situation---I did not want a man who was himself particularly interested in racing---we had to have a man who would best represent the people of Ontario, as Chairman. If you got a race track man he might be looking towards his interests and the same thing applies to a man interested in thoroughbreds and harness racing.

After a good deal of consideration, subject to the passing

of this Act by the House, I thought the proper man to be Mr. Tupper Bigelow of the Magistrate's Court of the city of Toronto. He is a man who is constantly dealing as a Magistrate with all the problems of life and I think he has the capacity to do the job that we would want him to do. That is about all I can say in connection with this matter. I can assure you of this, I am anxious to do the things which I have outlined to this House. I am anxious to clean this up, I think there is some housecleaning to be done. I don't know how much. If I can do anything to influence the Federal government to limit race track betting and as far as harness racing is concerned to the pari-mutuel, I will do so.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the purpose of this Act, and I think we can materially change the situation.

MR. WILLIAM L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): In the first place, I wish to commend the government on the introduction of this Bill. I think it will correct a certain situation and I speak with some experience, having served as a steward and I am conversant with it. Something had to be done. A cold war was being waged with regard to harness men and track men and it should be subject to a Racing Commission. This is the sport of Kingsand it has to be cleaned up. It will not be cleaned up unless the public has confidence inthe Commission. I think this Bill willhelp to clean up the situation.

As regards the Chairman of the Commission, -- and I know that my suggestion will not be followed, -- I would have named Mr. W. A. Hewitt who has been the presiding ste ward for all Ontario. He has a wealth of experience and Mr. Sheridam of the Horsemen's Benevolent Protective Association would be perfectly satisifed if Mr. Hewitt was elected. You have always to keep in mind that you are dealings with jockeys, horsemen, horse owners, trainers and track members as well.

In the stand when we were calling up jockeys or trainers, Mr. Hewitt was always strong and he was fair in his judgments in every case and at all times had the confidence of everyone concerned. I felt that he would be a very fine gentleman to be chairmanof this Commission. I think thehon.members will agree if you get a cheap man to do a job he will do a cheap job. Perhaps some of you do not know Mr. Hewitt, but among other things he is the father of Foster Hewitt. I am wondering, on your Commission, if you should have one or two members connected with the runners and also with the trotters. They are separate. I would like to leave that thought with you. I know that Mr. Hewitt is outstanding and he has had the experience and I know he has the confidence from all branches of racing and of the racing public. I say again, this is a Bill which will help to correct a very serious situation and this is a great revenue producer and it should be administered by the province.

Before I take my seat, I wonder if it would be well--and I presume Mr. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) you will have this under your thumb--I wonder if it would be well seeing as you will not have the time to give much attention to this, would it hot be proper to take one of the members of your Party and appoint him to the Committee as well. This is being set up as an Act and it should be reported to the Legislature. I leave you with that as a thought.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): I wish to ask one question. We all received a book the other day in the mail from the Greyhound Association.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: If these people manage to invade Ontario,

would they come under this?

MR. FROST: No, sir.

MR. MacLEOD: May I just repeat,---

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hon. Prime Minister has justsaid it will not come under this Act.

MR. MacLEOD: I believe it is my privilege to ask a question as to whether the greyhound racing would come under that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon.member (Mr. Frost) said no.

MR. MacLOED: I think , Mr. Speaker, you are treating me unfairly.

MR. SPEAKER: I will submit it to the House.

MR. MacLEOD: All right, submit it to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The answer is given, "no."

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the opposition): I do not know what this is all about.

MR. SPEAKER: I said we would have no discussion about greyhound racing. A question was asked of the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister answered, "no". The Bill has nothing to do with greyhound racing.

MR. MacLEOD: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), if he did not answer, I did not understand him to answer---I did not hear what he said. I wish to be given the opportunity of knowing what he did say.

MR. SPEAKER: When you asked the question concerning greyhound racing, the answer was given definitely.

MR. JOLLIFFE: To save time, my suggestion is whoever moved this second reading has the right to close the debate. If he wishes, or sees fit, he may decide. I imagine that would satisfy my hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod). He can answer when he replies.

MR. SPEAKER: We must confine ourselves to the subject at hand. If thehon.member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) has

any question on horse racing he is at liberty to ask it. I think we must confine ourselves to the subject at hand.

MR. MacLEOD: I have no desire to have a protracted discussion. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it has never been my practice to ask irrelevant questions.

We are dealing with the establishment of a Racing Commission. It does not say horse racing. I did not hear the answer of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). I thought Mr. Speaker---

MR. JOLLIFFE: It does seem to me that the creation of a Racing Commission is the onlyanswer to the problem. Horse racing has attained considerable dimensions. I think it would be safe to say that this province is one of the major centres on the continent for horse racing and the creation of a Commission is inevitable. We all hope that the Commission will be a good one and will succeed in bringing order out of chaos. I was interested in hearing the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) bring up the name of Tupper Bigelow. It is an honourable name. This is the first time I heard the name associated with a Racing Commission. I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is to be congratulated on his detailed knowledge of horse racing, and for a time I wondered how he attained that knowledge. However, as treasurer in recent years, the financial interests in horse racing would come to his attention.

That brings me to another point. Where the Lindsay fair stand? This pari-mutuel is a serious anomaly. I don't say you should correct it at once, but I do suggest that action should be taken to remove the anomaly, because I do not see any justification for it. Not only does bookmaking create other problems, but it makes it quite

impossible for the province to consider effecting that type of handling of pari-mutuels for revenue purposes. I think it should be removed.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): I would draw the attention of the House to the provisions of this Act, and the principle of this Act. As set out, the provision is for not less than three and not more than seven on the Commission and the indication is that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will have a lower number than seven. If you will read the Act you will see that the majority of the Commission attending. [illegible] makes the decisions. If the Commission is kept to three men, then the best you can hope for is a decision by two men, one of whom is the paid Chairman. I only raise the question to point out the complexity and the scope of the problem and when you boil it down you will probably have a decision of two men, one of whom will be paid full time. It seems to me on the question of providing for seven and limiting it to a small number it does not tend to deal withthe problems indicated by the Commissioner of Police. I would like the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to assist the Chairman by appointing someone to the Commission who knows all the complexities of the horse racing problem and who would be of assistance in advising the Chairman.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Miniter): I agree with my hon. friend, (Mr. Millard).

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): I would like a word.

MR. FROST: Are you going to get into horse racing, too?

MR. NIXON: I am in favor of this Billand it is long overdue. In 1942 I had an experience with an organization, the organization that has for many years controlled racing in this province, which led me to believe that such a Commission should

be set up at that time. I made a statement to that effect which I remember very well indeed. It seems to me that I was a little bit in advance. I was thoroughly convinced that they were carrying on and discharging their responsibilities and duties in a veryunfair and highhanded manner and I suggested during conversatiom with my colleagues that a Racing Commission should be set up, as it was being controlled so well in other jurisdictions outside of this province. The very people who are now so strongly in favor of a Racing Commission, including the Globe & Mail and Jim Coleman gave me a tanning and were suggesting that I was trying to establish political control and that I should leave it to the I. R. C. A.

The matter that brought it to my attention then was a most unfair ruling against one of my constituents, and if there is one thing more than another that will get me interested is when one of my constituents have been dealt with unfairly.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON: And in that instance the ruling was most unfair. There was a man of great reputation in the horse breeding business for 25 years and a well known figure all over Canada and the United States and without giving him any explanation or making any charge whatsoever they ruled him off the tracks and the one horse which he had which could win races was ruled off. When I made an issue of, it there was a suggestion that this horse ran inconsistently. He would win three out of four races and lose the fourth race. The fourth race he did not win. I felt strongly then that certainly Ontario should be in line with other racing jurisdictions and have a Commissionto control this matter but I was in advance of public opinion, and although the horse owners did endorse me, other circles felt it was not opportune, and with certain eruptions in the government I never had the opportunity to proceed. I feel that it is a good government policy and I am

in accord with the Bill now before the House.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): I feel that the introduction of the Horse Racing Commission would be a stimulant to horse breeding in Ontario. I think there are ten standard bred horses to every one thoroughbred. I think the standard breed man should have a man on the Board. I think we should have a Commission of seven. One representative from the tracks, one from the standard breeders and as to the third, I would not say. I feel that this is a great stimulus to a great industry in Ontario.

MR. WILLIAM L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): In reply to what the hon. member for Middlesex North (Mr. Patrick) has said, I have read of these Commissions in the United States over a period of years, and I think the largest Commission is made up of five members over there. But that doesnot control trotting.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): In conclusion--- I will have to skate around---the Canada Animal Act provides for betting classes of things. It does not include the item which was contained in the booklet which thehon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) held. That would be an Act of the Dominion Parliament, and I hope it is never passed. We have enough trouble now.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee of Supply; Mr. Patrick in the chair.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 62.

CITY OF LONDON ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 62nd order, House in Committee on Bill number 7, "An Act respecting the City of London," Mr. Patrick.

Sections 1 to 15 inclusive agreed to.

Bill number 7 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 63.

VILLAGE OF LONG BRANCH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 63rd order, House in Committee on Bill number 14, "An Act respecting the Village of Long Branch," Mr. Millard.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill number 14 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 64.

CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 64th order, House in Committee on Bill number 33, "An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie." Mr. Harvey (Sault Ste. Marie).

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill number 33 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 65.

CITY OF OTTAWA SEPARATE SCHOOL BOARD

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 65th order, House in Committee on Bill number 34, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa Separate School Board," Mr. Chartrand.

Sections 1 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Bill number 34 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 15.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 15th order, House in Committee on Bill number 107, "An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act," Mr. Doucett.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On section 3.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): This is a section on which I wish to make some remarks, particularly with regard to subsection 3 (a) of subsection 2, which reads as follows:

> "No implement of husbandry shall be drawn by a farm tractor on a highway unless such implement has two separate means of attachment so constructed and attached that the failure of one such means will not permit the implement to become detached."

When the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) was speaking of this yesterday he mentioned farm wagons drawn by a tractor. This goes further in referring to any machines of husbandry. Did the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) have any idea what that would impose upon farmers who live upon or adjacent to the King's Highway, people such asmyself. Not only is my farm divided in one direction by Highway No. 5, but also in the other direction by the Canadian National Railway and the larger part of the farm is on the opposite side of the road to the buildings. We are continually crossing the road and travelling the road in connection with ordinary farm operations, not onlywith wagons but with all the implements of farm husbandry used on a general purpose farm, I am appalled at the task this would entail on us there if we are compelled to carry out this Act and provide a second means of attachment on all the wagons and all the implements that we are using in our daily occupation. It is not only the providing of these attachments but the ceaseless labor and the difficulty and trouble when you are hooking and unhooking these implements to a tractor. We would feel uneasy if we had to check every time an implement went down a highway to see if it was properly attached to the tractor under this section. It may not be so important to farmers at a distance from a highway, in my case it would be an endless worry and irritation and I don't think it is necessary to go this far in amending the

Act. I am strongly opposed to this section of the Bill.

MR. ROSS A. McEWING (Wellington North): This was up for discussion the other day and I made some mention as to whether we should put a second tongue onthe wagon and it was treated pretty much as a joke.

(Take D follows)

MR. NIXON: Is it like putting two shafts on a plough?

MR. McEWING: Yes. I just want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) to what happened with respect to the trailers, and so on. You may say, "Well, put a chain on the waggon so that it will not become detached", but the tongue dropping down, with a piece of chain, does not prevent the waggon from slithering all over the highway, just the same. I think people would become more careless about the first hitch if the second hitch were demanded, because it would make them not liable if anything did happen.

I remember a trailer some years ago, where it was required for them to have two hitches, the people got very careless as to how they attached the main attachment to the trailer. But if they had a chain there, they would have complied with the law.

I think something should be done to compel them to be more careful. It would be a much better safe-guard. I think one good one would be a great deal better than two poor ones, that were attached, simply because they complied with the law.

As far as the saving of lives is concerned, we do not want to allow any laxity, but I have seen some things on our highways, which are causing destruction of life, yet we are doing nothing about it. I would like the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) to explain how he will simplify these clauses.

MR. DOUCETT: I may say I do not think this is as difficult as it may seem. While I readily appreciate the explanation given by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), I think it is possible to have a hitch on a tractor with a chain, and a second clevice, which could go to the pole or draw of each vehicle. For instance, at the present time, under the Act in the province of Ontario, if a farmer is going onto the

road, and hitches his rubber-tired waggon to his car, he must have a second hitch, but the fact that he takes the same vehicle and hitches it onto a tractor, enables him to go on the same road, without a second hitch. That just does not seem sensible, does it?

The thing is that these rubber-tired tractors are travelling at such great rates of speed on the highway -- I have seen them going 15 or 20 miles an hour on a highway -- in some sections of the province of Ontario. Not so much in the section of the country I come from, but let us consider the County of Kent, and I will tell you a little experience I had when going over the County of Kent last fall. I was up attending some meetings -- not political; they were purely municipal -- and the driver and I were going down the road to Wallaceburg. It happened to be in the beet season, and a farmer was driving a load of beets on the highway, perhaps seven tons on a special truck made for that purpose, but the fact that he had it hitched to his tractor made it unnecessary for him to have a safety hitch. When we were a very few feet or yards away from him, the truck broke loose, and turned right, and upset in the ditch. Had it taken a swing to the left, it is possible we might have collided with it. That is an instance of what can happen.

This recommendation is brought before the House as a matter of safety on our roads.

I have something from the Police Department of the City of Chatham, in which the chief constable cites five or six major mishaps involving large vehicles, during the past two and one-half or three years. In one case a trailer loaded with corn broke loose and collided with a house. Another accident involved a trailer loaded with sugar beets, which occurred about a year ago, and so on.

One of the magistrates in that same vicinity wrote us about this a year ago, saying that he thought something should be done in this regard.

It is not our intention to put any extra or undue hardship on the farmers, but if every piece of equipment drawn by a tractor, or any other persons on the road, which is similar to that of the farmer, he has to have this second safety hitch connected by a chain, or in any way he may find convenient, and is it not reasonable to ask the farmers who today are travelling in hundreds -- yes, thousands of trucks on the road, to put on this safety hitch, the same as anybody else.

It is a matter, Mr. Chairman, of safety devices which we think will add to the safety of the travelling public. Again I say you should ask yourselves, "Is it reasonable that a farmer can hitch a rubber-tired waggon and drive down behind his car, and then he has to have a safety device, but he can hitch it to his tractor and go over the same road, on the same business, without a hitch.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, I think any of us who have been down in the sugar beet area when the loads were coming into the factories appreciate that there is indeed in that situation a hazard of some consequence. But would not the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) consider for this year limiting this double-hitch business to waggons rather than extending it to all vehicles on the farm?

MR. DOUCETT: I think we could do that.

MR. OLIVER: I think you should do that for this year, and for this reason particularly; because that is more or less a problem in a concentrated area. There are areas up north where I do not think it presents anything like the problem it does down in Chatham and Wallaceburg.

MR. DOUCETT: I agree.

MR. OLIVER: I know several farms -- and the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) does too -- where the highway runs right through the farm; the farmer has land on both sides of the highway, then he has to make sure that his hired help is putting that double hitch on all the time. If he has to take that responsibility, it is something to really think about.

I would seriously suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) if he can see his way clear for this year to limiting that to waggons, it will be very acceptable to us.

Another thing in regard to trailers which require mudguards. The hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) knows quite well that in the rural areas, the farmers have any kind of an old trailer to run out and get some chopped wood, and if you insist on this, I think you will demobolize a lot of trailers in different parts of Ontario, because they would not know how to put mudguards on them anyway. There is a practical problem there.

MR. DOUCETT: There is nothing about that in this Act. It is already in the Statute Books.

MR. OLIVER: Well then, consider my first request.

MR. DENNISON: There is another problem which the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) might consider out of Ontario's 175,000 farmers --

MR. DOUCETT: Are you one of them?

MR. DENNISON: Yes. We have a farm down in Renfrew County, and half of our farm is on one side of the road, and half is on the other, and we just cross the road with all kinds ofvehicles. If this Bill is put through, it will make a farmer absolutely responsible for the crossing of that road. If there should be an accident, he will be in court. Who will notify the farmer this year about that responsibility? Will the Department send a letter to the Ontario farmers drawing their

attention to this change in the Act, and the necessity of having a change?

I am wondering if this section should not be limited just to farm vehicles, when they are being hauled along the road a distance, and should not apply when just crossing the road. Some machines have a power hitch on them, and a chain dangling there would not be practical in the fields. It would probably have to be taken off again, after it crosses the road.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Just one more suggestion, before the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) speaks about this. He referred to the increasing speed of tractors, and that is a problem.

MR. DOUCETT: That is on account of the rubber tires.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is not dealt with in this section. Tractors travel on the highways a good deal faster than they used to, but even so, they still do not travel at the same speed as a car hauling a trailer, at least, not in the ordinary course. You hitch a trailer to a car, and the car can travel at a very good speed. In fact, some people are travelling at normal speed when the trailer is hitched to the car, a great deal more than when it is hitched to a tractor, even at the speeds of the tractors at the present time.

That is one thing. The other is, it seems to me, there is a very great difference between hauling an implement of husbandry across a highway, or perhaps down the highway for a few hundred yards, an implement loaded with produce which you are taking to the mill or market.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) if he will try and work out something along these lines. If a man uses his tractor to haul a big load of produce, like beets, for some miles to market, there is all the difference in the world then, from hauling a plough just a few yards down the road,

or simply across the road.

MR. DOUCETT: In view of what the hon.member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) said, would this suit you: after the word "husbandry" insert the words "designed for carrying a load"? That would take in waggons.

MR. DUNBAR: It is not very often I have the opportunity of saying something nice about the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison). He was asked if he was a farmer, and he said he was. I must say I had the pleasure of driving past his farm last fall, and I was really surprized at the job he is doing in reforestation on that farm in Renfrew, and I think he is to be complimented. He is making a wonderful job on that farm. I stopped and talked with the neighbours, and they certainly appreciate the good work the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) is doing.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: There are certain exceptions to be taken to what the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) now proposes. There are various kinds of loads, which are just being hauled out on the highway and into the fields. You can foresee there will be many vehicles or many pieces of machinery on the farms, upon which loads would be placed, and taken from one part of the farm to the other, and in the course of that, would have to cross the highway.

MR. NIXON: Yes, and that would include the manure spreader,and the stoneboat we have to take out on the road with milk. I will spend the rest of my life in jail if this law is put on the Statute Books. I know you cannot get the men to do that, where you are crossing the road 40 times a day. Everytime you bring a load of corn over, to put it through the silo, and you take it off the load, and put it on the belt, then you have to put on that chain again, to go back for the

next load. That would take all the pleasure there is left in life on the farm. Anyone who lives alongside a highway these days knows it is impossible to move a herd across it. I came down one of those highways last summer, and a farmer and his daughter were standing there with a herd of cows. He had a red flag, but as long as I could see them before I got up to them, and as long as I could see them after I passed, there was not a chance of breaking through that stream of traffic. My goodness, looking after this imposition would be just impossible.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, if it is satisfactory to the House, I would suggest we hold section 2, subsection 3, and tomorrow I will try to bring in some amendment.

MR. NIXON: Yes, if you could bring something in to the effect "if going beyond the boundary of the farm", it would be entirely acceptable to me.

MR. DOUCETT: I am a farmer myself.

MR. NIXON: I would like to have the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) out there for a couple of weeks. We try to carry on as best we can, in a practical way.

MR. DOUCETT: I have the experience.

MR. NIXON: As I see it, from a practical standpoint, it is just impossible.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (Temiskaming): I respectfully submit the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) should be "double-hitched" himself before he brings in any amendment.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Section 3 stands.

On section 4.

MR. DENNISON: May I raise the point I raised the other day with the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) with regard to the

weight of these trailers that are travelling along our highways? I came down on a highway north of Toronto behind a trailer which was loaded to the gunwhales. This was a black-top highway, and you could see that highway move when the trailer went over it. It seems our highways are called upon today to carry loads which should be travelling by railway, not by trailer.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: I think in the interest of the money the taxpayers are spending on the highways -- and I know the large trucking companies are spending money too, for the providing of these highways -- but I do not think it is the Department's job to provide a railway road bed. I think the Department should limit the weight, and I would respectfully suggest that 14 tons on one truck is too great a weight. I would like to see that cut down, and the highways relieved of the necessary repairs and damages which are required today.

MR. McEWING: Mr. Chairman, regarding that matter; I quite agree with the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison). I have been very much impressed with that for the past several years, because we have been damaging our roads to a very great extent, and not only that, but we are damaging the earning assets, one of our greatest traffic-carrying institutions we have in the Dominion of Canada and the province of Ontario.

I think many of you will have seen the opinions of Donald Gordon recently, regarding the C.N.R., and he has asked that transportation other than railways be put under control. He has made certain recommendations regarding the C.N. Railway in the hope of "getting it out of the red", and this very thing is something which has been helping to keep it in the "red".

Take a truck rolling down our highways with 14 or 15 tons on it. Why, that means a freight car. It means you are

taking that much away from the revenue of our national railways.

I realize there are some sections such as that spoken about by the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Newman) who feels that they want more highways up in their territory, and where there is no railway, we must make some allowance for transportation facilities, but it does not need to be loaded like that.

These transport companies are making a tremendous lot of money. I know of some who started on a shoestring, awhile ago, and are very wealthy now. They are increasing their equipment, and everytime they get a new one out, it gets bigger, and why should they clutter up our roads and bridges and highways, and why should we build more highways for their use? I think we should drastically cut down the size of the loads, and I would ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) to consider this, and when the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) goes to Ottawa to meet in conference on Dominion-Provincial matters, he should get help down there to preserve our railways.

MR. D. BAXTER (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Chairman, I want to bring forward one other aspect. In the company with which I am associated, we use the tractors and trucks and they are going out with this tonnage, and sometimes higher, headed for Toronto, and in going to Toronto, they have to go over the bridge at Bowmanville, which is a frame structure. The other morning I was in the plant, as a load was pulling out, and I said to the driver, who had 14 tons on his load, "What do you do when you go over the bridge at Bowmanville?", and he looked at me a moment and then he said, "I open the door and I prepare to jump in case something happens". So from that aspect, we are endangering the lives of our transport drivers, when asking them to take a load like that over a bridge like the one at Bowmanville.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, I do not

know anything about "couplings" or "hitching", but I do hope to learn, and also to become a farmer, at the first opportunity. On this question of the effect of the heavy trucks on the highways, I think we should be very realistic about it. All the sentiment is against the use of these heavy trucks, because of the damage they do to the highways, but that will have very little effect, because you cannot stop them.

MR. McEWING: Why can you not stop them?

MR. SALSBERG: Because it would be not only a retrogressive act to try and hinder the utilization of the motor roads, which are an efficient method of transporting goods from place to place. It is true, that these heavy trucks do damage the highways.

I read recently the findings of the Pennsylvania State Highways Department study of this problem, and they came to the conclusion, I think, that on highways where heavy trucking is not allowed to travel, the cost of repair is about $350. per mile. Where they do allow these heavy trucks, the cost of repairs runs as high as $4,000. a mile. I imagine the same result would be obtained by a similar study, if it were undertaken by the Department in Ontario.

I was wondering if the time has not come for the government to make these transport companies carry a larger share of the cost of repairs and maintenance of highways. I think that would be a more realistic approach than removing them from the highways, which I do not think is possible, and is most unlikely, but it would be reasonable to think they should bear a larger share of the cost. The difference between $350. per mile for repairs and maintenance on some highways, and $4,000. on others where trucks are allowed to travel, is quite a sum, and perhaps they should be asked to pay a greater part of such costs.

As for the sentiment expressed by the hon. member (Mr. McEwing) that they be excluded, I suggest to you that will not likely take place.

MR. DENNISON: They are a big monopoly, too.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes. While I think that you cannot take them off the road, this House can -- and I suggest this to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) for his consideration -- can make them pay a larger amount than they are paying at the present time.

MR. McEWING: And you would not put any restrictions on them?

MR. SALSBERG: That would depend on more scientific knowledge of the facts of this use of larger trucks than I have in my possession. I do not know. If the Department would come to a conclusion, of course, they should. I am dealing with the particular problem of whether they wish their removal from the highways, the reduction of loads, or with the remedy of collecting enough from them to enable the Department to keep these roads in proper repair, at the cost they should pay.

MR. J. L. EASTON (Wentworth): I would like to put the matter before you from a municipal point of view. In the case of trucking on the streets, in a city like Hamilton, they do not use the highways, they go down the side streets to the different plants, and those streets are not built to carry such heavy loads. In the city of Hamilton we felt we were unable to put on any restrictions, under the present Act. The roads are broken up today from the use of these trucks, with their enormous loads. And yet the municipal taxpayers have to pay the repair bills without sufficient assistance from the province. I think there should be a way of lowering the weights, if it could be done.

(Take E-1 follows)

I might say that this has been a problem and I agree we will not find the solution overnight. That transportation is here to stay and the railroads will have to face the issue. I think the railways are entitled to fair competition. Take our own railroad in Northern Ontario. It is not as long as the Canadian National Railways, but it is just as wide. It was built to open up Northern Ontario and then we built the Porcupine Highway. When the revenues are starting to go down we find that some department, whoever issues these licenses, give a license to someone to run parallel with the railway and take the business away. A bit of research was done in this matter in New York and there were a number of convictions in New York for overloading and the breaking down of bridges. I was in Brock-- ville, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said I was playing politics. They built a school and a hotel, in Brockville 75 cents of every dollar came from the railway. Here is their money being utilized and all these transports were going through.

The city of Brockville and the Chamber of Commerce and the various organizations there have complained of what is being done to their streets, their culverts and so on, and they have been unable to get a nickel tax on it. They have to absorb the tax loss or raise the ante of the fee and limit the grants. Anyone will tell you that in moving household furniture the transport can do a better job. In northern Ontario there were more than 200 car-loads of hay taken out by transport and going through the various towns, and in many cases where the bridges were light there was no way of assessing the damage they did. I am making a suggestion for some sort of arrangement so that the railroad will have an honest break. We built a railroad and they put up a fence and they have to plow the snow and do all these things for the maintenance of the railroad, but when it comes to a highway the municipality does the plowing, and who comes along and takes away the business? There is a saw-off some place to consider. I think the

transports are here to stay and with justification. In the movement of perishable goods they can beat the railroads in a number of instances. I do hope there will be some cooperation and some controls put on and put them in their proper category where they belong.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): In these provisions there is nothing suggested that we increase any weights, and the weights for trucking have not been increased for 12 or 15 years. This act is permitting the trucks to have the same number of wheels whether they are in the front or at the rear, and they can carry the same load. When I attended the Dominion-Provincial meeting I think that, for Ontario that I was the only one that stood out for the weights that we have here for transportation on our highways. British Columbia was very strong on the need of incrdased loading. I am not one who is trying to increase the loads.

MR. ROSS A. McEWING (Wellington North): My view was to bring out the damage that was being done and the need to reduce the weight we have now, realizing the damage we are doing.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Does the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) find in checking the scales itis working out successfully?

MR. DOUCETT: We do.

MR. NIXON: There was an instance on No. 2 highway where the traffic was detoured off the road entirely and in going over the road to Linden one truck of steel crossed a bridge which we thought was substantial but which collapsed and obstructed all traffic and nearly killed the operator of the truck. It jacknifed. Could not the Department exercise some care in

the
detouring/traffic which goes on to a road and on to a bridge that is not capable of sustaining these loads.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I think we are taking great precaution on that, but where an emergency compels a detour, you cannot detour traffic from a class A road onto a class B and make them unload. In no case does the municipality lose by it.

Section 4 agreed to.

On section 5.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: On section 5 I would like to move an amendment changing the word "Minister" to "Department."

Section 5 as amended agreed to.

On section 6.

MR. R. A. McEWING (Wellington North): I do not seem to understand that. It seems quite a distance from an intersection to prohibit parking within 300 feet.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: This is just permissive, and it may be 200 feet if it is required.

Section 6 and section 7 agreed to.

On section 8.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): With regard to drunken drivers, last year we had 18,000 injured and 800 killed and it was estimated that 50% was due to drunken driving and I think we should do something to keep this type off the road.

Section 8 agreed to.

On section 9.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Will the plates be lifted, will they be taken away?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Absolutely, and always have been.

Section 9 agreed to.

Sections 10 to 14 inclusive agreed to.

Bill number 107 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 16.

HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 16th order, House in Committee on Bill number 118, "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act," Mr. Doucett.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): On page 7 of the Act, subsection 2 of section 9 reading "Any county council, commission or board may with respect to the roads under its jurisdiction, pass by-laws." Does that apply to a city council?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: No. Because in a city, like your city, there is no suburban commission. It is where there would be a suburban commission.

MR. ROBINSON: Is there no legislation under the Highway Act that permits us to carry out this in the city? I am interested inthe control of signs in the city.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: As far as signs, surely, yes.

Sections 1 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

Bill number 118 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 14.

CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 14th order, House in Committee on Bill number 78, "An Act to amend the Conveyancing and Law of Property Act." Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): I move an amendment to section 1 by deleting in the second last line the word "or" which follows the word "race" and add after the word "creed" the following, "color, ancestry,, or place of origin."

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): I am moving an amendment which I was hoping the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) would move, but since he did not, I do so now.

(Take F follows)

I am not making any remarks, because I made them yesterday. The amendment is:

> That subsection 20 (a) of section number 1 of Bill number 78 be amended by deleting the words "after this section comes into force" from lines 1 and 2 of the subsection

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to include under the coverage of this Act all discriminatory covenants which may exist at this time.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, concerning that provision, as was discussed here yesterday---very widely discussed---while I think many of us have sympathy with the proposal made, it would be very unsafe legislation to pass for this reason: As I explained here yesterday, I myself have no qualms about passing legislation of that nature which is retroactive in effect, if we know whatwe are legislating on and if it is in the public interest to do it. The great difficulty in this problem is that we do not know what the effect of those words would be throughout the province. As I say, we have here 150 years of registry offices in this province with varying conditions and varying problems to deal with. The difficulty is that nobody knows here inthis Chamber what the effect of that would be. If the effect were what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Salsberg) has in mind, I think we would agree with him, but the difficulty is that we do not know, we are legislating in an unknown field and we may have some very curious reactions to that situation.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): You have some examples in mind.

MR. FROST: No, I have not. The matter of retroactive

legislation in that field in dealing with such a doubtful proposition we could not say what the effects might be. My judgment is the best method of handling this problem is, first of all present covenants in most cases die out. We do not permit any more of them, that is one thing, it is the main thing.

MR. MacLEOD: Except the ones that were made yesterday or a day before.

AN hon. MEMBER: Maybe tomorrow.

MR. FROST: Those things happen. In any event, however, this provision will take effect from the day this Act receives assent and I am hopeful of getting the Bill through and having his honour give assent to this in some other Bill before the termination of this Session.

Under the laws of conveyancing, in a great many cases these things run out and if they do not and if there are cases which appear to violate public interest and conscience, then they can be dealt with. In the meantime I think we are far safer to proceed with this from the time it receives Royal assent.

Again I make my position clear. There have been a lot of things said about retroactive legislation. The fact of the matter is that most legislation is retroactive in some sense. It affects interests which are vested, and there is a retroactive effect. In dealing with things we specifically know about that are against public interest, I do not think this Chamber can chain itself in regard to those things, but I think it would be extremely unwise to add those words to the section, with all the uncertainties which have to be dealt with.

I think my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) should withdraw that amendment.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of discussing this matter at any length. That was done yesterday. What I suggest to the House is that the Bill as it now stands could

be interpreted by some as going out of its way to safeguard restrictive covenants that may have been into effect until now or that may be put into effect between even this moment and the time the Bill will be proclaimed.

I am certain the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost), the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) and the government are not at all desirous to accommodate such people and to make it easier for such restrictions to be put into force. I know that. I am certain of that. At the same time, I do suggest that by deleting those words which I moved be deleted we do not necessarily go to the extent which I would be prepared to go if I were in the government of clearly nullifying all covenants that may have been put into effect until now. The deletion, however, would have this effect, it would put the onus on those who have done the thing which we will now consider wrong and illegal to go to court and the principle of the Bill, which is laudable and which we all gladly lend support to, would be strengthened by its deletion.

That is the suggestion, and, much as I desire to accommodate the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) and the government, and I think I have expressed my appreciation of the government's action in regard to this Bill very definitely and clearly yesterday, I think nevertheless this amendment is in order and would add a great deal to the purpose and principle of the Bill.

The amendment negatived.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, I move,

> That section 2 be amended by reading as follows:
>
> "This Act shall come into force on the day it receives Royal assent."
>
> And that the section now marked "2" shall be referred to as "Section 3."

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, before you put the vote on this amendment, which of course will--

MR. PORTER: Are you opposed to this amendment?

MR. MacLEOD: No, I am just asking a question. Is it possible that during the next year when the goveernment has had an opportunity to perhaps give more thought to this question, that at least a portion of the point contained in the amendment of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) might be taken care of by a government amendment? I mean, you can extend this, can you not? You can change this Act? Does this close the door forever?

MR. FROST: We do not contemplate anything of the sort, no. As I say, these situations in most cases willdie out themselves. It may be that in days to come there willbe situations which will arise which might be counted as being so much against the public conscience that a Legislature might want to deal with those matters at a later date, but as I say in my experience as a solicitor in the province there are not to date very mamy of these covenants. Actually speaking they are very much in the minority. You run across them occasionally.

However, I think it is true that if nothing is done, if this thing is permitted to run on, you may get all sorts of these thing occurring across the province. What would happen, for instance, if in some of these lands up in York County that may be used for housing schemes have restrictions of that sort put on? How would you ever plan a community? The thing would be impossible, and I would think now is the time to stop that sort of thing. If there are special cases which offend against, as I say, the public conscience, they can be dealt with atthat time. We would not contemplate anything further. I do not know of anything at the present time that is particularly undesirable. There are some, no doubt.

MR. . B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the opposition): Mr. Chairman, there remains the question I raised yesterday, namely that we may have, following the enactment of this legislation, applications to the courts arising out of restricted covenants similar to the one that was dealt with by Mr. Justice McKay, and the courts may follow Mr. Justice McKay and hold that they not only are null and void and they always have been null and void. On the other hand, it is possible I suppose, the courts may hold that the enactment of this legislation makes Mr. Justice McKay's decision quite irrelevant and thereby give a measure of protection to pre-existing covenants which does not now exist.

I raise that point again but it does suggest that developments during the next year may make it necessary for the government and this House to reconsider the matter. It cannot be a closed book. We just do not know what this is going to lead to and I would therefore suggest the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) reserve their opinions on the matter and not make any extreme commitments until we know just what view the courts are going to take of the effect of this legislation.

MR. FROST: Like Mr. Asquith, we will "wait and see."

MR. JOLLIFFE: It did not work out very well in Mr. Asquith's case.

MR. FROST: There is a lot of truth in that.

Motion agreed to.

Section 2, as amended, agreed to.

Bill number 78 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report certain Bills, reserving the right to sit again on Bill number 107.

HON. G. H. DUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman,

before doing so, since we are getting on with the Session, I move,

That in Bill number 107, section 3 be deleted.

Motion agreed to.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: You see, you got your point.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): I appreciate it very much, too, I assure you.

MR. DOUCETT: As I said yesterday.

MR. NIXON: You are more than fair.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Here we are, one law for the farmer, and one for the city.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): One for the rich, one for the farmer, and one for the poor.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole begs to report certain Bills without amendment and certain Bills with amendment, and moves for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the House to revert back to Notices of Motion and call order number 4, a resolution standing in the name of the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail).

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Notice of motion Number 4, page 16.

By Miss Macphail,

Resolution,-

That in the opinion of this House, the Government of Canada should be requested to eliminate the means test as a condition of old age pension and to assume responsibility for the full amount

of any additional expenditures involved.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I was a little fast in rising, but I broke my glasses coming up the steps today, and I am just going to look like the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter), putting them on and taking them off continually. I cannot see with them off, and I have to take them off to read.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): I did not know you were as speedy as that.

MISS MACPHAIL: I shall speak only very briefly because I covered this subject pretty thoroughly when I spoke on the Throne Speech, at least as regards the tensions. I want to see the removal of the means test for several reasons, and I will enumerate them.

It will take away the charity aspect of the pension, which is I think a humiliation which our old citizens should not have to bear after giving a lifetime of service, in their seventy years. It used to be that was the end, three score and ten, but people now are living beyond that age, and they are humiliated to think they have to receive charity. Many people who really need the pension will not apply for it on that account. They are too proud, their pride is so great that I have known cases, and I am sure other hon. members know of cases where people really needed the pensions greatly, and yet would not apply for them because they thought it was accepting charity.

I think the proposal is sound from an economic point of view, because if the means test were taken away, a great many people who are not now receiving pensions -- well, everybody at seventy would receive them, and it would mean, particularly in times like these when we seem to be, and I hope we are not,

going into a "recession" , I think is the nicest word for it -- not quite so great an economic activity as we have had -- I think the elimination of the means test will tend to keep goods moving from producer to consumer.

The difficulty in a pile-up of goods is too old -- the people with the money do not want the goods, and the people who want the goods have not got the money. In a very small way, this would tend to solve the problem.

It would cover a pretty wide field. There are a great many people now who have reached seventy years of age. I think seventy is old, but I hope as time goes on it will -- I am sure it will -- become available to people at a younger age. However, I am not asking that at the moment, I am just asking this House to approve the removal of the means test.

The other day when we were talking about how small were the retirement sums given to teachers who were retired several years ago, before the new superannuation came in, the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) approved of the removal of the means test. I will quote him from this weighty volume which we call Hansard. On March 13th, at page B-7 he said:

> "If we can find some manner, and I hope we will, to abolish the means test, that would do more than anything to level up the problem."

The problem we were discussing was that of people like teachers, then somebody talked about retired railroaders and retired people of all sorts who would then come under the pension, and would receive it to supplement their meagre superannuation.

However, going on to page B-8, on the same date, the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) said something that is rather discouraging, I think:

> "The indications are, I think, in the next two years or

more, the federal government will set up a committee that will be successful in ironing out the problem of the old-age pension..."

I just want to say once again --

MR. FROST: I do not think I really used the words "two years". I had hoped it would be shortly. I think it is really this Session, is it not?

MISS MACPHAIL: I would not be surprised if it is wrong, because when I read the speech I made, I was greatly surprised.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): You speak for all of us on that.

MISS MACPHAIL: I am delighted to hear the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) did not say "two years", because that is what discouraged me. It reminded me of a discussion in the House of Commons. A certain Premier whose name need not be mentioned was keen about committees, and one hon. member said, in illustrating it, that if a man were drowning in a pond, this Prime Minister would set up a committee to see how the water got in the pond.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MISS MACPHAIL: I was going to say if this committee could not be set up for two years, it was going to be a long time before the old age pensioners got the money to buy goods, and that is the only interest I have in the matter, but certain people, I suggest -- and I am going to name people -- just everybody, of course, at seventy, and if they did not need the money, they would just pay a little more income tax -- but there are such people as industrial workers, farmers, who acquired fifteen or more years ago, domestic, underpaid, poorly-paid white collar workers -- sometimes I think the "new poor" are the white collar workers, an awful lot of them, but of course if

they are determined to have white collars and white hands --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MISS MACPHAIL: Preachers, they are a notoriously underpaid group; teachers, all those people who are just living on pittances when they retire. If the test were removed, the two pittances, pittance plus pittance, might make a decent living.

AN hon. MEMBER: A double hitch.

MISS MACPHAIL: Yes, it would be a double hitch.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MISS MACPHAIL: It would be enough that they could eat, at any rate, and buy new clothes once in a long time. Even at that, it would not be much.

My last point, because I do not want to labour this thing, is that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is going down to bargain with Ottawa and we could help him by all agreeing that he approve the elimination of the means test under the condition that the federal government would assume responsibility for the full amount of any additional expenditures involved. You see, Mr. Speaker, it had to be worded that way in order that it could be brought before the House at all, but I would like to see that because after all the federal government has the most money and they waste a lot of it in"Patronage Harbour" and the like, so there is no reason they could not do some good things, which, in the elimination of the means test, is I think, the best thing. I do think it would help more people who need help than any other one thing. It costs money, but that does not worry me at all, because when I was in Ottawa -- here too, but more especially in Ottawa -- I saw money spent in enormous sums for what did not seem to me to be very worthwhile projects. So if you are going to spend large sums of money, let it be for something that is worthwhile. For those

reasons, I am asking the House to agree unanimously he support elimination of the means test on the condition the federal government "pays the shot".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Might I have the name of the seconder of the motion.

MISS MACPHAIL: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jolliffe seconds the motion.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I must say that---

MR. JOLLIFFE: May I ask, is the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) closing the debate?

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, do you not think it would be only fair to hear from other hon. members on this? This is the only purpose of a resolution such as this, an attempt to get unanimity on the subject. The hon. member (Miss Macphail) has been very brief, deliberately so, and I would respectfully suggest that --

MR. FROST: Well, if my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) would like --

MISS MACPHAIL: If he is going to agree, it is all right.

AN hon. MEMBER: Are you going to agree?

MR. FROST: Perhaps you would let me speak, and then if you want further consideration, I am quite content to have this held over.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, I have nothing to add to what the hon. member has said, but it does seem to me that on a matter which affects all hon. members of the House we would all,

I think, welcome a contribution which might be made from other groups in the House.

MR. FROST: The only thing was--

MR. JOLLIFFE: We have no monopoly on th sentiments expressed inthis resolution.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIV R (Grey South): With the kind acquiescence of my hon. friend (Mr. Frost), I just want to say a very few words on this motion of the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail).

I am sure all of us pretty well agree, at least in Ontario, that there has to be some revision in the old age pension law. I think in Ontario, and I suppose throughout Canada, we agree that the means test should be abolished. There is no room for any particular argument on that score except as to how it is to be accomplished.

My hon. friend the member for York East (Miss Macphail) has moved that we place the whole responsibility on the Federal government. That, of course, I imagine, is brought about by the fact thatwe are forbidden as private members from moving in the Legislature motions which involve the expenditure of public funds.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, they suggested it the first time.

MR. OLIVER: So we moved outside our jurisdiction, having been forbidden by our own rules to do the thing we like to do here and we say if we cannot assess this province to do this good job, then we will go to wider fields and will say: "The whole thing should be thrust on the doorstep of the Dominion administration," and I am not very unhappy about that, although I feel at times we should not pass in this House a whole list of resolutions that have to bear on something beyond our own jurisdiction. I think we can very easily get into a sort of "We can't do it, but you had better" attitude if we did that to any great degree.

I am not criticizing my hon. friend (Miss Macphail) in this particular instance, but if we carry it on to any great extent, I think it would become something not desirable.

There is to be, as I understand it, a committee set up, composed of hon. members of the Dominion Parliament, to study all aspects of the old age pension law and what in innovations could be made to that law. I hope, and I think perhaps we all believe that one of the recommendations will be the abolition of the means test.

The only objection I have to my hon. friend's (Miss Macphail) resolution is that it sets out that all this additional cost to wipe off the means test shall be borne by the federal government. I think it is fair, perhaps, to say, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to have the federal government take the initiative in this thing that the expenses involved, the money involved to carry out our wishes should be borne on the same ratio as the expenses for old-age pensions are presently borne, on a 75/25 percent. ratio.

Toward that end, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Nixon:

> That the words "the full amount" be deleted, and the words "75 percent. of the amount" be substituted therefor.

MR. NIXON: It does not say the province has to carry the other 25 percent.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I did not know you were going to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: It not only puts the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) "on the spot" it also puts the Speaker "on the spot". I am just a little bit afraid that is a commitment here on money.

MR. NIXON: It does not say so.

MR. SPEAKER: It is pretty vague.

MR. OLIVER: I do not really see how.

MR. FROST: I know you would not.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no mention of money, but there is certainly a very direct implication of money. "75 percent." of something must be --"of the amount" you see, " 'the full amount' be deleted and the words '75 percent. of the amount' substituted". Now if I might have made a suggestion, we would have a wide open debate on "75 percent. of something", if you had not put in "of the amount". I take protection under those three words. It is a commitment of a financial nature, is it not? I think I must rule it out.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Only 25 percent.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry I have to rule the amendment out.

(Take G-1 follows)

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, the only reason I feel I should rise is because silence might be taken as dissent, and I would not want to be put in that position.

Of course, there appears to be unanimity in the House if we take the words of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) quoted from Hansard, at their face value, that the abolition of the means test is a desirable thing. I feel very strongly that it would be a great step forward, if this Legislature did nothing more than pass a resolution to the effect that, in the opinion of this House, the means test should be abolished .

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: I do not think we should quibble over percentages, and so on. I say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that nothing would have a bigger effect on Ottawa, nor on the forthcoming Dominion - Provincial Conference, than just such a resolution given unanimous assent by this Legislature of this great province of Ontario.

I have a feeling inside of me, that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is going to get up in a moment and perhaps himself move a resolution along those lines, and so in order not to prejudice the case further, I will let it go at that.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have been most interested in the viewpoints taken by the hon. members opposite, and I want to say to the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) that there really is no complaint I can find in regard to this resolution.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I have stated, myself, on many occasions that I feel the means test should be abolished. I do it for the reason I stated in this House. I think in the days in which

we live, the means test is having a very unfair effect upon our people. There is no doubt about that. In these days we are entering into now, where industry is going into pensions, and in regard to what is pending in several states, where state pensions from a central government for the state are being incorporated into arrangements made with industry, it is apparently obvious as to what will happen in this country.

I think that the federal government hold that view also. They must recognize, of course, the fact that there has to be a sane approach to this thing, and they are taking active steps now, -- I am sorry the Hansard report of my speech said "two years", I hope that committee will be set up and start sitting at once -- I just forget the figures involved, but taking the figures from memory, my recollection is that this thing will cost around $250 million. I think it is almost parallel to the cost of the family allowances. No government can consider that matter lightly. The federal government has to make arrangements to get the money. That is obvious.

I will say to the hon. members opposite that I would like to be in a position to accept 25 per cent of that amount, which would run to $50 million or $60 million. But if I did, I am afraid the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Oliver) would go to the assistance of the financial critic of his group, to see that I have a relly good deficit next year.

If we had to find 25 per cent of that cost by ourselves, it would be extremely difficult. For some of the other provinces, it would be impossible. We might as well face that. There are some of the other provinces now, even with large Dominion assistance, putting on sales taxes, and so forth. We have had three provinces do that in the last year or two.

That does not indicate a state of flourishing finances, to the extent they can bear 25 per cent of this burden.

While I am thoroughly in accord with the principle which the hon. member (Miss Macphail) advances, I hope it will be worked out in Ottawa by a non-partisan committee there, but I will say that I would not want to do anything to hurt the case, or make it difficult down there. I will be frank in saying if the federal government or the parties down there, are able to find a solution to the problem, I am perfectly willing to give them all the credit, and I know the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) will, too.

I do not know that it would help the case at all if we passed a resolution which, in effect, might appear to, at this time, sort of "put them on the spot". I do not know whether that would be good business or not. I think our position is one of agreeing to principle, and that we want to sit in with the authorities at Ottawa in every way possible, to see that this is accomplished, and I must admit that I agree with the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), and I think it would be better if we allowed this matter to stand, and wait for the consideration of the committee.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I would move the adjournment of this debate.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Let us deal with the principle of it. Actually, we are all in agreement. Why not deal with the principle of the Bill?

MR. FROST: I will adjourn the debate, and discuss this matter with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). If he wants to bring it up later, I will call the order, and we can consider it further, later on. At the moment I have two other Bills which I have agreed to call, under the arrangement

made with the hon. members, but I am quite prepared to consider this matter again, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) desires.

I will adjourn the debate, at the moment.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) indicates his motion to adjourn the debate is not a formal motion, but that he will call the order again, I will agree, because, as a matter of fact, I would like to have an opportunity of discussing it with him. But I do not think we should vote, when that vote expresses an opinion.

MR. FROST: The wording of it is, "in the opinion of this House, the government of Canada should be requested to do so and so". The effect of such resolution in the past, has not been good. I remember one time when the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) was sitting on this side, there was a resolution passed in connection with the conduct of the war, which worked in reverse.

MR. MacLEOD: It was not quite the same.

MR. FROST: I really feel that we have all given our expressions of opinion. The people know what we think about it, but I think it is better not to pass a resolution of this nature at the moment.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I was hoping the word "resolution" would not come up, but actually I understand that conditions at that time were different. However, if the order will be called again, I will not oppose the adjournment.

MR. FROST: I will discuss it with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe).

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 57, Bill No. 106.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifty-seventh Order, second reading of Bill No. 106, "An Act respecting Fair Employment Practices", Mr. Brown.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 106, "An Act respecting Fair Employment Practices".

Mr. Speaker; before I discuss this Bill, I want to compliment the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) upon the very efficient manner in which he is carrying out his schedule for this afternoon. I received a note from him about two hours ago stating that this Bill would be discussed at five p.m. It is now 5.26, and I think that is running strictly on schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to spend very much time in the discussion of this Bill. This is precisely the same type of Bill which was so ably debated by the hon.member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) in the absence of the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) on Bill 56, and also by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) on Bill No. 54. With this one exception, that the recommendations in this Bill are that a commission should be appointed, which would be called the "Fair Employment Commission", a Commission consisting of five persons and, like the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) I felt it was necessary to insert a clause in here which would state that the hon. members would serve without remuneration, otherwise it might be considered as one embodying the expenditure of money, and be disallowed. I would hope, however, that the government itself would introduce it as a government Bill, as they have done today with the Racing Commission, under which this Commission could be paid.

The purpose of the Commission is to be purely administrative. It would receive complaints from t ose who felt they were being

prejudiced or discriminated against.

This commission would receive complaints and sift them, and deal with them. It would be the duty of the commission to report to the provincial Legislature, if in Session, or at the next Session of the Parliament when it convened.

This plan follows very closely that which is in effect in the state of New York at the present time. There they have a commission which is called "The Commission against Discrimination". It is felt by this group that it would be in the best interest of all of these persons who might be discriminated against, to be able to appear before the commission and air their grievances, and to have that commission report to this House, or to deal with the cases as they have been presented to them.

In many cases it may be found there are no just claims at all. These would be immediately disposed of. In other cases, it would be the duty of the commission to deal with them, or to bring such action against the employers as they deemed fit.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member (Mr. Brown) certainly did a very good job in keeping up to schedule in connection with this matter. I think in connection with this matter, the government's views were given pretty well yesterday. They were given on the Bills proposed by the hon. members of the Opposition, as well as the other group, and deal with this same principle, although perhaps on a little more extended basis.

As I stated yesterday, our feeling here is that this is a matter in which we should go slowly. You recollect I referred to two parts of an editorial which appeared in Toronto Saturday Night, and I think that should be our position. We have taken, in the last little while, two very definite steps, one of them today, which I think is very far reaching in this matter, and I agree with the view of the

Toronto Saturday Night, to the effect that in matters of this sort, it is well to let public opinion crystalize slowly; that matters should not be rushed, because sometimes in rushing them, more harm is done than good.

After all, the principle which really counts in this thing is the attitude of the people--the attitude of men and women which really counts. After all, our legislation to date is largely on the line of "thou shalt not do certain things". We think that attitude is good. When we enter into the field by saying "they must do something", that is a different field. Actually speaking, I think in this great tolerant province of ours -- and it is a great tolerant province -- you might do more harm than good by going too quickly. I think that is true of our partnership with the great race with which we are associated in this country. They have been, over the years, very tolerant with our views. I know that some people do not like the word "tolerant", but, nevertheless, it is a great word, and it has a special meaning in this country of ours. They have been very tolerant with our views, and we have likewise with them, with the result that we have formed a great partnership which is functioning in this country, not because of the law, but because men and women learned to live with citizens together, working for the common good, and the common recognition that it was in the interest of all, that there should be a partnership between our two great races.

Personally I think that in this country, with our background, and our history, we will work it out, and it will be well with our people. If you go to the United Kingdom, and consider the matter of the Liberal government there, which has been in office now for some five years, you will find there is no legislation of that sort over there.

I am extremely doubtful myself as to the worth of such

legislation in this country. On the other hand, time will tell, but I think we should be careful in the steps we take. To date, we have been sound in the positions we have taken. It may be that other steps will be sound, as we go along. These things can be taken up in the years to come.

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

Motion agreed to.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): I will say to the hon. members opposite that i calling this resolution, we have not a great deal of time. The timewas allotted to the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), and he has asked that his Bill be postponed, and that the second choice of the Liberal group --

MR. NIXON: How about the official opposition? Do not they enter this thing?

MR. FROST: There is a revolution there. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) suggested as his second preference a motion standing in the name of the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison). I wanted to discuss that. That is a matter dealing with another aspect of hydro, and I wanted to leave that discussion until the representative of the government in charge of hydro is present. I am anxious that the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) should have the opportunity of discussing other features of hydro, and that may be done on this Order.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is reasonable.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 53.

THE POWER COMMISSION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The 53rd Order, second reading of Bill No. 76, "An Act to amend The Power Commission Act", Mr. Houck.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I beg to

move second reading of Bill No. 76, "An Act to amend The Power Commission Act".

If I recall rightly, the late D. B. Detweiler of Kitchener was one of the first gentlemen who conceived the idea of the distribution of electricity to every home throughout the province of Ontario. He, along with the late E.W.B. Snider, conceived the idea of Hydro. He was responsible for the first public meeting held to formulate plans for bringing power from Niagara to Waterloo County and district. This meeting was held in Kitchener in February, 1903. This and subsequent meetings resulted in a Commission being established with Mr. Snider acting as chairman for the period of three years, then retiring in favour of the late Sir Adam Beck, who was also a Waterloo County boy. The late Mr. Detweiler's original plan was that Hydro should be publicly-owned, free from government domination, with power to be sold at cost and made available to all our citizens. The Hydro Electric Power Commission was created by special Acts of the Ontario Legislature in 1906 and 1907.

Sir Adam Beck, who played a vital role in the creation of Ontario Hydro, and to whom much of its early success is due, served as chairman from its inception in 1906 to his death in 1925.

Although the Commissioners are appointed by the government, Ontario Hydro is in no way a Department of the government. It is a separate entity, a self-sustaining public concern endowed by The Power Commission Act with broad powers to develop, produce, buy and supply electricity and to perform certain regulatory functions with respect to the activities of the public utility commissioners of the member municipalities.

I hope Hydro is not being used as a political football, contrary to the ideas of its founders and most certainly in

opposition to the wishes of its real owners, the municipalities of the province whose interests and opinions are rarely consulted.

(Take H-1 follows)

The original legislation, the public discussions at the time of inception, the debates in the Legislature from time to time and the actual actions of Sir Adam Beck, as chairman, as well as his often-repeated statements, all confirm the fact that Hydro was not, and never was intended to be, an adjunct of the provincial government. The basic fundamentals of Hydro was, and is, that the central body of the organizations is a co-operative enterprise owned by the partnership of municipalities, and therefore that the commission and commissioners and staff are in a position of trust for the municipalities, and not for the provincial government.

This, Mr. Speaker, was absolutely Sir Adam Beck's idea, and he stuck to that until the end, and might I say, Mr. Speaker, in bringing this Bill forth to the Legislature you will recall that since the year 1944, since this government has taken over, there have been two or three Acts to amend the Power Commission Act. One was in 1944, another one in 1946, and one in 1947. May I just read from Hansard Mr. Drew's speech when he brought this amendment to the Power Commission Act, to the attention of the Legislature. I am quoting Hansard as of March 26th, 1947:

(Page H-2 follows)

"MR. DREW: Mr. Speaker, with the consent of hon. members, it might be advisable if I indicated the nature of this amendment.

" It is a very simple amendment to section two of the Power Commission Act. Section two is the section which names the number of Commissioners, and how they shall be appointed. That is the only section amended by the Bill now introduced.

" It will provide that instead of three Commissioners, as now named by section two, there will be nine Commissioners. It makes no other change beyond taking out certain limiting words now in that section.

" This amendment is consistent with an indication which was given earlier that as part of the re-organization of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, it would be broadened in its scope and be made more representative of the broad field of activity covered by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission. While the amendment merely provides for the appointment of not more than nine Commissioners, it is the intention of the government that those appointed up to a number not more than nine shall be three executive members of the Commission, upon a similar basis to those who have been appointed for many years. In addition to those three executive members of the Commission, there will be appointed representatives of the following organization and groups of our people:

The Ontario Municipal Electric Association

Labour

Agriculture

Housewives

Northern Ontario:

As is known by the hon. members of this Legislature, there has been a repeated demand on the part of the Ontario Municipal Electric for some time, that they should have representation upon the Commission. This government sought to comply with that request by appointing the then president of the Ontario Municipal Electric Association."

I presume, Mr. Speaker, he referred to Mr. Strike.

"We recognize however, that once a man is appointed to the Commission in one of the executive positions, and ceases to be president of the Ontario Municipal Electric Association, that it is not unreasonable for that association to cease to regarded him as entirely representative of that association.

" The intention, therefore, is to have an additional representative from the association, whose appointment will be made in consultation with that association. It is also intended to appoint a prominent representative of labour, and it will be a prominent representative of labour who is interested in the labour movement. There will also be a representative of agriculture, whose experience and background will qualify him to advise in regard to the tremendously important work of supplying and expanding the use of electric energy on the farms of this province.

" Then, the appointment of a housewife is, I believe, an important addition to this Commission. Perhaps we are sometimes inclined to overlook the fact that a very large part of the work of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission and the local commissions

and boards which supply energy, is to provide the electricity required for the many household uses, in which a housewife is obviously the most expert advisor who can be appointed. In making this appointment, regard will be had for the experience of the lady appointed, and also to her activities which would qualify her to advise in this important field of the work of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission. Also there is to be a representative of Northern Ontario, so that advice at all the meetings of the Commission may be available in regard to the very special problem of that great Northern area."

Mr. Speaker, in introducing this Bill I say if this was important in 1947, following out the wishes of the then Prime Minister (Mr. Drew) it is important at the present time. I might say, Mr. Speaker, using the words of the Cabinet across the way, that I have just brought this in as a matter of sort of "tidying-up" legislation.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am rather at a loss to know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Houck) is in favour of the amendment which was passed some two or three years ago, or whether he wants to repeal that and substitute this provision.

MR. F. OLIVER (Grey South): We think ours is better.

MR. FROST: I assume he wants to wash out the speech which was made by the then Prime Minister (Mr. Drew) and substitute this for it.

MR. HOUCK: Well, I would like to wash out all the speeches that were made by the then Prime Minister (Mr. Drew).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Houck) might bring in a resolution to that effect.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Expunge them from the records.

MR. FROST: However, Mr. Speaker, there are some comments I would like to make on the hon. member's (Mr. Houck) speech. Under the present legislation there is ample scope to do everything necessary. I think we have the power to appoint, is it not nine commissioners? Something of the sort.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): That is what the speech said.

MR. FROST: Well, in any event there is a very wide field that we can operate in, and I do not think really it is necessary to take advantage of this amendment, perhaps, of my hon. friend (Mr. Houck). He read the speech which was made at that time, and which was also sent to me, by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod).

MR. MacLEOD: Did you read it?

MR. FROST: I have a copy of the speech, and I have what my hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod) has said, and I am quite familiar with the proposal which was made at that time.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Do you agree with it?

MR. MacLEOD: How is my thesis?

MR. FROST: Well, I hate to do things according to my own lights, you know, and I have to work around and try to administer the affairs of the province in the light of 1950, and all of these things I suppose I have to give consideration to. However, I may say I was interested in my hon. friend's (Mr. Houck) references to the early days of Hydro, and about Mr. Snyder, who never received the credit to which I think

he was entitled in the formation of Hydro in its early days. With respect to Sir Adam Beck, I may say to the House, that a short time ago I was given some letter written to the late Sir James Whitney in relation to Hydro matters in the early days, before the change in government in 1905 -- or, rather, written by Sir James Whitney or "Mr. Whitney" as he was then, in his own hand. This was before the days of typewriters. Most of them were written by Sir James from his office in Morrisburg. Some day I will give those letters to the Archives when this building across the way is completed, because they are interested in giving the background of things of those days.

My own godfather, Andrew Miscampbell, a member of this House in 1903, introduced as an Opposition member, a resolution in relation to Hydro, which I always trace back to my native town of Orillia, which was the forerunner of Hydro, and which surpassed in its activities and achievements in a relative way, all of the things Hydro has done.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Did the resolution get to a vote?

MR. FROST: Well, I am going to adjourn the debate in a moment, but I just want to --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh.

MR. FROST: I want to come to this point with my hon. friends: Sir James Whitney's letters were hand-written back in 1903 and 1904 from his office in Morrisburg.

(Take I follows)

Sir Adam Beck, at that time was filled with the same idea, the formation of a municipal partnership in Ontario. I feel that Sir James Whitney, who died in 1914, and Sir Adam Beck, who died in 1925, would have had no idea of the Hydro of today. The Hydro of today comprises the life's blood and the economy of the province of Ontario. I think the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) is quite wrong when he suggests that the provincial government can divorce itself of any interest in this, and leave the construction of that great development which controls the life of Ontario, to a group of municipalities. It just cannot be done.

MR. HOUCK: I did not make that suggestion.

MR. FROST: The hon. member (Mr. Houck) sat in this House, and saw the government which he supported sitting on these benches and deal with certain aspects of Hydro, because they thought it was in the public interest. They repudiated contracts; they never consulted the municipalities at all, and the fact is that the Ontario Municipal Association was always about five miles behind them, and never had an opportunity of discussing any of these things with the Hepburn government. They acted because they thought it was in the interest of Ontario, but I think history has shown that the Hepburn government was quite wrong. However, I do not disagree with their right to deal with something which deals with the affairs of this province. I would say that in 1950, the system which covers the whole of the province of Ontario from end to end should not revert back to the conceptions of Sir James Whitney and Sir Adam Beck. Any idea to that effect is fantastic. The fact is that the hon. members in this Legislature, representing the people of Ontario, must also take an interest in Hydro.

In accordance with the agreement with the Opposition, I will move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. HOUCK: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows full well that this Bill calls for the government to turn Hydro over to the heads of the municipalities. Does he believe the municipalities should be represented on the Hydro Commission at the present time?

MR. FROST: Yes. At the present time there is a very able representative in the person of Mr. Strike, who has been a municipal man all his life. There is more representation on the Hydro now than in the whole history of your days, when you did not put anybody on.

MR. NIXON: Albert Smith was a member of the Electric Association.

MR. FROST: Was he there because of that, or because he was a member of your group?

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as I see the clock, it is six o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being six o'clock, I do leave the Chair.

At six o'clcok the House took recess.

- - - - - -

The House resumed at eight o'clock p.m.

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 25.

EXCEPTIONS TO THE LORD'S DAY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 25th Order; Second reading of Bill No. 116, "An Act to Provide for Certain Exceptions to the Lord's Day Act (Canada), Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 116, "An Act to Provide for Certain Exceptions to the Lord's Day Act (Canada).

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Queensbury Rules or catch as catch can.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter), on the introduction of this Bill the day before yesterday, gave a very full and extensive explanation of the Bill and the purpose of the same, and the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) will be winding up the debate for this side, or for the government.

I should, therefore, like as head of the government, to lay before the hon. Members of this house the conditions which have led to the placing of this Bill before you for consideration, and in so doing, I may say that there is no issue.....

(Page AA-2 follows)

which has arisen for many years, which has given me more personal concern than the subject matter of this Bill which arose from petitions of the cities of Windsor and Toronto, based upon affirmative votes of the electorate of these two great cities. The petition of the city of Toronto, based upon the question affirmatively answered by the electorate, reads as follows:

"Are you in favour of the city of Toronto seeking legislation to make amateur, professional and other forms of commercial sport legal on Sunday?"

This was addressed to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council in a petition of the city of Toronto under date of January 27th, 1950. I won't read the petition in full.

MR. E. D. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Well, is it a petition?

MR. FROST: It is in the form of a petition:

"The petition of the undersigned Corporation of the City of Toronto,"

issued under the hand of the solicitor of the Corporation reciting the vote, the question submitted and that:

"At a meeting of the City Council held on January 23rd, 1950, an application to the Lieutenant-Governor-In-Council for enactment at the forthcoming session of such legislation as may be necessary to enable the Council to pass bylaws permitting the holding of amateur, professional and other forms of commercial sport on Sunday was authorized."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will not refer to the Windsor vote. The Windsor vote is worded differently. The terms, or the form of the question submitted to the people of Windsor was read to you by the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) here

the day before yesterday and is part of the proceedings of the house, and I won't read it again. I will say, of course, those who come from the Windsor district are familiar with the conditions surrounding that vote, but I should say that the people of Ontario were vastly more familiar with the Toronto vote and I should like to refer to the background of that vote because undoubtedly, the background of the Toronto vote is similar to that of the City of Windsor. When this question was submitted to the people of Toronto last January, and when discussions were taking place in the month of December, I will be quite frank with this house in saying that I personally thought the question would be answered in the negative. With all the Toronto newspapers and various candidates and leaders advising a negative answer, despite all of that, with a very heavy vote-- the heaviest municipal vote in the history of Toronto-- this question was carried.

The implications, Mr. Speaker, of the vote are inescapable. It was an unmistakable upsurge of public opinion. Now, there will be, of course, and there has been some criticism of the manner in which the campaign advising a negative vote was conducted. But I should like to refer the hon. Members of this house to an editorial in the United Church Observer, my own church, under date of January 15, 1950. I will only read a small portion of the editorial although I may assure the Hon. Members here that the editorial is very worthwhile reading. The Observer refers to the fact that there might have been on the part of some people,

criticisms as to the campaign conducted by the negative side. I must admit myself, in main, I could not complain about the campaign. In campaigns, people are inclined to be a little hot-headed but nevertheless I think the campaign was reasonable. However, the Observer was a little critical and it says this:

"However, in spite of all the weakness of the campaign the vote of 88,108 voters voting "Yes" for commercialized Sunday sport is proof positive that the people want it, and in a democracy the people get what the majority want."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this brings me down to my own personal position and to the position of the government; how with the varying conditions in a great province such as this, as broad in extent and as broad and great as it is in population, four and a half million people, what is the best method to protect the people, to give them what they want, to give the communities that do not want it and to give to communities that do want it, to meet the conditions that you have in this great province of ours-- that is the problem. I say unhesitatingly I am anxious, as the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) said the other day to preserve the essential features of the Sabbath Day, and that anything approaching a wide-open Sunday in this province is, to my way of thinking, most undesirable. I am conscious of the fact that the Toronto vote, and indeed the Windsor vote, was wide-open sofar as sport is concerned, but in fairness, in connection with the Toronto vote, and I have noted this in the papers and on the radio, most of the

advocates of the affirmative side of the question suggested restricted hours.

My attitude concerning the preservation of the essential features of Sunday is quite plain. I say, Mr. Speaker, without hesitation that personally I regard church attendance and the religious and moral background of our people as a most important and essential part of our national life. I say that without hesitation. If I had my wish, it would be that everyone would attend church at least once on Sunday. We would be a much stronger people if such were the case. And again I say that anything I could do or say which would influence the people to support and attend church, I would say and do unhesitatingly, and I think that applies to most of the hon. Members in this house, perhaps all of them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, scarcely less important is the desirability of keeping the sabbath day as a day of rest, as far as possible, free from work.

Now, despite these things, the results of the Toronto and Windsor votes have given us much cause for thought. May I be pardoned for referring to my own case and my own views? My way of life is probably the average of all of us here. It is very, very simple indeed. I must admit that for years my Sunday afternoons have been spent as I desire. Now, I will say this, that coming from my background and the Scottish town of Orillia, I was brought up in the traditions of the old Presbyterian Church. My father during all the days of his lifetime was a very strong churchman. Our Sundays in the days of my youth, living on the shores of Lake Couchiching were

very strict Sundays indeed. Referring to the days of many years ago, back in the early days of the century, I well remember in our old place in Orillia when my father first said he did not think there was anyt ing wrong with putting the boat in the lake on Sunday as long as it was tied to the wharf. I remember in his later days when I used to take him down to the shores of Lake Couchiching on Sunday afternoon -- that was after he attended church on Sunday morning. All of us have had our personal experiences in these things and I want to say that I do not deal lightly with these personal experiences. I do not deal lightly with expressions such as my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Millard) used the other day in connection with a Bill we were passing with here. I would not want to hurt the religious susceptibilities or opinions of anybody if I could possibly avoid it and I recognize that these things have an effect on each one of us here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must admit again that my Sunday afternoons are now spent as I desire, in the country, and as I want. Sunday sport means nothing to me personally, and to quite a degree, that is true of all the hon. members here. I spend my time in the country, on the lakes, or motoring, or engaging in outdoor life. Many people engage in golf. I do not myself. I have never been able to get the time, or afford it, but many people do play golf.

The results of these votes have caused us all to say, -- "What is the cause of the upsurge in Toronto and Windsor, where reside nearly a quarter of the population of the province of Ontario.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, there are indications of the same move elsewhere in this province. It is undeniable that such is the case. I was interested in reading a Gallop Poll taken of the civil servants in Ottawa and the result of that Poll is said to be 85 per cent in favour.

Now, what is the cause of this upsurge? I do not think it is because of the weakening of the moral fibre of our people. I would hate to think that my moral fibre had changed or altered since the days my father first permitted the putting of the boat in Lake Couchiching, forty or forty-five years ago. I would hate to say such is the case. I do not think so. I think the moral fibre of the people of this grand province is very great indeed, but I think it is simply just that the people of large centres and urban areas have not the advantage that others have. The views of people living on crowded streets -- and I recall that old hymn, "The Crowded Ways of Life" -- and their other problems of life -- are different from those living in other areas. Undoubtedly, radio and the conditions in other states and provinces have had their effect on our people. Mr. Speaker, it is undeniable that the vote of the Toronto and Windsor people, coming as it did from the people, cannot be brushed aside. We cannot brush it aside and disregard it. In the last months, I have spent a great deal of time talking to the ordinary cross-section of our people, in all walks of life, particularly in the Toronto area. I have had the advantage of talking to people in this very building, employees of the government

in all walks of life, from people who are engaged in cleaning these buildings to those who occupy positions of-- perhaps I should not say greater importance because all jobs are important-- but engaged in different classes of work.

I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, and I say it unhesitatingly; I believe people are good people. Do not let anybody tell you that the people of this city or the city of Windsor or elsewhere are not good people. They are good people; they are just as good as we are. I have talked with them. Most of them go to church and have just as strong religious convictions as I have. I have asked them about this upsurge. I have been interested in it and their answer to me is this: "You do what you want to do." That is what they say to me and they would tell you that. They say:

"You do what you want to do. You can motor; you can go out in your boat; you can live at your summer place; you can play golf; you can do what you like. We live within four walls. We cannot afford these things; there is little for us to do. We think we should be able to have sports and games on Sunday. Why can we not have these things?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the Observer editorial;

"In a democracy, the people get what the majority want."

Now, from the standpoint of government, from the standpoint of the individual responsibility of every hon. Member in this chamber, I think the wise course for the government of this province to pursue is in the best way possible to guide the course of public opinion, having regard to the varying conditions and problems of our people conserving the essential parts of

our way of life. The problem of this government and of the hon. Members here is one of meeting the expressed views of the people and conserving the essential features of Sunday.

Now, I should like to refer again to the Toronto vote. The Toronto vote was in favour of amateur, professional and other forms of commercial sport. We have had many discussions on that point in this session. We must all recognize that in these days, it is impossible to define the difference between amateur, professional and commercial sport. It is so intermingled that it cannot be unscrambled. Here is the problem: the problem really gets down to one as to whether an admission fee is to be charged. After all, go abroad and you will find this in many of the country areas. Ball games and what not are held and the hat is passed and that is the way the provisions of the law are met. Let me compare that to here, in this city and the city of Windsor and other large communities in this province. In large cities, places where sports are conducted involving heavy expenditures, the expedient of passing the hat which works in some places certainly is not workable under these conditions. Therefore, if anything is to be given, it involves the charging of an admission fee, otherwise they will not have it. That is all. In any event, Mr. Speaker, despite my interpretation of it, that is what those people voted for. That is the plain vote, the plain terms of this vote. They voted just for that thing.

Now, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) stated the other day and I think this is a very important feature

of this legislation, that the Lord's Day Act of 1906,- that is the Dominion legislation,-recognized and recognizes today--and he gave the background of the passing of that Act--the varying conditions in Canada and that Act made it permissive for the Province to make exceptions. Now, I would like to say that in some of the Provinces that Act is not enforced at all. I do not want to refer to particular Provinces,but as you know, the Act provided that no prosecution could be brought unless the Attorney-General of the Province gave his consent, gave the necessary fiat--I presume that is what it is--to bring an action. In some provinces that is disregarded. In one of our close neighboring provinces the Act of 1906 has never been enforced. We have enforced it here, but again, as I say, the Act made it permissive, recognizing the varying conditions in a country as great as Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Act before the House, on which I am speaking now, extends this permissive right, with the restrictions with which we surround it, to the municipal councils, but with the consent of their own people. This legislation is purely permissive and I would like the hon. Members of this House to bear this in mind. This legislation opens nothing---bear that in mind--and I repeat it, that this legislation opens nothing. It gives the people and the councils in the municipalities the right to do certain things within limits which we impose, within restrictions which we impose, to which I shall refer in a moment.

(page AA-11 follows)

It forces nothing on any municipality. It places the key in the hands of the people, that is what the Act does. We impose nothing on any municipality, we simply place the key in the hands of the people in the manner which I described. And it is done, I think in a way which is best calculated to preserve the essentials of Sunday. It is quite consistent that some here would surport this permissive legislation, at the same time opposing its use in their own communities. It is perfectly consistent for this reason: we could not hope in this Chamber to pass a Bill which would meet the varying conditions of this problem that we have here in the province and it is perfectly consistent, I would unhesitatingly reserve my right to vote as I wish if this matter came up in my own municipality of Lindsay, or in the township of Fenelon , where I am also a voter and where I spend much of my life when I am able to be away from the city of Toronto. I would certainly reserve the right to vote according to the circumstances which obtained in those municipalities.

After all, conditions vary, and must be dealt with in accordance with the views of the people and the conditions existing in a thousand municipalities across this province.

Mr. Speaker, nothing can be more democratic than that. This permissive Act is very simple. In the matter of hours, it does not go as far as the Toronto or Windsor votes asked, and indeed in view of the campaign in Toronto I have a great deal of doubt in my mind as to whether the people, the 88,000 people in this city who voted affirmatively, wanted a wide-open sport Sunday. In any event, I think we are justified in stepping in and regulating it at that point. In the questions submitted to the Toronto and Windsor electors, there was no mention of hours. This Act we have before us restricts the permission

to conduct sports to four and a half hours on Sunday, from 1.30 p.m. to six o'clock in the afternoon. It reserves the rest of the day, including Sunday mornings and evenings, and I should think that if municipalities desire to further restrict that four and a half hours, they are fully empowered under this Act to do so, according to the needs of the community where the by-laws are passed.

I have mentioned the desirability of keeping Sunday as free from work as possible, having regard to the interest of all of our people. I must say to you, Mr. Speaker, that is something I regard as just about as essential as the religious features of Sunday. However, we all recognize there are already wide exemptions in the Lord's Day Act. It is my recollection that in the Act, there are some 20 subsections making very wide exceptions in connection with work of necessity and mercy. For instance, we have Sunday trains that bring people back to Toronto on the weekends. I very often come on a train from my own town which is crowded to capacity, and brings people back from Lindsay and Peterborough into the city of Toronto. There are a host of other exceptions which I would not attempt to enumerate.

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this angle with some of our well-known labour leaders in this country, and there is one good feature in the sports matter, namely that sports are seasonal. I do not know that any games -- if there are, they are few -- that are all year round games. Of course there are some, but in the main it is seasonal and it has been pointed out to me in most cases the workers engaged in those games are occasional. I am quite free to accept, that does not cover the matter of transportation and things of that sort, but nevertheless the transporation services are there and I assume that perhaps they are widely used in any event. This view has been

expressed to me by many persons who are interested in this angle of the problem, and Mr. Speaker, it is a problem.

As regards the vote, before any municipality may avail itself of the permission given in this Act, there must be an affirmative vote of the people. The votes that have already been taken in Windsor and Toronto are recognized. It is only after a number of votes of the people that the municipal council may act and may do the things which this Act authorizes, within the hours and within the scope of the Act. That may be done only after a vote of the people.

Race tracks are expressly excluded, and I will be quite frank in saying they were excluded for the reason that if they were not, it would automatically include the provisions of the Dominion Criminal Code, and we would have no control whatever over gambling that might be conducted on the tracks, and it did not appear to us that was consistent with the religious features, of the Sabbath Day, and that there was a great difference between people watching a ball game or a hockey game and something else.

If the vote of the people is affirmative, then the council must specify the types and kinds of sports to be played and where they are to be played. I should like to refer the hon. members to the leading editorial in the Star of today, dealing with that very question here in the city of Toronto, where in the city of Toronto, there was quite a wide difference of expression of opinion, and I can quite understand that the city council might decide to exclude certain portions of the city, and that would apply to any municipality. There are many things that would influence that. In Toronto, for instance, the city council may recognize it is to be advisable to have sports in certain parts of the city. Again, one type of sport

may be desirable in one municipality, and quite undesirable in another, or in a part of the same. I can quite understand how that might be.

Mr. Speaker, concerning the constitutionality of this provision, may I point out that municipal government is part of provincial government. We must never forget that. Municipal government is provincial government, it is part of provincial government. The powers of municipalities arise from powers which are given by the Legislature, and it is the opinion of the law officers that there is no doubt about the constitutionality and the validity of this provision.

Again I say that this Act gives permission to the people of the municipalities to authorize their councils to pass by-laws permitting types of sports in localities in the municipality. The council representing the people can change or alter the types and places at any time to meet the needs and the wishes of their people. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, anything could be more flexible than that to meet the great requirements and the varying conditions that there are in this province. After the electors have said "Yes" it gives the municipal councils, then, the widest powers of controlling type, place, and nature of sports, and even restricting and altering the hours within the four and a half hour period that we give them.

Again, -- and I will refer to this in a moment -- the people have the widest powers of repealing the permission which they may at one time give. There is no restriction on that point. The votes are to be conducted on municipal lists, and I realize some hon. members of this House would want an explanation on that point. They are conducted on municipal lists, which means this, that the electors who elect the councils are the same electors who vote on this question in any municipality.

I think that is perfectly reasonable and desirable. I quite understand there might be the contention: "Why should not this vote be extended to the legislative list?" And I quite admit there are many arguments, but remember this, we are giving to the councils permissive rights to do certain things, we are giving them permission to do certain things. It seems to me altogether logical and proper that the people who would vote on a certain issue would be the same class of people, the same section of people, who would elect the municipal council. There have been, as I say, representations for a vote on a legislative franchise. There is another big advantage to that, and that is it involves a very expensive enumeration of the list and then raises another point which I would like to acquaint hon. members with, and that is the question of a 60/40 vote, such as we have in liquor votes. A 60/40 vote would apply in caseof either adoption or repeal. After the most thorough consideration of this point, Mr. Speaker, the government's view is that the best method is by a straight vote. If the people of a municipality do not like it, they may have a straight vote to repeal it. The government believes that better results may be obtained in that way.

Some hon. members will say: "How about the present liquor votes? Why the 60/40 provision on the liquor votes?" I would say, Mr. Speaker, the present 60/40 vote in connection with liquor has many disadvantages. I believe there are many cases where,if there was a straight vote on repeal, the matter of the enforcement of law in this province would be simpler, for the reason that many of those people entrench themselves behind a 60 per cent vote.

On the other hand, remember we are dealing with history, and with conditions that arise from many years ago. We have

a great many municipalities in this province who voted themselves under the liquor laws on a 60 per cent vote, and gained a 60 per cent vote on the express understanding that vote would obtain in case of repeal, It is undeniable there are some disadvantages to that and I do say quite definitely that in the matter of the problem we are confronted with and are dealing with, the best way to handle it is on a straight vote. If the people carry it, then they can repeal it on a straight vote if the thing is not satisfactory, instead of them touching something that is not satisfactory behind a 60 per cent provision.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that after a most thorough consideration of the problems involved in this matter, which I say again cannot be sized up, the government commends this legislation to hon. members of this House. It carries out the permissive idea of the Lord's Day Act of 1906, it is strictly democratic; the matter is placed in the hands of the people themselves and in the absolute control of their elected councils. There is nothing "wide-open" about this Act. It does nothing to induce any community to change its pattern of life. It enables the people to settle their own affairs in their own way.

This Act, again I say, opens nothing, only the people themselves can do that. The people themselves have the key in their own hands. We do nothing in this Act to open anything.

I believe it broadly conserves the essential fundamentals of the Lord's Day. I believe, without hesitation, it presents a solution to a problem which is squarely and inescapably before us.

It sensibly restricts, and it does not oppresively restrict, and I believe it will commend itself to the hon. members of this House, and to the people of the province of Ontario.

Furthermore, and I think this is important, Mr. Speaker, I believe it will sensibly settle the Sunday issue for a generation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in commending this Bill to hon. members of this House, and the people of this province.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): I have not the slightest intention, Mr. Speaker, of taking violent issue with what has been by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). It happens that in a great deal of what he said on this subject I am in agreement, but I have many reservations and something to add which I think may find a response among a good many hon. members of this House.

My starting point in approaching this problem is a very simple one. It seems to me axiomatic that public opinion with respect to Sunday observance is not the same in 1950 as it was in 1850. That may be regrettable, it may not be regrettable, but it seems to me a very obvious fact.

Secondly, public opinion in some communities of this province with respect to Sunday observance is not exactly the same as it is in other communities of this province. That seems to me also to be obvious.

In the third place, as well all know, within each community and each neighbourhood, and on the same streets, there are honest differences of opinion, or, if you like, differences of practice with respect to Sunday observance, and there is no escaping the fact that some people in our democracy wish to

observe Sunday in one way, and others wish to observe it in another. It therefore seems to me there must be, so far as this House is concerned, a point of compromise with respect to any legislation regarding Sunday observance, and of course the problem the government has had to face, the problem we all have to face, is what that point of compromise should be.

I have a few comments to make on the background of the situation which is now before the House. We know that each and every new exception to Sunday observance is likely to give offence to substantial numbers of people. We also know large numbers of people desire the right not only to engage in their own pastime, or in amateur sports, but to become spectators or "paying guests" at professional sports on Sunday, That is certainly true of a large number and they made their preference clear in at least two municipalities in Windsor and Toronto votes. At the same time, we know -- and this seems to be one of the most regrettable features of the whole controversy -- that commercial sport is spectator sport, and, quite apart from all the arguments about Sunday observance, it seems to be deplorable that in this respect this province is unlike some areas, and I think particularly of an area like Australia or parts of Australia where most of the people who are interested in sport are interested as spectators. That seems to be deplorable, but it happens to be a fact in Ontario. Very few men and women actually participate in sport after they leave school, fewer still participate in sport after they are 25 or 30 years of age. I think it is most regrettable that it has given rise to what amounts to a major industry in these days, I suppose, namely commercialized sport.

I have no illusions about the principal backing for the recent affirmative votes in Toronto and Windsor, and I do not

think anybody else has any great illusions either. The most powerful and aggressive backing for the affirmative votes in both Toronto and Windsor was commercial. None of us were born yesterday, and we think we know that to be true. On the other hand, it is equally true that very large numbers of people who have no interest whatever in commercial sport, no interest, that is to say, in the profits to be derived from commercial sport, unmistakably expressed their desire to be paying guests or spectators at commercial performances on Sunday, We must, I think, have some respect for the wishes of the majority when they are clearly expressed, and for my part, I think they were very clearly expressed, at least in the Toronto vote, which I believe was more decisive than the vote in Windsor.

Another regrettable feature of the matter is the most of these commercial sports are not the kind in which families can take an interest or take a part. Generally speaking, it is not a family interest, for all to attend the base ball game, a football game, a hockey game, or whatever it may be, for which admission is charged on a Sunday, and I suppose there will be some difficulties arising and there will be more than one argument about whether the head of the family should take the car to the baseball game or take the family to the country, and that again seems to me the regrettable feature of commercialized sport when held on the Sabbath Day.

Nevertheless, we cannot overlook the plight of a great many people who live in larger cities. They do not participate in sport, they have no opportunity to participate, the same municipal council in Toronto which authorized the holding of a vote on January 2nd, of this year, fails even to allow them to make use of the city playgrounds on Sunday for participating purposes, as the city council have authority to do, and the

unfortunate result is that large numbers of people in Toronto, some of them living in one room, who have no car, who cannot go fishing, who cannot take the time or have not the money to travel through miles of crowded suburbs to get out into the country, who have access to very few parks, feel the only recreational outlet for them on Sunday would be for them to buy a ticket for a ball game if there were one being held within reasonable distance of their homes. I must say to the opponents of professional sport in Toronto on Sundays, that they overlook or at least they underestimate the number of Toronto people under conditions in 1950 who have a very dull, miserable time of it, in their one-room habitations and who may not have been able to vote themselves because of the restrictive franchise but who undoubtedly exercise an influence on the result of that vote in the city of Toronto. As far as I am concerned, their interests must no longer be disregarded in a matter of this sort.

I know it has been said also that we have six other days of the week on which people can attend professional performances. That is quite true. However, it also happens to be the case that a good many working-class people find it very difficult to go on the other days of the week. I do not say it is impossible for all of them to go on other days of the week, because as we all know many thousands of them do, though a goodly number of them on other days of the week and other nights of the week do not fit in very well. That is particularly true, for example, of a man who is very much interested in base ball, but who, under the conditions of this day, may have to live in York township, which I represent, and perhaps go to work in a factory in Scarboro township, and who has very little opportunity for going to a hockey game or base ball game when he has to go back and forth over that long distance on five or in some cases six days

of the week. That again is a problem which has to be taken into account.

There has been much objection made to the pro m of the vote in the city of Toronto. I must say I thought it was a very oddly-worded question, and I thought although it was very questionable whether the council of the city of Toronto had the jurisdiction to put this question to the electors in view of the decision of Chief Justice McRuer, in another case. However, they did it. They did it, it was not challenged, and the result, as I have indicated was quite clear.

I must say, coming now to the Bill itself, and taking notice for a moment of the view of those who regard Sunday as essentially a religious day and one for rest and religious observance, I think it is quite possible that this Bill, even though it is permissive legislation, restricts the hours to certain hours on Sunday afternoon, and I am sure there would be much more opposition to the Bill if that restriction were not there. On that point, I think the government is to be commended because it gives recognition to the view of, I think the majority of the province that Sunday has great religious significance and that the whole day simply must not be given over to professional entertainment.

I want now to say a word or two about the Bill itself. This Bill of course embodies the principle of local option, but I must say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) merely to point out that this is the local option principle, this is permissive legislation, this does not open the door, the door still remains to be opened by the electors and by their councils, that statement overlooks the fact, and I think we all agree that not everything can be subject to local option. Nobody in this House would suggest that all the subjects with

respect to which we legislate can be referred to local option. It simply cannot be done. And even with respect to this Bill, there are important objections to the local option principle. For example, we have had a vote in the city of Toronto, and it is a form of local option to the extent that the validity of that vote is recognized after the event in this Bill. However, many people who had no opportunity to vote in the Toronto election will be affected by the result. We have all these subur an municipalities, people in New Toronto and in York township and in Scarboro and in East York and North York who will be affected by the results. If for example, somebody who resides in my constituency, perhaps in York Township of in Mount Dennis, happens to be an employee of the Maple Leaf Gardens, they are going to be called into work on Sunday, as a result, the indirect result, of a Toronto vote in which they had no part whatsoever. So I must say it is a little artificial to pretend that only the municipality which takes the vote will be affected by the result. We simply to have recognize that is not so. Others will be affected and may have some grounds for objection.

Another principle of the Bill is, I think, a thoroughly bad one, and here I differ strongly from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). I refer to the principle that only the municipal electors should vote. That proceeds on the basis that only the municipal electors have an interest in this question. Obviously that is not so. Obviously the people who are interested in Sunday sports, for or against, are not concerned to those who are eligible to vote in a municipal election, and yet the Bill, in effect, limits the franchise to those who can vote in a municipal election. I know the argument may be made that they are the people who elect the municipal council, and the municipal council has to pass a by-law, but the fact

still remains that the vote will be one conducted under provincial legislation. The people to whom this House is answerable are the people eligible to vote on a provincial election. We are passing legislation which affects all of them, and not just a few of them, or some of them. I think, therefore, the franchise ought to have been extended to all those who are eligible to vote in a provincial election, and any other course seems to be thoroughly unsound and undemocratic.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I have a final question to raise which gives me no satisfaction, but I raise it because I think that sooner or later it may well become an issue. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said the law officers of the Crown are satisfied that this Bill is intra vires of the Legislature of Ontario.

(Take BB follows)

They may be right, I don't know, it remains to be seen. I want to point out that nearly 20 years ago in 1923 the Manitoba Legislature passed an Act concerning Sunday excursions but they were more cautious, they were not sure the Act would stand up and instead of providing that it would come into force on receiving Royal Assent, the Manitoba Act to amend the Lord's Day Act of 1923 concluded by providing it would come into force by proclamation of the Lieutenant-Governor. Three months after and before it was proclaimed the government referred it to the Court of Appeal for decision on the question of its validity. All this was reported and the case reached the Privy Council, a decision with which the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) is familiar, and the Privy Council held it intra vires. They took the precaution of ascertaining before proclaiming the Act whether it was intra vires and there was no possibility of anyone being discommoded. This government is not following that course. If the law officers should be wrong, and they are not always right---

HON. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): Are not all lawyers right?

MR. JOLLIFFE: They can only hope for 500% over the year. There are times when the law officers can be wrong. If they are wrong in this action and it is subsequently held by the courts that this is ultra vires of the legislature of Ontario, and it will cause damage to a number of people who have made arrangements and commercial people who have undertaken some heavy commitments it will be a very unsatisfactory situation. And I am not satisfied that that would not be the result.

HON. MR. PORTER: Would the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) express an opinion as to his view of the validity of the Act?

MR. JOLLIFFE: No. What I will do, I will suggest some of the reasons it is possible that the Act may be ultra vires.

Speaking for myself, after consideration and taking into consideration all the factors I have mentioned and some mentioned by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), I will vote for the passage of this Bill on second reading, but I would not be doing my duty if I did not point out that the government is approaching the matter in a fashion that will not necessarily stand in the courts. The government is contemplating towalking the plank instead of waiting to find out the court's view of the Act, when they say it will come into force on assent. What the significance is, I don't know. I suppose if they did not make the decision--

HON. MR. FROST: You have the Manitoba decision you refer to.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I will say more about that.

HON. MR. FROST: The law officers have advised us that this is intra vires and we have no doubt about it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Repeat that for the record.

HON. MR. PORTER: There is no doubt about that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am not saying I disagree with the law officers. This Act is not the Act of 1923, that was an excursion Act and the Privy Council held there was nothing in the law of Canada or the Criminal Law in existence prior to 1867 to prevent Manitoba from passing that Act. When you come to an Ontario Bill in 1950 in a different province and subject to different provisions so far as constitutional matters are concerned, you have a different question from that tried by the Privy Council in Manitoba case.

HON. MR. FROST: What is the difference?

MR. JOLLIFFE: The difference is the criminal law of England prior to 1792 is still in effect in this province except as repealed by Canada. There was a part of the criminal law of England in 1625 and 1677 which I believe gave some

authority for Sunday sports, and which, therefore, is a part of the law of this province. One thing is clear, it was made clear by the Privy Council in 1903 in the case of the Hamilton Street Railway that it is part of the Crimimal Code so far as the British North America Act is concerned, and section 10 of the Criminal Code provides that the criminal law of England as at September, 1792, insofar as it has not been repealed by any Act or law in the United Kingdom or by the late province of Canada still has the force of law and alters, varies or modifies, and establishes the criminal law of the province of Ontario. I know that some of the legislation has been reppealed by the Parliament of Canada. The statutes of 1625 and 1677 have not been repealed.

To sum up, I will vote for the principle of this Bill but I do regret certain features of the Bill and I think it would have been wiser for the government to establish in court as well as on the strength of the opinion of the law officers that it is intra vires. I may say, fortunately or unfortunately, that the issue raises questions upon which people have differences of opinion and what I have sought to suggest is that a point of compromise must be arrived at. I think a crompromise here is not undesirable in our circumstances and in this year 1950. There are others who do not agree with me. So far as the hon. members of the official opposition are concerned, they will express their opinions and it willnot be necessary for them to absent themselves from this House rather than express their opinion.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): Bill number 116 if passed by this Assembly willgive to the cities of Toronto and Windsor the right to have commercial sports on Sundays between definite set hours and willallow the rest of the province of Ontario, the cities, towns and townships to vote and then these municipalities will be accorded similar rights to those accorded to the

cities of Toronto and Windsor in this Bill.

The particular point I want to make at this time is this, I am not opposed to sports or playing games on Sunday. I think the Lord's Day Act allows very wide latitude in regard to the engaging in sports on Sunday. The particular deterring factor against sports is that admission to these sports shall not be charged. In our minds at this time as we seek to analyze our own position, there arises before our mind's eye this clear line, of demarcation between commercial sports and other sports. I believe that if the city of Toronto and the city of Windsor had given some thought to organized sports and playing facilities for their people on Sunday on a commercial basis, that the people of these municipalities would have cast a negative vote when they were asked in the two recent votes held in Windsor and Toronto.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: It was because these municipalities failed to develop within their own territories these sports and the facilities for these sports that the people in a frustrated manner burst out and voted for this. I suggest to you and to the House that is one very definite reason why at this time we should go slow in giving approval to this particular legislation. I am convinced, as I stand before you that if these things I suggest were done in these municipalities, the vote would have been negative on the issues involved. If the vote would have been negative, then I suggest that the majority of these people do not want commercial sports and that must weigh on us as we consider this particular matter.

With regard to the Bill itself, if one wants to be specific on the hours that are set in the Bill, if we are going to have commercial sports, why not have them between 1.30 o'clock and 6 o'clock.

With regard to the simple majority required to bring in

or throw out sports, I suggest to you, Mr. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that there is roomfor argument as to whether the simple majority gave approval. I think it would be well to have some consideration for the liquor control vote in regard tothis matter. The way this Bill is drawn a municipality could this month vote for commercial sports and within the next couple of months 10% of the electorate could force another vote and throw out commercial sports. I think with a simple majority we are going to have a continual in-and-out business and it will cause a good deal of confusion in these localities. It would be better to have something more definite in regard to the majority required before sports are permitted on a commercial basis or could be voted out. Another matter that isnot dealt with in this Bill; in the city of Toronto and in the city of Windsor it is considered that in these large metropolitan areas the playgrounds could be employed by the people for the sports and they could remove the playgrounds far enough so that they would not interfere with residential sections, schools, or Sunday schools or churches at the time the sports are taking place. That might be true in the city of Toronto and inthe city of Windsor, but it isnot true in 101 other municipalities that lie outside these two cities. When youget into small cities and towns and townships in Ontario,and that township votes to have commercial sports, you are going to find that the sports ground where the playing takes place is close to a church or a residential section and you are going to have a continual uproar and confusion on the part of these people who are annoyed because of the sports and the confusion attached thereto. And then there is this angle. The government says in the Bill that this will apply to cities and towns and townships. I can visualize, and so can the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in certain counties you might have a small compact community that would be able to get a 51% vote for commercial

sports. You might have that community right in the middle of a county and the rest of the county would be 75% or 80% opposed to sports on Sunday. That would be a nucleus and it would cause terrific embarrassment to the people in that area.

It seems to me these are important, the fundamental thing is what I mentioned earlier. At the moment, at least, I cannot vote for the second reading of the Bill.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): I find myself in just about complete agreement with the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister in opening this debate. Of course the mere fact that I say that,may not help him very much in any accounting he may have to make to the people of Ontarioat some future date. I think his statement was very forthright and made very sincerely. I may say that when he mentioned the condition of his early upbringing,he was giving a rather accurate description of my own because I was bornin a Presbyterian home, I was not allowed to shine my shoes on a Sunday, and my sisters were not allowed to wash the dishes. I had to go to church on Sunday morning and not only have to stay for the English service, which lasted an hour, I would have to stay an additional hour for the Gaelic service, and then there would be Sunday school in the evening and again at night. I was content in my house to regard Sunday as a day of rest and nothing has happened to me since those days that caused me to regard Sunday in any other light.

I spend my Sundays with my wife and family, very quietly and on not a few occasions, you may be surprised to hear, I have even spoken from the pulpit of at least one Toronto church on a number of Sundays. That being the case, I am frank to say that I have no strong feeling whatever on this question. If I was voting for my own personal preferences in the plebiscite in Toronto, my desire for myself would be tohave Sunday remain as it always was. I have no desire to go to see a hockey game

or a baseball game on a Sunday.

I think it should be pointed out that the people who decided to place this issue before the electorate of Toronto ---- don't know anything about Windsor, but the people who made this decision to place it before the electors of Toronto did not have cleanhands and pure hearts. The motivation to place it before the people of Toronto was political. It was a move designed to bring out a large vote in order to keep certain people off the City Council and the Board of Control. Let us be frank. They did that believing it would bring out a large vote and that Sunday sport would be divided, and along with Sunday sport a number of other people would go down under an avalanche.

That is exactly what I thought. I thought the people in Toronto would vote against it and so did those of my colleagues who are in civic life. Inthe case of others it was not forthright and it was a case of let your comscience be your guide and vote as you desire. Well, of course, the result of the vote has already been described by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

It is known in thatarea of Toronto that I represent in this House that the vote was rather heavily in favor of Sunday sport. Now, I notice in the Star of a few days ago this statement by a man called the Revl J. A. Pue-Gilchrist in Kimbourne Park United church on Sunday. I will read it to you. I am quoting from the Toronto Daily Star of March the 20th:

> "The premier should note that the vote for the open Sunday was the voice of vice-ridden Windsor and the gangster-plagued slums of Toronto," he said, stressing that the majority for Sunday commercialized sport in Toronto came from Wards Four and Five, "where there are many Communists and foreign-born people."

That is the way he describes Bellwoods, and I say that is the most shocking statement that came from any clergyman in Toronto. My riding is not a gangster-plagued riding, my constituency is a good constituency and is composed of very fine citizens. I must hasten to say that the desire for sports and recreation onthe part of some of the people I represent is not connected with the condition under which these people have to live. The centre and south part of my constituency has very crowded housing conditions and very few parks and a great percentage in my riding do not have cars. So it is the desire to get some release and relief from what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has described as the "crowded ways of life." That had a great deal to do with the vote in favor.

Now the people have spoken and I must say for my part, and this may be one of the few occasions that it might be possible to say this, I want to say in the circumstances I do not see how, in the province of Ontario today in view of the relationship of political parties in this province, the party now in power can gain very many political kudos from this.

(Take CC follows)

MR. MacLEOD: I am assuming that if there is another election, Toronto would do what they did the last time, and perhaps a little bit better.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: I do not know. I may be wrong on that. The government draws its strength from that portion of Ontario which does not look kindly upon legislation of this kind. I think the government in this case has had the good sense and the courage to face up to something which must have given the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), and his colleagues, a great deal of concern, to come before this House with a piece of legislation which may not be perfect, but, nevertheless, under its terms recognizes the right of the majority to get what they have expressed a desire for, in a properly conducted vote.

That being the case, Mr. Speaker, we will support the Bill when the vote is taken, and I want to assure those who may not share our feeling in the matter, that if a Bill comes before this House, to impose upon the whole province of Ontario that which is being given to the city of Toronto and the city of Windsor, I should feel very strongly that I did not have the right to impose on the people in other parts of this province something which they just did not want.

But in this case, I think the Bill gives us a way out; it gives to Windsor and Toronto the right to do that thing for which they voted in this plebiscite, and it gives other municipalities in this province the opportunity of conducting a similar vote, and gaining for themselves the same privileges which are granted to Toronto and Windsor.

I have no word of censure for the government. I think they have done justly, and I think they have faced up to the problem, as I said a moment ago, with courage, and I shall have

a clear conscience in casting my vote for the Bill.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that in the introduction of this Bill the government fails to assume its responsibilities, and by the introduction of the local option feature, it is merely "passing the buck" to the municipalities the question of a decision with regard to Sunday sports.

Now, a great deal has been said about the vote in the city of Toronto, and I would like to analyze that vote for just a moment or two. There are on the provincial lists in the city of Toronto, the names of 467,000 voters. On the municipal lists, in the city of Toronto, there are the names of 320,000 voters. Now, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) stated that this was a strictly democratic vote. I want to say that I think it was a strictly undemocratic vote, when one third of the total men and women of the city were denied the right to express their opinions upon this question. I believe if we are going to decide a question which is going to change the way of life of the people of Ontario, which they have enjoyed ever since Ontario was first a province, all the people of this community should be entitled to express their opinion.

The vote broken down, results in this, that 87,000 people voted in favour of Sunday sports and 82,000 voted against it.

In this case, 5000 people are going to decide the policy for the province of Ontario; the other four million people are going to have their vote on Sunday sports decided by the vote of 5,000 people.

MR.SPEAKER: I am sorry, I cannot permit that. I want to be absolutely fair, but the Bill does not extend, as I understand it, to the other four million people of the province,

I think you must be quite fair. It does not deal with the other four million. That is my understanding of the Bill itself. It is not a compulsory matter.

MR. TEMPLE: Mr.Speaker, I was about to observe that by the local option feature --

MR. SPEAKER: Has the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) a question on my ruling?

MR. JOLLIFFE: What the hon. member for High Park (Mr.Temple) was saying was clearly a matter of opinion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I would never have called the hon. member (Mr. Temple) to order if he were expressing an opinion. This was a statement of fact.

MR. TEMPLE: I think when I complete my remarks, Mr. Speaker, you will find that I was entirely in order. I was about to say that under this Bill the four million people of Ontario will be faced constantly, year after year, with the question of voting on commercialized sports in their municipalities. I believe that every town, village and city of this province are annually going to be faced with a vote, caused by certain selfish individuals who wish to use commercialzed sport on Sundays in order to make a profit for themselves.

By the local option principle, we will keep the people of Ontario in a constant state of unrest. We will have a hodge-podge of votes around the province, and I believe this question should have been decided by the government of the province, on a provincial-wide basis, and not passing it back for 86,000 people to decide, as in the case of Toronto.

The question in Toronto boils down to this; 86,000 voted in favour, 82,000 voted against it, giving a majority of 5,000 votes in favour of Sunday sport, when actually only 18 percent. of the eligible voters in Toronto voted in favour of

those sports.

I want to say that I believe the passage of this Bill exalts materialism; it gives to certain selfish interests the right to exploit Sunday for their own selfish purposes.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, may I say a word? Do I understand the hon. member (Mr.Temple) correctly? Did he mean to say that the 5,000 majority in Toronto should be stacked against the vote in Pembroke, Renfrew, Arnprior and Almonte, and all these other small towns, who could not have 7,000 votes; that the 7,000 votes here was going to uptset all the votes down in the Ottawa Valley? I say "no". That is not the feeling of the people of this province.

MR. TEMPLE: I would like to resume my trend of thought, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say that I do not w nt to work myself on Sunday, and therefore, I do not think I have any right to ask anybody else to work on Sunday for my entertainment or amusement.

The passage of this Bill will permit commercial activities on Sundays, and that means that men and women are going to be forced to work, men and women who enjoy a rest on Sundays as much as I do, men and women who may wish to go to church on Sundays as I do, and I say, by passing this Bill, we are permitting the way of life of the people of Ontario, which they have followed for the past 150 years, to be changed by a very, very small majority of the people of the city of Toronto.

I do not believe it is democratic. I think it is anything but democratic.

I just want to close by saying this, that I would like to see the tennis courts,and the swimming pools, and rinks, and baseball fields open on Sunday for the youth of this city, in

order that they may engage in wholesome, clean, outdoor activities, but I do not want to see the city of Toronto, or any other community, turn to commercialized Sunday sports and activities, such as we see in the country to the south of us. I do not believe the people of Ontario will be any better for having Sundays such as they have south of the line.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first of the wedges into a wide-open Sunday. We will see the demand for beer parlours -- and this government has never shown any reluctance toward the sale of beer on any day in the week --

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I say at once, that as long as this government is in office, there will be no sale of liquor in this province on Sunday.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member (Mr. Temple) should be a little more termperate in his positive statements. We are not discussing the sale of beer on Sundays.

MR. DUNBAR: That is just a pure clap trap --

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. DUNBAR: That is what it is, clap trap, right from the gutter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I must rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I do so with respect. You may have noticed the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) failed to sit down while you were speaking --

Hon. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Oh, go on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. TEMPLE: I will close immediately, Mr. Speaker, but I wish to say this, that this government has never shown any

reluctance to sell beer as openly as they can, on six day of the week.

Hon. L. P. CECILE (Minister of Travel and Publicity): You are a liar.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Some hon. member made a very unparliamentary remark. I have no idea who he is. That remark must be withdrawn.

MR. CECILE: I will withdraw it.

MR. DUNBAR: What can you expect when listening to all this clap trap?

MR. SPEAKER: It is twenty minutes to ten, and I do not know how the hon. members feel, but I am sure that we want to get away at a decent time tonight. I understand you have six or eight Estimates to pass. Let us get on with the Debate. The Debates so far have been on a very high plane, almost on a spiritual level, up to this point.

We are dealing with a very important subject, and it is not a subject to be dragged into the ground. Whether we are in favour of it, or opposed to it, makes no difference, and I do feel that the hon. members will want to keep the debate on a high plane. I know we are enthusiastic one way or the other, but whichever way our enthusiasm leads, let us be temperate in dealing with a very, very vital subject.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): One correction, Mr. Speaker. Some of us are not "enthusiastic".

MR. SPEAKER: We will not have a discussion on that subject.

MR. TEMPLE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say this that I very, very much regret the introduction of commercialism on Sunday into the province of Ontario. It has never been here before, and I am sure all of us have noticed the conditions south of the line, and I believe they are not in the interests of the people of this province.

I must vote against this Bill on second reading.

MR. DUNBAR: You are not speaking for Ontario.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. TEMPLE: I did not say I was.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Let us act as hon. members of the Legislature.

MR. F. J. HUNT (Renfrew North): Mr. Speaker, when I came down at the opening of this Session, I came down here firmly convinced I would oppose any Bill which had to do with commercialized sport any place in Ontario on Sunday. I came down convinced, for two very good reasons. The first was that I felt the people of my riding are not in favour of commercialized sports; the second was, because we had a little experience in the town of Pembroke just a few years ago. We are in close proximity to Petawawa Camp, and for a number of years, while the Petawawa Camp was open, our movies used to open up at 12 o'clock on Sunday night, and you could see a line-up of our young people to buy tickets, who should have been home and in bed at that particular hour.

I would like to add this, that on several occasions I have stated what my intentions were, but I would like to say this for the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) and all the hon. members of the government, that no coercion has been used to bring anybody into line. I intend to vote for this Bill, because I think it is a good Bill.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HUNT: I think every hon. member of this Legislature can support it. I think it is democratic; I think it is a democratic way of handling this problem. It is leaving it with the responsibility on the municipalities, and they can decide whether the people of those municipalities want Sunday sports or not.

Like the hon. Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Oliver) I have no objection to sports on Sunday.

Since 1919, when I came out of the Army, I have on many occasions attended sports on Sunday and have paid admission fees, and it is not through any self-righteous convictions that I was inclined to take any opposite view.

There is one other reason, and I think a very good reason, as far as I am concerned personally.

We have a good hockey team in the town of Pembroke, which is in the play-offs. A great many of the people who came to me and voiced their opposition to any Bill to permit commercialized sports on Sunday in Ontario, have seen fit to arrange to send our hockey team down in Buckingham to take part in Sunday games. If they can take this view, I cannot see any reason why I should not support this Bill, and support it conscientiously, and I intend to vote for the Bill.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DONALD BAXTER (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr.Speaker, I do not wish to prolong the Debate to any great length, but I would like to say, just by way of mentioning my past history, that the minister of the United Church, who now leads in prayer our hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) on Sunday was my mentor, in my days of Young People's work in the United Church. I can understand, knowing the warm friendship between the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and this minister, how deep this matter must have gone in the mind of our hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) before he presented this Bill.

Likewise, I have always been impressed by the democratic way of life, and the rule that the majority rules, and for that reason, I have every respect for the wishes of an apparent majority of the citizens of Toronto and of Windsor, and I am only standing here tonight to say that I feel they should have the right to do what they have expressed as their wish.

My hon. leader (Mr. Oliver) in his remarks previously, covered to a very great extent the thoughts I always had in my mind. I do think that to a far greater extent than we realize, it was indeed a lack of suitable playgrounds in these cities, which led to the result of the vote last January. I do feel that had a more agressive attitude been taken on the part of those who were civic leaders, and not the backward attitude they did take, we would not have any need for this Debate in this Legislature at this time. I cannot agree with what I believe was the expression used by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) when he said this did not necessarily mean that casting a vote for this Bill in this Chamber would force us to an expression of the same opinion back home. I feel that our actions here and our words are watched very closely by those people, even on the back concessions, and I feel that "old man Ontario" who now lives in Prince Edward-Lennox, as was indicated the other day, is listening quite closely to us here tonight.

Coming as I do from a rural constituency, I have had many letters and many visits from people out there -- fathers and mothers -- who cherish the Sunday as they have known it for years, not only for themselves, but for those youngsters who are coming on, and they have asked me to oppose this Bill.

Not only because at one time I was a Sunday School superintendent, but I can see the obstacles which are in the way of Sunday observance on the part of those leaders in this church work, and I am still very strongly against this Bill, because, after all, we men and women sitting here are the legislators for this province. We are the ones who speak for them on every important subject. And by our actions here on this Bill, if we support it, we are putting the stamp of approval, in my opinion, on organized, commercialized Sunday sports, and we are openiug the way -- in just a small way it

may be now -- but we are opening the way to a much more wider open Sunday than many of us have any desire for. For these reasons, I find I must vote against this Bill.

MR. B. E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, as we do not want to stay very late tonight, I would just like to rise to state my position in regard to this Bill. I feel when any municipality has given a democratic vote either for or against anything that comes before this Legislature, as a true democrat, I must support it.

In the city of Toronto, we had a democratic vote; not a large majority, but sufficient to indicate the wishes, in my opinion, of the people of the City of Toronto, and I wish to go on record as supporting the principle of this Bill.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I will take but a very few minutes of the time of the House, but I would like to express, to begin with, the fact that I am in favour of the principle of the Bill, and I appreciate this opportunity of saying these few words, because it will be necessary for me to leave the House to catch a train very shortly, and I would not want to be accused of running away from the House at this time.

I believe this Bill puts the municipalities in kind of a tough spot. I can imagine a municipality calling a meeting and trying to decide what sports they are going to approve, and what sports they will not approve, and they will be badgered on all sides by the people who think their sports should be approved. I have a feeling that the government was fully aware of that situation, I would have been much more satisfied with the Bill, if the government had seen fit to specify, even in a broad way, the sports they were prepared to call legitimate, and those they were opposed to.

MR. PORTER: All sports, except horse-racing.

MR. ROBINSON: That opens up a tremendously big field.

I appeal to the government that in that section, that by that section, it is going to work quite a hardship on the municipalities, and I am sure that all hon. members of the House realize that it will be no small chore for municipal councils to draft by-laws under this Act, to suit all the various sections of the community, and I feel -- to use a slang expression -- there has been a little bit of "buck passing" that they took a look at this and said, "Boy, that is a hot one; we will leave it with the municipalities".

That is hardly fair, I think, on an issue of this kind.

I can see the difficulties facing any municipaly which is called upon to draft a by-law --

MR. PORTER: We are not interfering with them.

MR. ROBINSON: You are not making it any easier for them.

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, before taking myseat, that I want to make one point, that I think time will prove the very point I am raising now.

Other than that, I am in favour of the principle of the Bill.

MR. C. CALDER (London): If I may get back to that quiet tone in which the Debate opened, I would like, for the purpose of my own personal position, to take the same approach I did on another rather controversial Bill, and that is to proceed with the argument actually from the place at which it was put by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) himself.

There are many other things which could be said, and they may be said at other times and places, but in this House I will confine myself simply to the few points taken by the hon. Prime

Minister (Mr. Frost), and as far as possible use his own language.

On the constitutional point, he said he has no doubt. That may be true. He also had no doubt last year on another equally important matter, on which I think he is now a little less sure.

MR. PORTER: What is that?

MR. CALDER: I think it is called the"Charitable Gifts Act".

MR. DUNBAR: That is still bothering you?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Let us keep on the principle of this Bill. I will give all the leeway possible, but we are discussing a large enough Bill right here.

MR. PORTER: You are not right on that one.

MR. CALDER: I would point out to you, sir, that in answer to a question, I gave an answer.

Like all other hon. members here, I do not think any one of us has to take a self-righteous approach to this thing. The dominant viewpoint which weighed with me was stated by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) late this afternoon, when moving the adjournment of a Debate, when he said we should go slowly in this one field. That is a point.

(Page CC-13 follows

That is a point with which I am in sympathy. This is a Bill apparently quite smooth on its face, yet it is as thorny as could be, underneath, and for that reason only I am reluctant to go along as fast as the government wants to go---

MR. PORTER: Are you going to speed, too?

MR. CALDER: No. I will take an example from the Federal government, sir, which I think a couple of years ago introduced the Income Tax Act, an extremely complicated law, and they brought it in and immediately laid it over untilthe next Session, so that countless people could go into it and ascertain how they would be affected. That procedure might well be followed here, because legally the provisions are simple, but socially and its other implications are immense.

So far as the cities of Toronto and Windsor are concerned, I say let us give it to them as an experiment right now. They voted for it, and personally I would be prepared for a year to try it out with them. They want it. Let us see how it works there. We are being asked to try it out on the whole province of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. CALDER: There is one thing that I think we might follow up and which cannot be expressed too often, which has been pointed out very properly by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) when he said that this Bill is the result of poor housing and no town planning.

Finally, sir, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) began his statement,---

MR. PORTER: Do you want it in London?

MR. CALDER: I don't know. But I will not rush headlong into it. I may be mistaken, but I want to make a mistake onthe side of caution because the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) opened his statement by saying "This Bill opens nothing," and he closed by

saying, "It will settle the question for generations." I do not think we should be too hasty in puttigg forward this Bill before the people who do not and cannot realize the countless angles from which its troublesome features must be considered.

The hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) said on one hand "It opens nothing," and he concluded by saying, "It will settle the question for generations.

I remember the old definition that "a straight line is the shortest distance between two points." His argument has not convinced me, because it sounds like "the most flexible distance between two points."

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Speaker, in rising to express my own opinion regarding this Bill and the principles contained therein, I think I ought to make my position very clear. I would say, therefore, that I have absolutely no objection to non-commercialized Sunday sports and recreation ---none whatsoever.

I want to say also that I have no objection to the principle of a genuine system of local option on important moral issues. I think that can be resolved in a democratic way, but I have to say, as well, that I am unalterably opposed to the propositionof profit-making, commercialized Sunday sports, and I think there is a very great distinction between the two things, to one of which I have no objection, but to the other of which I am unalterably opposed.

I am strongly opposed to the Bill which is now before us, and for what I consider to be reasonable reasons.

I believe that Bill number 116 is thoroughly undemocratic; it is totally inconsistent; it moves, as the previous hon. member (Mr. Calder) has stated, with undue haste in this situation, a haste that is not called for, unless it is that there are certain interests which have their schedules drawn up--

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I want to say if the hon. member (Mr. Millard) is making inferences of that sort, they are absolutely and positively untrue, and the hon. member (Mr. Millard) knows they are untrue and yet he indulges in that sort of tactics every time he gets up. Let him try to be a gentleman, at least.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. FROST: He might try to be.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MILLARD: The hon. Premier (Mr.Frost) has suggested I am not a gentleman. I would like him to retract that.

MR. FROST: I will withdraw it, Mr.Speaker. If the hon. member (Mr. Millard) does not want to try to be a gentleman, that is all right with me.

MR. SPEAKER: Again I plead with you. There was, in my own mind, a suggestion or inference or sort of implication that there were certain influences at work in connection with this Bill. Do please let us keep this Debate on a high level. That was an inference which is a little bit questionable on the part of the hon. member (Mr. Millard) making that statement. It is tending a little bit to lower the tone of the Debate.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, what have you to say as to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) saying to the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) that what he said was untrue and that he knew it to be untrue.

MR. FROST: Mr.Speaker, I take strong objection to any hon. member opposite implying that I am a party to crooked dealings behind the scenes. I act fairly for the people of the province of Ontario, and I will not stand for that.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: In answer to the question by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), the inference was made

by the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) not by the hon. Prime Minister.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am asking for a ruling on the remark made by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

MR. SPEAKER: The inference was quite clear that there were powers behind the scenes which were affecting this Bill, which to my mind is not quite up tothe desired level of Debate. I can appreciate any hon. member rising to defend himself in such a situation. It is a serious situation, and it is not a very fair inference.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I understand what your ruling is with reference to the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard), but what I would like is your ruling on the remark made by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr Frost).

MR. FROST: If anybody accused you of being a thief, what would you do about it? That is what it amounted to. I have some regard for my personal honour, and my dealings in the interests of the people of this province. I may be wrong in some of the things I do, but I am at least honest, and I will not stand for any implication such as was made by the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard).

MR. JOLLIFFE: In answer to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) I will endeavour to clothe my remarks in Parliamentary language.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said that the remark made by the hon. member for York West (Mr Millard) was untrue, to his knowledge.

MR. SPEAKER: I have ruled on that. I defended the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), because it seemed to me there was a direct implication, and if my ruling is oont considered to be fair, I am directly subject to the ruling of the House.

There was a direct implication that there had been some

powers at work behind the scenes with regard to the presentation of this Bill. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) was not in his seat when that inference was made, but I heard it, and I have given my ruling, and I think I would feel exactly as did the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) or any other hon. member of this House if such an inference was made that there was some underhanded work going on in connection with a Bill. Even as the Speaker, I think I would be quite upset, and quite ready to defend myself under those circumstances. If there is any question on my ruling, I stand before the House.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is not a question of appeal. What I am asking you to rule on is whether the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) made the statement that what the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) said was untrue, and he knew it to be untrue, and whether that is a parliamentary statement.

(Page CC-18 follows)

That is what I am asking the ruling upon, not on the remarks which led up to it.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) believedthe statement was untrue, he has a right to say so.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He said it was known to the hon. member (Mr. Millard) to be untrue. That must be withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: This is getting to be rather childish. It seems to me the hon. member who made the statement (Mr. Millard), was the first one to make the accusation, and if there is to be any retraction, I would suggest that the hon. member who made it (Mr. Millard) should make the first retraction.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEARKER: There will be no applause on any ruling by the Speaker.

The hon. member (Mr. Millard) has the floor.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I cannot retract what I have said and I believethat Hansard will show, if it is correctly reported tomorrow, that what I said that there was no need for undue haste in this matter, unless it was because of the necessity of somebody drawing up a schedule.

MR. FROST: That is just a guttersnipe suggestion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, I want that statement withdrawn.

MR. FROST: All right, I will withdraw it, so we can get on with the business.

MR. SPEAKER: This debate will be cut off in short order by my leaving the rostrum. We are going to conduct this debate in a decent way. I am awfully sorry that this situation has arisen. I would ask the hon. member (Mr. Millard) if he will please keep the debate on a high level without inference, without insinuation, without inuendo, and without even suggestions. If he has a case to present, he will have a fair hearing, as will any hon. member of

this House who is speaking. If he does not do that, the debate will be adjourned, and we will carry on at some time when the tempers have cooled off. We are dealing with a very significant and important subject.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, it may be proven to me that I am not capable of getting onto a high level--

MR. SPEAKER: I do not want any suggestions. Get on with the debate.

MR. MILLARD: I believe I was in order and on a high level in saying what I said, in view ofthe background of this case.

Now, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has treated us with a long account, a sort of form of review.. in which this particular Bill falls. And he read portions of an extract from the pages of the Toronto press, in which it was stated that certain controllers in the city of Toronto were urging that petitions be sent in, for the very reason that the baseball schedule had to be drawn up. That is why it was put in here. That is common knowledge. It was in the press, and further that there were negotiations on the part of the commercial interests behind the baseball club---the Maple Leafs, I believe they are called---to get this legislation passed so that the matter would be resolved and they could proceed and draw up their schedules for this year. That is not an unknownfact, and, therefore, was not an insinuation,

MR. FROST: Does the hon. member (Mr. Millard) infer that has anything to do with our decision to bring in this Bill?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, do not be so childish.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. FROST: I do want the honl member (Mr. Millard) to be honest. Why skate around the issue? Come out and say what you have to say. Surely you are not afraid to say things in this House, that you will be going out and sneaking around outside of

this House, and saying these different things. Come out and say anything now you have to say.

MR. MILLARD: I will ask the hon. leader of the government (Mr. Frost) to withdraw that remark. I do not have to "sneak" around anywhere, in this country of ours.

MR. FROST: All right; I will withdraw it.

MR. MILLARD: I will add, that that is borne out, and was even mentioned this evening, and there was no objection taken to the proposal, but inotherBills we have been counselled by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to go slowly, in regard to other Bills, concerning the removal of the means test,

(CC-21 follows)

the adoption of a Fair Employment Practice Act, which was recommended unanimously by the hon. members of the Opposition, and to which other hon. members of this House have subscribed. But in that case it was suggested that we move with deliberation, and with caution, but in this case it is first brought in here without being provided for in the Notices of Motion, and they were anxious to get this Bill on this afternoon, and now it comes up tonight, and I think I had some reason for saying that there seemed to be undue haste in this case.

The next point I would like to make is this: I said the Bill, in my opinion, is inconsistent. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in one breath says we must eliminate horse racing, as a sport, on Sunday --

MR. FROST: Because of the gambling.

MR. MILLARD: Because of the gambling?

MR. FROST: Yes, that is right.

MR. MILLARD: I frankly agree, The fact is there will be gambling going on in connection with commercial sports. It occurs with other sports, outside of horse racing; if you cannot stop gambling on horse racing, you cannot stop it on other forms of commercialized sports on Sunday. This House today indicated its readiness to go into the business of gambling, through a horse racing commission, and the control of the pari-mutuel machines, they are going into the gambling business, and I say to the hon. members of this House, when we go into commercialized Sunday sports, we are going into the gambling business.

AN hon. MEMBER: Did you ever gamble?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MILLARD: Because out of every dollar that is taken

in these games there will be coming in for the purpose of making profits, ten cents as an amusement tax.

MR. FROST: Fifteen cents, my dear boy.

MR. MILLARD: Well, fifteen cents. It is going up. So every hon. member of this Legislature, when they vote on this Bill, will have to decide whether we want to go into the business of Sunday commercial sports or not, because we are going to be in it, and when we consider the estimates next year, and the public accounts, we are going to consider the revenue derived from this business, and we are going to engage the people of the province of Ontario in the business of Sunday commercial sports, whether they like it or not, if we pass this Bill. There is no question about that. That is very plain. It is contained in the Bill.

Then I would like to indicate that this also proves that we have accepted a very vicious principle, in my opinion, In this case, we have two municipalities taking a referandum on two different questions, but we see in the Bill that it shall be deemed to have voted in the affirmative on the question set out in subsection 1. So without any further reference to the people of Toronto, or the people of Windsor, they say, "You have got it". They say, "Now, the only recourse for you is by a simple majority vote to repeal, with a restricted electorate. That is what we see here in this Bill.

I would like to read to the hon. members of this House, and make it a matter of record, that in the city of Windsor it was not the same question as that asked of the people of Toronto. Do you not believe that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) purposely evaded giving this particular question --

MR. FROST: The hon. member (Mr. Millard) knows full well --

MR. PORTER: Both of the questionswere read verbatim on the first reading of the Bill.

MR. CHALLIES: I think you were elusive that day, and were not here when that was read.

MR. MILLARD: I have read the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Why do you say it was not read?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Proceed, please.

MR. MILLARD: I said the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) did not read it tonight.

MR. PORTER: We assume that the hon. members have some intelligence.

MR. MILLARD: If you are speaking of yourself, that is a big assumption.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. PORTER: It is, in your case.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MILLARD: That is a very big assumption on your part.

(Page CC-24 follows)

MR. HANNA: What is the hon. member's (Mr. Millard) game anyway?

MR. SPEAKER: Order .

MR. MILLARD: The question in Windsor, as Mr. Speaker undoubtedly knows, was totally different from the question put to the people of the city of Toronto. The question in the city of Windsor was:

> "Are you in favour of the city of Windsor making application to the Ontario government to adopt a policy of local option in the enforcement of the Lord's Act, so that specified forms of sport or entertainment might be permitted locally, when the municipal council so requests."

That is not the principle of this Bill. Then, in here it says straightforwardly:

> "Specific forms of sport or entertainment".

We are not dealing with entertainment in this Bill at all.

MR. PORTER: Do you think we should?

MR. MILLARD: I will not lead up to that point, except to say that in my humble judgment -- and being dishonest and all the rest of it, sneaking around in the dark, as suggested, probably my judgment is not very good-- but in my humble judgment what we are doing in this Bill is just the forerunner of entertainment in other forms, because I think that this Bill is totally inconsistent. How can you say to a baseball club owner: "You are permitted to operate under the provincial Act", but to the man who owns a picture show, say: "You are not permitted to operate under this Act. It discriminates against you."

MR. FROST: Does the hon. member (Mr. Millard) want the

theatres to open in this province on Sunday?

MISS MACPHAIL: Why not?

(Take DD-1 follows)

MR. MILLARD: I will answer that question, Mr. Speaker. Now I have been asked--

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): The hon. member (Mr. Millard) can propose an amendment.

MR. MILLARD: Why does this government suppose everybody wants to go to a baseball game?

MR. FROST: Because they voted for it.

MR. MILLARD: They did not vote for it. That was not on the question either in Windsor or in Toronto. Why does the government suggest a man might not want to go for his recreation to a picture show? But they say "No," and I am convinced, Mr. Speaker--

MR. DUNBAR: That is indoor sport.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MILLARD: --that it is just a matter of time--

AN hon. MEMBER: Is that your sport, George? (Mr. Dunbar).

MR. MILLARD: As I say, Mr. Speaker, it is just a matter of time and probably not too much time when these people--will say they have a legitimate claim on this Legislature and on municipal councils---why should they be deprived of the growing price of entertainment and yet other groups operate their particular sport on Sunday? But that is not taken into consideration.

I refer again to this vote at Windsor. Windsor says: "We will make application to this government to establish a policy." So what does the government do? The government says: "We will give you a Bill and it will be deemed that you voted in favor of the Bill. You have got it."

I come now to this question of the restricted franchise.

MR. PORTER: They canhave another vote if they like.

MR. MILLARD: We have an anomaly here tonight. Probably I should not mention it, I sho ld leave it for the hon. member in question. The anomaly consists in the fact we have an hon. member of this Legislature living in the city of Toromto who did not have a vote on the question before the electors, but he is asked to come to this Legislature and vote on this entire Bill for this province.

AN hon.MEMBER: Who is he?.

MR. MILLARD: You see, he was denied the franchise, he did not have the judgment necessary, under the Municipal Act to cast a decision on this question on a local option basis, but he is asked to come to this Legislature and pass on it for all the province. That is an anomaly, surely, and that bears out the point which was made by other speakers in the debate, that thisfranchise is altogether restricted.

I said the local option procedure provided inthe Bill is absolutely and wholly undemocratic. In thelabor law---and God forbid we should have that kind of thing in this particular Baill ---we have to get a majority of all those eligible to vote before we get certified under the Labor Rel tions Act, and the Bill we have considered recently is not much better in that regard. I would not suggest that. I do not recommend it, I think it is wholly undemocratic. I am prepared to take a majority of those who participate in the election, provided everybody has had the opportunity.

AN hon. MEMBER: You would be just the same asyou are now.

MR. MILLARD: But I am absolutely opposed to a minority deciding in the name of a majority, and I believe the Bill should provide that if we are going to stick to majority basis, it should be a majority of a majoity, that a majority should vote before the majority can decide in that issue. Then I think it would be fair. It isnot fair under the present setup of this

Bill.

I direct the attention of the government to another feat re which I think is absolutely wrong. Not many people quarrel with this in many Bills, but those who have drafted the Bill, I think, were mistaken when in one section of the Bill, the concluding section, the Act is referred to as "this may be called The Lord's Day Act (Ontario)". Now, surely that is going to be very confusing and I would suggest to the government if we are going to persist in putting this Bill on thestatute books---and inthat persistence I might say that I will be opposed if the government is going to proceed and insist in putting it on the statute books, then I strongly urge they change the short title of the Act and make it what the Act provides for, that is to provide exemptions or exdeptions to the Lord's Day Act of Canada. Certainly we do not want to get two Lord's Day Acts all mixed up together in this situation. Let us be sure of what we are doing in that regard. I want to conclude my rem rks with two other ideas which, it seems to me, are rather important. I happen to represent a riding which is on theoutskirts of the city of Toronto. There are a number of municipalities in that particular riding and they had no say regarding this referendum which was taken in the city of Toronto, all they could go by was what the papers said and the controversies backward and forward on this question. I say the question was not thoroughly discussed. There was a lot of confusion because there was nothing specific the electors were to vote on, except to make a petition to this government for some type of legislation to permit certain types of sports and things to be played on Sunday---commercial sports. During the campaign, and I will leave this to the judgment of thehon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to read the press, it was time and time again indicated that the question. involved was the

question of amateur sport, non-commercial sport and that was really one of the main reasons for taking the referendum, to make amateur or non-commercial sport more readily available to people. I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, a lot of people voted in that election, some from emotion, some from conviction, some from a sense of heed, possibly some, as the hon. member said, out of a sense of frustration in the situation, but at least it was confused;

MR. PORTER: Thehon. member (Mr. Millard) does not trust the people.

MR. FROST: That is plain.

MR. PORTER: He does not trust the people.

MR.MILLARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how thehon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) draws that conclusion from what I have said, but his devious reasoning, I am sure I could not follow anyway.

(Page DD-5 follows)

MR. PORTER: I did not give any reasons.

MR. MILLARD: So I am not at all surprized at that kind of reaction on his part. However, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to hon. members of this House, that in my opinion there should be no previous votes allowed under this Bill. I said in the beginning I am absolutely in favour of placing this matter before the people and letting the people decide, but I do not believe we are justified in an inconclusive question that was put and a different question again in Windsor and proceeding on that basis to say that those votes shall be considered as having qualified under this particular Act, and that the only rememdy to those who are not in favour is to bring on a vote for repeal.

My next point is that the people in West York, South York, and East York, where there was no vote taken, are definitely affected by this particular decision in this Bill, and I think it is an imposition to impose this Bill, because, as an hon. member previously said, some 5,000 of a majority of those voting -- it was a minority vote -- in Toronto decided in favour of some type of Sunday sport -- "Some type of Sunday sport". It was a very indefinite question, but because that happened, the government feels constrained, feels it necessary, feels it urgent, if you please, to bring in a Bill here that is going to affect, yes, all the suburban municipalities, and certainly in the final analysis all of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MILLARD: And so, Mr. Speaker, I believe this government ought, as suggested by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), who does not share my entire view in this matter but who I thi k will agree with me on one point, at least make this apply on a uniform basis to all municipalities under the Act and not exempt some, as suggested by the Act.

And, too, that the matter do be held over,

until proclamation and that proclamation should not come until we find the Bill is in fact sound law. That is a reasonable request, that everybody ought to have the opportunity of voting on exactly the same basis on specific questions and not on indefinite questions as has been done in Toronto and Windsor. Also, that this Legislature should not proceed to pass a law which is bound to be questioned, bound to go into the municipal arenas across this province, bound to be taken up by some and rejected by others, it is going to destroy the unanimity that has existed up until this time in a questionable, so far as I am concerned, direction.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to make an earnest plea to this government that they withhold this Bill as they are doing in the case of other Bills, that they take a little bit of their advice and go slow, let the thing rest, get some further opinion on the matter, modify the two clauses that I have suggested and give very serious consideration to putting this on the universal franchise basis.

I believe that all our young people, all those people who live in crowded areas in the cities, ought to have the right to express themselves. I realize in doing that the tendency may very well be that there would be a bigger majority in favour of Sunday sports. But let us make it democratic, let those people have a say, because, hon. members of this Legislature, those people are going to have to live by the consequences of these Acts in the future, and if they are going to assume that responsibility, it seems to me as adult citizens they ought to be given the opportunity of participating in these local option votes all across this province.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the government to hold up this Bill, or if they are going to pass it, to modify these clauses in

line with the suggestions I have made and then save if for proclamation until we are sure it is sound law and before we authorize the various municipalities to get into this scramble under the urge of commercial interests who want to bring in first commericalized Sunday sport and then commercialized entertainment and then the wide open Sunday in this province.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, after so much has been said on this Bill, I doubt whether it is possible for me to add any new light, and in any case I assure you it is not my thought to add any new heat, but I do feel that I would like simply to place my position on record and before you, sir, on this very important Bill before the vote is taken.

I have a great deal of sympathy with what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said tonight of his background and of his early life in this province. My own was very similar indeed, except that it was inthe Methodist church instead of the Presbyterian, but certainly we were brought up to the very strict observance of the Lord's Day and those early teachings are very difficult to evade, even if we wanted to at this late stage.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) also said this afternoon that he must do things according to his own light, and certainly in this vote, Mr. Speaker, I must vote according to my own light, and that is against this Bill.

As Ilook back over a rather lengthy experience in this House and participating in many, many divisions and never yet having walked out on one, and with very, very few votes that after consideration I would change, I am cer-

tainly not going to vote now and be sorry for it afterwards, I cnn assure you.

As my hon. friend the member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) gave one instance that he felt was not fair, other instances could be given on the other side in connection with this controversy in the city of Toronto. Just yesterday I noticed a statement ---from an alderman in the Council, who said that now the city could unlock the gates of the parks and let the kiddies use the swingson Sundays. Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, they can do it now, but they could have done it before this vote was taken and before this Bill was introduced in the House---a statement just as unfair as that which the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) took exception to.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, may I make a correction. That statement was made by a Controller.

MR. NIXON: I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg).

MR. SALSBERG: And a member of the party to which thehon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) belongs.

MR. NIXON: Well now, Mr. Speaker, the "member of the party" business has no influence on me. Surely this matter is not a party matter. It certainly is not as far asI am concerned. I respect my hon. friend's (Mr. Salsberg) correction as between Controller and alderman, in fact I hesitated for a moment to get the word "Controller", but it slipped my mind, and I used the word "alderman." I accept the correction as to that, but as far asmy hon. friend's (Mr. Salsberg) other suggestion, I think it is totally out of place.

Let me say, with others who have spoken here tonight, that I am not opposed to Sunday sport and Sunday recreation. Like the hon.Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), one of my few Sunday afternoon occupations is to drive around the constituency and the country, and in doing so I see groups of young people play-

ing ball in the fields and having a good time, doing nobody any harm. Sometimes there is quite an aggregation of spectators there and I think it is all to the good, I have no objection to that whatever. and in my own little village, my service club, when I was president of it, I went to a great deal of labor and expense, to provide a rink and paid for the upkeep of a sheet of ice whenever possible, and the young people of the community skate there on Sunday and play hockey on Sunday. We did ask them not to use it during church hours, but they have a good time and do no harm to anybody and get the benefit of outdoor recreation and sport, and I say it is all to the good.

I agree entirely with the hon. leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Oliver) that if these cities had made more effort to provide recreational facilities for their people and not keep their parks locked on Sundays so that the kiddies could not use the swings, then there would not have been this upsurge of public opinion of which thehon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) talks, and I think they might well try it out on that basis and give the people the facilities for recreation. We know at Sunnyside they allow them to use the facilities there for bathing, which are greatly enjoyed by all the people; why could they not let them use the facilities they have here in the beautiful parks of this city?

The government seems to feel they are compelled to give recreation to these two plebiscites that were held in the city of Toronto and in the city of Windsor. Now, Mr.Speaker, plebiscites have been often held in municipalities as "straw" votes to get an indication of the opinion of the people and not under any legislation of this House, and the government of the day did not feel that they were compelled to give immediate recognition to those plebiscites and the vote of the people.

I know in the city of Brantford---and hon. friends opposite will remember this---they held a municipal vote on permitting the city to go into the milk business. It carried by a large majority and the Bill was presented to this House, and we had no hesitation whatever in throwing it out.

Why should the government feel they should give immediate recognition to these two plebiscites which were simply held as a straw vote, without any legislation justifying them or authorizing them in any way whatever? I say we are not under any obligation to pass this Act because two municipalities took a straw vote without any authority of legislation by this House, to see how their people felt on the question of commercialized Sunday sport.

I agree entirely withthe views my hon. friend the member for West York (Mr. Millard) expresses so emphatically and ably and I am in accord withour people enjoying the facilities of sports on Sunday, the recreation, the benefits of being in the outdoors, but I am unalterably opposed to the comercialized scheme which this Bill places before the municipalities for their consideration and which unquestionably will disrupt our municipalities tremendously. I doubt whether there will be many of them that willnot have this issue placed before their councils within the next two or three years. I cannot agree that I could vote one way in this House and a different way back in my own constituency. I believe my constituency would be 80% opposed to this legislation, as I am, and as I intend to vote here tonight.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that such an innocent Bill should cause such a controversy in this House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. ELLIS: And especially in view of the fact the Bill has given permission to the city of Windsor and the city of Toronto to do something their people voted for. I do want to take exception to the statement of the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) when he said there was a possibility the people in either of those communities were "frustrated" at the time they voted.

AN hon. MEMBER: The people of Windsor are never frustrated.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. ELLIS: I want to assure the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) that insofar as the people of Windsor were concerned, they were far from frustrated, in fact if I am not too badly mistaken I was one of the frustrated people in that community on that particular election day, because I may say I ran a campaign in that particular election and thought I knew what public opinion was. I thought the people of Windsor were opposed to Sunday sport and, being a good neighbor and a good citizen, I wanted to do what my neighbors and my fellow citizens wanted, and so I went to the polls with my good wife and voted against Sunday sport, and, lo and behold, when the vote was counted, it was not those who did the talking that won the election; it was the silent vote that came out and voted for the proposition for Sunday sport. They were unheard from and during the course of the campaign there was no attempt by myself or anybody else who was running that campaign to make this a major issue in that particular election. The only thing we heard was the opposition that was expressed by groups of individuals and by organizations to the principle of Sunday sport, so that I feel the vote there was a spontaneous vote, I think it came from the hearts of the people and it proved that is what they want---Sunday sport.

You know, while I have always supported the principle, because I was born and raised in the West , and I well remember on Sundays there we Irish Presbyterians used to go to church in the morning and then play football in the afternoon and drink tea and then go back to church at evening to rest after our strenuous afternoon.

AN hon. MEMBER: Drink tea? That is an understatement.

MR. ELLIS: I often feel that is the type of people we have in Windsor.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. ELLIS: I mean, the people of Windsor think very much like the people in my own little home town in the West. There the question probably has been brought on by the fact that we are so close to a large American city, where these privileges are enjoyed, and probably that has some bearing on the opinion of the people in our city, but the fact remains that the great majority of those who voted in favor of Sunday sport did so because they thought there were those who could afford to play golf, they had something to do on Sundays; those who could own boats and go to the lakes on Sundays, they had something to do; those who could afford cars and go to the beaches, they had something they could do on Sunday. And so they, the people who did not have those privileges, felt they also had some rights in this world and that just so long as they went to church in the morning they should have the right to spend their Sunday afternoons seeking enjoyment in the form of recreation or other types of entertainment. That undoubtedly accounted for the fact such a large majority voted in favor of it. It has been said here probably if these towns or cities had kept their parks open there would not have been this turnover of public opinion. May I say to hon.members of this House that at no time have the parksin Windsor been locked to the children

of our community on any Sunday.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ELLIS: Probably the only time we have any difficulty down there is when the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) decides to enforce the Lord's Day Act.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. ELLIS: And then we do find ourselves in difficulty, but the parks are not closed there and the children of Windsor have always had access to their parks, playgrounds and bathing beaches on Sundays. Nevertheless the fact remains they feel they want something else beside that.

However, there is one thing I wonder about this Bill and I bring it up because of a condition we have down there of midnight shows on Sundays. These shows start approximately, I think, one minute after twelve on a Sunday evening, and I feel very strongly against those midnight shows. I think many others in Windsor agree because we feel that too many of the young people are out at all hours of Monday morning when they should be in bed, instead of seeking entertainment trying to see a motion picture. I am inclined to agree that if this Bill permits the opening of theatres in the city of Windsor during the hours between 1.30 and 6 o'clock and if we can persuade our council to stop these midnight theatres, I would be agreeable to the people of Windsor having the right to attend open theatres on Sunday afternoon.

I am going to ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) whether or not in his opinion that would be permissible under the present Bill. It seems not. Well, I bring that up because I do not know, when you restrict this to sport, what you mean by "sport." Recreation? We do not all have the same idea of "sport". Some people enjoy indoor sports, some people outdoor sports, and so I wonder just what you mean by the word "sport."

Recreation, I suppose. Well, what is recreation? Recreation to some people is to go out and play golf or go boating, and recreation to other people is to attend some form of entertainment. I do not refer particularly to picture shows, it can be entertainment of a social character other than the theatre, and so I would like to see the government give us some interpretation of just what they mean by "sports" and just how far that can be carried insofar as the local autonomy of the municipal council is concerned, under this Bill.

(Take EE follows)

MR. DUNBAR: At this time of the year, marbles.

MR. ELLIS: I say that I will support the Bill, because while the terminology does not suit us all, and there may be things to which we can take exception, I feel the Bill carries out the wishes of the community I represent, and I congratulate the government to that extent.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Mr. Speaker, I think it can be fairly argued that participation in sports is good for the youth, and for restless children as well, but just going and watching professional games is not the same thing, in my opinion, and has not the same value. I think when people take part in sports they learn something about obedience to rules, and something about team play, which is good. But that does not apply when they pay a large fee as an entrance fee, and then watch other people play, and that is really what this Bill is providing for.

I agree with several of the hon. members who have spoken before me, that if in the cities of Toronto and Windsor, there had been created organizations, and people had taken an interest, and if the councils had taken the interest they should, in having ball games organized, and space for tennis to be played, and all the sports which the young people like, made available to them, they would not have felt the same as they have shown they do.

I think people who live in one room -- and there are too many people living in single rooms -- are very anxious to get away from their confined quarters, and to have some sort of activity which is of interest to them, and which gives them more space, at any rate, and amusement as well.

I think that all can be done better where they are participating in sports, than when they are simply watching

them. I will go so far as to say that sometimes I think commercial sport is a very injurious thing to youth. I certainly think it interferes with their studies and homework. Formerly, they had to go out to see the game, before it interfered with their work, but now they can just turn on the radio, and then the ideas of everybody in the house in regard to recreation is interfered with. You would think sports were more important to the country than the most economic problem, such as trade, and so forth. Look at the pages of our morning paper devoted to sports. I can hardly get my Globe and Mail read in the mornings before the boy, about twelve years of age, who lives in the same house as I do, wants to see the sporting section. I am not sure that is good.

If the only reason why Toronto did not open the parks, and arrange games, and provide recreational centres for youth, was because it cost them too much, surely some arrangement could have been made as between the city of Toronto and the province of Ontario to provide for grants in aid -- which they do in many things, anyway, which would have enabled the city of Toronto to have carried on various sorts of recreation, and sports for the youth. I think this would have assisted in the health of the youth, and also prevented juvenile delinquency, and I do not think that professional sport, with a large entrance fee, has the same effect at all.

I think with the crowded conditions of the housing, if we wanted to do something to assist the youth, the thing about which we should exercise ourselves is not so much commercialized sport, as it is to see that the youth has some room in their homes, in their gardens, and in their yards. I would think this: what about the women? Are women very much interested in commercial sports? I doubt it. May be there are a few. Maybe they do go with their husbands, or somebody else's husbands, to see a game, but women, I think, are not very much interested in commercial sports.

I hear that some women even enjoy wrestling. I cannot understand that.

What about women? What is this Bill going to do for women? If you are going to please women, and give them something which I think would interest them, first of all, have a decent home for them to live in -- more than one room, and I think if we had lawns and gardens which were bigger than a pocket handkerchief, that would be all right. I can remember when I was in Sweden how impressed I was by the beautiful gardesn. Of course, there were no gardens in the large blocks of apartments, but everyone who had an apartment, had a really beautiful display of flowers, which was given to them free. They did not have to rent them or buy them; they were provided by the city of Stockholm so that every family could go out and seem some beauty, and get some fresh air on the Sundays. That was the purpose of it. Personally, I think it makes sense. I think women here would approve of that. I agree with the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Ellis) that we should try and have recreation and sports to suit everybody. Personally, I feel that agreat many women would much rather go to the theatre and perhaps take some of the children with them. As it is now, you will have father going to the ball game, and spending the money the rest of the family might have a share in, and the mother and children are going to be left at home, which I do not think is very good business. I do not think that women are very much interested in professional sport. Certainly they are not, if they are all like me. Maybe they are not. Maybe I should be interested in professional sports, but I am not.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is another thing: we live in a day of noise, confusion and speed. I feel we all need one day that is quiet, and when you do not have to hurry. When I

see even children hurrying and hurrying every morning and night, I think it is very good that everybody has one day in which they do not need to keep on schedule, when they do not have to hurry, but, if they want to, can rest, and proceed easily and quietly.

We, in this House, know we are spending large sums of money on mental institutions, and I have often wondered a day of quiet and rest would not be more beneficial and less apt to add to the already large sums of money we are spending, without professional sports being played.

My constituency is York East, which is a very large one -- the largest in this province -- and is not too anxious to be linked up with the city of Toronto. That being so, they cannot now say they have been consulted in regard to this vote. They may be later, if they become part of the city of Toronto. I will not say they will not be, as all signs point in that direction, but at any rate, whe have not yet asked them if they want professional sport or not, so I do not feel, in that case, that I am obligated to vote in a way I personally do not feel like voting.

Personally, I cannot help but think we are not going to improve Ontario by having sports on Sunday, and, therefore, I will vote against the Bill.

MR. EAMON PARTK (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, those of us who come from constituencies within the city of Toronto can at least say that we have had an indication from our constituents as to how they feel about this matter. It may be -- and it is true -- that not all of the persons who are eligible to vote in provincial elections were given an opportunity to vote on this question, on January 2nd, But nevertheless, I think it is true to say that the votes which were taken across the city were an indication of the general opinion of the people

of this city, the constituents which some of us represent in this House.

I think it is very important to know this about the Toronto vote; that when the vote was taken, the pressure through the newspapers and their editorial opinions shows that they have some considerable influence in the municipal affairs of this city, because it is a fact that hardly anybody can be elected to a city office without the aid of the newspapers.

And yet, in the face of newspaper articles and editorials, and their direction, we should vote "No", the citizens of Toronto decided to vote "Yes." I think in spite of that kind of Opposition they decided to vote "Yes", which clearly indicates there is a strong feeling in the city for bringing about a condition where some forms of Sunday sports are available.

For that reason, I am going to support this Bill and the principles, which are contained in it.

One thing that struck me, in thinking about the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) introductory remarks this evening, when he told us about his own boyhood, and how he remembers how at first he was able to push the boat into the lake, but to make sure it was always tied to the dock, but a little later on it was taken away from the dock, and he was able to go down the lake a bit, was, that I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is proceeding a little bit that way now. He has the boat tied to the dock, but he is leaving it to the municipal councils to push it down the lake for him.

I think probably he has little alternative, but to put this on a municipal basis. I think if that we are placing a grave responsibility on the municipalities, one which I can see will cause considerable difficulty in some of our municipal councils. Frankly, it is quite possible to see under this Act, cat and dog fights in every city council meeting in Toronto, and

I will say frankly they are not hard to start.

When the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) spoke about conditions arising in industry, and about industrialism, he mentioned some of the problems which are being created within this province. I think this is one of the problems; it is one which has arisen directly out of the concentration of industry in this country, and the industrial life, which is built up as a consequence. We are not living in the old days. We have created new conditions, under which people are forced to live, whether they like to live under them, or whether they do not. I agree with everything that has been said by the hon. members who advocate sports, in which the individual participates, rather than the kind of sports in which each person is merely a spectator. The fact of the matter is, we have the great bulk of people in these urban areas, like Toronto and Windsor, and perhaps some others, and there is very little either way that they can find, by way of sports, except in the role of spectators.

I want to assure the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) that while I do not expect I will be taking advantage of it, when this Bill passes the Legislature, and the city of Toronto acts to permit the international league to have Sunday base ball -- while I probably will not have the opportunity of often attending Sunday afternoon games, if I do, I think I will have my wife with me, because she is as ardent a base ball fan as I am.

As to the point made by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) that if the council of the city of Toronto had taken different action before, to make available playgrounds, and rinks, and the like for the people of this city, this present condition might not have arisen; I think that is perfectly true, and the fact that the condition has now arisen, I want to assure him that if we have to wait for the city council of the city of

Toronto to do anything about it, we will be waiting a very, very long time.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill will give expression to the views of the people in the constituency which I represent in this House, and they have expressed it through the ballot box, on January 2nd. Therefore, I will support the Bill.

However, I do regret that in the vote we still stuck to that old municipal franchise. I want to say to the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) that in my own experience in the Toronto elections, if I had wanted to exercise my franchise, I could have had two votes. It would not have been legal for me, it is true, to vote twice on this question, but there would have been no way for the city clerk of the city council to know that I had voted twice on this question, but it would have been quite possible for me to cast two votes in this election.

It would have been possible, in case I owned property in nine wards across the city of Toronto, to have voted nine times in a city election. There is no way in which I could have been checked, and I think, in fact, they have to rely upon the honesty of the person involved, because I do not think there is any direct method of checking up on it. I think there are many cities and towns which are divided into wards, and I feel sure that this problem will arise in a great many places. So I suggest to the government they ought to give very, very serious consideration to this restricting of the franchise merely to those who are municipal voters.

The Bill we are considering in this provincial Legislature is, to a certain extent, based on a Bill which is part of the Dominion statutes, and if that is the basis upon which a law is to be made, then the people should have the right to

vote in this kind of an election, and should have the right to decide this question when put to them in a referendum.

I regret the government has not taken that step, and I hope when the Bill reaches Committee stage, they may be able to persuade them to make the necessary alterations at that time. Mr. Speaker, on the general principle of permitting the people to decide this issue for themselves, I am voting for the Bill.

MR. G. I. HARVEY (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, at this late hour in the debate, I am somewhat at a disadvantage because most of the things for the Bill and against the Bill have been said. However, I wish to make a few remarks, because I will be voting against the Bill.

I think we forget that in this Bill we have two principles the principle of local option, and the principle of Sunday commercialized sport.

First of all, I am not against organized sport, athletics or recreation being held on Sunday. I am opposed to the commercialization of that sport or recreation on Sunday. Having been a participant for many years in athletics, I realize what a benefit it is to human beings to participate in these sports. They build up the character of the people, and build up the moral calibre of the citizenship.

However, there is ample opportunity for people to participate in recreation and in sporting and athletic events on other days than Sunday. The people for whom we are providing this legislation, are the people who perhaps feel frustrated in the congested areas in which they live, in such urban areas as Toronto and Windsor, and perhaps Hamilton. They want, for awhile to get away from that congestion, and their only chance is to patronize commercialized sports.

Once you allow commercialized sports on Sunday, it will

leave the door open for a wide-open Sunday. There is no doubt in my mind that as soon as commercialized sports are allowed on Sunday, we will have peitions from all other enterprises providing recreation and entertainment for the people.

As an illustration; tonight in this debate one of the hon. members suggested that it might be a good idea to consider opening up the movie houses on Sunday. You see how spontaneous it is, When they see the possibilities of extending the application of such a principle.

I have lived in town for many years, and we have always observed Sunday as a day of rest, a day of peace, and a day of quietness. On the other side of the river, we have the twin city of Sault Ste. Marie,Michigan. They have wide-open Sunday. Now, what happens? Our people on the Sault Ste. Marie Canadian side are dissatisfied, because they want to see a ball game on Sunday, but that isno reason why we should have commercialized sport on Sunday in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario. I am giving you that illustration so that I can make this point against the local option principle of this Bill. I think we forget too soon when we come into this House that we are legislating for the good and benefit of all Ontario. The way the discussion has gone tonight, much emphasis has been placed on the votes taken in Windsor and Toronto. We forget our many municipalities which have never given any expression at all as to what they want. Legislation here, if passed, will give municipalities the right to pass a by-law allowing commercialized sport on Sunday. I believe in every community there is a section of the people who want Sunday commercialized sport, but I do not think the majority of the people want commercially organized sport.

Now, I am opposed to the principle, as I said before,

of commercialized organized sport on Sunday, for the reason that it destroys peace and quietness. I am not opposed to the fact that people will be employed to conduct these enterprises. We must have people to drive the streetcars, and ushers, to usher in the people. I am more concerned about the fact that perhaps there will be divisions in the homes, that, as has been pointed out before, the male adults in a family will want to go to the ball game, and the females and children will want to go to the parks, or take the car out to the lake side. I think there will be a tendency to cause disagreements in the homes. That is one thing we w ll have to be very careful about.

Now, why do we need Sunday sports? There are 168 hours in a week, and in some places only 40 of these are used in earning a living, or at the most, about 48. We are told we need about 56 hours sleep, and you still have 64 hours in each week, to go to the hockey games, the football games, or the baseball games, or go to a show. I feel there are sufficient leisure hours during the week to attend commercialized organized sport.

I do not think there is a nation more taken up with sporting activities than Britain. I remember, as a boy, I wanted to play football, but no, I could not. There was no professionally-organized sport in Britain. They have found that the people in Britain were all able to attend sports during the week. It is true, they have a long weekend in some places, from 12 o'clcok on Saturday, and Saturday afternoons are devoted to football, and other sports. I feel we have lots of time here to go to football games and baseball games and hockey games during the week. I do not think we need Sunday to do that.

Regarding the local option principle of this Bill, I think that is something we have lost sight of. I am opposed to the local option principle in all things, in liquor control

and all other aspects of our economy, and for this reason: in my section of the country we have the twin cities of Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario and Michigan. On one side everything is wide-open, on the other it is not. You see what happens. The people of the city which is not wide-open, are dissatisfied, and in order to satisfy their urgent desire to see a football game, they go across the river. You will have the same situation when this Bill comes into force, and the people take a vote on the local option principle.

(Take FF follows)

It is not beyond possibility. Port Arthur and Fort William are right together; suppose Port Arthur were to vote for Sunday organized commercialized sport and Fort William were to vote against it. What would happen? On Sunday, all the people from Fort William would be coming over to Port Arthur, and patronizing the football games and the baseball games, and you would represent them and want to give satisfaction to them.

I feel we often forget we are legislating on behalf of all the province and not just a few, and I feel the government has ignored its responsibilities in this Bill in providing in it permissive legislation for municipalities to take a vote. I would much prefer that the government introduce a Bill which would provide for commercialized Sunday sport without this local option principle attached to it.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am voting against this Bill.

AN hon. MEMBER: Is the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) not going to close the Debate?

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): There has been so much eloquence, I would not think of adding anything to it or subtracting anything from it. I might lose a supporter somewhere if I did.

MR. J. B. ELLIS (Essex North): What about the hon. Minister of Municipal of Affairs (Mr. Dunbar)?

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): You had so much to say all along, come on, let us hear you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. THORNBERRY: Or can you not get up?

AN hon. MEMBER: Are you in favour of the Bill?

MR. JOLLIFFE: We have stayed all night to hear him speak.

MR. THORNBERRY: Come on, Mr. Dunbar, can we not coax you?

The motion agreed to on division.

For: 59

Against: 20

Second reading of the Bill.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, we will proceed tomorrow on Government Orders and Bills. If we can take an Estimate or two, we will do that. Owing to the fact that tomorrow afternoon is short, we have only two and a half hours, we will not proceed with any of the Opposition Bills, but we will go ahead with some next week.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): That means adjourning at 4:30, is that the intention?

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Would the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) say a word about the program for Monday?

MR. FROST: On Monday, Mr. Speaker, at two o'clock we will start on the Debate on the Conservation Report. My hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) adjourned the Debate and he will start at two o'clock. I do not anticipate calling any other Orders, but intend to give that Debate the priority on that date.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And a night Session?

MR. FROST: That is right.

Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:30 o'clock p.m.

- - -

Volume 27 .

P R O C E E D I N G S .

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS TWENTY-FOURTH DAY OF MARCH, A. D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT TWO O'CLOCK, P. M.

- - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario
Friday, March 24, 1950
2.00 o'clock, p. m.

- - - - - - -

2.00 O'CLOCK, P. M.

And the House having met.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to table answers to questions 8, 27, 56, and 69.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Could I have an indication as to answer number 6, shortly? It is a matter for the hon. Minister of Education, (Mr. Porter).

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): I would like to point out, that some of these questions involve an immense amount of work, and some may have to be held for order for return. We are doing the best we can. We are battling against a great number of questions.

Mr. Speaker, concerning this afternoon, as I mentioned to the House yesterday, we would like to obtain Royal Assent particularly to Bill No. 78, "The Conveyancing of Law and Property Act", so I have arranged with his honour, the Lieutenant Governor, for him to come to the Chamber at 4.15 o'clock this afternoon to give assent to this, and he will give assent also to other Bills. I think we have some sixty Bills on which third reading has been given.

We will proceed with third readings and then routine business until 4.15 of the clock this afternoon, when his honour will come and give the assent to the Bills, after which the House will adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 2.

THE CITY OF LONDON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, third reading of Bill No. 7, "An Act respecting the City of London", Mr. Patrick.

MR. TL.L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 7, "An Act respecting the City of London".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 3.

THE VILLAGE OF LONG BRANCH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, third reading of Bill No. 14, "An Act respecting the Village of Long Branch", Mr. Millard.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 14, "An Act respecting the Village of Long Branch".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 4

CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 4th order, third reading of Bill No. 33, "An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie," Mr. Harvey (Sault Ste. Marie).

MR. GEORGE I. HARVEY (Sault Ste. Marie): I move third reading of Bill No. 33, "An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 5.

CITY OF OTTAWA SEPARATE SCHOOL BOARD

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 5th order, third reading of Bill No. 34, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa Separate School Board," Mr. Chartrand.

MR. DONALD BAXTER (Prince Edward-Lennox): In the absence of Mr. Chartrand, I move third reading of Bill No. 34, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa Separate School Board."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 6.

THE CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 6th order, third reading of Bill No. 78, "An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): I moved reading of Bill No. 78, "An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 7.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 7th order, third reading of Bill No. 107, "An Act to amend TheHighway Traffic Act," Mr. Doucett.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): I move third reading of Bill No. 107, "An Act to amend TheHighway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be

intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 8

THE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 8th order, third reading of Bill No. 118, "An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act." Mr. Doucett.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): I move third reading of Bill No. 118, "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 52.

THE PHARMACY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 52nd order, second reading of Bill No. 108, "An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act," Mr. Goodfellow.

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move second reading of Bill No. 108, "An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act."

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment is to frame a logical course in pharmacy, which until now it has been two years in pharmacy and two years apprenticeship. This will bring it to four years in pharmacy and as far as the apprenticeship is concerned, that will be set out in the regulations, which will permit of them serving their apprenticeship during the Summer months.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): The actual length of time will not be longer. Is it a change from two years in a college to four years in a college?

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): The hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) partially answered my question in his explana-

tion. I know of a young man who returned from overseas and he will have served the four years full time apprenticeship before being admitted to college. In a case like that when registered and having served his apprenticeship he will not come under this new Act?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: I think that is correct. I understandthis will not come into effect until the backlog has been called. It will be only for new applicants registering. As I understand it, it will be two years before this course comes into effect.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 54

THE POLICE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 54th order, second reading of Bill No. 122, "An Act to amend The Police Act, 1949," Mr. Porter.

HON. DAN. PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move second reading of Bill No. 122, "An Act to amend The Police Act, 1949."

Most of the provisions of this Bill are the same as in the Fire Departments Bill, and as I stated the other day, we will hold over the Fire Departments Act in its committee stage until I discuss certain matters with representatives of the Firefighters Association. Changes that may be provided in that Act will no doubt be also proper in most respects for this, and that can be held in committee.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Minister, are you planning to meet with any representatives of the Police Department on this?

MR. PORTER: If they wish to do so, There has been no representation from the Police Department.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): The question I wished to ask was whether these organizations will be given an

opportunity or if they have been given an opportunity, until now, to do that?

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): I cannot hear you.

MR. SALSBERG: That is the first time anyone has said that.

The reason that the police have not made any representations is due to the fact that they did not know of the Bill, and I imagine the same goes for the Fire Department.

MR. PORTER: The firefighters knew that it was coming, and it was discussed.

MR. SALSBERG: My information is that it was not.

MR. PORTER: Your information is wrong.

MR. SALSBERG: My information was telephoned to me yesterday, and that is why I ask you to leave it.

MR. PORTER: What is the name of the official to whom you spoke?

MR. SALSBERG: I will give it to you privately.

MR. PORTER: I have given assurance this Bill will not be carried in Committee, until ample opportunity is provided for discussion.

Motion agreed; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 55

INVESTMENT CONTRACTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 55th Order, second reading of Bill No. 123, "An Act to amend The Investment Contracts Act, 1948". Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 123, "An Act to amend The Investment Contracts Act, 1948".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 56.

CONTINUATION SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 56th Order, second reading of Bill No. 124, "An Act to amend The Continuation Schools Act". Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 124, "An Act to amend The Continuation Schools Act".

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) give some explanation, so that we may go more fully into the provisions of this Act?

MR. PORTER: This Bill, generally, provides an alternative mode to the composition of the continuation school board where some of the school sections are absorbed into a township school area and one of those not absorbed is the section in which the school is situated. It is explained in the Act.

Also it provides that the distribution of costs of maintenance of the school vary according to whether the school board is constituted under subsection 14 or 15.

These are the main points covered by the Bill. I do not think it is necessary for me to go into them, and detail each section. That is the purpose of the Bill. I think it is fully explained. It is the result of certain situations which have arisen, where it had been found some unforeseen conditions existed, and this is an endeavour to change it.

MR. MILLARD: Does it have anything to do with the adjustment of school organization and curriculum?

MR. PORTER: None whatever.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): 57th Order.

THE REGISTRY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 57th Order, second reading of Bill No. 125, "An Act to amend The Registry Act", Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 125, "An Act to amend The Registry Act".

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, could we have some explanation of the first section? How do these villages know whether they received a grant originally? There is no restriction now that would prevent them from assisting the government in the preparation of the plan.

MR. PORTER: The former restriction covered more than 5,000 acres.

MR. NIXON: What assistance can be expected from the government now?

(Page A-10 follows)

HON. DONA PORTER (Attorney-General): The Act does not set forth any specific preparations because in some cases it might be considered, in view of the complications and the various difficulties that have arisen in certain areas, and in view of the relative wealth of the district, there might be a greater contribution in one place than in another. It does not arise very often, but it does arise every once in a while and to my knowledge it arose in two cases where less than 5000 acres were involved and if this change was not made we could not contribute. Both of these were cases where the contribution was justified.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 58

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 58th order, second reading of Bill No. 127, "An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund," Mr. Frost.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move sedond reading of Bill No. 127, "An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leaderof the opposition): You could make an interesting speech on that.

HON. MR. FROST: I do not want to disappoint the House.

MR. A. A. McLEOD : Where are we going to borrow the money?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Where is the money coming from?

HON. MR. FROST: Wherever we can get it the cheapest.

MR. MacLEOD: It will be borrowed in Canada?

HON. MR. FROST: Oh yes, everything is in Canada except for long-term refunding.

MR. MacLEOD: How much will it cost?

HON. MR. FROST: It depends on the nature of the country

and the proximity of the enemy.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee, Mr. Patrick in the chair.

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I beg to inform you that His honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions recommends that they be brought to the consideration of the House.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The following resolution has been received:

Resolved,

That,

every purchaser of admission to a place of amusement or entertainment shall pay to the Treasurer of Ontario for the use of His Majesty in right of Ontario a tax on the price of admission,

as provided by Bill No. 114, An Act to amend The Hospitals Tax Act, 1948.

Resolution agreed to.

(Page A-12 follows)

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The following resolution has been received:

Resolved,

1. That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council be authorized to raise from time to time by way of loan such sum or sums of money as may be deemed expedient for any or all of the following purposes, that is to say: for the public service, for works carried on by commissions on behalf of Ontario, for discharging any indebtedness of obligation of Ontario or for reimbursing the Consolidated Revenue Fund for any moneys expended in discharging any such indebtedness or obligation, and for the carrying on of the public works authorized by the Legislature: provided that the principal amount of any securities issued and the amount of any temporary loans raised under the authority of Bill No. 127, An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, including any securities issued for the retirement of the said securities or temporary loans, at any time outstanding, shall not exceed in the whole $100,000,000.

2. That the aforesaid sum of money may be borrowed for any term or terms not exceeding forty years, at such rate as may be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and shall be raised upon the credit of the Consolidated

Revenue Fund of Ontario, and shall be chargeable thereupon.

3. That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may provide for a special sinking fund with respect to the issue herein authorized, and such sinking fund may be at a greater rate than the one-half of one per centum per annum specified in subsection 3 of section 3 of The Provincial Loans Act.

Resolution agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 36.

THE SURROGATE COURTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-sixth order, House in Committee on Bill No. 68, "An Act to amend the Surrogate Courts Act," Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On section 3.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Section 3 deals with appeals and it is proposed to add certain subsections to that section. I believe the Bill has been re-

(Page A-14 follows)

printed and should be in the hands of the hon. members, so the amendment is duly set forth. This is the result of representations made by persons who thought the appeal practice should be set forth in this way and it was considered advisable to do so.

I move that section 3 be amended accordingly.

Amendment agreed to.

Sections 3 to 5 inclusive, agreed to.

On section 6.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): There is also an amendment to section 6 which was made necessary as a result of the previous amendment, and that is also set forth in the reprinted Bill. I move the section as amended be agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 6 (as amended) agreed to.

On section 7.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the opposition): There is another amendment in section 7.

HON. DANA PORTER: There is an amendment in section 7 also made necessary by the appeal position as amended, and I move the section as amended be agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 7 (as amended) agreed to.

(Take B follows)

On section 8.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, to section 8 of the Bill, as it was introduced add the words at the end of the section dealing with the public trustee:

"Whoever appears for the taking of such accounts shall have the same right as any other person having an interest in the estate."

Various representations have been made to me by persons not involved in hearings for charity and other legatees of one kind and another, and they asked that be left without change.

Under the section, as it now is, the public trustee has to take his position just as any other counsel appearing for any person, and he has to take his chances on being awarded costs, on application, in the judge's discretion if it is thought fit he should receive them.

I am entirely in accord with the representations as made, and I recommend that section 8 of the Bill, as passed on second reading, be withdrawn, and I move the amendment accordingly.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then the effect of it is that the trustee continues, as he did, to take his chances?

MR. PORTER: Because there are many cases, Mr. Chairman, in which the public trustee might have to decide whether it was necessary for him to appear. The position that is taken by certain members of the legal profession who are concerned with some of these matters, is that the public trustee ought not be paid his costs if he appears unnecessarily. In a great many cases the charities represented in the passing of accounts are charities well known, and can easily be taken care of, and they do not need the protection of the public trustee. The public trustee will have to decide whether there is public interest in any particular estate, which makes it advisable for him to appear. I think it is perfectly fair, that the

estate should not have to bear the costs of any duplication in that respect.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think that is correct. I think, on the whole, it has to be left to the good judgment of the public trustee, and the matter of costs, of course, is to be left to the court.

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: So the only possible danger there is that an incompetent trustee, if we had one -- which we have not -- might possibly be unduly cautious upon entering the hearings where he ought to attend, if he thought there was a danger that he might not get costs. I do not think that is a serious danger. I think, therefore, the provision should stand as it is.

MR. PORTER: I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that the public trustee who now holds the office, is not unduly cautious in that direction.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, Section 9 now becomes section 8, and I move the amendment accordingly.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 8, (as amended) agreed to.

On section 9 (formerly Section 10).

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I move a further amendment to this Bill, to the effect that this Act shall come into force on the day it receives the Royal Assent.

I may explain that the reason for that, in this case, is that there happens to be a matter of some importance going through the courts now, and they merely suggested that it would be of great advantage to all parties concerned, if they

could have the benefit of the new procedure, whereby they could go directly to the court of appeal. I did not see any reason why they should have to have an intermediate stage, where the intermediate stage could be eliminated generally, so it is to meet that case, that this is included.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 9 (as amended) agreed to.

Section 10 agreed to.

Bill No. 68 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 38, "The 'Brown Bill' ".

THE AUDIT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-eighth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 90, "The Audit Act, 1950", Mr. Frost.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On section 3.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I take it that the financial watch-dog of the Liberal party (Mr. Brown) is satisfied with this Bill now. Is that correct?

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North); That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Sections 3 to 17 inclusive agreed to.

On section 18.

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, on this section 18, I would like to urge that in the preparation of the estimates, the previous year's estimates should be before the House when the estimates are considered. I made this suggestion both in regard to the Audit Act, and in regard to the estimates. The way the Audit Act of this year, and the auditor's report, are assembled, makes it easy to read, and easy to follow, because you see the amounts which were voted

last year, and the expenditures last year. I can see no reason why this provincial Legislature should not have just as much service in connection with these debates, voting money at the time of the estimates, and so forth, as any municipal council. has, and in all of our larger municipal councils, the members are provided with that information, right in front of them.

It is true we can find it for last year, or the year before, if we have the public accounts open in front of us. But that does not give us an accurate estimate of what was spent last year, on each item.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) --

MR. DENNISON: I think the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) agreed with me when I raised this question before.

MR. FROST: I would be most anxious to give all information possible. In the preparation of the estimates, and the final round-up, it involves a great deal of detail. We have to remember that, first of all, you have the previous estimates. I think the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) was referring to them -- and also you have the actual expenditures for the year. To break all of that detail down is a very considerable job, indeed. I do not know with a Budget the size of ours, whether that is just feasbile, or not. The fact is that in off times, you have a change in the forms of the estimates. For instance, this year we have the fire and police departments in the department of the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter). They are being moved over for this following year to the Department of Municipal Affairs.

I realize a matter of that sort sounds simple, but when you come to printing all that, and being accurate -- because if you are not absolutely accurate in this thing, some people

are bound to be a little critical of it, so we have to be very careful on these points. As regards our expenditures; it is ten months actual, and two months estimated. In the end, the expenditures is only an estimate. It cannot be more than that. There are difficulties in what the hon. member said (Mr. Dennison). Personally, I would like to do everything possible to make our estimates plain to the hon. members, and to give any assistance possible.

I am frankly interested in this. Some of the hon. members opposite are not so anxious, but I am very much interested in the elimination of unnecessary expenses of the government. I have taken that up with our department heads, and I can say that I certainly intend to pursue that. I think in these days there may be the tendency to get too much overhead in our business -- because it is a business. I am most interested in anything that will tend to keep that within bounds, and I would be interested in giving to the hon. members of this House any information I can.

On the other hand, I do not want to make a promise to do something which involves a very great deal of detail. We must remember these estimates, in the end, have to be printed very much in a hurry. In the preparation of this last budget, we started on the details of it around the first of December, and the Treasury Board did an immense amount of work, particularly the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Hamilton) who is on the Treasury Board. Every item in that Budget was combed and re-combed. It did not get to the point of actual printing, I would say, until a week before the Budget was delivered. We run it, of course, at the last moment, because of adjustments which arise in a Budget as large as this, and covering the various fields of effort of this government. You can see if you get down to the elaborate

details, that is very hampering in preparing the Budget.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Premier (Mr. Frost) there must be a point where you make our final decision on which you present the figures as your next year's Budget, in your deliberations, where you have them for use on estimate of the ten months actual, and the two months estimated, or the nine months actual, and the three months estimated. I wonder if it would be practical to give that estimate upon which you make your decision, at the time we get the estimates.

MR. J. B. BROWN (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the problem which the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) has. As a matter of fact, it was one I had too. I discussed it at quite some length with the provincial auditor (Mr. Cotnam) and as a result of my discussion, I realized that sometimes it is necessary for convenience to give way to impracticability. I do not know, under the present system, that it would be practical for the department to have available to this House the details, such as we do have in municipal councils, with the estimates for the immediate past year, the actual expenditures for the current year, and the estimates for the year into which we are to come. I think it is a difficult matter. As the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has pointed out, the difficulty is not just the accumulation of figures, but there is also is the problem of printing as well. I have the assurance from the Provincial Auditor (Mr. Cotnam) that if at all possible either next year, or just as sson as is practicable, they will attempt to bring in the estimates in the manner suggested by the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison). I do appreciate full well the difficulties which they would encounter in this regard.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has said that he wanted to reduce the overhead as

far as possible, and to save money for the taxpayers. I can assure him that he will have the sympathetic support in that, of every hon. member of the House.

But we, in Opposition, can be of some assistance to him. Some of our criticism may perhaps wound the feelings of some hon. ministers, but it is a fact, after all, as I said before, that criticism by and large, does open up possibilities for economy and efficiency in any government. I do not care which faith it may follow. That would be true in any democracy which ever has been, and always will be.

I want to make this suggestion for the assistance of the government; it would assist the Opposition in its critical examination of the estimates and it would, I think, reflect greater efficiency on the part of the administration, if the estimates themselves were in better condition.

I appreciate what has been said about the difficulties of time and printing, particularly when some decision of necessity has to be taken rather late in the day. I appreciate all that.

But, at the same time, I do suggest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) -- and he is in a strong position to do it, because he is not only the hon. Prime Minister but also the Provincial Treasurer -- that he will lay down the law to some of the departments with respect to the organization of their estimates.

Section 18 is very broad, and gives him all kinds of latitude to lay down the law.

Just to indicate that I am not talking at large, let me give a very simple example of what is obviously a sloppy arrangement of the estimates.

I would refer the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to

page 61 of the estimates, for the coming year, and on that page you will find this rather amazing contrast. In vote 96, for the main office, he will find, in item 10, this startling item:

"Litigation of constitutional and other questions; $5.00."

That is a specific amount. That gets down pretty well to the last nickel, and it is a great satisfaction to us in Opposition to know that the Department of Labour is going to litigate constitutional and other questions in the coming year, and the cost will be $5.00. No one could accuse you of being extravagant, as far as that item is concerned. I congratulate the department on getting their legal services, I presume, for free.

Let us not be diverted from this amazing contrast, and I know the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) will be amused at this.

Just above the $5.00 appropriation, we have this item, number 9, and these are all in the one item:

"Advertising, Educational Work, Conferences, Speakers, Publicit , Legal Fees, Administration of Justice, Witnesses and Interpreters in the Department of Labour, including Apprenticeship Branch, Boiler Inspection Branch, Factory Inspection Branch, Board of Examiners of Operating Engineers Branch, and the Administration of the Private Employment Agencies Act".

Then we see the figure of"$11,000." for all those items. The contrast between those two items is just fantastic, and it does not indicate an orderly or systematic arrangement of the estimates.

I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will agree with me. That may be an extreme case, but I suggest in all seriousness the estimates ought to be a little better arranged

than they are, and it would show better efficiency in the administration of the department concerned.

MR. C. CALDER (London): It is so seldom I feel in sympathy with the administration, that I want to express it now.

I think every hon. member who has had municipal experience shares the feeling of the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) because in striking the mill rate, it is invaluable to know whether your individual items are up or down from the previous year.

But here we are in a different position altogether. I have every sympathy with the government. I do not think it is practical to make the change, and if we, on this side of the House, can do anything about it, we will attempt to do it. I would support the government. I see no real sense in urging any change.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I may say, in conclusion, that I have sitting over here (indicating) some of the Treasury officials, and the provincial auditor, and I can assure the hon. members that any suggestion which can be worked out will be worked out. I think there is evidence of that in this Act. We will continue to do that. I appreciate what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has said about the work of the Opposition. After all, the Opposition has a very important part to play in our system of government, and I appreciate the assistance and the good that an Opposition can do in obtaining good government.

I may say to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) that when we were over there in Opposition, scrutinizing the accounts, and so on, the expenditures of this province were only $100 million --

MR. NIXON: And they still got good government.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Now, it is up to $286 million, which really indicates the fact that the Opposition is not doing its job.

Section 18 agreed to.

On Section 19.

MR. DENNISON: Does this mean the public accounts are being speeded up? Is this the same as the way we have always got the public accounts, within the first ten days?

(Page B-11 follows)

MR. FROST: You mean to say in regard to the preparation of the public accounts?

MR. DENNISON: Yes.

MR. FROST: This section is an amendment of section 20(2) R.S.O. 1937, chap. 24, which has appeared in somewhat similar terms since the original Act, 49 Vic. 1886, chap. 4. The changes are threefold.

1. It is now made clear that the Public Accounts are to be prepared for the Auditor rather than by the Auditor.
2. The presentation of the Public Accounts is now to be made to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council for submission to the Assembly rather than to the Treasurer. This is felt to be an improvement in that the submission of the Public Accounts is now made in a more direct manner.
3. A definite time has been set for the tabling of the Public Accounts.

I will say to the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) that in the tabling of public accounts I think at one time it was the practice to send them out, if they could be printed, before they were tabled in the House. My recollection is that some years ago that was the practice.

Of late years, that has been difficult, because of the difficulty in getting the accounts printed and completed. Therefore, they have been tabled here I think on the first day of each Session.

Personally I would have no objection to sending them out before that time to the hon. members, if it would be of assistance, providing the printing can be done.

Sections 19 to 24 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 25.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Just in connection

with this section, Mr. Chairman, and not by way of criticism at all; it is my sincere hope that every hon. member of this House will avail himself of the opportunity of reading the Auditor's report, as it is now presented. I raised that point when I was speaking on the Budget, and I want to raise it again, because, as I said before, and I say again, it is one of the finest handbooks we have on municipal financing in this province.

Sections 25 to 33 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 90 reported.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 39

PREPAID HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL SERVICES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 39th Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 105, "An Act respecting Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services", Mr. Porter.

On Section 1.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, when this Bill was at the second reading, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) said he was going to give us more information about the co-operative organizations, which had been consulted. I wonder if he is in a position to give us that information today. In particular, of course, I would like to know if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) had the advantage of views of the Co-operative Union of Ontario, about this Bill.

MR. PORTER: Yes. The Secretary of the Co-operative Union has been consulted on several occasions.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What was his view about it?

MR. PORTER: They are all in favour of it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: They are in favour?

MR. PORTER: Oh, yes. There has been no criticism. With their co-operation, of course.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 4.

MR. PORTER: There is a proposed amendment to section 4, which reads as follows:

> "No association shall, within Ontario, contract to furnish hospital, medical, surgical, nursing or dental service, or any combination of them, on a prepayment basis, or make payments therefor, unless registered under this Act."

Those words were omitted in the first draft of the Bill, and I move the amendment accordingly.

Amendment agreed to;

Section 4, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 5 to 18 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 19.

MR. DENNISON: I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) introducing the Bill, can indicate if this is the nearest we will come in the foreseeable future to implement a promise that Dr. Vivian made some years ago for a province-wide prepaid hospital plan? There was promise of a hospital plan -- prepaid and province-wide. I think the suggestion was on the basis of $21. for each person in the province of Ontario.

I wonder if the government in introducing this, has given up that idea, they talked about so much at one time.

MR. PORTER: I do not know to what promise the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) is referring, nor about the $21.

MR. DENNISON: That was a promise by Dr. Vivian.

MR. PORTER: That is a long time ago. He has not been here for several years, and if any such promise was made -- well; I do not know.

This Bill has absolutely nothing to do with the point raised by the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison). The

hon. member (Mr. Dennison) knows perfectly well that this Bill has only to do with the registration of certain types of associations carrying on and supplying this sort of service.

MR. DENNISON: You might be considering a plan yourselves.

MR. PORTER: The Bill says nothing about any such thing.

MR. DUNBAR: We had only 38 seats, when he made that promise.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NIXON: Who was it said that "confession is good for the soul"?

MR. PORTER: Barred by the lapse of time.

Section 20 agreed to.

Bill No. 105 reported.

(Take C-1 follows)

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 40

THE MARRIAGE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 40th order, House in Committee on Bill No. 87, "The Marriage Act, 1950," Mr. Welsh.

Sections 1, 2 and 3 agreed to.

On section 4.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): I would suggest on the debate on second reading of this Bill that the hon. members read it and see if the authority to solemnize marriage does not come from heaven but does come from this Legislature.

HON. MR. FROST: What section is that?

MR. NIXON: This section says who shall marry and the magistrates have to register with the Provincial Secretary.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the opposition): It may also say who may marry and who may be given in marriage, but that does not make them public servants.

MR. B. E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): Is it not true they are all licensed?

MR. G. ARTHUR WELSH (Secretary and Registrar): They are all registered.

MR. WILLIAM C. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Maybe the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) could answer a letter which I received last week. This letter was from a girl in Illinois and she noticed that we were changing our marriage laws in Ontario and she wanted to come to Niagara Falls and she wondered if we could find in Niagara Falls someone who could speak English so that she may be married there.

Sections 4 and 5 agreed to.

On section 6.

MR. NIXON: Section 6 says, "no person shall issue a license or special permit to or solemnize the marriage of any person who is mentally ill or mentally defective, or who is

under the influence of intoxicating liquor or narcotic drugs." Who is going to be the judge of that? There have been many court cases as to whether a man was intoxicated when driving a car.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): That was in the Act in your day.

MR. NIXON: And you are putting it now in the Act even with your enlightenment. I might suggest that people who are mentally defective would not agree that they are.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Section 42 gives some protection to anyone who does issue a license or solemnize a marriage of a person who is mentally defective, if they did not know they were defective mentally at the time of the marriage being performed. I think there should be some endorsement on the back of the application or marriage form, this section or else the other section 47 which includes the penalties for doing this. Section 47 includes the penalties. I think these should be endorsed or printed. I took this up with the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) and he said it needed to be printed on the back of the form---now there is already on the form a list of people whom a person is prohibited from marrying and it seems to me that this is a wise thing to put these prohibitions on the back of the form th t is filled in at the time the marriage takes place. If we are going to make these restrictions which would prevent a person mentally ill or deficient, or a person under the influence of liquor, from receiving a license and getting married, these restrictions should be endorsed or printed on the back of the marriage form. I would urge the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) to agree to that. I think it is only logical. Very few peopleever see the Act when they get married and it covers the whole ceremony, but they will have to see the form when they get married and

the minister or magistrate or judge will see it, and that is the place to put your restrictions.

HON. MR. WELSH: They are a matter of a great deal more importance to the issuer than those going through the ceremony. You are not going to go in if you are a mental deficient and say that you are mentally deficient. I think they are protected by section 47. Let us not get this form too complicated.

MR. DENNISON: We are legislating here on a section which we will subsequently reach, section 43, which says:

> "(1) Form 9 respecting the prohibited degrees of affinity and consanguinity shall be endorsed on the licence and onthe proof of publication of banns.
>
> "(2) If at any time changes are made in the law affecting the prohibited degrees of affinity and consanguinity, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may direct changes to be made in Form 9 so as to make it conformable to the law for the time being."

Why not print on the form that people mentally ill or deficient or under intoxicating liquor shall not also be married?

HON. MR. WELSH: The minister or magistrate can look at the man and tell if he is intoxicated. He cannot tell of course whether they are cousins.

MR. DENNISON: It is the responsibility of the issuer, and the minister or the judge or magistrate to ask these questions to make sure he is not breaking the law. The hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) knows that there have been mentally deficient people married in this province and plenty of them and they have brought children into this world who inherited their parent's disease. The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) can tell you of hundreds of cases and it is a crime that this Legislature should not do anything to prevent that. We should make this ceremony of marriage very strong and

should put a deal of responsibility on those who issue the license.

HON. MR. WELSH: If the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) would read section 47 and the subsection, it is clear there that the responsibility is on the issuer, and it says:

> "Every issuer who issues a licence and every person who solemnizes a marriage, knowing or having reason to believe that either of the parties to the intended marriage or to the marriage is mentally defective or mentally ill or is under the influence of intoxicating liquor or narcotic drugs, shall be guilty of an offence and on summary conviction shall be liable to a penalty of not more than $500 or to imprisonment for a term of not more than one year, or to both."

I think that is covered.

MR. DENNISON: I think that we should stop this sort of provision that a person could not marry his grandmother. That does not need to be put in the Act, he would not marry her anyway. I think we have a form that he cannot marry his grandmother, or his wife's grandfather, or his uncle's wife, or his stepmother,---I doubt if that would be necessary---or marry his daughter or his sister. All these things are just ordinary things that are not done anyway.

But these other mistakes are made and for the sake of six or seven extra lines of printing when making new forms, and these will be printed this year by the thousands, and will remain around for 40 years, why not add the extra few lines? Why not put in that information now?

Take our Highway Act; the average motorist is not supposed to read it, but when he gets his licence he is given a summary of the Act. I suggest that we give the people who are

getting married a summary of the marriage form itself.

HON. MR. WELSH: This can go on indefinitely. There is no compulsion for a minister, or magistrate or a judge to perform the ceremony until he is satisfied. The fact that you have a licence does not say you can go to a minister and that he will marry you. He is familiar with the Act and what isprinted on the back is not all his information, he knows it. He will not marry mentally defective people or marry someone who is under the influence of liquor or narcotics.

MR. DENNISON: You are hard to convince.

Sections 7 to 24 inclusive agreed to.

On section 25.

MR. WILLIAM J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Subsection 2 of section 25 provides that the marriage shall take place in the judge's chambers. In northern Ontario our magistrates travel all over the district, they have an office in every town. Does this make it legal for the magistrate to marry people in any of those towns or must they go to his headquarters?

HON. MR. WELSH: It is intended that the ceremony should take place in any office normally used as his office.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the opposition): Will they understand that? The point is when these magistrates travel around they often use offices that are not their own, they use municipal offices, and I saw one using a provincial police office. A magistrate might feel that that wasnot his office and he could notperform the ceremony under this section.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): I received a letter from the judge in my district pointing out this difficulty. One day he will be in Kitchener and then other places, and he is also a member of the police commission in all these places and he is wondering wher to solemnize these marriages. Will he do it in his own office or will these people follow him around from town to town?

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Why not wait instead of following?

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): I think there is a point in what my hon. friend says. I think perhaps in view of the expressions by some of the hon. members made today perhaps it would be better to leave this section the way it is. I do not think there will be many marriagew under the section. If they take the restricted view I do not think there is any harm done. If it needs remedying, it can be done.

MR. NIXON: Is it the thought of the government to send these licenses to every judge or magistrate that may apply?

HON. MR. WELSH: They have to get a license in the ordinary way.

MR. NIXON: No, you have missed the point. This license or permit that applies to the party that is getting married.

HON. MR. WELSH: Yes. It is not issued to the judge or magistrate. Every judge and magistrate hasthat authority.

Section 25 agreed to.

(Page C-7 follows)

MR. NIXON: In connection with this form of ceremony this Bill is rather absurd, it seems to me. Do you not think it would be better to drop that, and put it in the regulations? It is certainly brief in the extreme. There is a lot of the ceremony I went through that is not in this. I do not see "until death do us part". It does not say whether this is the maximum sentence or whether you are giving them a minimum one.

MR. WELSH: I have confidence in the judges and magistrates of the province, and that the ceremony will be performed in a dignified manner, and that it is the full maximum.

MR. R. A. McEWING (Wellington North): No lawyer ever drew that up.

MR. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Was this prepared by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter)? Did the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) read this?

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): I think that is a grave omission from this Act.

MR. MacLEOD: There should be an amendment.

MR. PORTER: It is all there now.

MR. MacLEOD: Look at page 8, subsection 3 of section 25. Do you recall reading it?.

MR. PORTER: Oh, well, I made a mistake. I misunderstood my hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod). I thought he said the Attorney-General should have the right to solemnize a marriage, but that is not his point.

MR. MacLEOD: Do you find where it stands in the Bill now?

MR. PORTER: I thought it was recommended that I should have the right to solemnize marriage.

MR. MacLEOD: What is the answer to my question?

MR. PORTER: I am entirely in favour of the Bill as set out.

MR. MacLEOD: I agree with the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon). I do not think it should be in the Bill at all.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): There are objections to that. If the Legislature is giving power to judges and magistrates to solemnize marriage, it does not seem to me that that should be part of administrative law, that the words and the form should be transferred to government departments; it should be said here. These words are taken from other Acts of Canada that are used.

MR. PORTER: Does the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) suggest anything else that should be added?

MR. MacLEOD: I do not see there any of the words that were used when I was married. If I was married under that, I would not think I was married at all.

MR. PORTER: That is not an answer to my question.

MR. MacLEOD: It is as close an answer to your question as the answer you gave me to my question.

Sections 25 to 27 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 28.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): I want to refer again to Form 8. I raised the matter on second reading, the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) will remember, and I appreciate that there was no intention on the part of the government or others who were drawing the form, in asking that question about racial origin, and that there was no thought of discrimination. I would like the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) or any other hon. member of the Cabinet to say what this means. If it is for the records, the meaning of that phrase will be different to every person who fills out the form. I think it is useless on the form, as well as being the kind

of question that some people object to answering. If the hon. Minister (Mr.Welsh) can tell me what racial origin is, I would like to hear it.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): These things arise if we were asked by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics or our own. It has been in the Act for a long time, and I think we will agree on this, that there is not anything in the line of discrimination or reflection in this.

I think it is of immense value in a country such as this, to say that the racial origin of this country is 40 percent. from the French people, and a certain percentage from the people of England, and a certain percentage from the people of Ireland, and a certain percentage from the people of Scotland. It is just filling in government statistics.

(Take D-1 follows)

MR. FROST: I think if we omit that, we might be omitting something of value to the statistics which form part of the statistical information which is so useful to this country. Many of these things arise, because the Bureau of Statistics at Ottawa asks that the information be obtained.

MR. PARK: I appreciate the point made by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), and I am not suggesting there was any feature of discrimination or anything of that kind in the principle of the Bill. All I was wondering was how useful that kind of an answer is, because I am sure it does not mean anything. It means different things to different people, and if you want to know the place of origin, or the national origin, put that down, instead of"racial". The word "racial" is an unscientific word.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think probably the government is not to blame, because the Bureau of Statistics at Ottawa is more to blame than anybody else. The point is that the hon. member (Mr. Park) has said that the term "racial origin" is an unscientific term, which is not capable of precise definition.

The only people who are in a position to give a correct definition, if there is one, would be the anthropologists, because anthropology has to do with such matters as origin, and so forth, and if these anthropologists have difficulty in deciding where the line should be drawn, then you can imagine how much more difficult it is for the laymen to attempt to categorize people, according to their racial origin.

I was very much interested in what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said about the people with French blood, having that racial origin. That use of the term is far removed from the use of the term in which scientists indulge. That relates to the geographical origin of our ancestors, and has nothing to do with race or anything else, and as the hon. member (Mr. Park) said, it means one thing to one person,

and a different thing to another.

As the hon. member (Mr. Park) has pointed out, it is useless, because it does not mean anything, and it is high time the Bureau of Statistics stopped acting in this unscientific manner, and consulted the head of the anthropology department of the University of Toronto, or somebody who knows something about it, because, obviously, then do not.

MR. FROST: This comes from a request for standardization from the Bureau of Statistics, who seem to think it is useful. Whether it is or not, we do not know, but it is there, anyway.

Section 28 agreed to.

On Section 29.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, is it possible for a person who has issued a marriage license, to later on perform the marriage?

MR. WELSH: No, not to my knowledge.

MR. GRUMMETT: Then what is the meaning of section 29?

MR. WELSH: Unless you had a township clerk, who is also a magistrate.

MR. GRUMMETT: Section 29 reads as follows:

> " Marriage licenses may be issued by the clerk of every city, town and village, and by every magistrate in territory, without municipal organization, and every such clerk and magistrate shall be ex officio an issuer of marriage licenses."

In that connection, in northern Ontario, we have not the municipal organizations, and a magistrate may issue a marriage license, and later on perform the ceremony.

MR. WELSH: That is right.

MR. PORTER: Is there any objection to that?

MR. GRUMMETT: I asked if it was possible, and the hon. minister (Mr. Welsh) did not think so.

MR. PORTER: Is it not all right?

MR. GRUMMETT: I do not see any objections, but I just asked the question.

MR. PORTER: I am just asking you. If there is no objection, that is fine. If there is, we would like to know what it is, and we will consider it.

Sections 29 to 39 inclusive agreed to.

On section 40.

MR. GRUMMETT: In connection with section 40, this is the section which provides for the collection of a fee by the judge or magistrate performing the ceremony. I wonder if the hon. minister (Mr. Welsh) considers having somebody else collect the fee. I do not think it is in keeping with the dignity of the office of a judge to have to say, after he has performed a ceremony, "That will be $10." You might have the case of a magistrate, who might be a little absent-minded, and he would say, "That will be $10. and costs".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: It is ten dollars in advance.

MR. EASTON: Or three months.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. GRUMMETT: Seriously, would it not be possible to have the clerk, or the local court clerk, collect this fine and remit it, without having to place the judges and magistrates of this province the duty of collecting this $10. fee, I think is beneath the dignity of the judge to have to say, "That will be $10. for the ceremony."

MR. WELSH; I cannot say that I agree with the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett). I think it is not derogatory to the dignity of the judges to collect the $10., and why let somebody else collect the money. I think

they will make their collections beforehand, and there will be no question about that.

MR. NIXON: I am going to suggest, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that this is, in fact, a new taxing section. The magistrate or the judge must collect this $10., and remit this $10. to the Treasury of Ontario. That has never been done before. This is a new taxing section, and should be preceded by a resolution in this House.

MR. FROST: It is a fee, just as you charge for a license for an automobile.

MR. NIXON: I daresay that was preceded by a resolution of the House. I was rather shocked -- and I think the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) must have been, when the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) said, "Of course, this does not prevent the judge or magistrate taking a tip on the side, because he collects the $10. and remits it to the Treasury."

MR. FROST: He did not say that.

MR. NIXON: That is what he said.

MR. WELSH: Absolutely, but I thought everyone understood it was said in a joking way.

MR. NIXON: Then he is not supposed to take any tip on the side? I wish the hon. minister (Mr. Welsh) would clear this matter up.

MR. WELSH: All right, we will go back to the point of racial origin. If he is Scotch, he probably will.

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, I resent that.

MR. NIXON: Why does the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) want this $10. anyway? You take $4.00 out of the $5.00 they pay for the marriage license. Surely that is "small potatoes", is it not?

MR. GRUMMETT: There is nothing obtained by the hon.

Treasurer (Mr. Frost) when a minister performs a marriage. Why not leave it the same way, when the marriage is performed by a judge or a magistrate?

MR. MILLARD: He can add it on to his income tax.

MR. GRUMMETT: He is compelled to collect the fee and remit to the Treasury. I think a judge or magistrate should be placed on the same basis as a minister, who is not forced to collect a fee.

MR. MacLEOD: Why do you not put it in the sinking fund?

MR. WELSH: That was done deliberately. There is nothing in this Act which was designed to make it easier for people to be married by a judge or magistrate. We prefer the church marriages. That is the feeling on this side of the House, and I know it is on the other side. We do not want to put anything in the Act which might make it more attractive to be married by a judge or magistrate. That is why it was put in.

MR. GRUMMETT: $10.00 is cheap enough, to go to a magistrate or judge and to be married.

MR. A. W. DOWNER (Dufferin-Simcoe): That is what you think.

MR. GRUMMETT: Any more than they are obligated to give $10. to a minister.

MR. G. I. HARVEY (Sault Ste. Marie): Why not put some impediments in the Bill, so they cannot go and be married by a judge or a magistrate?

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me -- I hate to use the word I used recently, so let us say "discrepancy" in this particular clause with the argument which was given to us on second reading.

The clause which provides for civil marriage is to accommodate those people who have some kind of conscience in this matter. Now you are going to put a penalty on that kind

of conscience, so that when they go to the judge or magistrate, they have to pay, unnecessarily -- and perhaps a higher -- fee than they would pay elsewhere. That is not consistent with the arguments for civil marriage which have been used in this Legislature.

I think, myself, if we are going to give people freedom of choice, then we should not put a penalty on that freedom of choise, and the fee ought to be a moderate fee, and it ought to be retained by the judge or magistrate who performs the service in the same way it is retained by the minister who performs the service.

Let us put this thing on an equal basis, or at least, be consistent. If we are going to make it applicable to people, who, because of some kind of conscience want to go through a civil marriage ceremony, let us put it on the same basis, as near as possible, as the people who have ceremonies performed by other persons, in other sections of the same Act.

Sections 40 to 45 inclusive agreed to.

On section 46.

MR. WELSH: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the deletion of section 46.

MR. NIXON: Why?

MR. WELSH: Well, section 46 is a section which, on reconsideration, we decided was unnecessary. It puts the judge or magistrate or the minister in the position where they are being penalized, perhaps unfairly. Actually, there is no necessity for it.

MR. NIXON: There is no penalty provided, if they perform the ceremony within the three-day limit?

MR. FROST: There was not, in the former Act.

MR. NIXON: I always thought it was a very important provision, in our Marriage Act.

MR. PORTER: There was no prosecution.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, there was a section in the other Act, the same as section 6, which had the penalty right in the section. That penalty has been removed from section 6 in this Act, and I thought when the penalty was removed from section 6, that was the reason why section 47 was put in.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, after all, we have very respectable people in our community, the clergy, the judges and the magistrates, and we are giving them certain duties in this Act. Now, we put in section 46, just as aimed right at the clergy, the judges and the magistrates.

Section 50 has the same effect. Some of the clergy and judges took exception to this section; they felt it should come under the general section.

MR. DENNISON: You are removing section 47?

MR. FROST: No, just section 46.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 46 (as amended) agreed to.

MR. MILLARD: There is a subsection for the issuers?

MR. NIXON: Does not the same apply to section 47?

MR. WELSH: No, not altogether, Mr. Chairman. The situation is a little different there.

MR. FROST: The issuers get prescribed fees, and so on, and there are a lot of them looking for the job.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Section 47 also sets a penalty for violations.

MR. NIXON: Yes, it is $500. in this case.

MR. MILLARD: You removed $100. penalty, and give them a $500. penalty.

MR. HARVEY (Sault Ste. Marie): I think the waiting period is what is meant by section 46.

The amendment agreed to.

(Take E follows)

Sections 47, formerly section 48, and section 48, formerly section 49, agreed to.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the opposition): On section 49, this provides for the people who are left out?

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): To avoid duplication.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): The provision in section 46, formerly section 47, provides a penalty of not more than $500.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Knowingly.

HON. MR. WELSH: Under the old section it says "knowingly." They are in the best position, I don't think the penalty is unduly harsh.

Section 50, formerly section 51 and section 51, formerly section 52, section 52, formerly section 53, section 53, formerly section 54, and section 54, formerly section 55, agreed to.

Forms 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If you would look at form 7, should there not be some place with the full name and address? What does the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) think about that? Many years later it might be necessary for a person to obtain a marriage certificate for some reason, possibly in connection with the administration of an estate, and unless the full name is on the certificate, you would get into definite difficulty some times.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: You have it on the birth certificate.

Forms 7, 8 and 9 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 87 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 41

THE DRUGLESS PRACTITIONERS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 41st Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 109

Bill No. 109, "An Act to amend the Drugless Practitioners Act," Mr. Goodfellow.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 109 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order no. 42.

THE VENEREAL DISEASES PREVENTION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 42nd order, House in Committee on Bill No. 111, "An Act to amend the Venereal Diseases Prevention Act, 1942," Mr. Goodfellow.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 111 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 43.

LAND TRANSFER TAX ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 43rd Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 113, "An Act to amend the Land Transfer Act," Mr. Frost.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 113 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 44.

ACT RESPECTING ONTARIO RACING COMMISSION

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 44th order, House in Committee on Bill No. 115, "An Act to establish the Ontario Racing Commission," Mr. Frost.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

On section 5.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has given some consideration to the chairmanship of this Commission. Has he given any consideration to the remuneration?

HON. MR. FROST: No, that has not been definitely settled. I may say that I have considered what my hon. friend from Niagara Falls said (Mr. Hauck). As he said, there is a salary for the chairman, but as to the others, that will have to be decided.

MR. NIXON: It would not be a full-time job for the chairman.

HON. MR. FROST: For the first year or two, yes. My discussion with Mr. Bigelow was this; he is interested in his work as magistrate and I have been anxious to get someone to take oger this task who was not connected in any way or had any interest in that business. I wanted to get a man who had broad experience and the confidence of the people and with judicial background. I discussed the question with Mr. Bigelow and he said he would be prepared to undertake it. I may say that, the arrangement is that he is merely seconded from the magistrate's service for a year or two until the matter is straightened out. He may go back on the bench.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the opposition): My guess is that it isfull time.

The magistrates are not under the Public Service Act.

HON. MR. FROST: As far as superannuation, yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There was some legislation some years ago about the superannuation and for some purposes they might be; otherwise they are not.

HON. MR. FROST: They are independent.

MR. JOLLIFFE: They are under the Magistrates Act. In a subsequent section of the Bill the Chairman is brought under the Act, it makes it clear he will be a full-time Chairman. Is that the position? I take it that the Chairman, as the Bill now stands, would be a full-time Chairman and would not also exercise the functions of a magistrate.

HON.MR. FROST: My recollection is they come under the Superannuation Act in any event.

If he assumes this office he would not alter his position as to pension and superannuation. We will have to look into that.

MR. JOLLIFE: He cannot act as magistrate while in this office?

MR. FROST: Oh no. For the purpose of this chairmanship, he ceases to act as magistrate. He will not sit in any court or have any duties other than the chairmanship of the Commission. At the end of a year or so this situation may be cleared up. It will take his full time.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Is it the intention of the government to have as another member of this Commission, a member of the House, to act as vice-chairman, because the second clause of section 5 says the vice-chairman shall act. When you mention that the Commissioner is going to have a full-time job, I think that the vice-chairman should be available as well.

MR. WILLIAM L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): I want to say a few words about this appointment of stewards. I want to suggest again the name of Mr. Hewitt. He knows the business from A to Z and he hasthe confidence of the horsemen and everyone connected with the track, as well as the confidence of the public. Mr. Hewitt has been paid a good salary and he could not take an appointment as an honorary commissioner. As I said, he has the full confidence of the public and I think would give great strength to the Commission.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): The point was given some consideration a day or two ago. There is no doubt about the integrity of Mr. Hewitt and his ability and knowledge of the racing problem. He is a very fine man and will certainly be considered in this situation.

MR. HOUCK: I would say appointing stewards on a track is more important than the chairman of your Racing Commission.

Sections 14 to 16 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 115 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee now rise and report certain Bills, some with amendments and some without.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report certain Bills without amendments and certain Bills with amendments, and moves for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): As I informed the House, the Lieutenant-Governor is waiting to give assent to certain Bills, and with your permission I will go and escort the Lieutenant-Governor from his chambers.

(Take F follows)

His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, entered the Chamber of the Legislative Assembly, and took his seat upon the Throne.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly of the Province has at its present sitting passed certain Bills to which, on behalf and in the name of the said Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

(Page F-2 follows)

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: The following are the Titles of the Bills to which Your Honour's Assent is prayed:

Bill No. 1, An Act respecting the Town of Port Hope and Trinity College School

Bill No. 2, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton

Bill No. 4, An Act respecting Canada Conference Evangelical Church

Bill No. 6, An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur

Bill No. 7, An Act respecting the City of London

Bill No. 9, An Act respecting Central Canada Exhibition Association

Bill No. 10, An Act respecting Border Cities Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations

Bill No. 11, An Act respecting The Hospital for Sick Children

Bill No. 13, An Act respecting Mount Hamilton Branch, Canadian Legion and Salvation Army

Bill No. 14, An Act respecting the Village of Long Branch

Bill No. 16, An Act respecting the City of Windsor

Bill No. 17, An Act respecting the City of Toronto

Bill No. 18, An Act respecting the Township of Cornwall

Bill No. 19, An Act respecting the City of Guelph

Bill No. 20, An Act respecting the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ottawa

Bill No. 22, An Act respecting Knox College Library

Bill No. 24, An Act respecting the Town of Leamington

Bill No. 25, An Act respecting the Town of Alexandria

Bill No. 26, An Act respecting the Town of Riverside

Bill No. 28, An Act respecting the Township of North York

Bill No. 31, An Act respecting Executive Committee of the Provincial Young Men's Christian Association

of Ontario and Quebec

Bill No. 33, An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie

Bill No. 34, An Act Respecting the City of Ottawa Separate School Board

Bill No. 35, An Act to incorporate the Ontario Municipal Improvement Corporation

Bill No. 36, An Act respecting Appeals to His Majesty in His Privy Council

Bill No. 37, An Act to amend The Commorientes Act, 1940

Bill No. 38, An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act, 1949

Bill No. 39, An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act, 1949

Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Partnership Registration Act

Bill No. 41, An Act to amend The Agricultural Associations Act

Bill No. 42, An Act to amend The Farm Products Grades and Sales Act

Bill No. 43, An Act respecting LiveStock and Live Stock Products

Bill No. 44, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act, 1946

Bill No. 45, The Stallions Act, 1950

Bill No. 46, The Weed Control Act, 1950

Bill No. 47, An Act to provide for the establishment of Restricted Areas for Seed-potatoes

Bill No. 48, An Act to amend The Surveys Act

Bill No. 49, An Act respecting the Westerly Limit of Hincks Location in the Township of Johnson

Bill No. 63, An Act to amend The Housing Development Act, 1948

Bill No. 64, An Act to amend The Public Officers' Fees Act

Bill No. 65, An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act

Bill No. 66, An Act to amend The Insurance Act

Bill No. 67, An Act to amend The Magistrates Act

Bill No. 69, An Act to amend The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act

Bill No. 70, An Act to amend The School Attendance Act

Bill No. 71, An Act to amend The Auxiliary Classes Act

Bill No. 72, An Act to amend The Mining Act

Bill No. 75, An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act

Bill No. 78, An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act

Bill No. 79, An Act to amend The High Schools Act

Bill No. 80, An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act

Bill No. 81, An Act to amend The Teaching Profession Act, 1944

Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Power Commission Act

Bill No. 84, An Act to amend The Game and Fisheries Act, 1946

Bill No. 85, An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act, 1939

Bill No. 86, An Act to amend The Milk Control Act, 1939

Bill No. 91, An Act to amend The Statute Labour Act

Bill No. 92, An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act, 1949

Bill No. 93, An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act, 1949

Bill No. 94, An Act to amend The Athletics Control Act, 1947

Bill No. 96, An Act to amend The Extra Provincial Corporations Act

Bill No. 98, An Act to amend The Companies Act

Bill No. 99, An Act to amend The Public Lands Act

Bill No. 100, The Provincial Parks Act, 1950

Bill No. 101, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act

Bill No. 103, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act

Bill No. 107, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act

Bill No. 118, An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: In His Majesty's name, The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these Bills.

His Honour was then pleased to retire from the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, may I submit the following motion:

> Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Porter, that when this House do adjourn its present sittings thereof, it stands adjourned until two of the clock, on Monday afternoon, and that Rule No. 2 of the Legislative Assembly be dispensed with, insofar as it applies to this motion.

I make that motion, Mr. Speaker, and will say we will proceed on Monday with the Debate on the conservation matter, which stands as Order No. 11, "Resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for consideration of the Report of the Select

Committee on Conservation".

I assume that will take all afternoon. There are a large number of hon. members who want to speak on this. We will have a night Session on Monday, but no night Session on Tuesday.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4:20 of the clock, p.m.

- - - - -

S I X T H E R R A T T A.

- - - - - -

VOL. 17: Page A-8; Line 18: Delete "Motion agreed to".

- - -

VOL. 23: Page G-2; line 9: Change "G.T. Gordon (Nrantford) to "H. W. Walker (Welland)".

- - - -

Page G-2: line 19: Change "and answered" to "in Hansard".

VOL. 25: Page B-11; line 1: After the word "test", insert the following:

"I think the issue raised by the amendment, is a question of conscience. It is not a case of whether we agree or do not agree; we have to respect their rights, and for that reason, I think these persons, if they wish a civil marriage, should be able to get it.'

- - - - - - -

VOL. 26: Page B-8: line 25: Change "Committee of Supply" to "Committee of the Whole".

- - - - - -

VOL. 26: Page C-8; line 17: Change "Canada Animal Act" to "Criminal Code".

- - - - -

VOL. 26: Page G-7: line 29: Change "Liberal" to "Labour".

- - - - - -

Volume 28

P R O C E E D I N G S .

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY OF MARCH, A. D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT TWO O'CLOCK, P. M.

- - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario
Monday, March 27, 1950
2.00 o'clock, p. m.

- - - - - -

2.00 O'CLOCK, P. M.

And the House having met.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting reports by Committees.

MR. B. L. CATHCART (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to report the Seventh and Final Report of your Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, and move its adoption.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Your Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills begs leave to present the following as its Seventh and Final Report:

Your Committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:

Bill No. 3 - An Act respecting the Town of Parry Sound.

Bill No. 8 - An Act to incorporate the Congregation of the Priests of the Sacred Heart.

Bill No. 30 - An Act respecting the Administration and Trust Company.

Your Committee would recommend that the following Bill be not reported, the petitioner having requested that it be withdrawn and your Committee would further recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted:

Bill No. 27 - An Act respecting the Township of Sandwich West.

Your Committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 8, "An Act to incorporate the Congregation of the Priests of the Sacred Heart."

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed) Bryan L. Cathcart
Chairman.

Motion agreed to.

Introduction of Bills.

THE DRAINAGE ACT

HON. GEO. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Provincial Aid to Drainage Act", and that same be now read a first time.

I may say, in bringing this in, this is to recommend 33 1/3 per cent for the counties and the rest for the territories, and we are bringing this in as rapidly as we can, and going forward as soon as possible.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Daley, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Public Health Act", and that same be now read a first time.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Could we have an explanation of that, please?

MR. GOODFELLOW: The proposed Bill is not to change the Act, except for existing irregularities, and regulations in respect to a couple of matters.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to questions 92 and 95.

Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I may say that this morning there was signed on behalf of Canada and Ontario an agreement relating to the use of our waters on the Niagara River. Hon. members of the House are familiar with all that has to do with that problem.

A number of years ago, going back fifty years or more,

there were certain deviations at Niagara Falls, of the water coming out of the Chicago drainage canal, and the use of water by Hydro there in the canal. Then came the word that it was required there should be additional water at the falls. In order to clarify all this, through the Hydro and the State of New York through the Hydro of New York authorities, a treaty was negotiated and it still has to be passed by Canada and United States. The terms were agreed upon and certain waters were turned into Canada and certain to the United States.

There are certain remedial works to be done, but we are not asked to do these remedial works. As a result of this, we will have approximately 800,000 additional horsepower over and above our present development, with the present use of water.

The agreement signed this morning was a simple agreement giving Ontario counties the right to use this international water.

I would like to take the third readings and then resume the adjourned debate on the motion for consideration of the report of the Select Committee on Conservation.

I would like to put through the R.V.P. Bill, and I will call third readings, starting at Order No. 2.

THE SURROGATE COURTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, third reading of Bill No. 68, "An Act to amend the Surrogate Courts Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. T.L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Porter, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 68, "An Act to amend the Surrogate Court Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and

be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 3.

THE AUDIT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, third reading of Bill No. 90, "The Audit Act, 1950", Mr. Frost.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 90, "The Audit Act, 1950".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 4.

PREPAID HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL SERVICES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order, third reading of Bill No. 105, "An Act respecting Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services", Mr. Porter.

HON. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Porter, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 105, "An Act respecting Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services".

Motion agreed to; third readin of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 5.

THE MARRIAGE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order, third reading of Bill No. 87, "The Marriage Act, 1950", Mr. Welsh.

HON. WM. GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Welsh, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 87, "The Marriage Act, 1950".

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): I understand that this Bill has not been reprinted, and I suggest that it be held over.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): The Bill will be held over.

Bill No. 87 Stands.

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 6.

THE DRUGLESS PRACTITIONERS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixt Order, third reading of Bill No. 109, "An Act to amend the Drugless Practitioners Act," Mr. Goodfellow.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Goodfellow, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 109, "An Act to amend the Drugless Practitioners Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 7.

THE VENEREAL DISEASES PREVENTION ACT, 1942

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order, third reading of Bill No. 111, "An Act to amend the Venereal Diseases Prevention Act, 1942", Mr. Goodfellow.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Goodfellow, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 111, "An Act to amend the Venereal Diseases Prevention Act, 1942".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 8

THE LAND TRANSFER TAX

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth Order, third reading of Bill No. 113, "An Act to amend the Land Transfer Tax Act", Mr. Frost.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 113, "An Act to amend the Land Transfer Tax Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 9.

THE ONTARIO RACING COMMISSION

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Ninth Order, third reading of Bill No. 115, "An Act to establish the Ontario Racing Commission", Mr. Frost.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 115, "An Act to establish the Ontario Racing Commission".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Why not call the first Order?

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): You raised so many questionswe thought we might look into it more fully.

MRI OLIVER: I think you are wise, at that.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 10.

THE CITY OF OTTAWA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Tenth Order, second reading of Bill No. 21, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa,"Mr. Chartrand.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 21, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 11.

THE CITY OF KINGSTON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eleventh Order, second reading of Bill No. 32, "An Act respecting the City of Kingston," Mr. Stewart.

MR. H. A. STEWART (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 32, "An Act respecting the City of Kingston".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 39.

THE K.V.P. COMPANY LIMITED

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-ninth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 117, "An Act respecting the K.V.P. Company Limited", Mr. Porter.

On Section 1.

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, I would like again to bring this matter to the attention of the government, and in that connection the answers given to a question by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) that the company, up to now, has only attempted to move solids, and even then it is just a small amount of solids from the effluent from the pulp mill. No attempt is made to neutralize the acid that is

really detrimental. I would like to draw to the attention of the House that since the opening of the mill at Espanola, the profits of this company on their operations in Canada and in the United States in 1946 were $871,609., and their sales were $21 million.

In 1947, when they got this project rolling the profits jumped to such an extent that we can see only that they made great profits on their operations in Canada. In 1947 the jumped to $2,180,142. on sales of $34 million.

In 1948, they jumped to $2,668,181. on sales of $39 million.

I would like to bring to the attention of the government, that the company is not financially embarrassed, and they are quite able to clean up this pollution. I would direct to the attention of the House a report that the company has operations in townships valued at $108,115 and in a township named Acheson, in that section, they have been cutting to the water's edge, and have been dropping small pine trees that should be allowed to stand. They have been cutting everyting in that area, leaving no seed trees, and right to the water's edge. People at the lake have objected. I would like to draw the hon. minister's (Mr. Porter) attention to that. In giving the company some release from the injunction we should see that this situation is cleaned up.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I have every regard for the plaintiff in this case, and also for plaintiffs generally, who, by reason of their common-law rights, obtained orders of the court to enforce their rights. I do not think we can regard them lightly. This matter has been, in many ways, a difficult one. We are faced with an injunction being obtained, and we have

a community to deal with, and we have to deal with farmers and clerks, and profeesional people and others. I asked them one day, in a public interview, "Are you, the residents of that community, satisfied that this company is doing everything it can to lessen the pollution of the Spanish River". They told me that such was the case.

I would say that our idea is to protect the public interest and to keep the trap going, and keep the streams from pollution. They spent a quarter of a million dollars to remove the cause. We have the Research Council in there, and we are not paying the costs. What the Research Council may say, I do not know. Out of this case will come methods of dealing with other cases we have in Ontario, and I hope the procedure outlined will be a pilot case, to enable us to deal with other cases in the province. It would be a mistake to make the scope of this Act too wide. We asked the Research Council to deal with this case. We can later deal with this problem that is now 150 years old.

I have been advised by the law clerks that the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) wanted to make some amendment to this Act. I will ask that the whole Bill wait until the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) is here.

MR. DENNISON: Before we discuss this Act, do you not think it would be fair to make an assessment on the other pulp companies, to help the Research Council to solve this? It is not only one company.

MR. FROST: We will wait until we come to them.

Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise and report one Bill to be held over for further consideration.

Motion agreed to.

(Take B Follows)

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report progress on one Bill, and moves the report be adopted.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 12.

CONSERVATION COMMITTEE REPORT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 12th Order, "Resuming the Adjourned Debate on the motion for consideration of the Report of the Select Committee on Conservation", Mr. Thomas.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I believe it is appropriate that this House should mark its appreciation of the issues involved in the Conservation Committee's report by discussing it at this Session. Those of us who were members of the Committee, and who spent a great deal of time in its investigations and in preparing the report will look forward to hearing, not only other members of the committee, but also other hon. members of this House, if they have had the time to read the report, and from whom we hope to hear.

All of us on the Conservation Committee were greatly impressed with the importance of the problems which emerged during our travels, and during our hearings, and we all believe that much of value can be contributed by other hon. members of this House who may see fit to take part in this discussion.

We, of course, will appreciate the fullest and frankest comments by them, both on recommendations and on the material in the report.

I would like to take this opportunity of saying a word of appreciation for the work of the chairman of our committee. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas) was a most happy choice as our chairman. I must say, that I know every other hon.

member of the committee will agree that he performed his duties most conscientiously, and that he worked so hard that he set a very hard example for the rest of us. I do not think that any selection committee could possibly have had a more conscientious or hard-working chairman than the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I should also like to draw attention to the fact that the proposal to establish a committee was originally sponsored by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) and if there is any value in the report or investigations which preceded the report, then much of the credit is due to my hon. friend for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) who first pressed for it at the Session last year.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I will not repeat the acknowledgements which appear in the report itself, of the splendid co-operation which was given to us by public servants, federal, provincial and municipal, both in this province and in the province of Quebec, and I will not repeat what is also said in the report about the marvellous contributions which were made by citizens locally who appeared before the committee. That is fully dealt with in the report itself. Nor of the specialists who appeared before us, and gave technical advice which was of great value, nor to the press or radio, which seemed to be aware of the importance of the conservation issues.

I might, however, be forgiven for referring to the hospitality and co-operation extended to us by other hon. members of this House. Wherever we encountered them, they were most hospitable, almost too hospitable, particularly, I think the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Newman), and probably a word of appreciation is due to them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to speak at undue lengths about this report. There are some things to which I want to draw particular attention, notably the general subject of "water". The hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), the Leader of the Liberal Party, will draw particular attention to others, but before I say anything about "water", I would like to make a few preliminary comments on a few other matters.

The report, it will be noticed, deals, in the main, with our three renewable and most important resources, namely, soil, water and wood, and the first comment I would like to make is that these are all resources, which are not all specialized or of local significance.

This is the subject, Mr. Speaker, which is a challenge to all of us, to forego some of our local or sectional loyalties and interests, and try to grasp the larger interests of the province as a whole.

Soil conservation is of importance, not only to the farmers, but to all the people of this province. Water conservation is of interest and importance not only to the municipal engineer -- whose problems are increasing year by year -- but to everybody, because we all rely on an adequate supply of water. Our great resource of wood in Ontario is of interest and importance to everyone in this province, not merely to the foresters or to the people who depend on the pulp and paper industry for their livelihood.

These are resources which are of great importance to everybody, and, as I have said, they challenge all of us to rise above some of our local and sectional interests, and look at the province of Ontario as a whole. And not only to look at the province of Ontario today, but to try to look at the province of Ontario over the next generation and succeeding generations. It is our duty in these days to take a longer view and a broader view than we do with respect to many of the

matters which come before this House.

Now, for these reasons, we have found and then emphasized in our report that conservation extends across a very broad front. It is the concern of all levels of government, it is the concern of many volunteer organizations, it is the concern of every individual.

One of our problems in approaching a conservation program is to integrate and co-ordinate the work of so many different governments, so many different organizations, and so many different people, because there must be a very large measure of integration and co-ordination if we are to succeed in a conservation program.

Now, the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas) in introducing the report, discussed at some length the soil recommendations, which are to be found in the second part of the report. I do not propose to discuss soils, except to say this -- and this is a comment of my own, -- that the subject of soil conservation in Ontario is extraordinarily important for all of us, for the reason which is already appearing, as we find difficulty in retaining our foreign markets. If we are to sell our farm produce abroad, we must be able to produce food at a relatively low unit cost. That is a difficult thing to do in Ontario, because our costs of production are inevitably rather high; the costs of living of our people are inevitably rather high, and as far as our agriculture producers are concerned, as we all know, they cannot produce as economically as some of those who live in a climate where there is all-year-round grazing, and many of the costs are lower than ours. It is apparent, if we are to remain in the markets of the world, our products of the farms of Ontario must be as efficient as possible, and our unit costs must be low as possible. Soil conservation

is one of the answers to that problem. For example, if we permit our agricultural land to suffer from erosion, if the land's fertility declines, our costs of production will increase. There is no doubt about that. I remember that during the course of our travels, one of the senior officials at the Central Experimental Farm pointed out to us that whatever you may think about the present standing of Ontario agriculture, Ontario farmers are growing a great deal of oats, and he gives us an average figure of 35 bushels per acre for oats production in Ontario, which, as he pointed out, was not economical for Ontario agriculture. That averages too low. We cannot on that basis hope to compete with other countries in the markets of the world, and, therefore, not only the conservation of our existing resources, but the improvement of soil fertility in Ontario is of tremendous importance to the future exports of this country. And that is so, and will be so, as long as we have to export a surplus of agricultural products. It will still be true, if our population is growing to a point where we no longer export food surpluses from the province of Ontario.

Now, there are several other preliminary points I want to make. One is with reference to the provincial administration. This was a subject to which our committee gave a great deal of time and thought. As I have already indicated, we had to face the fact that the conservation issues are the concern of many different governments, and many different departments, and some way had to be found of providing the necessary leadership in an integrated and co-ordinated way.

Now, other countries have faced these problems, as we know. In the United States, the federal government, the state governments and local governments are deeply involved in conservation programs. But their solution cannot be the same as ours must be. What we have suggested in our report

and what seems to us to be the only possible solution in Ontario, is that the leadership for a conservation program should be given by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the Prime Minister's department. So many other departments are involved, that we cannot see that a particular policy could be worked out or be effectively implemented, unless the Prime Minister's department accepts the responsibility. That, of course, would be true, no matter who the Prime Minister might be, although undoubtedly it would be a greater advantage if the Leader of the Government happened to be someone very much interested in this subject. I merely say that, because the conservation in the United States owes a great deal to the leadership of the late President Roosevelt. Time and again President Roosevelt went on the radio, and sounded the challenge of conservation to the people of his country, and throughout his administration he gave the most hearty support to the efforts of the Department of Agriculture and other departments in his government to promote conservation in the United States. It is a question of leadership which is needed in our province, and probably in other provinces as well.

I would not go into detail about the recommendations involved with respect to provincial administration, but there is one thing I do want to mention, and that is there should be a standing committee of this House which should be constituted each year, and which would meet at each Session, and review the work for the preceding year, and plan for the ensuing year. It has seemed to us that would be of great value in keeping this House closely in touch with what we have done with the program.

I want to refer for a moment also to the recommendation with regard to education. If you go into this subject, I think you will be surprized by the extent to which conservation has been neglected in our educational processes. We have built up,

over the centuries, a very costly and elaborate educational system, primary, secondary and senior. We have primary schools, elementary schools, secondary schools and universities, but it is not very often, even when you are undergoing a very costly education, that you see anything about conservation. There has been some improvement in recent years, and we know that many of the teachers of Ontario, because of their interest in this subject and the opportunities which they are given in connection with agricultural courses, have been promoting the spirit or knowledge about conservation, but it is quite apparent that educational leadership has not faced up to the importance of conservation.

There is an interesting anomoly in this connection. The men who did the pioneer work in conservation have been those at our universities and certainly we owe a great deal to our university scientists. I think we are all aware of the splendid work that has been done by some of the men at Western Ontario, at Queen's and at Toronto. But although these universities provided some of the pioneers and leaders in conservation, if you look through their courses of study, you will look a long time before you find a reference to soil erosion, or a reference to water-supply, or anything of that kind, and yet these are matters which can make or break us in Ontario -- or in any other country, for that matter. The maintenance of deep soil, without which no nation can live, the maintenance of our water supply, without which no nation can live -- I do not want to be unduly critical in these remarks, but if you look at the calendar of the University of Toronto, and even at the courses of study and the honour courses in geography, you will find I think only one passing reference as part of one course in one year, to soil erosion. This indicates, I am afraid, that the whole subject has not received the

study it deserves in our universities.

And the same is true in our high schools, and our public schools.

While I have touched on the subject of "education", may I say something for a moment about a different branch of education, and that is the specialized work done by the Ontario Agricultural College and associated institutions at Guelph. There are some very important recommendations in the report regarding the future of these institutions. I can assure the House that perhaps no question in the course of our investigations gave us as much concern.

(Page B-9 follows)

I think probably no question was given more careful thought and study than the position of these institutions. It was brought home to us that they represent the nerve centre for conservation work, certainly as far as agriculture is concerned in this province, and that the future depends to a very large extent on the educational work, the research work, and the extension work which spreads outward from the vicinity of Guelph. The purpose of our recommendation is to enable these institutions to continue and to enlarge the great function they have assumed during the past generation in this province. We believe that the demand upon these institutions in the future will be greater than in the past. We believe it will be necessary for them to rise to a higher status, and to make that possible, it becomes necessary to reconsider their present status, and their present source of support. I think, Mr. Speaker, if the House will permit a personal comment on the institutions at Guelph, I have often visited them, and I have often thought that the early governments of Ontario deserve a great deal of credit for the establishment of those institutions at Guelph. When you think, Mr. Speaker, how small the provincial Budgets were in those days, 50, 60 and 70 years ago, and when you think how few people appreciated the value of these institutions, and how few people have connected scientific work and investigation with agriculture, and when you think, as a matter of fact, that most people at that time were quite skeptical about the value of such institutions in connection with agriculture, and with the veterinary sciences. When you remember all these things, it is remarkable that the early governments of Ontario had the vision, the foresight and the courage to invest the money they did in these institutions. It is a little difficult to understand, as a matter of fact.

I realize in those days you could put up a building

for much less than you can today; I realize that the ages of the hired hands who did the job were much less than they are today. But even admitting all that, it is still surprising that some of the governments in the latter part of the last century could see far enough ahead to make the investment they did in the great institution which today enjoys world-wide fame, and when I say that, I want to include both the veterinary collage and the agricultural college.

Now, the agricultural college during the war was somewhat disorganized. As we know, its work was interrupted at the beginning of the war, its buildings were used for other purposes, and that has made it somewhat difficult for the college to resume its proper role in the life of this province. However, it has been done. I think the present hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) has done all he could to assist in the re-establishment of the college. But the demands are very great and because the demands are so very great, there are criticisms being levelled against the O.A.C. I do not think, so far, these criticisms have done too much damage. Certainly the men from O.A.C. are still in great demand in the United States; they seem to be very welcome indeed, when they seek positions in American institutions or with American companies. But the fact is that the demands are greater than ever before, and the task is bigger than it ever was. I do not know whether all the urban hon. members of this House realize how greatly the agricultural sciences have advanced in recent years. There have been revolutionary changes, and each change has been by new avenues of investigation, which require more people, more talent, more effort, and more money. During the last decade, whole new fields in agriculture have been opened. That means the jobs are much bigger than ever before, and, I am afraid, more costly

than ever before. My hope is that the administration of the day will display the foresight and vision which was shown by earlier governments, and will make an investment in this institution commensurate with the very great responsibility they have.

We pointed out in the report how many jobs these institutions are asked to do today, and I want to emphasize that point. I have had some experience in universities and colleges -- I forget how many. I remember attending university in China, and I can remember one or two here, and one in England. I do not know of any institution which has been called upon to give as much service as the institution at Guelph. Some of the hon. members in the House may have noticed that this summer the O.A.C. is having a short course for the clergy. You may ask, why? Well, there is a short course, for which there is some demand, for the rural clergy, the parsons out in the country, who apparently need to know more about agricultural questions than they do. That is just one of the multifarious services performed by the O.A.C.

That institution is doing a great many different things. You know how it is, when you have to do something, you want to do it, but you may find how difficult it is to do it as adequately as you would like to. The O.A.C. is called upon to do research work, something that is very important; it is called upon to train students in the higher academic studies, in the degree courses; it is called upon to give what I would term "vocational training" in the larger courses which do not grant a degree, but to whom they give vocational training. It is called upon to give advisory service, by telephone and by letter to the general public, and to engage in extension work all over the province, and also, of course, to look after innumerable visitors to Guelph, who come there throughout the year, sometimes as individualls, and at other times in large

groups, who like to go there, and call upon the college for many services. This sort of thing is not done by the average educational institution, and it imposes a heavy strain on the one at Guelph. I think I have said enough to indicate how important the thing is. I will conclude this reference to the college, by saying that we of the committee believe that this institution must be the nerve centre for the conservation program, so far as the settled land in Ontario is concerned. The extension work, which radiates from this institution, will be of great importance during the years to come; the research workers, who stand behind the extension men, may have all the facilities and sufficient money to enable them to carry on and keep up with their job, and keep abreast of scientific advances in other countries. These things are only possible, we believe, if our responsibility with respect to the Guelph institution is implemented within a reasonable period of time.

I want to make another comment before I come to the subject of "water supply", and that is on the importance in this province of our voluntary organizations. I am referring to organizations such as the Crop Improvement Association, provincial and county, and I am referring also to the people who serve as advisors and representatives for these organizations, in many of these capacities. I have in mind their enthusiasm which is invaluable. Nothing is more precious in this province than enthusiasm of these public-spirited citizens who engage in a great deal of work, because they believe in the cause, and not for any personal advantage.

The Crop Improvement Association, as our committee has indicated, is of great importance in any conservation program.

The only other one to which I wish to refer as being somewhat outstanding is the River Valley Authorities. These people have some official responsibility, under the legislation.

But what I am most concerned with, are the citizens who serve on the River Valley Authorities, and support them and their associations.

I think it is very important that we remember that while there is value in these organizations, there are also certain dangers. There is the danger if these people cannot succeed in what they are trying to do; they may become the victims of frustration. Some of the enthusiasm, which has been engendered in recent years, may be lost. If a man serves, shall we say, for seven or eight years, on the River Valley Authorities, and if he is finding an excellent service is done for his authority by the Department of Planning and Development, and then after some years of waiting finds there is not very much they can give them, and they cannot raise much money themselves, and the necessary grants are not available, they are subjected to the danger of a feeling of frustration. I am raising that point, because I am desperately anxious we should not disappoint these people; we should not allow them to become victims of frustration,

if they find that the whole plan which they have developed, and about which they have become so enthusiastic, cannot be implemented over a long period of years.

This brings me, of course, to the suggestion that this year -- and I hope it will be this year -- we ought to reach an agreement with the dominion government on the grants which have been proposed to River Valley Authorities. I do hope -- and I am sure all the hon. members in this House hope -- before very long the Dominion will see its way clear to participate on an equal basis with the province, in the proposed grants to the River Valley Authorities, to enable them to get on with their research, and their dam-building program. If we fail to do that, my fear is some of the fine citizens who have invested so much effort in River Valley Authorities and similar organizations, will become so disappointed that they

will give up the fight.

Now, Mr.Speaker, my other remarks today will be in reference to the chapters in the report about "water". I think we all appreciate the importance of water, and at this season of the year we have to appreciate some of its dangers. The morning newspaper carries the customary March report about floods, including loss of life, damage to property, and some sensational rescues of people in danger. That has been our experience almost every spring in Ontario for some time, and I feel it is required that something be done about flood control.

This subject has been given careful consideration in that report, and I am not going to recite what is set out in the chapter on "flood control". However, I do want to say this; that we should not expect to solve our flood problems in a day, nor can we expect to solve them with one easy solution. There is no single solution for the flood problem. I noticed that one of our western Ontario newspapers, the Galt "Reporter" has editorially emphasized the reforestation solution for flood control, as well as for municipal water supplies, and the report in the newspaper suggests we have not given sufficient attention to the importance of reforestation. I think we gave it very great consideration, and attach a great deal of importance to it. Reforestation is something which has to be taken over a generation, not just this year, nor next year. In any event, all of the evidence is that reforestation alone will not conquer our flood problem, nor will it solve our water supply problem.

We have to do a great many things. We have to go back to the farm lands of the province, and we have to improve our practice on slopey and hilly farm-lands, so that the water will not escape too quickly, and carry so much soil away with it.

That is the beginning of the flood control solution. We have to restore many of the mill-ponds and mill-dams, which always are a factor in flood control, although perhaps not a large factor. We must undertake some large reservoirs, if we hope to control our unruly flood waters. All these things cost money, but they are the answer to the flood problem, and no one alone will be sufficient to meet the problem.

I realize that some of our people have become rather cynical about this matter; some of them tell me there is a great fuss about floods every spring, but nothing is done about it, nor is anything heard about it from about May, until along in March of the following year. I do not that is true. I think we have been thinking about it more seriously lately; I think we realize it will cost money to cope with the flood problem, in Ontario, but we must above all, realize that a full-fledged conservation program is necessary, not just one isolated solution. If you meet a man with a pet idea, who has an easy solution, it is necessary to disillusion him; there is no one solution which can adequately deal with this problem.

Then there is the question of the municipal water supplies. This is another feature where there is a very large measure of misconception on the part of the public. We have in Ontario about 354 communities with a water works system, and almost one half of them depend on sub-surface water. The result is that we have become more and more concerned with the falling water table with dwindling water supplies, for both the farms and the towns of Ontario. If you look at the map which appears following page 92 in the report, you will see very clearly the large number of communities, particularly in western Ontario, which depend on sub-surface water for their supply. Southwestern Ontario happens to be a peninsula. It is surrounded on three or four sides at least by the Great Lakes, and that means there is a large supply of surface water, and we

just do not have the territory from which to draw the surface water. Our rivers are small rivers -- they are streams rather than rivers, and there is water underground.

I may say that as the chairman of our committee, the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas) has received a rather strongly-worded letter from a well-driller in the Fergus area, who takes issue with what he anticipates to be the finding in our report regarding sub-surface water. This gentleman says he has read about this in the papers, and he says that what he has read led him to say it is about the most absurd thing he ever read. He operates in the Elora-Fergus-Guelph area, and he states that in that area there is an abundance of sub-surface water, that he never had any trouble finding water wherever he went, and that the City of Guelph has an abundant supply.

I am well acquainted with that area myself, and I realize that perhaps Guelph is in a more fortunate situation, as far as water is concerned, and, being a large centre in southwestern Ontario, we may find that to be the case. The well-drillers are finding that the water tables are going down, but at the same time we are finding the cities and towns which are expanding, and which have growing populations, such towns as London, find it difficult to get enough water from the wells to supply their increased population, and their industries.

(Take C-1 follows)

This is most certainly true of the western Ontario cities and towns. They have to go outside of the cities to dig their wells, and the neighbourhood farms lose their water supply. One just has to see some of this land, to be forced to the conclusion that the province must review its legislation for sub-surface water. We must do as in the State of New York, and work out a procedure for the protection of those whose livelihood depends on a well. It is not easy, and we cannot suggest that anyone should have a monopoly. We cannot have one municipality going all over the place to have water, and eliminating the supply of other municipalities. We certainly need more information. In recent years, well-drillers have been at work, and while licensed, some of them do not know their business. We must find out more about the nature of our sub-surface supply.

The gentleman who wrote this letter has his own theory, that this water comes from the Great Lakes. I would point out the difficulty there because Guelph is a thousand feet higher than the Great Lakes, and I do not see how you can pump the water seven hundred to eight hundred feet high. No one knows. We know so little about our sub-surface, we are not in a position to lay down rules. We shall have to enact some new legislation to protect the livelihood of existing occupations where it is needed, in cities like London and other great industrial communities.

Some attention has been given to the communities' recommendations that an enquiry should be made to piping water from the Great Lakes. The committee did not recommend that we undertake this year or next year, to pipe water from the Great Lakes. We do say this: this problem has reached such proportions that we are going to make an investigation and make

a detailed study of the possibility and the probable cost of piping water from the Great Lakes to western Ontario. We should know what we are facing. It might be that as a result of that inquiry it will be found necessary to pipe water as some municipalities are doing in south-western Ontario. When that time comes, it will be done co-operatively. This is a job which will have to be done co-operatively, and I think the safe way to do it would be for these municipalities to work together as they now do through the Hydro-Electric Power Commission. There may be a day when water will be piped, and when it will be administered through the participating municipalities in much the same way as the Hydro administers electrical energy. In discussing pollution, in our report, in the chapter which deals with the subject, there is no concrete recommendation. It is a difficult subject.

The problem is serious and is not getting less serious as time goes on; in some respects, it is getting worse. I think the Bill before the House earlier today may provide one of the keys to our solution. I think we have had enough experience now to know that the average manufacturing or processing plant does not work out an adequate correcting program in this respect, and my opinion is that the procedure adopted in the K.V.P. may become necessary in others. It may be necessary to call upon our own Research Council to do the job and find the remedy in each case, and when a remedy is found, it will have to be applied. That would seem to be the probable solution, and I would remind the House that there is no over-all solution. Many processes are being used, some are tending to correct the situation, and some not. I am referring to the industrial processes. When a new process is commenced, that means a new

corrective agent has to be found. That means research, and the manufacturer is reluctant to undertake the job; he wants to get on with his manufacturing. The public interest must be protected, and the government will have to undertake the protection of that interest.

The other important form of pollution is the sewage works of the communities in this province. There is a lot of public confusion about this. Every city dweller assumes that because he has a water works system, there is a sewage system. But in a number of municipalities there is a water system and no sewage system, the sewage empties into the rivers and lakes of this province. I will not look into that particular operation, because there are too many who have "sinned." Many of our largest and more enlightened communities are today emptying large quantities of raw, untreated sewage into those lakes and streams and will continue to do it until they realize the importance of protecting our water. I do not believe there is any need for me to emphasize the value of pure water for the better possibilities of this province.

We have some cities which have a primary treatment for their sewage, but even in the case of primary treatment the sewage which is emptied creates pollution. There are very few plants in northern Ontario which provide secondary treatment as well, and make the river harmless. We have many small dams on the lake shore that need restoration. I am sorry the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) is not here. I say that we need speed in the restoration of these small dams. We have approximately five small dams in Ontario that are in bad shape, and falling into decay. If the department will use the powers given it by last year's legislation, and if the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) will proceed with the

restoration of a part of the small dams, it will do a world of good to the polluted waters, and provide recreational facilities for many people. I think the Department of Publicity might take an interest in this and get in touch with the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott).

People from other lands come here and ask me why we cannot swim. I remember only last summer I arrived at the scene of a drowning near my own home, and here was an old dam broken up, where a man and his wife -- both about fifty-five years of age-- had gone out in a boat on a summer's jaunt, and they were only a few yards from shore. This man and his wife had lived all their lives in that locality, and they were very hard-working, farming people. Both had lived within three miles of swimming facilities, but there were no recreational facilities there, either for the small ones, or for the adults. This evening they set out in the boat, and they had never learned to swim, and they went out to enjoy themselves on a quiet summer evening last year, and they were drowned. They had never learned to swim in that pond when they were young.

We all know of hundreds of cases like that, and there is no excuse. The restoration of our small dams and the importance of our mill ponds cannot be exaggerated. It would make life more wonderful in many of our small communities.

The last chapter, Mr. Speaker, is lake-shore erosion, which the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Oliver) will be discussing.

There is a need for Dominion - Provincial co-operation. One thing that much impressed me in the course of our travels, and no doubt every hon. member was impressed, was to visit some lake-shore community where people have built cottages or houses, and the lake shore has been eroded until it comes to the door-step of the house or the cottage. This is getting worse as

time goes on. We saw places where houses had to be moved, and cottages that were closed because of lake shore erosion. We have recommended that municipalities should be empowered to restrict further building where that exists, but that is only a stop-gap. I know that in the United States there has been a great deal of money spent and work done, studying the question of erosion, and Great Britain is working at it on their sea coast, and it is a serious matter. They cannot afford to lose land. We have our troubles, too. We may find the way out if we are prepared to do the necessary work before spending money on occasional work, but this will have to be co-operative.

In commenting on our representation to the consideration of the House and the government, we want to emphasize the importance of certain measures which can be undertaken only by the government of Ontario, but we also emphasize the importance of other measures which must be undertaken by the municipalities, and by the citizens.

In the final analysis, a great deal depends on the efforts of the individual, not only the farmer or land owner, but every citizen who has this opportunity to assist or impede conservation work in this province. There are some who have a key position and can contribute much more than others, and I think every hon. member of this House can do very much to make an important addition to the cause of conservation. And the same is true of our school teachers, and most of our public servants, notably the extension works, the department of Agriculture, and the department of Lands and Forests.

There are departments who feel they have no responsibility but their own particular department. They must co-operate with the other departments. I do not wish to strike a sour note, but speaking for myself, I am not satisfied that everyone in

the Hydro Department is greatly interested in the conservation cause. It includes a great many hard-working men and engineers, who are going out to do a good job. But there are times when they just go out of their way to seek co-operation with other departments, and neglect our resources. We shall need, in the future, not only electricity but also soil and water, without which electricity would be of no value. So the key role is not in one department.

The same is true of our school teachers, and other public servants. The school teachers have a great influence upon the young of our province.

We submit the report for the consideration of the House and the government, and I commend it, and would also commend the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) for the introduction of the Bill, of which he moved first reading this afternoon. There are other recommendations which will take time and consideration to work out in detail.

I hope and trust, however, that every person will realize that time is of the essence, and we have not much time to lose. Some of the most important recommendations should be acted upon before many months have passed.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): In continuing this debate, I wish to congratulate my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Jolliffe) upon the very able presentation which he just made. The hon. member for South York (Mr. Jolliffe) was the only legal man on the Conservation Committee, and we who are laymen often had to call upon him for a legal interpretation, so that it would be correctly worded and the public might read it in full.

I wish to say, also, that we were most fortunate to have the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas) on this committee.

With the great qualities of leadership and hard work that he possesses, and in acting as chairman of the Committee, much of the credit for the Committee's success and for the report that is now before the House, must go to the chairman, and we are anxious that he should have it.

I want to say that when this resolution was placed on the Order Paper last year, the resolution that brought about this Committee, it was not put on the Order Paper in a casual sort of way. It was placed there with the conviction that something of a definite character had to be done along the lines of conservation for this province. It was placed there with the knowledge and the background of what happened to Europe and Asia,which were once the granaries of the world, which now, because of faulty practice, are in the category of a desert. We realize that in the United States, itself, great efforts are being made at the moment to rectify the mistakes of the past, insofar as conservation is concerned. They are pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into the jaws of restroation and re-adjustment, and re-building the farm land of the United States, and replacing the barren lands with new trees, and building dams to correct the flood waters. The knowledge was there, as to what had happened in western Canada in the early 30's when the wind would take up the top soil, and the Dominion government, under the P.F.R.A. instituted conservation which brought that prairie back to the position which it occupies today. The work done by the P.F.R.A. should serve as a guide to those of us in this province of Ontario to show to us that the Act became more than a word, it became a reality.

In the far East, they are going on marsh land and reclaiming it, and they are doing a great job in restoration and

that is of interest to the province and to the Dominion. In Ontario, also, there was this knowledge, that in the springtime we had too much water. The water came down our waterways and carried away with it the topsoil, the good topsoil, and did great damage. And as the weeks ran into months, it disappeared, and where we had too much water in the spring there was not enough in the summer. It seemed clear that soil correction measures should be taken to rectify this situation, and even up the flow of water as between the spring and the summer. Great damage has been done by floods and by lack of water in the times when it was needed, and in this province we saw the forest lands of Ontario being depleted. We saw them being cut farther than they were intended to be, and saw them being burnt by fire and damage done by indiscriminate waste. We realized that there would be an awakening that our forests in this province were not indestructible.

(Take D follows)

and that unless the men and women who constitute these citizenry of this province rise to a realization that if we want to have forests in this province for succeeding generations, then all of this generation must lay the plans, in order that growth will be maintained of our forest areas, both in Old and in New Ontario.

So far as our farm lands are concerned, I do not think any one doubts for a moment that there is need for the application of the conservation policy. My friend, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr.Kennedy) will say that there are farmers in this province who are producing all the fine arts without conservation, and with him in that regard I would agree. There are some farmers who are doing that job. But it is that great bulk of agriculturists in this province whom we have to reach, by the message contained in this report. It is to the hundreds and thousands of farmers who have not yet had the opportunity to apply on their own land the methods of conservation, and to them, this message must be conveyed.

My friend, the hon. member for South York (Mr. Jolliffe) made that statement quite plain.

I want to say at once, Mr. Speaker, so that we can fix our attention on the matter from the angle I wish to direct it, that I would not have you think for a moment we have not done any conservation work in this province. Certainly we have. But I would say that it has not been co-ordinated, that it is too scattered; that it has been ineffectual, and the one thing this report will do, I think, above everything else, is to focus the attention of the people generally on matters concerning conservation, so that they will have before them as a whole--not as one individual, but collectively the whole people of Ontario--willbe able to see the great need which exists for the practice of ordinary conservation.

My hon. friend, the member for South York (Mr. Jolliffe) mentioned the O.A.C. I, too, want to say that the O.A.C. at Guelph has done through the years a remarkable job. I do not think the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) will find any remark of mine to contradict that. I have always been a friend of the O.A.C.; I have always wanted them to go faster and farther, perhaps; I have always wanted them to be more venturesome and more bold than sometimes they seemed to be, and the farm doctrines and the farm education in this province has been, and must continue, carried on at the Ontario Agricultural College at Guelph, and that the limitations which are imposed upon it by many factors, which I do not care to go into today must be lessened, and in spite of those limitations they have done a remarkable job.

In the report, those who have read it will find that the committee recommends a new set-up for a board of regents for the Agricultural College at Guelph. I want to say to the House, Mr. Speaker, that it has been proposed from time to time that the Agricultural College at Guelph should be another university, or should have a university status. The committee went into this matter very fully indeed, and our conclusion is that the time is not ripe at the moment at least, for bringing the O.A.C. at Guelph up to the status of a university.

One thing we must remember is in discussing any change in the status of O.A.C. at Guelph, that the O.A.C. at Guelph depends upon this government and succeeding governments for almost every cent of money that it takes to operate the college. Whether it is wise at this time to put that institution, dependent as it is upon government finances for its operation, under an independent board, and give them the full authority to carry out the program as they see fit, may be open to argument. Personally, I am not ready at the moment to take that step, or to make that move.

But the Committee did feel we were losing much valuable help we might get in this province, by not having a board of regents in an advisory capacity, or in a semi-administrative capacity, as well as to help the faculty at Guelph outline the policy and the curriculum of the college, and to be the intermediary between the college and the government in the matter of finance.

I do not think any one will doubt for a moment that a board of Regents could do a good job at Guelph. It seems to me, if you bring into the discussion, the curriculum and discussion on policy, new ideas, new thoughts, and a new outlook, that may be held by these men who will compose that board of regents, perhaps will give to that institution at Guelph some of the solid backing of the ordinary citizens of this province, the ordinary citizens who question some of the work done at Guelph.

It seems to me, too, that this board of regents, should be composed on a numerical basis as set out in the report. Some may criticize that the Federation of Agriculture has been given five members out of twelve. I think they should recall that the Federation of Agriculture is the voice for many, many farm organizations, and it is conceivable that they would appoint men who would speak for all the different branches of the agricultural industry, and, as such, I think their strength as outlined in the report is not too great.

One thing that the board of regents can do, and I think effectively, is to come to this government with the budget of the O.A.C. It always seemed to me rather an odd situation, where you have the president of a college, who is in reality a civil servant, coming down to this or any other government, and saying to the government, "I want so much money to run this institution", and if the government be so minded, they would say "no, you cannot have that much; we will give you half as much". What could the civil servant do? All he could do would

be to take what they give him and go home and pretend to be satisifed, and try to carry out the policy and curriculum of the O.A.C. on a reduced stipend from the government. It seems to me that this board of regents, supporting the president of the college, could come to the government, and could make out for the college a much stronger case than can be done at the present time. That is one more reason why board of regents would be a good move, as far as Guelph was concerned.

I want to touch on just one more matter before I go into the question of forests, and that has to do with the administration at the top level. The hon. member for South York (Mr. Jolliffe) said, and I repeat that we had put before us as a committee, many, many solutions to this problem as to who should head up the conservation work in the province. Some there were who suggested we should start a new department of government; some there were who said we should have a board -- commission -- some said the Department of Agriculture should handle this work, some said we should leave it with the Department of Planning and Development.

None of those suggestions, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me contain the answer to the solution of this problem.

I remember when the Department of Planning and Development was organized in Ontario -- as I am sure every hon. member remembers -- I said at that time in the House, to the hon. member who is now the Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) that he might as well either throw the job up, or we should give him some more authority. That was exactly the case at that time, and it is still.

This Department of Planning and Development which was supposed to be the one to head up conservation work in this province, had no authority to initiate a program or spend money; all it was, -- andalmost all it is today, is a map-

drawing department, a department which makes plans and submits them to the municipalities.

It seems to me, as it did to the hon. member for South York (Mr. Jolliffe) and others, that if we are going to give the importance to conservation in this province which the subject deserves, the only place that can be handled in the present set-up of our governmental machinery, is in the department of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). We cannot expect-- and Iwant to argue this for a moment -- the Department of Planning and Development to enforce the co-operation necessary for the successful carrying out of this project. We cannot expect the Department to say to the Department of Agriculture, "you have to co-operate". We cannot expect them to say to the Department of Public Works, "This is your part of the job; we want you to do it".

It just does not work that way. We are convinced, at the committee, that if it can be placed under the Department of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that he either has or should have the ability and power to co-ordinate the various departments of government into a nucleus that can spell success for the conservation program. However, whether that is taken up in that class or not, depends on the government, and I would say this, that anyone who has read and studied the report, will come to the conclusion that a great deal of the success of this report depends upon whether the administrative set-up is as we have suggested in our report. If another form of administration is accepted, then the recommendations contained in the report will not be as easily brought into effect as they would, if our formula were accepted and followed out.

Iwant to touch on one more subject before I go into the question of forests, and that has to do with loans to the young farmers. I want to deal with that for just a mo ent. I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the hon. Minister of

Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) are quite well aware that in this province there is a great need for loans to young farmers. What we want to do about this work is to ask the young farmers of this province to do the conservation work that is necessary, and we should be prepared on the other hand, to grant them some financial assistance, through a provincial government loan.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is quite well aware that there is a dominion farm loan board applicable to the people of this province. And he indeed well aware, too, that the provisions do not meet the needs I have outlined here this afternoon. There are very few young farmers who can put up 50 percent. of what they require to commence their farming operations. It seems to me there is a place where the province can come in and do a very worthwhile job.

In the province of Quebec, the dominion farm loan board operates, and the provincial government as well, have a farm loan board of their own operating, and they loan money to farmers -- particularly to the younger farmers -- at a low rate of interest, over a long period of years, and I think it can be proven that the operation of the provincial farm loan board in the province of Quebec has not been a failure financially; I think they have lost no money at all, and they are rendering a tremendous service to the rural people of that province.

The young farmer today is in the situation where he finds that when he starts, he is entering into competition with a man with a tractor, or a combine, and all this other equipment which takes a tremendous amount of money, in order to initiate a farm operation, and rather than endure the hazards which would come to him in starting at farming, the young man invariably says, "I will take the dinner pail; my responsibilities will be less down there".

We are losing to agriculture many of our best young men, and we are losing the very type of young men who would be so

invaluable in putting into effect in this province a sound conservation program. That is why the members of the committee are anxious that finances can be forthcoming, so that the young men will stay on the farms, and that they will foster the new ideas so essential in this day; that they will lead others to see the light, so that we in Ontario can become a farming community founded on sound basis, and look forward with hope to the future.

Now, I want to speak for just a moment -- and I will not weary the House for very long -- about the subject of our forests. I think we can all agree we are not keeping pace in this province with the new forest growth. We are cutting trees and burning them faster than we are replanting them. The day, when our forests will have disappeared is more easily discernible today, than it was 25 or 30 years ago. In other words, we can see the day when forests will not be the asset they are at the moment, unless we take very realistic means to meet the problem which confronts the whole forestry industry.

As every one in the House is aware there are three types of help for the forestry industry.

First, there is the private planning which has been going on in this province for many, many years. There is the provincial county planning system, which is giving good service, and then there is the recommendation in this report for the state -- the dominion-provincial operation.

I want to discuss for the moment the progress or lack of it we have made in private planning in the province of Ontario. I think it is time we took stock of just how much we are gaining by our system of private planning. I am afraid it will be found on close examination that much of the planning that has been done by private individuals has been wasted, and has come to no account, because the cattle grazed on it, as

it was not planned properly, and so on,and on, and on. I do not think we should look with disfavour on private planning, but I think we should look on private planning as a very small means indeed to reach the great objective of rejuvenating forests in the province of Ontario.

Then again whether or not we look with favour on the provincial county operations, there are many of those in the province, and the counties and provinces seem to be satisifed that they are getting large acreages planted with new growth, and are doing a good job.

The committee recommends that the third category, the forest planning, should be set up, and that is the type of planning that would get the forest cover, these huge acres of the pre-Cambrian growth. I think the report mentions 3,600 square miles. It may be that all of that may not to be planted, but I feel sure that a great portion of it would have to be. I will say at once that I want to be abundantly fair to this government in this regard at least, and I will say that his matter is a project of such magnitude that no man in his right senses can expect the province of Ontario itself can do this greatjob. I think the committee as a whole are of that opinion. We feel that this huge acreage should be planted and brought back to forest cover, but we believe at the same time, there should be participation on the part of the dominion government with the province, in order to ensure this great project going forward.

Now, happily for the province of Ontario, the dominion government has already placed on the Statute Books a Forestry Act under the Department of Resources, I think it is. The provision of this new dominion Act are so wide, that the province may enter therein, and work with the dominion government on reforestation matters, and I hope the day is not far distant when the province of Ontarion and the dominion government

will be able to sit down together each paying their own share of the costs, and each one of them contributing to the formation of this scheme, so that in reality we will see the dominion and the province in a partnership to render this land that is now useless waste, by bringing it back to life, and bringing it back to tree-growth, and bringing it back to where it will be a great asset of this province of Ontario and the dominion of Canada.

I think the dominion should come into this work on these grounds. I think an area of 3,600 square miles is not a project which any province could go into and handle, but it is at once a project which should be carried on from a national viewpoint. It is on a national scale that this 3,600 square miles of what is now semi-barren land, should be brought back to a state of productivity, almost as important as it was to bring areas of western Canada into useful production. I think inasmuch as we have the dominion Act on the Statute Books now, we have an Act under which we can go forward at the present time.

Then there is the further question of large dams. We remember large dams. The hon. Member for South York (Mr. Jolliffe) made a good point of this.

(Page D-10 follows).

You hear people saying, "All you have to do to stop flooding is to build dams". Another group will say, "That is wrong; all you have to do is re-forest", and still a third group will say, "If you practice conservation methods on the farms, you will not have to do either one".

I think the real answer will be found in this triple alliance which each of them equally important in the set-up of flood control. It starts back on the farm. If we can open up our farm land, and stop the run-off, stop the erosion, we will have got out of the streams much of that water which creates the problem farther down the street. I do not think anybody can argue that if we plant the head waters of our streams with forests, and if they grow until they become a haven for snow, where snow can collect, then we have done something to stop flooding I think no one will question that. We, as a Committee heard of several instances. I remember Brampton, they said that a little creek formerly flowed through there, and they cut the trees off the head waters, and the creek ceased to flow, and some energetic people went back and planted trees at the head waters of that stream, and once again it started to flow, which, in itself, is proof that the re-forestry plan for the head waters of our streams is an important factor in flood control.

As a last resort, as the hon. member for York South (Mr. Jolliffe) suggested, we will have to build these huge dams which cost a lost of money. I say the people of this province are not getting the proper prospective with regard to the factors which go into the controlling of flood. It is not a single phase operation in any sense of the word; it is at least a triple phase operation, and one without the others, will not be conclusive. The way to succed is to

integrat the three of them together, and allow them to blend themselves into correcting the flood situation.

When we come to the question of large dams, we have one -- and one of the largest ones in Ontario -- at Fergus, built around 1939 or 1940, with the participation of the Dominion government and the municipalities, 37½ per cent, 37½ per cent, and 25 per cent. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is as it should be. I do not think we should ask the Dominion government to help us build a 12-foot span across some little creek. I do not think we should ask them to build some small dam with us -- or to participate in the building. But when it comes to these huge reservoirs costing, as they do, millions of dollars, I think one could argue it is not all a provincial responsibility.

Let me say to the hon. members of this House, that when London, Galt and Kitchener are flooded and when hundreds and thousands of acres of farm land are inundated with swollen waters, with the whole area covered, hundreds and thousands of acres, then I say it is not a municipal responsibility, it is not a provincial responsibility in its entirety. It assumes, in my judgment, something that is national in character, and is something the three levels of government, and so far as we on the Committee were concerned, and so far as I am concerned myself, and so far as the members of our group are concerned, we believe that the Dominion government will and should participate in the building of these huge reservoirs that cost so very much money, but which will serve to correct a situation that takes a toll, and a heavy toll, annually, then I think it is not only nor municipal, but is really national, as well, in its scope.

Then there is the problem of lake shore erosion. The thing which strikes me in regard to lake shore erosion is this, that there are the problems which seemed to be the concern of

nobody; nobody seemed to be worried about it, and nobody seemed to be doing anything about. The municipality cannot do it; the problem was too great. The province has not been particularly interested, and the Dominion government only in a very slight degree has been interested in this tremendous problem. When we see the shorelines of Lake Ontario, Lake Erie, and part of Lake Huron, or view the houses toppling over into the lakes themselves; when we see acres which used to be good orchard land, gradually eaten away by the onward march of this erosion, then it seems to me we have to do something to stop this, particularly where there are populated areas, and particularly where the land has worth, as it has in some places -- a value of a thousand dollars an acre.

We saw on a farm at Vineland terrific damage already done by lake shore erosion.

I want to complete my remarks just by saying this; that in these three fields of state forestry, forestry on a large sacle, and in the building of these huge reservoirs for flood control, we have a public service which is wider than flood control, for the control of lake shore erosion, and it seems to me in these three fields there should be participation between the three levels of government in this country, before we can hope to effectively serve the province.

Now, may I say in conclusion, that it is my sincere hope that we in this House and in this province will pay attention to this report, and that we will in this Legislature help to implement some of the suggestions contained therein.

Personally speaking, from rather long experience, I am rather happy about this particular condition. Now I have got help from the Globe and Mail, which paper, the morning after the report was presented, said that in many, many

instances, this type of committee was preferable to a Royal Commission. With that, I heartily agree. It seems to me that the Royal Commission hold their hearings, and then some bright morning they hand in a report to the government --

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Maybe.

MR. OLIVER: Yes, maybe, as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) just said. As the hon. members probably realize, there is one outstanding example of "maybe".

But they say, "We have done this for you; the inquiry is over". And the government then brings a report into the House.

In this particular instance here, there were nine hon. members who helped to compile this report, who were very much interested in its preparation, and are very much interested in what it contains, and are anxious that there be implementation to the recommendations in the report. There are nine hon. members, who are on the floor of this House, and it seems to me that it is much more preferable in many, many cases over the way a Royal Commission handles a question of public character.

I say in conclusion that one thing this report has done -- and I hope will continue to do -- is to focus attention upon the whole question of conservation. We have a grand opportunity in this province to learn from the mistakes of others. I would not say for a moment that we are in a bad way so far as the need for conservation is concerned. I would say, though, that we have the most glorious chance in Ontario to take very definite steps while yet there is time. What an opportunity this is. We do not see all around us the great havoc which has been wrought by the lack of conservation. We can draw on the experience of other countries, and while there is still time, put into effect in this province plans and a program that will off-set the ravages of the lack of conservation, and do it while there

is time, at much less expense than after the need has gained great headway against us.

I thank you.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St.Andrew): Mr. Speaker, it is a stroke of luck that because of the unavoidable absence of my colleague, the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), I have been given the opportunity of saying a few words on this profoundly important question I have no qualifications to speak authoritatively on some of the questions which the reporters dealt with, excepting this, Mr. Speaker, that I have a genuine concern for the preservation of the natural wealth of the province, so that it may be passed on to those who come after us, and whole livelihood and well-being will depend on this natural wealth in such a large measure, and it is well that it be preserved and passed on.

Mr. Speaker, one other point which may justify my speaking, is a sort of a secret romantic attitude to things bucolic and to farm life. My feelings in regard to this problem does not idealize farm life; my feelings, however, very often lead me to the idealization and the romance of life on the farm, near a stream, and so on. Not unlike many others, who do not confess it, I say that once a year at least I go out and look at a few acres near a stream, which I hope some day to be able to claim.

It is only with that justification that I speak today.

However, there is a justification for this group joining with every other section of the House in expressing appreciation to the general scheme of the work, and the recommendations which emanated from the studies of the committee, and to pay tribute to the work of the chairman of this committee, the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas), of whom I think the hon.

Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) spoke obviously with a great deal of feeling, as did the hon. Leader of the Liberal group (Mr. Oliver), when they said that on a question of this kind there is no partisan approach, but a very genuine attitude displayed by every section. We join with them in that sentiment, and in the opportunity of expressing it in the House at this moment.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is also very significant that the House is having almost a full-dress discussion on this question. That is most unusual. It is almost a third debate. I think it is good, and it is correct, because it will help to focus the attention not only of the hon. members of the House, but of every part of the province, on a matter of long-range significance, such as that with which the report is dealing.

May I, Mr. Speaker, draw your attention, and the attention of the House, to the fact that it is little more than 150 years ago since the clearing of the land in this province commenced on a large scale, and in this part of the present century, beginning the second half, it is a good and very opportune moment, to stop and look back at what happened since those early days, and see what has happened in a little more than a century and a half, and at the same time to plan for the century which lies ahead.

I was struck some time ago when I read about the first Session of the Legislature of Upper Canada, that when Governor Simcoe called the Session together, there were no more than ten thousand people in this vast land, that is even now not fully known. What an insignificant number in a large area such as this, and I understand a number of the legislators did not show up for the first Session, because they were busy clearing the land, and engaged in harvesting.

Since then, of course, revolutionary things have taken place, which are almost beyond recognized accomplishment, and are of monumental proportions,

While that is true, as the hon. Leader of the Liberal group (Mr. Oliver) has said, that it is not too late -- certainly it is not -- there is no room for alarm, and certainly no ground for panic, but I think it is true that much has happened to justify the planning on a grand scale for a long period such as is recommended by this committee.

You know, Mr. Speaker, that the people from whom I trace my ancestry had in ancient history, a day which was called the "New Year's of the Trees", a day set aside which was considered to be the Near Year of the forest trees generally, and that is still remembered, and a note is taken of it each year, and the children are encouraged to plant trees on that day. It was New Year's for the trees, whereas on another occasion it means the New Year for people and the prayer for rain, which, in ancient times, was one of the most important of services, is still retained by orthodox and conservative congregations, and to this day, in the fall, you will find special services being held to pray for rain. That is how important the trees and water and, of course, the soil was to pe ple in ancient times, and it means that in memory and tradition and practice, it remains to this day. That is the way it should be.

You know, when you go to Europe you become conscious of public service, as well as our lack of consideration. When you go to England, you are struck by it. When you go on the Continent, you become more and more aware of how careful people of every patch of land, and every tree, and their forests are pointed out to you as being perpetuated for centuries, and they have served indeed for centuries. Then you think back of what

is happening at home. The rivers and streams and the wholesale devastation which has taken place in forest areas in our province, and you see acres and acres of land already wasted, and you begin to feel that we should avoid the spreading of such a disastrous trend, and learn from the people of the old world how to preserve the land, trees, and waters, and so on.

This is, therefore, in my opinion, a good time. We have had a century and a half of experience in the exploitation of the land and the natural resources of the province; now we are coming to a new cycle, and the report on conservation should show us how to serve the people of the province well, in the immediate, as well as in the distant future.

You know, I am often struck by the recklessness with which we treat these things. The hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) will remember the time we were together in council, and the question was being taken up of converting the ravine which is just in the back of where I live, and is, I think, one of the most beautiful spots this city still has. It is a wooded ravine, with a stream running through it, and within a stone's throw of the teeming activities of life, but as you turn the corner and get into this ravine, you forget you are in a big metropolitan area.

However, the transportation commission was going to cut it up, and make a speedway out of it, so that those living in a certain area could get home that much faster. I organized the people in that area, and we fought it and stopped it, but I know the blueprints are still there, and the intention is eventually to do away with that ravine, and fill it in.

If you go through parts of Europe you see streams which are very clear near large settlements, and sometimes in the very heart of the city and you wonder why we cannot do that here

and you come to the conclusion that having so much of natural wealth, we are almost in the position of a man with barrels of money, we do not care, and we throw it away, and eventually the streams here will be driven underground into a sewer type, and the forests will be cut, and so on, Well, that is bad. It is good that attention is drawn to the people of this province of such things.

When you speak of Kirkland Lake, there is not lake at Kirkland. People there cannot see a lake, unless they drive a long way. The mines up there needed something to dump the slag into, and they utilized the lake, which was entirely unnecessary. The lake could have been preserved for the people who live in Kirkland Lake. That same thing is true in many parts of the province. It is time we began to stop that. Of course, with the immense wealth we have, which is not yet counted fully, we become indifferent and careless, and we have not the proper appreciation of our natural heritage, as well as some of the other finer things.

For instance, I was struck, when I was in Switzerland by the following. I walked down the main street of Zurich, which is a beautiful boulevard, not very long. It is called: "Bahnhofstrasse". I had a letter to mail, and I walked for a block or two looking for a letter box. I finally stopped someone and asked him where the letter box was, and he said, "they are in every block", and I said, "I beg your pardon; I have been walking here from the station and I have not seen a letter box yet." The man said, "You will not find them on the corners; they are up on the sides of the trees", and I just turned around, and there was a letter box near the first corner. We would not stop here very often to consider such small things.

I have already said that I have no important contribution

to make, except to make it unanimous, and also add a few sentiments and wishes, excepting on this point, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether the committee deliberately failed to refer to some of the recommendations made by the Kennedy Commission regarding our forestry. It is true that the Committée went over every angle of conservation, as is very clearly shown on page 113, but I do not think you can speak of conservation when you think in terms of many years without paying attention to the tremendous work that goes on in the forests. If those who now control forestry matters here are not doing the work satisfactorily -- and the Kennedy Commission certainly implied that was so, which suggested a forestry commission to operate independently, and without political influence, as does the Hydro Commission --

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): You know I am not subject to political influence.

MR. SALSBERG: The committee should have made some reference to that, and suggested some action now, while the great corporations are exploiting the forests, so that the harmful effect of their method of cutting the forests be stopped, and stopped immediately. That, too, I would say would be justified, and it could be considered as part of the conservation efforts to which the committee has paid attention.

I fully agree with the recommendation that ti should be in the office of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). On the surface, it would appear that the Department of Planning and Development should handle it, and I do agree that certainly for the beginning, it would serve the purposes of the report, and the interests of the province, if it were concentrated in the office of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) where co-ordination would be striven for, and the work gotten under way. Later on, it may go to the Department of Planning and Development,

and there may be several changes established in that, or any other department.

I want to conclude by saying that the big thing, in my opinion, is that we should try to do, aside from the reforestation and building of dams, and the other recommendations which have been made by the committee, is to put emphasis on education. I am glad that the report suggests that this education starts in the elementary schools, and I think that is where it should start, on a grand scale. Children from the earliest age should be taught to appreciate that earth is not just dirt, too many grown people consider earth as just dirt. It is far more. The forests are not just a place where you get boards, or Christmas trees, and when anything that is done that is harmful to the forests, what can we do to try and avoid it. I think the public school system should be involved very actively in this educational program, which is envisaged in this report.

(Take E follows)

I think the schools can arrange excursions of children, not necessarily into the country. From a city like Toronto that is not easy, but they could be taken to our lake shores and to our bigger parks, and could ., in a living way, in a living fashion, be taught the meaning of our natural wealth, of our resources, what it means to them, their future and how we should treat these natural resources. I think it would make quite a difference in the years to come.

I conclude by saying that I am thankful for the opportunity of saying these few words. It does not help the Commission, evidently they do not need much help from me, but I do appreciate the chance of speaking about some of the things in a manner in which we do not always discuss things in this House. It is something I think the entire House agrees upon. Much may yet be required, but I think the province will be thankful for the work that this Commission has done, will wholeheartedly support its major recommendations and will look forward to the beginning of implementing the recommendations made in this report.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. O. F. VILLENEUVE (Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, as a member of this Committee I would like to deal in particular with the Actas presented to this House today in regard to municipal drainage aid.

The last five out of seven years in eastern Ontario, we have had what could be termed practically crop failures in regard to grain, which could be traced in great measure to poor drainage facilities. I know the people in the eastern section of the province will appreciate the effort this government is making toward eliminating that factor. It is true that they have followed our percentage recommendations but in fairness we believe as a Committee, to start on a sound basis, a qualified land use engineer should be made available to give the necessary

merits or demerits to any municipal body that requires this information, as to whether the costs to drain are justifiable or not.

I have in mind the drainage of the Luther marsh, which at great expense was found out to be of little agricultural value and should have perhaps been left as nature meant it to be, a swamp for containing a water reservoir.

We feel there should be appointed to the Municipal Board a qualified man, first, in the program of conservation, and that Board should be the sole consulting Board to be approached, instead of what we have now, our local supervisors or referees, as they are sometimes called, because these men in the past have offered and given valuable service, but they do not know all aspects of conservation, and we feel that qualified men are in a position to render these very important decisions.

Since the government this taken up this very important obligation, I feel there is another subject that we as a Committee do not want to discuss, the weed problem as a whole. However, from what observations we have made and the information placed before us, it is very evident that where there is good management, weeds on farms are on the wane. The opposite result is also apparent where poor management is in effect. Having had the opportunity to go through the elevators, to see the handling and cleaning of grain at the lakehead, we feel that the large quantities of weed seeds in the screenings---which after all is not under the control of the province but comes under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Foodstuffs Act and the Canada Grading Act---should be discussed quite thoroughly with our representatives from the Department of Agriculture, as to the spread of weed seeds throughout Southern Ontario. The most expert advice we can find tells us that 10% of these weed seeds ger-

minate, therefore if we in our endeavor try to control weeds in the province, it is rather hard to make a great deal of headway if we are to be pestered, if I may term it that by Western grains containing many weed seeds coming in without some restriction or control.

Just the other day I had occasion to speak to a food dealer in my district who had bought a carload of ground barley and, to his dismay, the farmers are returning it as fast as he can sell it, because the hogs will not eat it. I am not making that as an unfounded charge, it is absolutely a truthful condition that exists today.

I have here a copy of the Canada Foodstuffs Act and I do not believe that too many people are acquainted with the liberal latitude given to these millers in order to sell this type of feed. I will not bother reading the description of No. 1 feed screenings, or No. 2 feed screenings; what we are concerned with is uncleaned screenings and refuse screenings. This is the Act, and this is how they are described here:

> "Uncleaned screenings is grain screenings excluded from the preceding grade or classes because of the content of weed seeds, chaff or dust, but containing at least 35% of material which, if separated, would classify as No. 1 seed screenings."

I submit that is a very broad latitude.

> "Refuse screeningsinclude all classes of grain screenings excluded from the preceding grades or classes because of the content of weed seeds, chaff or dust, provided that all such ground screenings when sold under certificate of class or grade issued by an inspector

"appointed under the provisions of The Canada Grain Act may bear the class or grade designation indicated in such certificate."

But now I shall read what No. 1 feed screenings consists of:

"Wild buckwheat and broken and shrunken grain and may contain small proportions of other seeds of feeding value and weed scourings. It shall contain not more than 7% of crude fibre, not more than 3% of small weed seeds, chaff and dust, combine not more than 5% of ball mustard, not more than 6% of small weed seeds, chaff, dust and ball mustard combined, not more than 8% of wild oats, and shall be cool and sweet."

That is No. 1 feed screenings.

We, as a Committee, feel that uncleaned screenings and refuse screenings, in particular, should be barred from being shipped into the province. We realize that the livestock feeder has to buy the grain to feed his cattle, but when an analysis is made of what these screenings consist of, it is of very little nutritional value and certainly is not palatable. Therefore we also recommend that none of these screenings, insofar as uncleaned screenings are referred to, or refuse screenings, be allowed to be mixed into any kind of feed that is sold in this province.

We do not believe it is necessary, or it may be too costly, for the province to have to set up a large group of inspectors. The Federal Government has a very efficient inspection service at the elevators and at the head of the lakes and I am sure that with proper understanding we can coordinate those services, which will be of vast value to our farmers, because we know that weed seeds cause a loss of

at least 10% in crop production in this province. Therefore, if we can control that in some way, it certainly will mean financial returns to our farmers who find themselves competing in markets with other countries at a price that is not too profitable at its best. We do feel it should be implemented as early as possible.

In regard to drainage , we have indicated, as I stated, that we feel engineers qualified as supervising engineers for this type of work, should be at the service of the municipalities in giving advice. We feel also that farmers also should have the services of qualified men to take ground levels when performing any work on their farms in the line of underdrainage.

At the present time the Tile Drainage Act has been in effect since 1878. Any farm with a hundred acres of land is in a position to borrow up to $3000. Underdrainage is costly, yet it is a proven fact that farmers increase their crops very materially thereby. Nevertheless, evidence has been brought out that people have spent large sums of money to improve their land, and possibl the tile drainage system is not functioning as it was meant to, , because it is possibly not laid with proper levels, which takes qualified people to perform.

You people in particular in western Ontario, in your cash crop areas, are very muchaware of the value of tile underdrainage. We have also had evidence there is a poor grade of tile being manufactured in some instances, both in clay tile and cement tile, and it doesnot warrant the expense on the part of any individual to put in poor material. We would recommend that those tile manufacturers have a license and be subject to having inspectors take a test or sample of their tile to see that their product is all of a necessary

standard for the drainage of soil.

We have a condition in Western Ontario where the province is most heavily populated that, in particular, inland cities that are drilling deep-water wells that are greatly affecting the shallower wells of numerous farmers. We feel these farmers established there for perhaps two or three generations should have some priority rights, but as yet there appears to be no legislation that will guarantee them any protection. Therefore, we feel they should have some amendments to the necessary Act put through in this province to protect their farms and property.

We find that Europe, 75 to 100 years ago, perhaps experienced what we in Southwestern Ontario are experiencing today, due to agricultural practices, the cutting off of the forests, draining our lands; we find these great inland cities, increasing in size with industrial growth, are consuminglarge quantities of water, and the necessary reservoirs that existed and contained water years ago have been practically disappearing. That is a subject beyond the scope of this Committee to study, but we feel that hydraulic studies of rivers throughout Ontario should, at the earliest opportunity take place with the Dominion and provincial governments, and, if necessary, an investigation into the feasibility and study of having water piped to these various municipalities from one of the lakes, either Lake Erie or possibly Lake Huron. We are not in a position to give any data of importance on this subject, as I have stated, because that is beyond the scope of an ordinary citizen.

We are today fast changing in our way of life. We feel as we travell through this province, that recreation must be given some consideration, that is in the form ofparks or beaches for the general public. Ipperwash Park on Lake Huron and

Rondeau Park on Lake Erie, and I believe Point Pelee, which is owned by the Federal Government, are the only three government parks, public parks that is, that are available in this vastly populated section of the province. We are told that on week-end holidays in particular there is scarcely standing room, let alone recreational facilities, in these three parks. We feel that, with the $250,000,000 spent annually on recreation in Ontario and the fact we are more or less on a five-day week basis, more consideration must be given by this or some government to providing facilities of this type for the public at large.

We hope some day in the near future when the St. Lawrence Development eventually takes place, to have our authorities consider this very important feature and, when allowing for land appropriation, make the necessary allowances for these public recreational grounds. We feel that it is a growing necessity and that most people today cannot afford to take their cars and drive off into the wilderness every weekend for a rest. It is essential we should have these recreational facilities a little bit closer, in particular to our larger cities and towns.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly on land use advisory services. We feel the present system of agricultural services, as performed by our agricultural representatives, is possibly inadequate. I am not in that way stating that these various representatives are not giving the very best service possible, but we feel with the growing demand . . today there should be assistance in these agricultural representatives' offices, so they could go out and advise farmers in regard to farm management and give a farm planning service, give him his drainage service and possibly call in these district engineers. Speaking of district engineers, we have but one drainage engineer, that is a government drainage engineer, in

Eastern Ontario, situated at Kemptville, who has to work from the County of Peterboro to the Quebec border, a distance of 200 miles, and from the St. Lawrence River to the Ottawa River up in the Renfrews, in width as much as perhaps another 125 miles. So it is not humanly possible for one man to cover this vast area. I am sure the same conditions exist elsewhere in Southern Ontario and we feel that these services, altough they will cost some money, are a sound investment, and if we do not helpthe farming population in general, these people will try to look after their own interests, but all they require is some advice and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, we spent some time in Northwestern Quebec because in our tour through Northern Ontario we were told what great improvement they had made towards their Land Settlement Act as in operation in that province, in comparison with Northern Ontario. After two days of travelling and on information, we have found that, based on government figures, they find that to establish a settler in that area costs the province $7000, that is taking into consideration public utilities such as roads, schools and such like. Then they have a system where they pay the farmer according to his own ability to clear his farm, and to erect buildings, on a sliding scale---that is, if he builds a barn of a certain type, he is allowed so much, and if he builds a house of a certain type he is allowed so much. However, when it is all figured out, it is a costly venture; it amounts to $10,000 per farm. I am not condemning or findingfault with their system, that is what is in vogue there and they have settled these farmers in mining or industrial areas where markets are accessible to them. We, in certain sections of Northern Ontario, in the past perhaps did not make a competent study to realize

that where a farmer must make his living, he must necessarily have available markets.

If there is one district in Northern Ontario that is very deserving of consideration, in my estimation it is the Rainy River area. There is a transformation taking place in that area. Great mining centres have opened up, and right today we have been given submissions that they need in excess of twelve to fifteen hundred dairy farmers to supply these mining areas. We understand in the Red Lake District they are paying as much as 25¢ a quart for milk, and most of thatmilk is being supplied by the Province of Manitoba. This would appear to this Committee to makeit sound, if the government so felt, to assist immigrants, or a selected group which was screened as farmers to fit into this environment.

In the past, many people have gone to farm in the North who possibly were not cut out for that type of life, or possibly interested as woodsmen and when the bush or woods were cut off, they left those farms. I have as an example one township around the Cochrane district, named Glockmeyer Township. All the facilities we have in Eastern Ontario or in Western Ontario are pretty much supplied to that township in regard to roads, a hydro development and available schools, and after a close survey, we found the following, and I will just read these figures if you do not mind, if you have no objection. I have cracked my fingers once and I hope it will not happen again.

There are 336 lots of approximately 150 acres each in this township. May I say, this is just as good land as lies outdoors, it is in the Cochrane clay belt, and Cochrane itself is situated in that township. It has all the necessary facilities and in these 336 lots, 76 lots are still unpatented, and most of them are for sale. 96 lots are occupied, and not all are full-time farmers. 52 lots have been patented and are now for

sale. 112 lots belong to the Crown.

After close examination while travelling through this township and discovering that it isfavorablylocated to markets, transportation and public utilities, facilities with good land, ithas beyond any doubt left the impressionwith this Committee that it is not in the interests of the settlernor the province to open up other lands much less favorable for settlement .

MR. J. S. DEMPSEY (Renfrew South): Oh, you do not know what you are talking about.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. VILLENEUVE: I am not condemning the progress of the north in any way, I am just stating the--

MR. DEMPSEY: They are only 75-acre lots. I know that district well. You do not know what you are talking about.

MR. VILLENEUVE: Well, my friend, this is just the information that was given to us, and we are not in any way trying to retard the progress or the development of the north, but we do feel that it needs a much-larger scope of survey and investigation than this Committee was afforded in the time available to it to study in ten or twelve days.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Hear, hear. All you have to do is to look at the vacant farms.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. VILLENEUVE: Well, weare just bringing this to your attention, and we feel you cannot make this study in a short time, but in comparison with the information we got in Northern Quebec, it costs money to settle these farms, and I know in Eastern Ontario in particular, you can buy 150 acres of land today, well built, for less than $10,000.

MR. DEMPSEY: How much money does it cost?

MR. VILLENEUVE: I am not stating that, I am making that as a comparison. At any rate, we do feel there is no question of doubt that there is a great transformation taking place in several of these areas, and as I stated, the Rainy River district in particular is one. Most of the farmers who are farming there today are men who have moved in, I believe, from Western Canada and have practised their type of farming, and since these mining areas have developed, naturally it would require some change in that particular type of farming. The people in that area are anxious to have these farmers but, as I stated before, if these markets are available to them and we have the interested people who want dairy farming, I think we are on a sound basis to go forward and try to give some help.

I do not want to get into any discussion with my hon. friend (Mr. Dempsey) as far as the North goes.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane, South): Go right ahead.

MR. VILLENEUVE: I am just stating what has been given to us as information. We realize this is a wonderful area. In the Matheson area there is no better land outdoors, and we realize the government certainly must do something towards helping these people find a destination for the products they can produce; that appears to be in some areas part of the problem, not in others.

In the Hearst area, the same condition exists but we find that Kapuskasing and Hearst import a great deal of their foodstuffs, and yet those farmers there,--it is unfair but we realize that they have not got the ready market to dispose of their foodstuffs when they have a surplus, and these are conditions, as I have stated, which must be studied at greater length.

There are other gentlemen on this Committee who will take part in this discussion. I would like to state that we in Eastern Ontario in particular are greatful for the drainage assistance this government has seen fit to recommend to the honorable Legislature, and we do feel that in this grain which is being imported from Western Canada, not to discriminate against any section of the country, that closer observation and restrictions will mean plenty of money to the farmers in this other section of the province.

Thank you.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. T. H. ISLEY (Waterloo, South): Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief, but as a member of this Committee I feel I should say a few words on the work that has been done. Before doing so, however, I would like to congratulate our very able Chairman, the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas), for the fairness with which he worked all Summer with his Committee. I am quite sure his background as an agricultural representative was a great help to him in bringing out at the various meetings across the province the things we wanted to know. I am sure it was he and our good secretary, Mr. Crown, who had all the headaches.

The thing which impressed me most in working on this Committee was the way in which all hon members, drawn from three different parties, could work together in a non-partisan way for the common good of the people of the province.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ISLEY: Never at any time did politics enter into our discussion, and again I would say in case it was heading that way, our very able Chairman the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas) was quite able to steer around it. I am sure that is one of the things

the public has taken notice of. I have been told on several occasions that is the thing which impressed the public of Ontario, that we as a group of people, elected representatives of this House, could work in complete harmony, regardless of our political affiliations.

I would like to say a word of commendation to the government in setting up this Committee. I certainly feel they should be commended on seeing fit to set up this Committee last year, but I would like also to add that such a Committee was, I think, many years overdue. I say that as secretary of a Farm Forum of some years standing. These topics were discussed as far back as eight or ten years ago, and again each year, and the topics that were discussed were such things as soil fertility, soil erosion, crop rotation, contour ploughing, strip farming, drainage, reforestation and practically all the subjects this Committee has dealt with this past Summer.

To implement this report, Mr. Speaker, there is very great need for an educational program. We know the government cannot pay to have all these things done, or the province as a whole cannot pay for having all these recommendations put into effect. The initiative in many cases must come from, especially in agriculture, the man on the land, in other words the farmer. We have a great organization, the farmers' organization, the Federation of Agriculture, along with the group of people I have just mentioned, the Farm Forums who, I am sure, can do a wonderful job in "selling" the thoughts and the recommendations of this Committee.

I would like to read you an article that appeared in Woodland World, February issue of this year, which indicates where these things are being done and recognized in some parts of

(Take F Follows)

Canada. The heading is, "Adults Study Conservation", and it reads as follows:

> " Recognition of the need for adult conservation instruction is made in programs such as that conducted by the Adult Education Division of the Nova Scotia Department of Education in which study groups give special consideration to forest management and soil conservation. Some classes for adults are making a study of forestry as it applies to their particular districts.
>
> " One of the important programs being conducted on a national scale is the series of broadcasts on soil conservation and related subjects undertaken this season by the National Farm Radio Forum sponsored by the C.B.C., Canadian Council of Adult Education and Canadian Federation of Agriculture. Many local forums have started action projects in soil analysis, farm planning and reforestation."

That is, I feel the type of program which we must set up here in Ontario. Co-operation between the existing organizations throughout the country, as well as in towns, which the various departments of governments, is necessary.

To get back to what I was saying, the briefs which were presented during the past summer were along the same lines, and in many cases presented by people who have taken part in these discussions in farm forums, together with people who are the heads of municipalities, and these were the people who presented these briefs, and they had first-hand knowledge of the problem in various counties across the province.

So I can assure you that the findings of this committee and its recommendations, have come to us, and are well founded,

because of the information received from the people who are right back there where the trouble is, and is information which is of the utmost importance.

I would like to say a word or two on flood control and river pollution, and I do so, because I see these two evils working right in my own constituency. I am going to point out that the Grand River which runs through Waterloo, is classed as one of the worst rivers for flooding in the spring, doing great damage to certain business sections, especially in Galt, and the losses are great to the merchants along the main streets, and again that river is noted for pollution. I am ashamed to say it, coming from such a great county, but I had a man ask me the other night, "When is this committee going to do something about this open sewer running through our county?" We found there are other rivers which are bad for pollution, but this river in part of the industrial area, is exceptionally rank.

I could go on and say more about it, but I would like to point out that I was called down to this river by an acquaintance, to acquaint myself with the conditions, so I could tell the hon. members of this House what some of the people have to put up with. I was called down to a man's home one night in the summertime, and he had all his windows closed, and it was very hot in the house, I assure you. I asked him why the windows were all closed, and he said, "If I were to open them, I would be chased out of the house by the smell from the river down there". That is the condition we are having in the industrial areas, and I am sure there are other parts of the province affected as well, and I am certain that in the future the government will lose no time in seeing what can be done to implement the recommendations of this report.

I would like to say a word on reforestation. I will not go into it at any length. We of this committee feel that a nominal charge should be made for trees taken for farm plantations; in other words, private wood lots. I think that is a very good recommendation. I am going to just give you an idea of why I say so. I recall the day when a neighbour not so far from me had a very steep hillside. Not being able to grow anything on it, he decided to put it in trees, and the first mistake he made was in ploughing this steep hillside up and down the slope. He, of course, was not conservation-minded. The result was that he put his trees into the furrow, and the following spring we had a very heavy rainfall, and he found his trees washed down to the bottom of the creek. Being disgusted with it, he turned his cattle in for the little bit of pasture which was on it, and today that island is a complete ruin. The ditch was washed out, and made much deeper. I feel if this man had been given a little bit of guidance through a forester -- of course, at that time they were few and far between -- but I am sure that with a little bit of guidance he could by this time have a very nice plantation, and we feel that with a little help, men will take more interest in their plantations.

You always feel when you buy something, you have something at stake, and you take a greater interest than if you got the trees free of charge. I have always felt that this province is probably spending money on some of these woodlots, which could have been spent more wisely in re-planting Crown land.

Now, the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) mentioned the agricultural representatives of this province. I would like to say that we found this summer a very splendid

group of hard-working men in the persons of the agricultural represnetatives. But if we are going to load more work on these men through the implementation of the recommendations of this report, we will either need more men in the county, or they will be forced to give up some of the duties they are now performing.

(Page F-5 follows)

I find these men are burdened with secretaryships of almost every agricultural organization, and I think it is the feeling of the committee that this work could be handled by some of the better men in the county. It is not necessary that the agricultural representatives lose complete contact with these organizations, but it is certainly essential that they must be relieved of some part of their work, if they are going to do the job which lies before them in the building up of the agricultural areas throughout this province, which are now so badly worn out.

Speaking on that point, I would like to say that in many cases a little bit of guidance to a beginner, -- and I am speaking of the younger farmers -- and a little bit of advice from the agricultural representative would probably save the young men from becoming disheartened, and eventually leaving the farms. A little bit at the right time is something which young farmers especially, the farm boy who is just beginning, would appreciate very greatly. We have many farm people who are away from the farm for a number of years, and then wish to go back, and they find themselves at a complete loss, inasmuch as conditions in agriculture have completely changed, and if all these people would consult the agricultural representative in their county, I am sure there would not be enough man-hours to reach around. That service is being given in the community, county agents are constantly in touch with the young farmers, and they work in very closely with the loans which are given, and the amount of the loan .

That brings me to the point of assistance to young men who want to get into agriculture. Each year we are losing vast numbers of our young men who should stay on our farms; we are losing them to industry, because they have not the necessary means to take over the old family farm. We are told

today that farming is big business, and that is quite true. Agriculture is, of course, in Ontario, one of the leading industries. The maintenance of our overseas markets for farm products is essential for a healthy economy and in order to compete in the world markets, we must be able to produce as efficiently as possible. We must produce as efficiently as the farmers in other countries, in order to hold our world markets, and one of the essentials for efficient production is the provision of sufficient capital to finance the farm boys. I feel quite safe in saying that the farmer today gets little assistance from the people who control the credit of this country, not any more than his ancestors did a century ago. It is true that some loans are made at a fairly high rate of interest through the dominion government, but apart from that, the farmers' only source of capital is through the banks which are operating on short-term loans. Also that through the dominion government loans, the man who was well established can get any amount of money.

(Take G-1 follows)

It is the beginner who is unable to take advantage of that loan. That is true also of the banks. You find a well-established man in business has no trouble giving enough collateral to get the finances he needs for the expansion of his business, or the improvement of his property. Here again it is the man who is probably a beginner, who is forced in the first place to buy a cheap, dilapidated farm, who is constantly hindered from expanding, getting a better grade of livestock or improving his farm buildings to make his work a bit easier, it is that type ofperson who constantly has the banker at his throat.

So it is that this younglad keeps on struggling, provided he gets someone to give him a start, keeps struggling away and finally he finds himself disgruntled and he too walks off.

It should be the responsibility of our credit institutions not merely to assist the propserous, well-established farmers, but toprovide boththe financial means and the leadership and advice to the young man with an adequate farm background who wishes to establish himself on his own land.

Also I think credit should be extended to the man who wishes to take up farming in case he has been away for a few years from the farm and wishes in later years, provided he is not too old, to go back to the occupation he was brought up in.

Agriculture is a long-term business. One of the leading economists in American has this to say, and this is taken from the Rural Cooperator, Tuesday March 14th of this year. It is by Doctor F. F. Hill, head of the Cornell University Department of Agricultural Economics. He was speaking tothe annual meeting of the Cooperative Union of Canada in London, and he made this statement:

"Doctor Hill said that it may take from 25 to 35 years to get returns on capital invested in

agriculture."

I am sure hon. members of this House, Mr. Speaker, should see that long-term credit is an entirely different proposition from the short-term credit that our present institutions are extending; when such leading men as Doctor Hill make such statements I am sure we should be quite serious in considering the report or the recommendations made under "Youth and the Land."

I am not saying this should mean the government going into the loaning agency, but it is being done in other parts of the world. We find in the sister province to the East, Quebec, through the Farm Credit Bureau up to 75% is loaned to young agriculturists at a low rate of interest.

I was quite amused to read the other night in the March 8th issue of "The Family Herald and Weekly Star," where this present Session of the Legislature in Quebec has passed an additional $8,000,000 to extend more credit to farmers. Mr. Speaker, the article goes on to say:

> "An additional $8,000,000 for rural credit has been asked by the Agricultural Minister for Quebec. In asking for the additional amount he pointed out that the Quebec Government as at December 31st 1949 has loaned $68,368,595 to 28,906 farmers residing on and oprating their own farms.
>
> "At the end of last year the farmers owed the government $46,796,920. Not one farm had been taken over by the Government of Quebec and the loss has only been 1% per $3000 loaned."

Note that, 1% per $3000 loaned.

> "The $68,368,595 had been used by the farmers to pay off mortgages, municipal school and church

"taxes and the total reimbursements had been $21,420,132, of which amount $12,932,843 had been paid before the due date."

The article goes on to say:

"The resolutions were adopted by the House and also the Bill without further discussion."

Mr. Speaker, to the south, in the United States, this Committee learned that the Federal government operating their land banks are making loans up to 100%. They are operating under the U. S. Department of Agriculture, and these loans of up to 100% may be made to tenants, sharecroppers, farm laborers, eligible war veterans. They are made to buy farms. Of course these people must have proven themselves in agriculture. The United States are not loaning money to people who have not proven themselves in agriculture.

We were informed that they are having splendid success and results with this type of loan and I am sure the people in Ontario are as worthy of farm credit and farm loans as the people anywhere on this Continent or anywhere else. We have got the land in Ontario to produce, and I think if we are careful, as our report will tell you, in where we are going to settle our farmers, in where we are going to open our new areas, and if we are a bit careful in selecting our young men who are going to be the agriculturists of tomorrow, I cahnot see why we should have any fears in extending them the money in order to operate.

The report of this Committee, to my belief, has covered the entire field of conservation, and I am in complete accord with all the members of the Committee that the recommendations we have brought in are sound, good recommendations, and I am certain that although we may not be able to implement them this year or

next, say over a period of five to ten years the fruits of this Committee's work should be seen right across this province.

In closing, I should simply like to say that anything the government may bring up in the form of legislation in the the future to implement the recommendations of this report will find, I am sure, the fullest support on this side of the House.

I thank you.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. B. McMILLAN (Kent, East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take some small part in this debate, first of all I would like to congratulate our very worthy Chairman (Mr. Thomas, Elgin) for the leadership he gave us this year on this tour, also the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the hon. leader of our Liberal Party (Mr. Oliver).

In the area which I represent, which is mostly a cash crop area, in the years past there has been a lot of straw burned, and that is a bad thing for conservation. However, it is not necessary to plant trees to protectthe soil if you sow a good cover crop, and I might say we have an experimental farm at Ridgetown of which we are veryproud and which certainly benefits Southern Ontario a great deal.

The Ridgetown farm was purchased in 1922 and Doctor Reek, who is now at Guelph, came there at that time to manage the farm, He stayed there until 1937, when he came to Toronto. Professor Steckley is now atRidgetown managing the farm. He is doing a good job and we think a great deal of him. I might say also the government is building a new dormitory at Ridgetown to house 150 students, who will be there to take the two-year course in agriculture.

The idea that 20% farm land be in forest is unsound in my area. I believe it to be unwise to plant good farm land to

trees. If we use good conservation methods on good land, it is just as effective as tree growth.

The recommendation that a grant of one-third be made on trunk drains will do much in some areas. So far as we are concerned in my riding and area, there ha been a lot of drainage work done, both ditching and tiling, and at thistime I would like to compliment the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) for introducing today in the House the "Aid to Drainage" Bill.

I believe the changes recommended by the Commission in respect to the Agricultural College will do much to coordinate extension work, which is the cornerstone of any successful conservation program. The Board of Regents will bring to the College and its work the view of those organizations who are particularly interested inthe future of the College, so that it may conserve the needs of agriculture more fully.

Mr. Speaker, there was a delegation which waited on this government about two weeks ago, I believe, from West Lorne. They hve a water system pumping water from the lake which has been there for a number of years, and erosion has taken place, so that their pump is in danger. Under the present legislation there is no assistance for that type of work, therefore, Mr. Premier (Mr. Frost) when you attend the Dominion-Provincial Conference this Fall, we hope lake shore erosion will be given consideration.

(Take H follows)

Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to the attention of hon. members here today the great expense caused by erosion. I have a report here and I think perhaps if I read it, it would show you the expenses incurred in this regard. This is the report of the township of Harwich on behalf of ratepayers of the Burk Drainage Works in support of an application for provincial aid for the further protection of the Burk Drainage Works in the township of Harwich:

"On behalf of ratepayers in the aforesaid drainage scheme and in support of their application to the Department of Public Works of Ontario, for further lake shore protection of the said works, I submit the following information relative to the said scheme:

"Approximately 1600 acres of land being the south-easterly portion of Harwich was reclaimed in 1914 under the provisions of the Municipal Drainage Act of Ontario and became known as the Burk Drainage Works.

"It is protected from the waters of Rondeau Bay on the easterly side by a built up right-of-way owned by the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company and on the south-westerly side from the waters of Lake Erie by a low sand bank which has been rapidly eroding these last few years and which can only be held and preserved by the construction of sea-walls and jetties.

"The scheme has, since its inception in 1914, cost in the neighbourhood of $500,000.

"This figure includes all construction, maintenance costs and lake shore protection work as well as the costs of constructing and maintaining lesser drainage works within the scheme.

"The approximate amount of money rebated the scheme would be approximately $300,000 which includes grants under 'Provincial Aid to Drainage', municipal road assessments from Harwich and Kent county, dominion and provincial subsidy in 1931 of approximately $75,000 and a grant of $12,000 from the village of Ericau during the same year.

"The village of Ericau is entirely dependent on the fourth concession road, which crosses the scheme and is the only means of communication with outside areas except the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway which has handled no passenger traffic for years.

"In accordance with the 1949 municipal directory published by the Department of Municipal Affairs of Ontario the following figures would apply to Ericau.

1.	Population	341
2.	Acreage	95
3.	Assessment (General purposes)	$349,660
4.	Road mileage	3

"In addition to the above Ericau is a port on which the Dominion government has from time to time done considerable work in constructing docks and jetties and also in harbour dredging.

"The Lake Erie Navigation Company each year unloads vast quantities of coal here and the port is

used extensively by local fishermen and a manufacturer of fishing tugs. It is also a popular summer resort.

"Insofar as the scheme in itself is concerned, the land, being a black muck, has proven very satisfactory for the growing of onions and to this end is farmed very extensively.

"However, due to the maintenance costs of the scheme and to extensive expenditures for protecting the scheme from inundation by Lake Erie, the tax levy has now reached a point which is causing the ratepayers much concern and it is only the heavy investments in homes and buildings which prevents them from relinquishing their holdings.

"The items listed below should give some idea of the area and holdings affected by this scheme.

Population	450
Number of homes including lake shore cottages	129
Acreage	1607
Miles of dirt roads	7¼
Miles of hard surfaced roads	2-2/5
No. 19 school house assessed at	$5,000
St. Anne's R.C. church assessed at	$7,000
Total land and building assessment of the scheme and affected area	$184,000

including

1 cold storage - capacity 225 tons or 17 carloads of onions

and

8 common storage - capacity 1350 tons or

90 carloads of onions.

"In 1949, the total tax levy on lands and buildings within the scheme, and those directly affected by the same, was approximately $20,260 of which $13,475 of this total levy, or something over $8,00 per acre, was for drainage debenture redemption and pumping rates alone.

"The last work of lake shore protection done by the municipality under engineer McCubbin's report of June 6th, 1947, has cost something over $48,000 and debentures are now being prepared for sale to cover the assessment for this work. It consists of 1750 feet of 4-inch seawall and jetties without supporting piles.

"Just previous to this the municipality completed 800 feet of 6-inch seawall, jetties and supporting oak piling at a cost of $32,000. This was done under engineer McCubbin's report of December 7th, 1945 and was an emergency work which had to be done to save the scheme.

"In summing up, it should be observed, that at the time of the construction of the Burk Drainage Scheme, the wide sand beach on the southwesterly side, which separated the scheme and Lake Erie was considered more than sufficient protection from the lake. It was at that time much wider than it is now and there was a road running along the lake which afforded access to Ericau.

"Ever since the Dominion government constructed a long cement pier at Ericau for harbour protection purposes, the shore of the lake, along the Burk

Drainage Scheme has started to erode. This is believed to have been caused by changing currents due to the aforesaid construction work.

"The old road has long since been washed away and it has been necessary to remove buildings from time to time to save them from being washed away from the steady encroachments of the lake.

"It now appears that the whole of the lake shore along the scheme will have to be protected or the scheme will eventually have to be abandoned.

"The figures and data in the above brief have for the greater part been taken from the records of the municipality and it is hoped that the information contained herein will help in giving a clearer picture of the situation as it now stands in respect to the Burk Drainage Scheme."

I might say to the hon. members that this was prepared by Mr. George A. McCubbin and W. G. McGeorge of Chatham, two engineers who have had wide experience in this type of work. We also have two other engineers, Mr. W. G. Colby, Sr., and Mr. W. G. Colby, Jr., so we are well supplied with engineers.

Mr. Speaker, I just have one more item to bring up here. We had a brief from Chatham about getting an ice-breaker to help break up the ice in the spring of the year. The hon. member for Kent West (Mr. Parry) knows the situation better than I do as it is in his riding. We hope that the government will look into this matter and give some assistance to us.

I have travelled around all summer with these other hon. members and it has been a great pleasure to me and I have learned a great deal. We have written this report and ended up by taking a two weeks' course at Guelph. Here is your

report and it is up to you to examine it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being six o'clock, I do leave the Chair.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

/ / / / / / /
- - - - - - -

(Take AA follows.)

The House resumed at eight o'clock p.m.

MR. C. E. JANES (Lambton East): Mr. Speaker, being a Member of the Conservation Committee I feel duty-bound to say a few words. However, I feel rather like old mother Hubbard; you know that old story where she went to the cupboard and found it was bare. Other hon. members of the Committee have been going to the cupboard so often I now find it bare, I do not know what to talk about.

First, I would like to congratulate the various hon. members of the Committee, especially the hon. leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Oliver) for the very fine job they have done. I feel quite sure if we carry on in this co-operative manner we will make a very good thing of this report. I rather hesitate to say anything nice about the Chairman of the Committee (Mr. Thomas) because he was not very nice to me all summer and if I say anything nice today it might spoil him. In spite of that fact, I do feel that he did a wonderful job. He was sort of a co-ordinator of our Committee and his experience has given him so many friends, such a large acquaintanceship throughout the province that there was someone to meet him, to help him and to assist the Committee. Therefore, I cannot help but say nice things about him. He really was a swell member of the Committee, I can truthfully say that.

I would like to take this opportunity of thanking the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) for giving me the honour of acting on this Committee. I would also like to thank the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) and the hon.

Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) for acting so quickly on some of our recommendations. Each one has brought in some amendments to a former Bill. We hope to have some further amendments, especially to the Drainage Act but that is going to require a lot of time and study and there is not the time at this Session. I must not forget the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott). He was very kind to our Committee in supplying planes to help us get around the country, without which it would have taken a lot more time.

I would like to say a few words about farm ponds which were mentioned. I am quite convinced that there should be a farm pond on every farm if for no other reason than for fire protection. Almost every day we hear of fires on a farm and they usually end up by saying, "There was no water, they could not do anything". If there was a good-sized pond within reach of each farm building there would be a good supply of water and the firemen could do something. As it is, when farm buildings catch on fire they are usually a complete loss. Also, those people who are fortunate enough to have spring water find it a very great source of food. On our one trip out of the province, which was mentioned by the Hon. Chairman (Mr. Thomas) in his report, we went to Ohio and saw farm ponds on numerous occasions which were filled with fish. I see no reason when they have a co-operative why our farmers should not have a source of revenue added to their farm.

We passed legislation a year ago giving the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) authority to

repair and reconstruct small dams. There are five thousand small dams in the province of Ontario that we know of, but there are probably many more which gives us five thousand acres of land under water.

In the matter of wells, we have no idea where the water comes from because in most cases the land is far above sea level. In most cases these wells are far above the level of lakes in the district so the water cannot possibly come from these lakes. It must be water that seeps down there, it cannot be done any other way. That was a funny thing, we could not get any information, nobody seemed to know anything about underground water, but I am convinced that moisture attracts moisture and if we had more small dams creating ponds of water we would not have such dry weather as we do. If you will notice, across the province, the parts of the province that has the least water seems to have more dry weather. It is not unusual to see storms come up across the lakes. We are recommending, as no doubt most of you have read, that where the municipalities use public money to build dams that they should retain part of that land for recreational purposes. After all, through the western end of the province we have approximately two million of a population; we have at least two million tourists who we must look after and in this area we are overrun with people. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) mentioned a summer resort up in our riding which is about the only one we have. Between 35,000 and 40,000 people come up there every weekend and we do not know what to do with them. A lot could be done to make more room and I would like to see it so.

I would like to see everyone living in the towns come to the lakes, to get to the water. From Sarnia to Goderich there is only about one place where the public can get to the Lake. I think that is a serious situation.

As I mentioned before, Mr. Speaker, we made one trip out of the province, over to Ohio. Here is what they say about it. I might say they have a small dam which is a dry dam and ten wet dams on this river. They have a large body of water and here is what they say about it:

> "While the basic purpose of the Muskingum Project was flood control, it seems probable that succeeding generations may think of it primarily, as a land conservation and recreation program. Despite the war emergency, its lakes will have been visited by more than one and a half million people during the present year. This represents an increase of some 25% over last year and of 50% over the year 1942. It is generally believed that the broad program of recreational development associated with the Muskingum lakes, and which should be developed in the post war period, will make these areas Ohio's greatest recreational asset. The water areas include 10 permanent lakes totalling 16,000 acres, surrounded by some 50,000 acres of District owned lands."

If that is possible in Ohio, it is possible in Ontario. We soon will have the same population as Ohio, in fact, I think in our case it will be a larger population. We are not far from the large district of Michigan and the people in Detroit come up to our Lakes every weekend. I am convinced that any

scheme that will help the water situation is something worthwhile.

I would like to say a word about the farm wood-lot. In the north we are asking for legislation passed in 1946 to be repealed and amended to make it province-wide. While we had that legislation we found in our western counties only seventeen counties adopted that legislation. It is very hard to enforce it in some of the eastern counties. If we get that amendment so that it is regulated by the forests in the different counties, we are convinced it would be more useful.

Another point as mentioned in our report is the Dominion Income Tax setup. This seems to work contrary to conservation. If you have timber and sell a part of it there is no tax on it; if you sell land and bush and buy the land back there is no tax; if the farmer goes out and cuts a few trees he pays tax on it. It sounds like a silly setup to me and I think some action could be taken to get the right authority and explain the circumstances to him. I find these people are generally very sensible and agreeable once you get them to understand a situation.

We have often heard the statement that 25% of Ontario should be in trees. The Dominion does not agree with that. It would look foolish to plant trees on the good land in southwestern Ontario because the day may come when that land will all be in use. We have heard it stated before that thirty-six hundred square miles should be reforested but I am convinced that no land should be reforested if there is even a slight hope that the land is good for farm land. In that case, I think it should be left because if our population keeps on increasing,

it will all be needed. We find places where all the land should be reforested but which is in private hands, there is quite a population that lives on it and many of these farmers are living there in what might be called slum conditions. The land is worked out, it will not produce anything but we are convinced it will produce good trees and if that was taken under a reforestation program most people would agree because a program such as we recommend would take quite a few men. If you make homes for them they will be sure to take care of things. At the present time, they are barely ekeing out a living. They are living in a section of the country where they are not gaining anything and they cannot pay tax and the result is they can hardly get their children educated. Under a proper setup they will have schools. Possibly it will be necessary to work out plans to accommodate the people by taking away the area and making their township smaller and their assessments smaller.

Then, we come to municipal reforestation. We have had requests from different municipalities, especially urban districts, that they be allowed to go outside their municipalities and buy some land for reforestation. A few cities in Ontario have done that by special Bills and they get very good results and are quite proud of their forests. I am convinced that quite a number of our cities would like to go out and buy land for reforestation purposes and I think there should be legislation to make it possible for them to do that.

There is always some land in our poorer areas being taken over for unpaid taxes and I hope the government will make some arrangement to take over that land and not let it go on tax sale.

Private reforestation should be encouraged but I do not think the government should supply trees or spend any money on private reforestation without having some agreement that the land could not be cut off again. After all, we should have a hand in controlling things because it is in the interests of the whole country and I do not think public money should be spent to reforest land without having some hand in it, and seeing that the land could not again become a liability to the province.

Going back to the government reforestation, there should be legislation that that land should never be allowed to get into private hands again. That was a mistake in the first place and we should not repeat it. That is where a lot of our best lessons are learned, through mistakes.

It is very necessary in reforesting land to have a test of the soil made in order to plant the right kind of trees. After all, there is no use in planting trees in southwestern Ontario which will not thrive there. We must have trees that are natural for the land and our experts know what trees will grow on certain types of land. Let us have the land analysed and plant trees that will grow on that land and develop. One reason for reforesting in southern Ontario more than in Northern Ontario-- I feel other hon. members of the Committee feel the same way-- that we are nearer to the end of our timber than we thought we were and the timber will grow many times faster in southern Ontario than it will in northern Ontario. We have found that in fifty years the trees grow considerably in southern Ontario but they do not do as well in northern

Ontario. The point I am trying to make is that we should reforest land in southern Ontario which is not good for farming and in forty to fifty years the province can be earning a revenue from that land.

Before I leave that point, there is not much encouragement for private persons to reforest. It takes too long, it is a persons lifetime before the trees are ready to harvest and then he does not know that his son or whoever takes over that land would protect it. I think reforestation should be done by the state because it carries on forever.

I am not going to take very long. I had thought I was going to take an hour and a half but I got so much abuse I will try to stay inside that time.

Now I would like to say a word on river valley authorities . We, in Ontario, now have thirteen authorities to study that and there is hope we will have another one before very long. We have a southern Ontario section including: Ausable, Big Creek, Catfish Creek, Don, Etobicoke, Gamaraska, Grand, Humber, Mimico, Moira, Napanee, Saugeen, South Nation. The southern Thames will probably be coming in, at least, we are hoping it will. I am convinced the river authorities go into two different categories, those which are purely rural and those which have larger assessments, where there are cities interested, for instance, South Nation, Saugeen, and so on.

The Committee was taken out to see the Saugeen River this summer. Somebody said it was a beautiful river and it is a beautiful river but it went on the rampage last spring and covered a one hundred acre farm to the extent of ten feet. To make matters worse, the flood carried that farm down about a

mile and covered another two farms with about five feet of water. There were three farms gone and it would not have cost too much money to have stopped that. Therefore, I say, if 75/25 is the right ratio for the work on the Grand, and the Etobicoke, and I think it is, it must be changed when we go to a rural district where the rivers are destroying the land and it will be necessary to make the ratio 10/90 or something of that kind. If you want it on the Ausauble, Thames, South Nation or Saugeen, it will be more than the farms are worth and they can do very little about it.

I think a lot could be done by teaching our children conservation in schools, more than has been done. I would like to take another minute to tell you more about conservation. A great many people think our dams are a waste of money. I am not convinced of that. It has been proven they are not a waste of money.

TAKEBB FOLLOWS

The last time they were flooded, there were 400 people killed and the damage went up into hundreds of thousands of dollars, and they put these dams in and they have not had a flood since. And they have enough revenue to pay the disbursements. They have built bathing beaches on the lakes, and they have given people the right to fish, and they issue unrestricted fishing licenses. That would be a vast asset to the province, if we had something of that kind.

I will not take up any more time; I would only like to say that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has often used the expression "Old Man Ontario". "Old Man Ontario" is now still looking over our shoulders. We travelled through more than 50 ridings and over 3,000 miles. These are the briefs that are filed in our report. I feel that the government is obligated to carry out these reports.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. M. NEWMAN (Rainy River): Mr.Chairman, I would like to say a few words about the chairman and the members of the conservation committee. People throughout the province who came in contact with the committee were impressed with their interest in our problems and their desire to find out the difficulty in each community, and the co-operation that has been mentioned here so often was given by different communities that met with this commission, and who were inspired by the high calibre of the commission.

The report presented to us, when we read it and digest it, will show that it is a very high calibre report, and one that will serve as a handbook for many years to come, and I am sure the real value of the report will be associated with what use the government will see fit to make of it. If acted

upon and digested carefully, the problems that we are confronted with will disappear, But it will depend on the use that is made of the report. I was interested in the references made to northwestern Ontario, and particularly, to two of the districts chosen as examples for land settlement, namely Cochrane and Rainy River. In the report referring to the third district Rainy River, it is stated that 13,000 acres in these three communities are available for immediate land settlement. This is in the eastern part of our area, and to the west of these, there are many thousands of acres suitable for agricultural use and throughout the Rainy River District, that land is available for immediate use, and we could use another thousand or fifteen hundred farmers.

References were made to soil conditions, by the committee, and I am sure from reading this report, that one would gather that the basic fertility of the soil is comparable to most of that in southern Ontario and our growing season there is comparable; we are so close to Guelph there is only a few hours difference in the growing season -- and the sunlight we have. Some of the notable advantages that we have in the Rainy River District, for settlement, are that we have all the municipal advantages established there. Around these farms that we talk of for settlement the roads are there, and the schools are there, and the telephones are there, and in most cases, the hydro is there, so in planning a settlement for that area, there are many advantages there that are not in any other areas at all. Our crops in the Rainy River District are comparable with any other part of the province, and we have had record crops of hay, grass-seed, and on one occasion, we had the record for flax, for the whole province. Two years ago we had

the record crop of potatoes, there were over 600 bushels per acre.

From reading this report, I would say our area is good for beef cattle and the dairy type. I believe in the Rainy River District our dairy activities and the raising of dairy cattle can supply our own needs, as well as the areas surrounding it. I do believe our beef cattle are more suitable than dairy cattle. We have good pasture conditions, our hay is plentiful, and it is easy to find hay and other food to give to beef cattle throughout the winter. So far we have not been able to produce enough beef for our own requirements; with some help we could have beef cattle for the Winnipeg markets, and some of our younger stock could be shipped on to the east as breeder stock.

I believe one of the things we need most is government aid for experiments in farming. Many of the things like silos and other methods of preparing feed; on that we will have to have some government aid to achieve,

It is too expensive for any individual farmer to take on a deal of that kind. I am sure that there are many farmers throughout that district who would handle these experimental schemes on a sharing basis. I do believe we need more drainage than in the past, or a continuation of a drainage program. I would not like to see The Rainy River District drained to a point to remind me of the prairies in the 30's. I remember the sand flying around down there, when you could hardly drive a car down a road. I think that onour farm land, facilities should be provided so that there would be a wood-lot on each farm. It would be good policy to have a forester who would be established in the same manner as an agricultural representative to aid

the farmers establishing a wood-lot on their farms.

I was interested to hear some of the members of the committee talk on dams. We must remember in draining water off our lands, there are other places where the water should be stored. To drain water off large sections of the land and put it into fast rivers, then it just disappears. I believe there are many places that dams would be of great advantage to us. Personally, in our district, I operate a 680-acre farm, and I was born on a farm in Manitoba, and have always been interested in agriculture, and in the preservation of the soil, and any time the government would like to undertake experiments with myself or other farmers, I will be glad to enter into it on a sharing basis.

I congratulate the committee on its efforts and great work in preparing and presenting this report. We feel confident that it will serve for many years to come, and the information will be of definite value for northwestern Ontario for many years to come.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. T. K. FOSTER (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, in rising to continue this Debate, I would like, like the previous speakers, to compliment the various members of this committee, but I do not wish to single them out. I think they all did a splendid job in formulating and preparing a report of such vast proportions. At this time I know that we are becoming bored with speeches, but I would like to deal, for a few minutes, with the problem of erosion.

I was glad to hear from the hon. member for Lambton East (Mr. Janes), on the Saugeen River. Perhaps the Saugeen River is more changing than any other that we have. There was one farm that was completely eroded, and his land piled on another

farm, and the highway bridge was left over dry land on account of the river taking an entirely new course, and the bridge had to be removed and erected on a new position. During these rampages the various towns in its path have suffered tremendous damage. Stores have been inundated to four and five feet, and at the mouth of a river, a serious situation exists. I brought that the other day to the attention of the Department of Highways. This was before the report was available, and after reading this report, I see a great possibility that the difficulties may be ironed out and the suggestions employed by the Department of Highways, as suggested by the conservation committee.

We have some land, to the extent of 100 feet, in the finest bush land in Ontario, eroded. One house was moved and another endangered, and will have to be moved. Further on, the only artery of traffic, the bridge, is in danger at one end.

Going from the point of erosion, I would like to draw your attention to the fire hazard to our great forest lands. Due to our position, we have one of the best and greatest tourist possibilities in Ontario. A few years ago this land was covered with good cedar, but not developed. Vast amounts of money has been expended there, in small hamlets profited to the amount of hundreds of thousands of dollars, from tourists, and they have invested their capital.

Unfortunately today these resources are lying approximately 16 miles from fire protection and rural municipalities, and people do not feel themselves financially able to provide that protection which is so needed, to the shore-line forests, and the tourists. I was glad to read in the report the section, "The Department of Lands and Forests already maintains a large fire-fighting service operating through the empire of the north, of highly trained

and experienced personnel. It would not be economical to duplicate that service. What is proposed is that its operations should be extended further to southern Ontario. This Committee therefore recommends: "that on application to the Minister of Lands and Forests, the boundaries of the fire district should be extended to include those municipalities or areas that have 25 percent. or more of their area classified as woodland, slash, waste or swamplands, and in all other municipalities the Minister of Lands and Forests should be empowered to enter into agreements to provide forest fire protection and to charge a portion of the cost back to the said municipality."

I think this section, properly enforced, should give ample protection to those districts where they are not able to get protection from the neighbouring municipalities.

During this afternoon's debate, the problem of tile value came in. As a farmer, and one who has been engaged in farming since boyhood, I can tell you of the great possibilities of tile. You take the water underground, and there is less damage from erosion, and the larger use of tile by the farmer, the greater his advantage will be.

I am sorry, when I drive through the country, to look at all these places which have become eroded, some possibly to the extent where it commenced only from a furrow, and there would be left only on that piece of land, maybe thousands of thorn-trees that are growing. The eradication of this pest and the reclaiming of this land will serve a great purpose. Today we are working to help the younger generation. We have heard discussion this afternoon of the possibilities of grants for farmers who are starting out their life on the old land. Today in Ontario we have an older generation of farmers, who have given their lives to the farming industry of old Ontario. Perhaps this report,

if acted upon, will help the younger generation to cherish the land as did the older generation. And if we will read a document like this, and if we work for the benefit of the younger boys and girls, we hope that they will cherish the land and establish themselves and become future citizens in this great agricultural province of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): I am sure every hon. member of the House will appreciate the work which has been done this past summer by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas) and his group of nine who spent practically every second day from the 18th of July to the end of the year, and even a few days in January and February, getting his report in shape, to present to the people of Ontario. I am sure they earned the thanks of the people of Ontario. I know of no other matter in my experience which is as important as this report on the conservation of our resources of soil, water and forests. I am sure the report will arouse Ontario citizens to the possibility of handing on their heritage togenerations yet unborn, by using it. If they do not use it, they have the power to use it. Now, it seems to me that the old idea in the province used to be that the city person did not worry very much about what went on back on the farm. The average city person, when I was younger, looked upon the farmer as a good, cheerful man, who accepted life and worked very hard, and then there was no telephones or good roads, and the city man felt that when the winter season came along, the farmer did not do very much, and the city man did not realize he was responsible for anything that went on outside the city.

I am pleased to be able to feel that this situation is changing today, the city person, from my own experience,

has at last began to realize that his welfare, too, depends upon the preservation of the soil. When the soil goes and facilities are destroyed, not only the farmer suffers, but the city person as well.

I am hoping that the recommendations made in this report will be as rapidly as possible put into legislation by this government, and into the policy of the government in some cases. This is as important as legislation.

At the present time, at this time of the year, as the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) mentioned, the headlines in the papers feature the floods which take place in our rivers. In the paper last night, the floods of the 6th, 7th, 8th and 9th of March this year, were headlined in the paper, and that brings once more, the attention of the city person, and the people living in the city, to the problem of controlling these floods.

In my opinion, to build dams on the rivers nearest the largest cities so as to make new channels for the rivers is not enough. As one hon. member mentioned this afternoon we had to see that our uplands are kept forested, and they are harvested over the years. We have to see that on the farmlands, there are small dams and catch-basins and ponds, and restoration of that kind, so that the silt does not reach the larger dams. If we build a dam along a river, the reservoir behind that dam in time, if we continue to allow the soil to go into the reservoir, will be filled with sediment and reduced to a silt-pond.

So we have to consider this from the head waters of the stream, right down, to where that stream enters the lake. For a number of years I have been interested in this problem of water-use, particularly from the point of

a municipality, endeavouring to treat its sewage and put back into the stream, water that is as pure as the water you pump out. Today, with modern methods and treated sewage, that is possible. I had the opportunity and privilege this past summer to travel through the Don Valley, to the head-waters. We visited the North Toronto sewage plant, which is one of the best in Canada, and we saw the murky waters being settled in one tank and transferred to another tank where they had air forced through, and at that point there was introduced the micro-organisms into the sludge which broke it down in the muck. We saw that black muck pumped to the disposal beds and dried and made available for fertilizers.

At the North Toronto plant little effort was made to sell or give that fertilizer away. When I was on the city council I used to advertise in the farm papers that we had the best fertilizer available there and it was available there for the people to come andhaul it away. No such program was ever accomplished and very few people knew of it. They do not know that sludge is available just by taking it away. I notice in the report that throughout Ontario if we were to build proper sewage plants we could produce fifty thousand tons annually of dry sludge cakes. That compares to the 350,000 tons of artificial fertilizer we now use. The fact that we have 83 cities in this province that have sewage systems and no sewage plant to dry it is a sad condition and I trust the Department of Welfare will see to it that this condition is rectified as soon aspossible. In the larger cities we have another problem, a new factor that is coming up which in itself pollutes the water. For instance I noticed that on the 28th of April, 1949, there

was an inspection at Amherstburg of the pollution of the St. Clair River where Hiram Walker & Sons, distillers, are located. They informed the people after the inspection that they were dumping into that river twelve tons of grain every day from that distillery. Another distillery was dumping six and a half tons of mash into the lake every day. Hiram Walker said it would cost them $603,000 to move that grain and they said they did not feel it would pay them to do it, ahtough at the present time they were selling the grain they did remove for $67.50 a ton. They said that at the price they received last Spring, it would pay them to remove that grain from the effluent but it would not at a later time. I think it is for the government to tell them that they should and they must remove that grain. It is not only a pollution but it is a waste of good feed. Brewers mash is used extensively as livestock feed.

I have a book giving some of the papers delivered at a convention in the United States last July dealing with pollution matters and the problems of manufacturers who are faced with state laws covering pollution of streams and we were told that in Georgetown, Massachusetts, where they instituted a treatment plant--not by the municipality, ahtough the local municipality does have a plant--every manufacturer in that town who pollutes the sewage has to have his own plant and has to treat his own sewage before it reaches the main sewer. The Gilbert & Bennett Company uses sulphuric acid and there is lime and acid in the sewage. They have to take that out and put the water in the sewers as pure water. The result is that in that town of Georgetown the river goes through the town and it is clear and it is stocked with trout and one of the best fishing grounds in the area. I mention that to say that it is possible not only to treat domes-

tic sewage but it is also possible to treat the waters filled with industrial sewage and restore it back for use.

I had a glass of water on my desk this afternoon and it gives us an idea of our drinking water in Toronto. When we pump the water in our plant in Toronto it contains not only domestic sewage but it contains industrial sewage from away up the lakes, from Buffalo, Windsor, and allthe way up.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: It might come as far as Sault Ste. Marie. This water has a disagreeable taste. Our plant has to do four things before it is drinking water and then it is not perfect but it is the best we can do. The first thing that isdoneis to put alum in the water and settle the solids and then it is filtered through a mineral filder and then chlorine gas is forced in and at that point the water has a strong taste, and so we put in sulphur-dioxide to take away the taxte and then we have a glass of pure water. I would like to say that conservation not only benefits the farmer and the hunter and the person who likes to swim, conservation benefits everyone. It is a science that benefits everyone and it seems to me it is one of the most important things we can study and we must learn to understand and use it for the benefit of mankind or the resources we have today will not be worth fiwe cents tomorrow.

(Take CC follows)

Some years ago a number of us organized in the Don Valley a conservation association. Our object was to prevent the annual destruction of trees by children during the Easter holidays. In the city of Toronto we have a problem at Easter holidays. Thousands of young boys from eight to twelve years of age who are penned up all Winter, when the sun comes and the snow goes away,--at Easter holidays every boy grabs his scout knife or his little hatchet or his hammer and nails or a pocket full of matches or a gun or an air rifle or some kind of weapon, and goes up the Don Valley or the Humber Valley. They go in droves and when the farmers see them coming, they shudder; when the birds and beasts hear them, they fear them too, because there is nothing more destructive, Mr. Speaker, than a small boy out on his Easter vacation,--

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: --if he hasn't received sound education in conservation.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: When we began to try to control this menace ---and I assure you it is a menace, because they set grass fires, they burn the grass completely off the floor of the Don Valley, they burn small trees down, they destroy property, last year three or four houses up in the riding of North York were burned down with grass fires and some plantings of young trees were killed by them---when we began, these children did not know the danger, so we attempted to educate them. The first year we got going was the Spring of 1948. The previous year the Game Warden took 275 guns and air rifles off these boys during the Easter holidays in the Don Valley alone---275. We conducted a campaign the following year in the schools; we had every teacher read a talk on conservation; we had the Boy Scouts movement tell the boys to leave

their hatchets and knives at home this time---and, in passing, I would like to say to the amazement of the leadership of the Boy Scout Movement, we found the Boy Scouts were about the worst offenders, because they knew how to handle an axe.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: But they didn't know how to spare the trees. Well, thenet result was that last year we cut down that depredation so that there were no more than 25 rifles taken off the boys last Spring.

We believe there was onlyone pine tree nicked last Spring. I will tell you what these boys do to a pine tree: They find a nice, big 100 year old white pine in the Don Valley and one boy takes a couple of nicks at it. The next boy will come along and he will take a coule of nicks at it; the next boy will open the wound up a little more and next year the pine tree will pour resin and gum in there to try to heal the wound. Next Spring the boys will light a fire at that spot and will burn the pine resin. Next year they will put another year at the base of that pine tree and in four years, that pine tree is lying flat on the ground, destroyed---the growth of 100 years destroyed because of the unthinking use of knives, hatchets and matches by boys.

Last year and the year before, we also initiated another educational program to teach these city boys something about what they should be doing. The Don Valley Association got 10,000 trees the year before last, and we laid out areas in the Don Valley for replanting. Wetook these boys out the first Saturday afternoon in May and gave them a talk on conservation. Charlie Sorrell, who really initiated this movement, gave the boys a talk on how wasteful they had beenwith their hatchets and axes and that the time had now come to go up the Don Valley with shovels and trees and replant some of the damage. The boys listened and worked

hard all that afternoon and the next Saturday afternoon, and we finally had those trees planted. We considered that was the best education we accomplished in our experience, to give these boys the opportunity of planting trees and to enjoy the thrill of watching trees develop.

I would like to say just a word about the farm wood lots, because I have been interested in that subject for a good many years. As I travel through the province, the only tree I see in South Ontario which seems to be able to fight its way back against the inroads of the pasture is the white cedar. All through the south part of this province, it does my heart good to see acre upon acre of white cedar right in pastures, growing up and thriving among the cattle, horses and sheep, who should not have been on the wood lot in the first place. I wouldlike to suggest to the Department of Agriculture that I believe we must undertake a campaign to get every farmer in the county to sign a statement, have a drive, get the farmer interested in developing his wood lot and persuade him if possible to sign a statement that he will fence his wood lot and keep the cattle and horses and sheep out of it. If that were done, a great many farm wood lots in south Ontario would rejuvenate themselves with a little planting here and there. You would not have to plant more than one or two hundred trees an acre to rejuvenate a good many farm wood lots in South Ontario. I think it is a tragedy that 73%---and I didn't think it was that high ---that 73%, according to the report presented, of farm wood lots at the present time are pastured.

I think planting machinesof course should be made available. I think that is a splendid recommendation. Also I believe a farmer who has a wood lot should be given more and more help

in trimming and weeding it. Like any garden, the forest garden has to have its weeds cut out. Some trees will take up much more space than they deserve, they waste the area. Certain of these "wolf" trees that get a start before the other grow up will take the place in a wood lot of ten other trees, and those should be weeded out and used for firewood, and planting done in their place.

I am looking now at the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott). I agree heartily with the recommendation that 3600 square miles in South Ontario should be planted in the next 25 years. That is 151,000,000 trees which that planting will reqire, which will meanthe hon. Minister of Lands an Forests (Mr. Scott) will have to step up the output from his forest nurseries ten times to meet the demand. That is not impossibble, and yet perhaps if we made a more careful survey, we might find that a good portion of those 3600 square miles of forest land inSouth Ontario already has a fair percentage of valuable forest trees on it.

Our white cedars, which I mentioned before, 50 years from now are going to produce a very valuable crop in Southern Ontario and we will be using this wood for many of the uses for which we now think white pine is indispensable.

I am also going to suggest to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) thathe should try to relieve the unemployment situation if it should develop any more by putting gangs of men in the Crown lands of South Ontario and weeding those trees. As I said last year in the House, there are on every acre of land in Peterboro County, in the Crown lands of the hon. Minister's (Mr. Scott) own constituency, I suppose two or three hundred young white pine now, growing up on their own account, natural regeneration of white pine. These white pine are growing sometimes right beside weed trees---pin cherries, blue beech and scrub trees---

that should be weeded out, removed. I know the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) will say there should be some shade provided for white pine. That is true but not right beside the trees. They should be weeded out and given a chance to grow.

I was very well pleased when I read the report and found they are recommending legislation whichwill permit cities, towns and villages to establish municipal forests outside their boundaries, and also that tax delinquent land in sub-marginal areas be made available to the municipality or to the province for reforestation purposes.

I suggested that to the House last year, if hon. members remember, and I received across Ontario support for that suggestion, from nearly every farm paper, from nearly every river valley association, and I am quite sure that reform will have strong support across the province .

There is no reason why some of our larger cities should not establish recreational areas and municipal forests in a locality where city people would have a chance to go out and get education in the ways and the value of forestry.

In regard to these recreation areas, I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) that wherever he has a camping place along the highway, he should also endeavor to get a beach nearby. I drew the Department's attention,back in 1944,to a situation on the north end of Mazinaw Lake on I think it is No. 41 highway, running north from Kaladar to Douglas, Ontario. About half way up that highway to Douglas, you come to Mazinaw Lake, one of the most beautiful little lakes in the province of Ontario. On thenotth end of that lake, for the last 40 years the beach there has been used by the general public, and everybody thought it was a public beach. To the amazement of everyone using the highway, about five or six years

ago someone fenced off part of the beach and put a cottage right in the iddle of what used to be a public beach. I drew the attention of the Department to this, and they told me they had investigated and found th t always had been private land.

Well, here the Department had a stop-over area in the pine forest right beside it, with picnic tables and chairs and a stove and wood and everything, and the beach right next door slowly being fenced off. I think in a case like that the Department should have purchased the beach if it were private land and kept th t beach as a public beach. That is theonly case I can draw to the attantion of thehon. Minister (Mr. Scott), but I do trust the hon. Minister (Mr Scott) will take steps to restore that beach to the public use, because it had been a public beach for at least 40 years.

Another thing I would like to mention on the subject of conservation,-and I think an important thing-is that a short time ago I saw a moving picture about a group of Indians who ate shell fish and gradually threw the shells outside the tent until finally there was a great big mound of shells which developed, and today we go to those mounds of shells and we can tell by the depth of the shells how many years those Indians lived there untilthey moved elsewhere. I think that is what isgoing to happen to our highways, with the number of beer bottles and liquor bottles being thrown along the highways.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I question that. I think you are going toofar.

MR. DENNISON: Future generations by sizing up the number of those bottles on our highways and beaches will be able to estimate how many years that went on.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: What I am afraid of is that the edges of our highways are going to become so littered with broken glass,

we will not be able to use our recreational areas. I have suggested to the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) in charge of the administration of liquor in this province that we should put a larger fee or a larger charge on the bottles, so they would be picked up and brought back again. In the city of Toronto I can remember a time when we gave the milk bottles away free, and the garbage collectors used to collect anywhere up to 5000 milk bottles every day in the garbage. Today they do not collect a bottle, because there is a five-cent charge on them. Apparently five cents is not enough on a liquor bottle to bring it back. I would suggest putting a 25¢ charge on them and they will not be thrown along the highways or on the beaches. Slap a 25¢ charge on them and make every company pay that 25¢ when the bottle is turned back. I think that will solve the problem of broken glass on the beaches.

In closing, I would like to say the River Valley Authorities can do a great job, but they do lack money. I do not know what budget the Humber Valley Authority, the largest of these areas, had to work on last year, but the year before last they had only $950 to work on. That is like a person trying to run this honorable Legislature on $3000 or $4000---it just cannot be done. There has to be more money spent on river valley development, and yet I do not think the taxpayers should have to pay it without getting some return, and I am going to make a suggestion, both to the river valley authorities and tothe government. This suggestion would solve the water problem in a good many river valleys.

I am going to suggest that we allow the river valley authorities to run the entire water system in that valley and charge for the water, and I am going tosuggest further that this

unified water distribution system charge enough for the water to pay for the sewer. You cannot have sewage unless you first have water, and if you charge people enough for the water to pay the complete cost of removing the solids from that sewage and putting it back into the river of water, you have your sewage problem solved and in a great many areas you will have your water problem solved too. It is true we willhave to pay more for water, but we will save ourselves on the taxes for sewage disposal and we will make thewhole river valley self-supporting and provide the river valley authority with a revenue for all time to come, and the authority to look after water and sewage throughout the whole valley.

They say the Humber Valley once had 55 dams and now it only has 10. I believe that if the Humber and the Don were amalgamated as one river valley authority and the supply of water vested in that authority, as well as the disposal of sewage, we would really take a step towards solving both our water problem, our sewage problem and our pollution problem in this area.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. C. W. COX (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the conservation debate, I can assure you I shall not be long, but I do want tooffer my congratulations to the government for the appointment of this Committee a year ago, and to congratulate them on the personnel. I know of nothing more important than the Conservation Committee and I know of nothing more important than the conservation ofour natural resources. I should also congratulate them on the most comprehensive report which they have made, and I am sure it will be productive of results.

I myself have been associated in the handling of natural resources for a long, long time and I have often said that more effective conservation measures should be put into effect. I

think I have said many times of that great northern area of which so much has been said, stretching from Sudbury to the Manitoba boundary, one way, about a thousand miles, and from Lake Superior to James Bay the other, about five hundred miles, that if the present cutting continues that enormous area which if properly handled would maintain a population in perpetuity, will in not too many years be as abandoned as the Sahara Desert.

I am quite in accord with the remarks which have been expressed by the other speakers. I was particularly impressed by some of the remarks of our good leader (Mr. Oliver) when he said the conservation of our resources isnot a municipal matter, it isnot a provincial matter, it is a national matter. Much of our revenue comes as a result of the development of our natural resources. Take newsprint, for instance. A very major part of our national revenue comes from the manufacture of newsprint from our natural resources. Much of it comes from Northern Ontario.

We have plenty of evidence and plenty of samples of deterioration of our natural resources and what has happened in the past. I have heard some talk about the depreciation of the resources in old Ontario, which was once covered by timber, according to reports, some 100 or 150 years ago. Most of you have some idea as to what has happened in Michigan. I have some knowledge of what happened in Wisconsin. Hon. members are perhaps familiar with what happened in Georgian Bay.

Over in the adjoining states of Michigan and Wisconsin, I could show you one place where there were 30 saw mills forty years ago. There are none there today. They were thriving communities thirty and forty years ago. I could show you one place where there was a railroad running out of Duluth for 100 miles, thirty years ago, carrying forest products. There

is no railroad and no industry there today.

On our own side, at Port Arthur at one time we had a railroad, part of the Canadian National Railways, running for about a hundred miles west. The principal revenue accruing to that line was from forest products. The forests were cut, nothing was left but an inferior species of trees, the railroad discontinued and the roadbed was torn up. There is nothing there today.

Since I have been operating there, in perhaps a quarter of a century, I know of many communities which were prosperous twenty years ago, fairly large settlements with schools and everything that goes to make up a settlement. When the timber was depleted, they moved out and nothing is left today.

My hon. friend the member for Renfrew (Mr. Hunt) was also up in that part of Northern Ontario twenty-five years ago and I am sure he will vouch for the fact that not far from Hurkett, a place east of Port Arthur, there probably were 40 or 50 settlers there 30 years ago, cutting in virgin forests. There was a substantial community, schools were erected, it probably took twenty years to remove that timber, and when the timber was gone, they all moved out. There is nothing there but tarpaper shacks today. All through Northern Ontario, you see results like that.

The greatest loss of all, in my opinion, is the loss from fires. Most of the results of the loss from fires are minimized. I am not saying that in a critical way, they are belittled as much as possible. Something should be done, to correct, if we can, the great loss from this source. I have suggested to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forest (Mr. Scott), and he did not disagree, that perhaps the use of helicopters would make a more practical way of handling forest fires. I think hon. members will all agree that if experienced men could be placed at the site of a forest fire

shortly after it had started, the chances are fairly good it could be extinguished, but once a fire makes headway, an army cannot put it out. The losses have been colossal.

I quite realize that to set up the machinery necessary for operating helicopters would be very expensive for the province.

I do not know whether I should drink this water or not after listening to my hon. friend.

MR. LAMON PARK (Dovercourt): What is in it?

AN hon. MEMBER: Put something with it.

MR. COX: Unfortunately I do not drink, I cannot put anything with it.

The machinery necessary for putting into the forest helicopters is very expensive indeed. I think several million dollars would be required, but the Dominion has the machinery for the operation of helicopters, and I think it would be an excellent thing if some arrangement could be made for the province to cooperate with the Dominion in making possible the use of helicopters. I think somebody should make representation to them because, as I say, they have the personnel, they have the machinery, they have the facilities, and the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) does not disagree with me that it is worth a try to see how practical they would be. My personal opinion is they would be more practical than any of the planes which we have in use today.

I see helicopters are now being used for the purpose of hunting whales, so they are coming into new uses every day. I do suggest to you, and my opinion is shared by many of those who have been operating in the north a long, long time, that if some effective method is not taken, it shall not be long until our forests are steadily depleted.

I heard someone say---and perhaps I should not mention

it---that in 25 to 50 years the bonds in those paper companies will not be worth the paper they are written on. It is just a matter of time. Maybe not in this generation, but certainly in the next one there will be nothing in that great northern Ontario area to carry on the great industries there. So I do hope some effective measures will be taken to prevent the fires and the deterioration that is going on today, and I am sure the results will be productive of excellent returns.

Mr. Speaker, I said I would not take too long. I do want to congratulate the government again for making this Committee possible; I congratulate the personnel of the Committee on the comprehensive report they made, and I am sure it will be productive of results, to perpetuate and preserve this great natural heritage.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate in this House I have got rather used to hearing of the indignation of hon. Toronto members because of people wondering about our city, but it did come with a great shock to hear the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) imply that Windsor is not only corrupting the morals of the good city of Toronto, it is also polluting the waters of Toronto.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to add my compliments to those which have been expressed to the Committee Chairman (Mr. Thomas, Elgin), and the members of this Committee who have brought in this very fine report, and I am most happy to see that efforts have been made already by the government to implement some of the recommendations contained in the report.

My few remarks are going to be directed to chapter 26, on pollution, of which we have heard much already. However, I do

feel this is a subject that cannot receive too much public discussion and thought, and I am glad the Committee saw fit to go into it to the extent they did. Far enough. I would like to quote from the report on page 102, dealing with the matter of pollution, of sewage pollution in our lakes and waterways:

> "People rarely come to grips with the virulent menace of pollution until it threatens to destroy them. Ontario, Southern Ontario in particular, is fast approaching that precarious position."

These are strong words and certainly the Committee did not mince their words when they stated it in that type of language. Definitely there is nothing they have said in respect to the problem of pollution of our waterways that is not justified.

But we go on further, in fact we go back to page 101, and I quote again from the report of this chapter. We are told there that:

> "The problem of providing adequate sewage facilities and sewage treatment is closely related to finance. The chief obstacle to the installation of the proper sewage facilities is the cost. In addition there is a widespread lack of appreciation by many people of their responsibility in providing adequate and safe disposal of all sewage and wastes.
>
> "The construction, operation and maintenance of a sewage disposal plant is a major financial undertaking for most communities regardless of size and many are limited in their financial capacity. With or without powerful laws, abatement proceeds only insofar as the public are willing to pay the costs."

(Take DD follows)

That is the whole story, and definitely it faces the problem. Then I go back to page 102, and I read the second last paragraph, quoting again from the report:

> "It is hoped that the Municipal Improvement Corporation Act of 1950 will make it possible for many of the communities to undertake modern sewage treatment works".

That is to be the sole recommendation of the committee in this respect.

And I will say this, that I realize that the problem of pollution in all its ramifications and the effect it has upon our economy and social life, is far too big a problem for a committee of this size to undertake in the limited time at its disposal.

I would like to point out to both the committee and the hon. members of this House that the solution of pollution, as it affects our municipalities, will not be achieved from the Municipal Improvement Corporation Act of 1950 alone. Definitely, the processes of construction of proper sewage disposal plants is far too expensive for our municipalities to take up. My opinion -- and I have said it in this House before -- is that it is a problem which must be faced, and faced in the very near future, as municipalities are not in a position to finance them in whole or in part. I feel very strongly, if we are to face this situation, we are going to have to have grants -- yes, substantial grants, provincial and federal, in order to definitely end once and for all the pollution of our lakes and rivers and streams, by the municipalities.

Now, primarily, there are two problems in respect to pollution and that is the pollution of raw sewage by municipalities, and undoubtedly they are the greatest offenders,

and, secondly, the wate from our industrial plants, and while it has been said that Windsor makes its contribution to that, it brings to my mind that I was informed -- and I regret the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Cathcart) is not in his seat -- that one of the greatest offenders all around Ontario is none other than the Polymer plant in Sarnia, a government-owned enterprise.

I leave that for what it is worth.

I do want to bring to the attention of this House the problem which existsdin the Detroit River, and this is an international problem. It is one of the very great problems which face the province of Ontario, when it comes to industrial pollution, and other pollution, and dead waste. It comes about by the fact t at we have a very large island known as Fighting Island, close to the Canadian chahnel, and in between Fighting Island and the American shore, there exists another island, not as large an island as Fighting Island, but a fairly large island, owned by the United States.

Not so many years ago, one of the industrial plants on the American side of the Detroit River found it necessary to find ways and means to dispose of the slag they have left over from their operations. This slag contains high chemical components, which are death to fish and vegetable growth. Apparently they tried to use the American island, but they could not dump the stuff on the mainland, no; the United States has very strict laws in relation to destroying the beauty of their waters through pollution of any kind. So they tried to get the right to use the American island, and were refused. What happened? They secured alease from our government in perpetuity, as I understand it, for the right to dump the slag on the Canadian island, and today, if you go and see

this island -- I may say in respect to Fighting Island, it happened to be one of the places where considerable wild life lived, and the ducks in their migratory flight invariably stopped at Fighting Island, and it was one of the few places the duck hunters had, where they could engage in their sport. But after they started dumping slag there, approximately one-half of the island is now covered, and there are no longer any fish along the Canadian side of Fighting Island. You never see anybody fishing there, because the fish cannot live. There is no vegetation on that section of the island where the slag has been dumped and that is approximately one-half of the island today.

As a consequence, because our government saw fit to turn over the right to an Canadian Island to an American firm to dump their waste, which they had to dispose of, and which their own government would not allow them to dump on their own side of the river, Fighting Island is ruined.

It came about that many attempts have been made to have something done about it at Ottawa, and I personally made a visit to the island this past summer, with a Mr. Brown, M.P., the hon. member for Essex West in the Federal House, and he took me with him to Ottawa, and I quote an article from the Daily Star of October 23rd, 1949.

> "Ottawa. legislative authority to restrict or curtail --"

MR. DUNBAR: Is that the Windsor Star or the Toronto Daily Star?

MR. ELLIS: The Windsor Star, I would not quote from the Toronto Daily Star at all.

I will start it all over again.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. ELLIS: "Legislative authority to restrict or curtail pollution of the Detroit River and other international waterways rests with the provincial government, Don Brown, Liberal, Essex West, has advised Reeve E. S. Totten of Sandwich, West township.

" Reeve Totten wrote to the Essex West member in regard to the dumping of refuse on Fighting Island, resulting in the pollution of the river.

" Mr. Brown explained that a private member's bill to present pollution of navigable streams was turned down here recently because the subject is ultra vires of Parliament. He pointed out that under the constitution property and civil rights are within the sole jurisdiction of the provincial legislature."

So now we know that the pollution of the Detroit River and the Canadian island is the responsibility of this Legislature. What are we going to do about it?

I think that the whole question of pollution definitely is a matter for international interest -- before I go farther, I want to deal briefly again with this pollution from the American side, of our international waterway. I have a letter here from Mr. Martin L. Leacock, in the office of the Attorney General, State of Michigan, in which he says:

Dear Sir:

As a long-time summer resident on the Canadian side of Lake St. Clair, I was interested in an account in the November 15, 1949, issue of the Detroit News of an inspection visit made by you with other members of a Canadian delegation to a new public bathing beach

constructed on the American side of Lake St. Clair by Michigan authorities.

" It has often occurred to me that, if such official does not already exist, Canadian authorities could well, and with ultimate profit, appoint a commissioner or inspector of sanitation to patrol or cover the Canadian beaches.

" This point is raised because the American side of Lake St. Clair is already so polluted that the re-attaining of sanitary conditions to such waters is a monumental task.

" The Canadian shore of Lake Erie, in my opinion, is already so polluted by Detroit disposal systems that I, for one, would not want to own any property on that lake.

" Furthermore, I have already noted enough preliminary pollution at several points on the Canadian side of Lake St. Clair to warrant the opinion that certain sections of that lake front are, at present, not very desirable for bathing purposes. I feel that, unless strict and prompt steps are taken for inspection of all present and future sanitation installations in connection with the building or maintenance of property along Lake St. Clair, it will be only a matter of years before there is a degree of pollution which will keep careful people away from Canadian beaches.

" I definitely know of open drainage ditches running into Lake St. Clair which receive raw sewage from inland homes and business establishments.

" It is because I place a high value on the Essex County shore of Lake St. Clair and make it my home for seven months each year, that I urge you to give consideration to my suggestion."

So Mr. Leacock, in his studies of the situation down there, found t at much of the Essex County shore of Lake St. Clair has been destroyed, not only by our pollution, but by the pollution on the American side.

I will not take up much time of the House on this matter, but I wanted to bring it to your attention, because I feel the committee has not had the time to give to this matter of pollution sufficient time, and while they have done a very fine job, I think that the recommendations, insofar as the matter of pollution is concerned, are not adequate by far.

In my opinion, we must, of necessity, face the matter of pollution, that is, the pollution by municipalities, yes; by pollution in our industrial plants, yes; by pollution in international industrial and disposal plants, on the other side of the border.

I feel that no committee of this House could do an adequate job on such a study, and such studies should be made and very definite recommendations brought into this House, and I would suggest to the government in all sincerity that this matter is so serious that a Royal Commission is in order, and definitely that we should have recommendations from a Royal Commission, and we should face up with the matter of pollution in a proper sense, and to an extent which will eventually wipe out the destruction of our waterways, and wild life, that is now going on.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. A. McEWING (Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, at this hour, and the amount of discussion we have had on this

report, I do not think it would be very wise to make a very extensive address, although the issue and the report is well worth it. I am not belittling either, as far as that goes.

There are a few things I would like to mention to the House and the hon. members of this committee.

The importance of this committee cannot be over-estimated. In my opinion, this is one of the greatest problems we have undertaken to solve, and to find some solution, possibly the greatest that we have previously had in the province of Ontario.

As far as reaching in many directions, possibly we have been just a little slow in tackling this. You know, if we had left Mother Nature alone, and if man had not interfered, we would not have had one-half the problems we have got, because you can take it right from the beginning of the cutting away of the bush and the forests, and clearing away the land, which was the act of man, and by ditching our land, and straightening our streams, and polluting our streams, that is practically all man-made, and therefore, man has to find some solution for the defects he has brought about, because if he does not, man will be his own destroyer, and I think we have come to the day when we must face in this province of Ontario the doing of so much to destroy the very things which are essential to the well-being of all our citizens.

We have a former committee, which was appointed, that is to say, which had to do only with farm drainage, and that committee found in its investigations that it would have a much wider field, and a much wider scope to deal with the problems as they saw them in their investigation.

They were confronted with a great many things which were out of their jurisdiction, but the things they discovered led them to say further on something about them, and I think

every hon. member of that committee appreciates the work that this committee has done. I believe the committee paved the say to some extent for bringing about this present committee, and the realization of the problems which are facing us today.

We found many things to be unsatisfactory in the Ditch and Water Courses Act, in the Municipal Drainage Act, and various other Acts which were related to the problem of farm drainage in that report. I think they faced the very things we found only in one small phase of the larger fields with which they were dealing.

I would just like to draw attention to the fact that there are still some things in these Acts I would like the department to amend. I do not expect the government would to all at once swallow this report, because it is quite a large report, and it will take time to digest it, and it will only be by time that these amendments to these Acts will be brought about, which will bring into being the very things they are recommending.

Here is one, for instance; under the old Drainage and the Ditch and Water Courses Act, an engineer would go out and three or four men would demand that he make a survey, and he would go out and make one, and would report his findings to the council, and the council would immediately adopt them.

I understand, in my own riding, where I think five men have demanded a ditch which is to cost about twenty-some thousand dollars, since the report came in, and it appeared it was going to be adopted, twenty-five men have signed a petition that it should not be done. That is the very thing that is happening, and I know from my own personal experience, in the maintenance and repairing of ditches, under the old Act an injustice was supposed to be done several of them on the lower part of the stream, who were not benefiting, but were saddled

with a greater portion of the cost.

I would like to see a board of referees which could deal with this problem, so that an over-all picture could be taken, and studied, to see whether the benefits out-weighed the cost of the thing, and whether the development cost might be greater than the benefits, In that case, the thing should be abandoned, but in our history in the past, it was never taken into consideration.

I have enquired a number of times where the drainage referees' reports were, and it appears there have not been any for several years. It seemed strange to me there was not, but after making a study of the situation, I felt that perhaps it was better that we did not have those referees' decisions, because they might be taken as precedents to settle present-day problems, and the precedents of 25 or 30 years ago are no good today. We are in a differnnt age, and perhaps it is just as well there are no drainage referees' reports for our guidance at the present time.

I see in this report they have made a strong recommendation regarding the same matter, and also to the other matter which I mentioned previous to that. They have some reference in regard to the matter of the manufacture of tile, and that, to my mind has created a very serious situation. We found that in our investigation. There is not nearly enough tile available, and it is not of the quality it should be. There has been too much tile in the last 25 years manufactured, sold and put in the land, which should never have been sold at all. If we had some supervision over the manufacture of this tile, cement tile would be required to be up to a certain standard, and of a certain size, and determined whether suitable to stand the test of time. I, myself, put in a drain about twenty years ago, of cement tile, and it was supposed to be all right, and it has

collapsed all along the drain, and about the only thing I can do now is to put in a whole new drain. I think it is not too late to set a standard for cement tile and clay tile, which would save the farmers a great deal. I think the government should take some steps to investigate the different types of clay in different parts of the province, and experiment as to the best possible type of clay, to make the tile, and then give some assistance to establishing these tile manufacturing plants, for them to manufacture in wholesale quantities, so that farmers can get tile of the right type. That is a very serious situation today. I believe they have a recommendation relative to that. Whether it goes far enough or not, I do not know.

Another thing was a matter of record in connection with the ditches and water courses. I have, in my experience, gone to the clerk's office to find an award made some years ago, and he searched all over his office. He had a desk with several drawers in it, and he searched every one, and he said, "Upon my soul, I cannot find it". We went into the vault, and you would have thought a cyclone had been in that vault, to mix things up there the way they were.

I went to another clerk in another municipality --

HON. GEO. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs); I thought you meant you could not find the cyclone in the vault.

MR. McEWING: I went into another clerk's office, and asked for the certain award, and he went to a filing cabinet, pulled out a drawer, and found the right award right away. There was no delay. It showed it is quite easy, when some encouragement is given by the municipal departments to set up some sort of a standard for those who have had no experience in that, and I think it is easy to accomplish that. We should

have a filing system for putting these things away. They are very valuable in the future perhaps. You will find them in municipal councils.

There is another point I want to touch upon. I wish to speak of the youth in connection with the land. That is something we have not paid enough attention to. We give a good deal of assistance in the urban centres; we give them the advantage of colleges, we pay their fees to a great extent, and when they set up a home, we supply them with money, and land for building, and the municipalities will give them certain services, and we do everything we can to assist them in the urban centres to establish a home. But what do we do in the rural sections to establish the young men? We say to them, "There are the wide open acres; lots of avail ble land, help yourself". I do not think it is hardly fair. You know, we are living in a machine age, and it is not as easy for the youth today to go out and be established on a farm to compete with the present-day age, because you cannot do it with the same methods we did it 30 years ago. It requires a great deal more capital, and you must have this machinery. We found in the Dithh and Water Course Act that it was no good, because it brought the machinery in, with the result that we are under the Municipal Drainage Act, instead of the Ditch and Water Courses Act, and for that reason it is costing the farmers of Ontario a great deal of money.

We should give the youth on the farms some assistance and some encourggement, the same as we give to those in the larger centres, because they are one of the greatest assets we have, and we should give them proper supervision, assist them in putting in their drainage, and prep ring levels, and preparing outlets. No inspector should be allowed to go below a certain standard, and he should make his reports regularly.

I would like to see the same assistance given the youth in the rural sections as we do in the urban sections. We will spend several thousand dollars helping them set up a home, but the government does not give them several thousand dollars to set them up on the farms.

I quite agree that from a business point of view, farming may not be as attractive. When a young man goes out and looks at a farm, and sees that erosion has destroyed a field, and there is no bush, and the fields are going to destruction, and there is nothing to cut, no timber and nothing to replace it again, it id a pretty blue outlook, and the dams are not the solution for erosion. We hear discussions among people, who are impressed with the fact that "building a dam will stop the erosion". You must go back to the start, where they began with the improper handling of the soil, improper cultivation, improper planting, improper wooding, and the like. That is where erosion starts. A dam will merely collect the silt which washes down there, and is no good. We would far rather keep it up in the fields, and a proper method by the agricultural department in encouraging the farmers -- not only the young men, but the older ones as well -- to utilize the proper methods of tilling.

I happened to have one field on my farm, on which I was troubled a little with erosion, and before I realized what I was going, I found a lot of it had gone down the stream one spring. I summer fallowed that one year, and when the snow came, and then melted, it washed down the side of my field, and I have had no erosion there for twenty years. I use it only for wood, or perhaps seeded for grass, and you will see how excellent-looking it is. Proper planting and irrigation will save erosion every time.

(Take EE follows)

There is only one more thing I would like to say and that has a bearing on the future and arises out of the things recommended in this report. That has to do with Provincial and Dominion relationships. In working out changes in some of our streams or working out new plans, we will come into contact with railway property, we will come in contact with telegraph property and telephone property. One thing we have found is that if you want to change a stream or make other changes, the railway will assume their responsibility and do so without any difficulty. They accept the engineer's estimate and advice and so on and go ahead but if you interfere with the Bell Telephone poles or cables or something which is a problem, you just cannot do it, you have to wait for them and if you do move it, it is what they say and you pay. They do not pay one dollar; and the telegraph company is the same. I think it is something that should be taken up at the Dominion-Provincial conference because there are going to be a great many things affected by our needs. If you are going to flood a certain area where the Bell Telephone poles are in for two or three miles or you are going to cross a stream, I think the telegraph company and the Bell Telephone Company should be in the same position as the railroads. They should share in this need, too. If there is a new project going on they should share. I think something should be done. I think there has been a test case taken to the Courts and so far the results have not been very happy.

I would like to see a great many recommendations in this report carried out, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is very serious in the future of Ontario.

I would like to congratulate this Committee; they have done a splendid job. I would like to congratulate the government for having accepted the suggestions and gone ahead with them and I hope there will be enough accepted that it will give encouragement to these men, not only the Committee, but men outside of the Committee who have worked for years for conservation, flood control, and so on. It may sound rather drastic to do some of the things in it but we have to do these things and I think this House will back this government and this Committee. If you will put the major part of these things into operation or at least start them-- we certainly cannot put them all into operation but we have to start them and I would be very happy to give any support I can because I think it is a very, very serious problem.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. S. J. HUNT (Renfrew North): Mr. Speaker, after listening to so much discussion on this report by so many able speakers, earlier this evening, it appears there is very little left to be said but as an Hon. Member of that Committee I have a few positive suggestions to offer to the government which I hope may be of some use. At the outset, I would like to state that it has been an inspiration to work under a chairman (Mr. Thomas) who is willing to work so diligently and conscientiously at the task allotted to him in compiling this report. We have tried to pass on to the government just the ideas and suggestions that were given to us as we toured this province from one end to the other. I was amazed as I went around with the Committee this summer to find such keen interest shown during the busy season by people who were really busy

and to see so many briefs presented to the Committee at our hearings.

I have heard the question asked on more than one occasion and even since the beginning of this Session, "Is there a need for the conservation program here in Ontario or was all this work justified that was done by this Committee?" I would just like to draw to your attention what I think are salient points and which have to do with our way of living. Only today, Mr. Speaker, I am quoting from the Toronto Daily Star where there is a headline "Dust storm over Chicago". It goes on to say what today is the effect of careless agricultural practices in some of the western cities carried out some years ago that have to do today with our cost of living and our way of life. About 450 years ago when the world population was much less than it is today, the western hemisphere was discovered. Because people thought at that time there was enough natural resources to amply provide for the needs of the human race for an indefinite period of time there was a tendency to go ahead and exploit those resources in the western hemisphere. I do not think that any place in the world has exploitation being carried on to the same degree in such a short period of time as it was in the western hemisphere. There was not too much in the way of development until about 150 years ago. In 1840, the world population was one billion people, in round figures-- those are statistical figures and I think are reliable-- by 1940, just one hundred years later, the population had increased to two billion, two huhdred million.

It is now estimated to be increasing at about 50,000 a day or eighteen million people a year. Then, again, in today's Star we read that starving Chinese are turning cannibal, the children victims. The children are being lured from the villages and cannibalism is being practised in China where famine is rampant. I know, Mr. Speaker, it is not a provincial problem it is an international problem but it is a situation that we as human beings cannot continue to overlook. Some solution will have to be found sometime internationally to solve what I believe is not altogether a problem of production so much as it is a problem of distribution. Our population, as I said, is increasing year after year at an alarming rate. Our production is decreasing from one decade to the next very considerably.

As we travelled over this province, we were told on many occasions this year that they were not growing the crops they were twenty-five to thirty years ago right here in some of our best farming sections of the province. As we set about compiling this report we did not try to picture an acute situation here in Ontario or paint a gloomy picture. I do not think conditions are nearly so bad here as they are in other parts of this North American continent today. In fact, I am quite sure they are not but the time has come, I believe, when some definite conservation program should be carried out and I believe the people of this province are demanding it at the present time from what we were told during the last few months. To my mind, conservation is only half the story which creates the problem today. The other half, Mr. Speaker, is one of rehabilitation or restoration. As the hon. member for Port

Arthur (Mr. Robinson) has said, we have seen our yields from our farms decreasing year after year.

Passing on to agriculture, I would like to say to this House that the lot of the farmers in this province during the last twenty years or more has not been a particularly happy one. From 1930 to 1940 they were producing at a loss. They saw their fences, their farm buildings, their homes, falling into a state of disrepair and the only way they could make ends meet was to dip into their capital resources and deplete further the soils already depleted. Most of our farmers at this time realised they were doing this but they could not afford to or at least they thought they could not afford to buy fertilizer to put back into the soil what they were taking out year after year. This is a serious situation. Since 1940, the lot of the farmer in this province has been somewhat better but he has only been trying to recover the ground he lost during the previous decade. The farmer is naturally a gambler. By force of circumstances he is a gambler against the weather, against the inevitable seasons and almost everything else he has to contend with but when the farmer is doing well he is quite willing to put back into his land something that is extracted year after year. I think that has a great bearing on stabilizing our economic equilibrium in this province.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

TAKE FF-- follows

There is not much point in going to the farmers of this province teaching conservation. I feel that if a conservation or rehabilitation program with relation to agriculture is to be carried out in the province it will have to be done by the farmers themselves with guidance and leadership provided by our government, working through the agricultural schools and colleges where the experimental work must be done and passed on to the farmers by way of extensions to the farmers on the land to be put into practise if we are to succeed. I would like to point out, in my opinion, some ways that could assist materially the farmers on the land today. We have as much money tied up in machinery as the farm is worth. The cost of machinery and the number of machines the farmer must have is not comparable to the farmer's resources. If we can lower the price of machinery or if we can reduce the number of implements needed on the farm we will accomplish something.

Last Fall the Conservation Committee had the opportunity of visiting Malabar Farm in Ohio and we saw at first hand what can be done in the way of reducing the number of farm implements required to efficiently and scientifically operate a farm and what has been done there could be done in this province under the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) working through our machinery companies and I think we could accomplish something to reduce the number of machines needed and the overhead costs. This would be something useful and of great benefit to the farmers. Another field in which a great deal of good can be done is in the field of land survey and land use. Something has been done by teams of provincial and Federal workers and this should be attempted by this government without great expense, immediately. I think it is essential that we should put into effect a conservation program in this province and know what we

are doing. I think we should have a complete soil analysis of the whole province. Even when a general survey has been made I believe that facilities should be made available to the individual farmer so that he may know just what his particular farm requires, whether it be lime or some special fertilizer formula. Tests should be made so that he can find out what he needs on his own farm. Even when tests have been made or soil analyzed to a certain point, there is a always a great variation in the needs of different farms. There would be possibly a different formula needed in the soil on one farm and a different formula needed on another farm that might be within a mile. The hit and miss system carried on in Ontario, a system of trial and error, will be too slow to correct the mistakes that have been made in the past hundred years. This must be done by the government through our agricultural colleges and schools assisting the farmers to help themselves. There is one other point I would like to stress and I do not believe that floor prices or subsidies are the answer to the problem. I believe that we as farmers may have to take lesser prices for our produce inthe years ahead if we are going to compete and hold our places; we are going to have to produce at a lesser cost and get larger yields. For these reasons it is imperative that something be done by our Department to enable the farmer to produce and compete and get the greatest yield per acre. One other experiment that has been tried out in the United States and brought to our attention this past Fall, and that is an experiment where they tried to utilize the low grade of coal which up to now was a by-product, by subjecting it to extreme heat and they claimed to be able to manufacture an almost complete job of fertilizer. The experiment has not been finalized, but we were told it was reasonable to expect that

a brand of commercial fertilizer not used formerly would soon be on the market, which contained all the ingredients necessary, hydrogen, potash, and what we need inour soil.

In 1944 I, together with certain other members of the House, had occasion to visit our extensive lignite deposits at Onakawanna, where we have millions of tons of lignite, resembling soft coal, for which we have not yet found any satisfactory use or market. I feel that something should be done in the way of of research to find out if we have not right here in Ontario a tremendous supply of raw material which might be used to develop a great industry and supply muchof the fertilizer needed for our province. These things I think we should go into. It is covered in our report but our report, like many other reports, will never be read all the way through and a great number of people will not know the recommendations contained in it. There is much more that I might touch on, farm drainage, better tillage practices, and demonstration plots on farms, that might to a great deal to help those in Ontario, these have been touched upon by other speakers, but I wouldlike to speak a few moment on reforestation.

In Ontario about 85% of all lands belongs to the Crown. In Northern Ontario, the most important problem seems to me to be one of conserving what we have left, and putting it to the best use. We are glad to know that more attention has been given to Northern Ontario in the way of forest protection in the last few years, and I am glad to see that the Department of Lands and Forests has given a great deal of attention to better protection and making the best use of existing forest wealth and eliminating wasteful cutting practices. That is important and if the policy in effect is carried through to continue with their reforestation, as mentioned by the hon.

member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) I think we may be able to hold our own in perpetuity and protect the great wealth that we have in Northern Ontario .. indefinitely.

A nursery station has been set up at Fort William and something has been done in the way of reforesting Northern Ontario. I know a great deal more may be done but when we come to old Ontario we have a different picture. Much of this land once carried enormous stands of valuable timber. In the process of land clearing, by the disastrous inroads of fire and I believe to a large extent by needless wasteful forestry practices, much of this land has been denuded of its once luxurious forest cover. I remember as a boy going through Canada and you would see large white pine twenty-four inches at the stump. Because there was some trunk defect they were cut down to make suqare timber and a large percentage was never used for anything. Even today you can go through some counties and see the remains of what was left at that time. A great deal of the land in older Ontario, and especially eastern Ontario, is privately owned and farmed at a loss. It should be open for settlement, but how we are going to recover lost ground, constitutes a great problem. In our report we pointed out that there are about 23,000 square miles in the precambrian shield alone that should be under forest cover. To accomplish this, as mentioned our report, will necessitate a great deal of effort and large expenditures. It will mean greatly expanding our nurseries to provide the young seedlings required. This year's production amounted to about 17,000,000 seedling trees. This will have to be stepped up to about 20,000,000 trees. When the present resources are up to full capacity they will be turning out about 50,000,000 to 52,000,000, in order to implement our program whereby 2,300,000 acres could be reforested in the next twenty-five

years, it would mean stepping up the output to 150,000,000 trees a year, and that will entail a lot of expenditure, but it is worthwhile. It is a task that has been accomplished in many European countries and we must make a start in carrying out this program. 60 or 70 years is a short span in the life of a province and it is a program that will be a worthwhile asset at the end of that time. There is one other aspect in this situation, and that is the unemployment feature, and it would help to relieve unemployment. We all know there is unemployment in Ontario at the present time and I don't know how soon a this will correct itself. Maybe it is seasonal and by next year the situation will have righted itself. I personally think that we would be very optimistic if we expect conditions to right themselves in such a short time. I think the sooner we can get a large reforestation project under way in Ontario, undertaken by Federal and provincial and municipal governments, the better it will be for us. I think that money so expended should be considered as an investment and capital expenditure and it would be very much more desirable than handing out money for relief. We can provide a great deal of employment.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HUNT: If we can invest today in such a program it would be very wise and the results to come in the years ahead would be a great return. If you have analyzed our report you would see it would cost at current rates over a period of sixty years about $567.83 to replant, protect and manage one acre of such land. But at present prices after paying all costs, the return from this acre would amount to at least $1012.87. These are round figures but are very close to being correct based on current records available to our Committee.

And besides the profit, we would have provided employment and hve created a real asset to this province in 50 or 60

years hence.

There are one or two other points I would like to mention and one has to do withprovincial legislation passed in 1946. In 1946 we passed an Act th t was called the Tree Conservation Act, I believe. This Act was of a nature to allow counties to pass by-laws subject to approval, to restict the cutting of trees on privately owned wood lots. These lots are a real asset to any farmer and there is not much danger about the farmer selling his wood lot or cutting it himself, where has has only a few acres of farm, But we have a number in Ont rio of much larger extent. In the last few years small jobbers have been coming in from outside towns and buying up the timber on the property and cutting it cleanand leaving nothing, and often the property has been let go for back taxes.

(Take GG follows)

I think the idea back of this legislation in 1946 was to try to correct that situation if possible, but unfortunately in my opinion, and I believe other members of the Committee will agree with me, this Act has not accomplished the purpose for which it was intended. Up until the end of 1949 only about 17 counties -- I think 17 to be exact -- in Ontario, had taken advantage of this permissive legislation, and had passed by-laws. In some counties where this action was needed worst, no action had been taken. In a good many counties where the by-laws had been passed, no steps had been taken to enforce them, so they were only dead letters. I think that 1946 Statute should be repealed, and the responsibility and the onus placed on the province to restrict the cutting of privately-owned land, to prevent this practice of jobbers and small companies coming in and stripping off this land that has no further use. This ought to be discontinued.

I had occasion during our trip to Eastern Ontario last summer to point out one or two specific instances to our committee, so they know first-hand what this practice amounts to. I could take you back to my own county at the present time, and show you where valuable cuts of timber are being slaughtered down to a size that would make a 2 by 4 scantling, where a good valuable crop of timber has been taken off pure sandy land that is of no use for anything else.

I do not think we should prohibit the owner or farmer from taking off a yearly crop of merchantable timber, and putting it on the market, but I think we should do something, and it is something I would like to see done at this Session, if we are not too late, and I hope we arenot; I would like to see the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) introduce a Bill that would take that responsibility on provincially

and see that that legislation was before us. I think it would be really something worthwhile.

There is one other point I would like to mention, and it has to do with municipal reforestation. Some years ago, provision was made whereby counties, and it was later amended to take in townships, might enter into an agreement with the Department of Lands and Forests, and plant or have planted by the Department substantial areas in any municipality. I think the agreement was something to the effect the county or the township supplied the land, bought the land, the Department of Lands and Forests planted the trees, and after a period of 20 years there was a clause in there which allowed the county or township to take it over at actual cost or the province to take it off the hands of the county or township for what they had tied up in it.

As we went around the province this year, we were given to understand there were urban municipalities who would like to enter into such an agreement. I think this Act, Mr. Minister (Mr. Scott), might be amended to make it apply to urban municipalities, who desire to go into municipal reforestation, and I think we can overlook in that way, whether it is individual, private reforestation in a very small way, or whether it is to be undertaken by a township, a town, or a county, or whether we get up to the level where it is undertaken by the province and the federal authorities jointly. I think it will require all of the effort on the part of all those different agencies to bring about or put into effect a program which I think is overdue and really worthwhile here in Ontario.

In conclusion, I would like to say that through representations made to this Committee during the last four months, I believe the people of Ontario are demanding that immediate attention be given to a realistic conservation program in this

province.

Tonight I have spoken simply as a member of a legislative committee, appointed by the Legislature as a whole, responsible only to the Legislature, and not to any one party. I tried to bring out what I thought were some important features in our report, and some phases that might be implemented in the near future without entailing excessive costs. Nothing that I have said is, or should be, regarded as criticism at all of what has been done or what hasnot been done by this government or any former administration. I spoke only as a member of the legislative committee, and suggested some things I think could be and should be undertaken very soon.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in concluding the Debate on this very monumental and interesting report, there is at the moment of course little to add to the speeches which have been made here today. We have listened to a large number of speeches on this very important subject or on certain of its phases, and one might wonder what speech was the best. When my hon. friend, the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hunt) rose after several hours of Debate on this subject, one might very well wonder what he would speak about, but his speech was certainly an excellent contribution to this Debate.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: It was started in that way by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and then by the hon. Leader of the Liberal Group (Mr. Oliver), and throughout the day this Debate has been on a very high plane, covering a great variety of matters of very profound interest to the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, and after the Debate that we have had, I am sure there is nothing left for me to add except to thank the chairman (Mr. Thomas, Elgin), and the members of this committee for the very excellent services which they have rendered to Ontario during the last year. It is just a year ago now since this committee was appointed and during all that period of time, they have been faithful to the task that was given to them. Many of us have run across members of this Committee sitting at various places in the province, studying the problems of the areas they were in. Throughout, they have shown the greatest interest in their subject. There was never any indication on their part that it was "just another Committee", they were interested in something of vital concern to our province.

On behalf of hon.members of this Legislature, and indeed the people of Ontario, I want to thank them very sincerely for their splendid work.

It has been mentioned during the Debate, and it was mentioned by my hon. friend, the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hunt) just a moment ago that possibly this report might simply be tabled and might be treated as "another report". I want to assure hon. members of the House that such will not be the case. We have set up a Cabinet Committee to study this report, and to consider the implementation of the same, and to consider the most practical ways of dealing with it. I am not unconscious of the fact the report hands over to the Prime Minister's department the carrying out of this report.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: I myself have comparatively little to do, and I would be very glad to take over this task. But in any event, we are studying this matter by way of a Cabinet meeting, and I can assure hon. members that we have not

any intention of forgetting it. We think, as you do, that the matter of conservation in Ontario is something of the utmost importance to our people, and if we did feel disposed to forget about it, I can imagine there are some other hon. members in this House who would not be disposed to let us forget about it in any event.

Mr. Speaker, may I again thank the members of the committee for the service they have rendered to the province of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to close tonight sharp at 11 o'clock, so we have about 20 minutes and there are some matters here which might be treated as routine on the Order Paper. I thought perhaps we might try to clear them up.

The first item is Order No. 52, the second reading of The Division Courts Act.

Mr. Speaker, if any of the hon. members of the House would prefer that any of these orders should not be called, just let me know and I will let them stand over.

THE DIVISION COURTS ACT, 1950.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 52nd Order, second reading of Bill No. 128, "The Division Courts Act, 1950". Mr. Porter.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Porter, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 128, "The Division Courts Act, 1950".

I might say in passing this Act is more or less routine. It follows the recommendations of a committee which was appointed last fall by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter), and deals with matters of jurisdiction, clarification of expressions and forms, and I should imagine it might be better

dealt with in committee than here on second reading.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the next Bill is perhaps not so routine, but on the other hand, it might be a matter which hon. members might want to discuss in committee. It is the Act to amend The Hospitals Tax Act, 1948. I would therefore call Item No. 51.

HOSPITALS TAX ACT, 1948.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 51st Order, second reading of Bill No. 114, "An Act to amend The Hospitals Tax Act, 1948", Mr. Frost.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 114, "An Act to amend The Hospitals Tax Act, 1948".

In this Bill there are two principles involved beyond the reduction of certain taxes. First of all there is the abolition of the Hospital Aid Fund and the placing of the moneys in the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I think the purpose for that is plain. With the reduction of taxes, the amount of money available from this tax is not going to begin to meet the hospital demands. I gave the figures in the Budget address. My recollection, just picking the figures "out of the air", is that the assistance to hospitals this year will run something about $14,000,000.

The purpose of this fund, I think, is that the moneys would be better to go into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and there to be treated subject to the ordinary estimates of ordinary and capital expense.

(Take HH-1 follows)

My recollection is that the matter was raised here some two years ago, when that fund was created. I did not imagine there would be much discussion raised on the reduction of taxes, which approximate reduction of some 20 per cent to 15 per cent -- about a 25 per cent reduction in taxes. We have, in the Act, instead of leaving it at a straight percentage, for purposes of collection reduced the taxes in terms of so many cents for a ticket of a certain value. The purpose of that is to assist in the collection of taxes. It is very simple, and provides that where the fee is above one dollar, the tax is on a straight 15 per cent basis.

That was discussed at considerable length with some of the amusement people over the last couple of years, and they felt that 20 per cent was too onerous, and I must admit that it was a very onerous tax. They had submitted briefs to us at various times, relative to the collection of taxes. We were anxious to make it as simple as possible, and after a good deal of consideration we adopted this schedule which carries the plan, and contributes to ease of collection.

Of course, there are no taxes paid on tickets below 15 cents, and then it is graded roughly on a 15 per cent basis up to one dollar. Over that, it is a straight 15 per cent.

There was another point which might involve discussion, and that is the new tax applying to cabarets, and that sort of thing. The purpose of that is that these places have been carrying on quite an extensive entertainment. Under our old regulations, we taxed them on the basis of a cover charge, being fixed at two dollars, With the type of elaborate entertainment being carried on in many of these places now, the tax is neither fair nor adequate. It is not fair to other people carrying on

entertainment in the city, and, therefore, we felt that this method was perhaps the best method of handling it.

I admit that it has the undesirable feature of being connected with the price of food and liquor, but we must remember that the entertainment in these places is, in very large part, on the basis of such things. Therefore, after a good deal of consideration, we went back to this method, which actually was the method of the Dominion government tax, before we took the tax over.

My recollection is that the Dominion government charged 25 per cent of the Bill in night clubs, and places of that sort -- cabarets. Here, the tax is on the basis of 15 per cent, and not to exceed a total tax of one dollar.

Under the old law of two years ago, it could be very much higher than that.

Mr. Speaker, we have made, as can be discussed in Committee, a distinction between places of amusement and places of entertainment. Roughly, it amounts to this: all taxation is carried on those places which are subject to tax. If it is just a question of music, as defined in the Act, then the tax is not payable, but if it involves a floor show, and elaborate entertainment, then the tax does apply.

On a bill of less than two dollars, the tax is less than under the old regulations.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There would not be many under two dollars.

MR. FROST: That is the purpose of this Act, and, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the Bill.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG: (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I think that this Bill can stand a bit of light and analysis. Two years ago the government stepped into the amusement tax field, after

the federal government dropped this tax. At that time, the plea of the government for support for that measure was that the hospitals needed assistance, and who in the House, or in the province, was going to stand up and object to the raising of funds for hospitals?

I remember at that time my colleague and I spoke against the Bill, and voted against it. If I remember correctly, we were the only two who voted against that Bill --

MR. FROST: You are not still against it, are you?

MR. SALSBERG: We were taunted by the hon. members across the floor, by saying, "Are you not ready to help the hospitals", and my good friend, the hon. members of the C.C.F. at that time fell for this appeal, and voted for it, and turned to me, I recollect, and said, "Well, Joe, you are right; it is a bad tax, but after all, the hospitals need assistance".

(Page HH-4 follows)

We argued at the time, but it was carried, with the provision to take over the hospital costs, and to relieve the municipalities of that terrific burden, without imposing an amusement tax, particularly a tax on the working-man's movie tickets, and on the tickets his children bought.

The Bill carried. It was an issue in the election, if you recollect, and the government supporters defended themselves before the electors by saying that the hospitals will be now taken care of, and who is going to deny the sick people a few extra pennies when you go out to have a good time?

What happened after that was that the hospitals and the municipal councils turned to the government expecting them to live up to their pledges and promises, and they asked the province to relieve them of the burden, and cover the deficits, and increase that portion for the care of indigent patients.

I know the government's spokesmen will say they did provide additional aid for hospitals, construction first, particularly, of new hospitals, and so on. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill is introduced chiefly for the purpose of providing the government with the means of "getting out from under", because in the city of Toronto, as an example, the city of Toronto is faced with the problem of finding the funds tomorrow to the tune of one and one-quarter million dollars to pay the deficit of the Toronto hospitals, and the tax-ridden home-owners will on Thursday be asked to pay a higher tax next year, and one of the reasons will be that the province has failed to assume the responsibility for that one and one-quarter million dollars --

MR. FROST: I must say, Mr. Speaker, that we never said at any time we would assume responsibility for that. There was never any hospital grant in the province, except in indigent cases, until I think about 1948. We at that time

introduced this sytem. We never expected that this would pay the municipality's share of the costs by any means, but we did feel that it would be of very, very substantial assistance to the hospitals.

I may say to the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) that at that time the total grants for the maintenance of hospitals was about $800,000., and last year the assistance to hospitals ran over $6,000,000. That does not include capital taxes at all. I am speaking only about public general hospitals and maintenance, which has increased from about $800,000. to something around $6,000,000.

I do not know what the situation is with regard to the city of Toronto and hospitals here, but in this Budget we have given this year to the hospitals a special grant of 25 percent. of the amount they received last year, so that there will be a very considerable contribution from the province toward any deficits which are presently accumulated, to the extent of 25 percent., which I think is estimated to run somewhere around two and one-half million dollars.

MR. SALSBERG: I am mindful of all these things.

MR. FROST: I want you to appreciate we have done very well.

MR. SALSBERG: I appreciate the difficult position the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) finds himself in. He is anxious to minimize the effect of my remarks, by bringing to the attention of the House and the public through the press, the increased contributions, an increase of grants of 25 percent., and so on. Well, let us be fair and objective about this. This province has increased income year after year. The needs of the people are increasing; the problems of the municipalities are greater than ever, and it is natural, of course, that you should give greater grants now than you gave some years ago.

Of course, you have more money, but the needs are greater, and all this should have been done without any amusement tax at all. And, mind you, I suggest the province should assume the responsibility for covering the deficits, regardless of whether this Bill goes through or not, and regardless of whether we have an amusement tax or not.

I am opposed to the amusement tax on other grounds. We do not need an amusement tax under any consideration, having introduced the tax, and having gone to the length the government and its supporters went, at that time, I say that the people took them at their word, took them seriously, and believed what they were promised, and they now come with a promissory note asking that it be paid.

(Page HH-7 follows

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) has explained the intention of the government at that time. He explained it a little differently than it was presented two years ago.

MR. FROST: Oh, no.

MR. SALSBERG: There were no --

MR. FROST: I would ask the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) to look at the Budget Speech in 1948, where it is set out in great detail, as to what was to be paid to each hospital. I think it started at $2.45, in connection with certain classes of hospitals, and it went down to --

MR. SALSBERG: I recall that.

MR. FROST: You had forgotten that.

MR. SALSBERG: No. My memory does not fail me on such matters. It may on other matters. I remember the speeches by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr.Frost) very well. There was a speech delivered in this House at the time the Bill was discussed, and this speech left no doubt about the hospital deficits going to be covered. Let it be understood that cities like Toronto and other municipalities are asking the government to live up to their promise of 1948.

The government has got out of that position by sending the fund into the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the province, and I am afraid that henceforth the contributions of the province to hospital costs and deficits will become frozen, because they will say, "We no longer have any special fund; that is all we can do".

MR. FROST: Read the Budget Speech, and see the amount of money set aside for hospitals -- $14,000,000.

MR. SALSBERG: I remember that, but I suggest when that was discussed, and we were discussing the principle of the Bill, that the principle seemed to be to divert the funds into the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the province, in order to get

away from the promise made two years ago, and telling the municipalities to try and take care of their hospital problems as best they can.

That is the principle I see in it, and I believe at that time I gave utterance to that feeling.

MR. FROST: You have a suspicious mind.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) if he does not honestly think that the title of this particular Bill is altogether inappropriate? It is misleading. It is not a hospital tax at all. It is dealing with the amusement tax, and is to be put into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, for aid to the hospitals. I think it is altogether misleading.

MR. SALSBERG: No. Why not change the name?

MR. FROST: On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the Act was designed to provide money and assistance to hospitals, and that is what the money is being used for. Actually speaking, we have taken this money each year, and have supplemented it with I think about three and one-half million dollars from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, together with certain moneys which were going into the capital payment plan. This year I think the Estimate -- and I am speaking only from memory -- is around about $5,000,000. from the amusement tax, or hospital tax, and this sum will have to be supplemented by considerably over twice that amount -- nearly three times that amount, to meet our commitments to the hospitals. I think we are spending more in hospital assistance now than our whole budget for health was when we came into office back in 1943.

MR. SALSBERG: I do think the government should change the name of the Bill, and I think the stubs of the tickets the people receive after they have paid the tax, should not read "hospital tax", but "amusement tax of the province of Ontario".

MR. FROST: We like to make them feel good.

Motion agreed; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, I move the customary motion, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that tomorrow, Tuesday, the 28th instant, and also on Wednesday, the 29th instant, this House 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.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow it will be our purpose to go ahead with items of government Orders, relative to committee matters, and then I would like to go on the Estimates, highways, public works, and lands and forests, in that order.

Tomorrow night we will adjourn at six p.m., to be "debunked" and "deflated".

There is one matter I would like to discuss with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). Perhaps on Thursday we can put in the estimates for agriculture, and I would take advantage of that to have the hon. minister in charge of Hydro (Mr. Challies) give a report to the House in connection with Hydro, under the item dealing with rural extension, and I would follow that with the resolution from the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison), concerning Hydro, and we would clean up these items, I think, in that order.

Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.05 of the clock, p. m.

/ / / / / / /

- - - - - - -

Volume 29.

P R O C E E D I N G S .

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS TWENTY-EIGHTH DAY OF MARCH, A. D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT TWO O'CLOCK, P. M.

- - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario
Tuesday, March 28, 1950
2.00 o'clock, p. m.

- - - - - -

2.00 O'CLOCK, P. M.

And the House having met.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

MR. H. M. ALLEN (Middlesex South): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the report of the Standing Committee on Fish and Game for the current Session, and move that it be printed as an Appendix to the Journals of the Legislature.

Motion agreed to.

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

(1) a return to an order of the House dated April 6, 1949 respecting the standing of candidates for secondary school graduation.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

THE INCOME TAX ACT

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "The Income Tax Act, 1950", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

INCOME TAX RENTAL AGREEMENT ACT

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Kennedy, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Authorize an Income Tax Rental Agreement or an Income Tax Agency Agreement Act", and

that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in explanation of these two Bills, "The Income Tax Act, 1950" and complementary to this Act, an Act known as "The Income Tax Agreement Act, 1950", being an Act to authorize an income rental agreement or income tax agency agreement, as the circumstances may indicate:-

When I introduced the Budget on the 17th of March, I made an extended reference, under the Ways and Means section of my address, to Federal-Provincial relations and there I gave a detailed statement of the purposes of these Acts and the intention behind them.

At that time I stated:

> " In 1936 the province imposed an income tax, which was suspended by the tax suspension agreements of 1942. Since the expiration of these agreements in 1947, this Act has been suspended each year by a tax suspension statute, but the old statute of 1936 has not been altered. It is now intended to repeal the 1936 statute and pass a new Act which would enable the province to impose a tax not exceeding 5 per cent of the federal tax and which, in case of imposition, would be deducted from the federal tax thereby not raising the level of taxation of any Ontario taxpayer. This statute will come into effect on proclamation and will be accompanied by a complementary statute which will permit the province to enter into an arrangement with the federal government whereby the federal government would pay over to the province 5 per cent of the tax col-

lected from the Ontario taxpayers, without the Ontario taxpayer filing any income tax or other return with the Ontario government. The effect of this statute would be to rent the personal income tax field to the federal government on the payment to Ontario of an amount equal to 5 per cent of the taxes paid by Ontario taxpayers to the federal authorities."

without the Ontario taxpayer filing any tax statement.

The Income Tax Act, 1950 now being introduced, in addition to the taxing sections which are contained under sections 1, 2 and 3 of the Bill, and which simply imposes an income tax of 5 per cent of whatever the amount of the federal tax may be, on residents of the province of Ontario or persons who are employed or carry on business in the province of Ontario, is administrative and is a parallel of the Dominion Act. In other words, this Act adopts all Dominion rates and interpretations and administrative machinery and, as stated, in order that there may be no multiple taxation or no inconvenience to Ontario taxpayers, and in order that Ontario taxpayers may be entitled to the complete deduction of the Ontario tax from the federal tax, the Acts are parallel in every particular. There have, of course, been substitutions such as "Treasurer" for "Minister of National Revenue" and other details of that sort, but outside of the taxing sections above referred to, the Act is a parallel of the Dominion Income Tax Act. In other words, this Act could stand on its own feet in Ontario and the necessity for this is plain. In order to claim the amounts which are due to Ontario under the Federal Income Tax Act, we feel that it is necessary to show that we have a statute which is complete and enforceable in itself. Otherwise, our position would be as it is now, namely, that our present Income Tax Act has no relation to

federal legislation and therefore it might well be pointed out by the federal authorities that we are claiming something from the federal government which we, in ourselves, cannot enforce. This Act removes this obstalce and puts us in a position, in discussing matters with Ottawa authorities, to show a taxing statute which, in effect, could stand on its own feet in the province of Ontario.

I suggest to the hon. members of the House that the important parts of this legislation are sections 1 to 3 inclusive of the Income Tax Act, 1950 which provides that our tax shall be 5 per cent of whatever the Dominion tax is. The rest of the Act, as stated, is administrative and follows the form of the federal statute.

The other important matter in these Bills is the submission of the Act to authorize an income tax rental agreement or an income tax agency agreement. Section 1 of this Act enables the Treasurer of Ontario, on behalf of Ontario, to enter into a rental agreement for this field with the federal government, on the basis of a payment to Ontario of 5 per cent of the tax collected from Ontario residents. The alternative is section 2, which provides for an agency agreement which would permit the federal government to collect for Ontario the amount and remit the same to the province of Ontario, making a deduction of 5 per cent from the payment of each taxpayer.

As stated, a full explanation of this matter was given in the Budget Address and the hon. members may refresh their minds on what was said by re-reading that portion of the address.

As stated, it is considered desirable, in view of the approaching Dominion-Provincial Conference, that the government of Ontario should have a taxing statute designed to meet present conditions and particularly fit in with section 32 of

the Federal Income Tax Act which permits the deduction by the federal government of any tax imposed by the province of Ontario up to 5 per cent of the federal tax.

I may say, as previously indicated, that this is a step to rationalize Dominion-Provincial fiscal relationships, and is designed to give the province the money to which it is justly entitled out of the Federal Income Tax.

The Act, relating to the income tax rental agreement or the income tax agency agreement, comes into effect upon the day it receives Royal Assent. In other words, authority is given to the Treasurer and the Act is effective at once. Insofar as the Income Tax Act, 1950 is concerned; it does not become effective until it is proclaimed. I desire to give this express undertaking that this Act will not be proclaimed and put in effect unless agreements contemplated by the Income Tax Agreement Act, 1950 are not arrived at without coming back to this House and obtaining authority for so doing. In other words, it is not the government's intention to impose an income tax upon the people of Ontario without express authority from the Legislature. Therefore, it is not the intention to problaim this Act unless a rental agreement covering personal income tax is arrived at under Section 1 of the Income Tax Agreement Act, 1950, or unless there is an agency agreement authorized as contemplated by Section 2 of the Act.

In regard to the last paragraph, we want to make it perfectly clear we have no intention of imposing an income tax in the ordinary sense, on the people of Ontario. We want to be in the position where we can go to the federal government and say, "Here is the Act and all its machinery", and we would have the 5 per cent, which comes to $13 million to $15 million

and which the federal Income Tax Act makes provision for paying to us. We would not claim the money under this arrangement, unless we could say, "Here is a statute which we can proclaim and which entitles us to make an agreement." If an agreement is arrived, at, we will not be proclaiming this Act.

I have no intention of proclaiming this Act unless an agreement is arrived at under section 1 or section 2 of the second Act that I will introduce. This proposition is so fair and so reasonable I cannot imagine the federal government not entering into an arrangement. If such a thing as that happened, then I would make this express condition before this House, that under no circumstances would we proclaim this Act without coming back to the House and getting authority.

MR. C. W. COX (Fort William): That section would indicate there is no increase in taxes.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. COX: Having the supplement whereby they are paying 5 per cent of the tax for the federal government, the federal government would take up the slack. Am I right that this is one more tax for Ontario and for Canada?

MR. FROST: It depends on the size of the surplus.

MR. COX. I do not think that answers my question.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): On a point of Order, are we going to have a discussion on this on first or second reading?

MR. FROST: I have no objection to answering any questions. I think the full explanation is given in the Budget address.

MR. SPEAKER: I support the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). Questions may be asked on first readings, discussions may be on second readings and in Committee.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): If the agreement is not reached

with the federal government and this Act is proclaimed, when will it be effective.

MR. FROST: Definitely it would be effective in 1950.

MR. WISMER: For the whole year?

MR. MacLEOD: Is not the second Bill "window dressing", if we are not ready to claim that 5 per cent tax?

MR. FROST: Actually speaking it is doubtful. We did in 1936 arrive at an agreement which is still in force, with the federal government, for the collection of Ontario income tax. That was not abrogated by the agreement of 1942. That is an agreement not by any means "on all fours" with this agreement. There are so many changes that while the precedent is there, the agreement is not there. What we contemplate in this agreement is entirely different.

We contemplate that either the federal government pay to us 5 per cent, which they allowed under section 36 of The Income Tax Act, or lose the corresponding rental on that field, under the Dominion-Provincial agreement which expires on the 31st of March, 1952.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE(Leader of the Opposition): I am wondering if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would indicate now, on second reading, whether there is any parallel to this arrangement existing, or contemplated, in any of the other nine provinces. It may not be possible to give an answer now, but we could obtain it later.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): If this Bill gets the approval of this House, will it immediately get approval at Ottawa?

MR. FROST: I have another Act to introduce relating relating to another matter, and we are inconsultation with the Ottawa authorities. In connection with the Income Tax

it might not wait until the Conference. I think it is desirable that the Act be there because of the coming Dominion-Provincial Conference.

MR. MacLEOD: Without attempting to debate the answer, I asked earlier would the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) agree that the Bills he introduced in 1947, 1948 and 1949 repealing the provincial Income Tax Act were "window dressing"?

MR. FROST: No. We did not repeal. We suspended the Act. The suspension of the Act asserted our right to be in the field. What I am now doing is showing our right to explore that field, and we are substituting them with an Act that puts us in a position of going to the bank with a note.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

LOGGING PROFITS TAX

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to impose a Tax on Logging Profits, " and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act, 1939", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, reference is also made to this in the Budget Address. If the hon. members will look at the "Ways and Means," under the Dominion-Provincial relations, it is in the last paragraph on that part. Reference was made in the Budget address to this

matter. The principle of this matter appears in the Mining Tax Act of 1947, but due to certain complications in the matter of the Logging Tax, this phase was not dealt with at that time. In the Mining Tax Act of 1947, we received a Corporiation Tax, 7 per cent Corporation Tax, but they imposed a Mining Tax of 7 per cent, 8 per cent, and 9 per cent, with regard to profit, and which were taxable on company income under the Dominion Tax Act, with the result that Ontario got one million dollars more taxes. The federal government got one million dollars less, and the taxpayers saved some money. I would say to the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) that as a result of this tax, Ontario would get a little more tax, and the federal government a little less. But the taxpayer would pay a little less in total taxes. That was the effect of the Act of 1947. The purpose is plain.

In 1946, the federal government accepted the principle that the provinces should have priority in the fields of revenue from natural resources. In its statement to the Dominion-Provincial Conference in 1945, the federal government states that, "Mining royalties, crown dues and other similar provincial charges are closely bound up with each provincial government's management of and expenditure on, its forests and mineral resources. These charges are recognized costs of operation and as such can be deducted from taxable income for Dominion tax purposes.

This proposal was translated into the Dominion statutes, Section 11, of the Income Tax Act above referred to. As stated, in 1947 the province took advantage of the proposal in relation to mining tax but because of difficulty in determining logging profit, the other matter was allowed to stand until the present time.

There has to be a decision made as to the portion of profit supplied to logging operations. There may be a saw mill operating and a planing mill, a pulpwood mill and it entails a separation of company profits. We had the same situation in connection with the nickel and copper operations, and we were able to solve that with the Income Tax Department and we feel there will be no difficulty in connection with this problem.

The effect of this Act is to impose a tax of 9 per cent on profits derived from logging operations after allowing an exemption of $10,000 by Section 11 of the Federal Income Tax. This tax is deductibel from income and the same tax appears in calculating Federal tax.

A complementary amendment is made to the Ontario Corporation Tax Act, 1939, allowing a deduction from profits taxable under this Bill the income tax the same taxpayers would otherwise pay under that Act. This is the same principle introduced in the Mining Tax Act, 1947. The result will be that corporations engaged in logging will pay a larger total tax to Ontario and a smaller tax to Canada, but in the total will pay a slightly smaller over-all tax.

The Act to amend the Corporation Tax Act, 1939 also introduced covers the principle above referred to. It, however, has some other conditions, such as deductions for contributions to pension funds and adjustment of the contributions by companies to past services of employees, to bring it in line with the federal statutes.

Mr. Speaker, the principle of this Bill, the Logging Tax Act is similar to the Mining Tax provisions brought in in 1947., I would ask the hon. members not to be alarmed by the magnitude of the Act. It is a very involved Act, and I would be very glad if any of the hon. members of the House

would be interested in sitting down with the Controller of Revenue and discussing some of the points, I would be very glad to arrange it. The Income Tax Act, the Logging Tax Act, and the Corporations Tax Act, are all of a technical nature, and might be clarified if any of the hon. members would wish to sit in with the Controller of Revenue and discuss it with him.

MR. C. W. COX (Fort William): When I saw the word "logging" I thought the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) was paying particular attention to the logging business. Most of the loggers do not make a great deal of money. Obviously this tax is, in other respects, similar to the Federal Tax Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members will have an oportunity for discussing the principle on second reading.

MR. COX: It is similar to one of the federal government.

MR. FROST: It is different from the other Act. This provides more. The principle is this: the federal government took the view that royalties that apply to timber falling to Ontario should be treated as a straight cost on company business. That already applies in the matter of stumpage dues, and things of that sort. They agreed to extend that agreement to a royalty on profits. Sometimes it is difficult to compute them on stumpage, and they agreed to extent the royalty principle and profits tax, provided the tax was similar to our mining tax. This tax would be included as a royalty and be deductible from the company profits before the collection of federal corporation tax, and that is where the corporation stays. They can pay a larger royalty, and at the same time, because of the 33 per cent, they save money because of the deduction of that tax from income.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Bearing in mind what you have said, does it include the recommendations which I made.

(Take B follows)

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): May I ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) how much money he expects from this nine percent.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I would say about $1,000,000.--I hope.

MR. NIXON: Just chicken-feed.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table answer to Question No. 101.

MR. SPEAKER: Order of the Day.

MR. FROST: Mr.Speaker, the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) is indisposed today. There are certain Acts here in which he is interested, so I will only proceed with a few of these items, and then we will go into the estimates.

I move that you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 7.

CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT, 1946.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 7th Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 119, "An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act, 1946", Mr. Griesinger.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 119 reported.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 8.

PLANNING ACT, 1946

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 8th Order, House in Committee on Bill No 120, "An Act to amend The Planning Act, 1946", Mr. Griesinger.

Section 1 agreed to.

On Section 2.

Hon. WILLIAM GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and

Development): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment to section 2, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, to delete that section, and replace it by the following:

> "Notwithstanding any other general or special Act, where an official plan is in effect, no public works shall be undertaken, and, except as provided in subsection 2, no by-laws shall be passed for any purpose that does not conform therewith."
>
> "2. The Ontario Municipal Board, upon the application of the council of a municipality for which an official plan is in effect, may, by its order, declare that the by-law of such municipality shall be deemed to conform with the official plan of the board, if the board is of the opinion that the by-law conforms with the general intent and purpose of the official plan."
>
> "3. The procedure upon application to the Board, under subsection 2, shall be the same, as nearly as may be, to the case of an application to the board, under section 406 of the Municipal Act."

Mr. Chairman, I may say the reason for that is the amendment to the by-law now suggested substitutes the Municipal Board for the Minister as the authority for determining whether or not a by-law affecting an area covered by an official plan conforms with the general intent and purpose of the official plan.

Since the application of this section is principally to zoning by-laws passed under Section 406 of the Municipal Act which must in accordance with that section be approved by the Municipal Board, in any case, the change will simplify

the procedure since the Board can in the same hearing determine both whether or not the by-law should be approved in the ordinary way and also whether or not the by-law conforms with the general intent and purpose of the official plan.

As set out in the explanation in the Bill as originally submitted, the object in view is to avoid the necessity of applications to amend the official plan to permit minor deviations that do not affect the broad purpose of the plan.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) has sent me a copy of this amendment just before the Bill was called. It is rather a complicated amendment. Some of the hon. members of this side are quite interested in it, and they did not have copies of the amendment just moved by the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger). They would like to see the text and consider it. I wonder if this section can be held over.

MR. FROST: Yes. We might proceed with the other sections of the Bill, and hold this section over.

Section 2 stands.

Sections 3 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 10.

LEGITIMATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The 10th Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 126, "An Act to amend The Legitimation Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 126 reported.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 11.

THE PHARMACY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The 11th Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 108, "An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On Section 3.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Chairman, I think this question is partially answered, but possibly the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) might make it plain again. I did not just catch the idea when this was to be proclaimed, and when it was going to apply. There are many questions being asked by those who are registered ,particularly as to whether they will, in fact, have to take this longer course, if they are already registered. They are anxious to have that point made clear.

Hon. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Welfare): I understand it is after those who have already made application for registration, but have not yet been able to take the course. It is 1954, when it comes into effect.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed to.

Bill No. 108 reported.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 16.

RAISING MONEY ON THE CREDIT OF THE CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The 16th Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 127, "An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund", Mr. Frost.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 127 reported.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise and report certain Bills, and progress on another Bill.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, The Committee of the Whole House begs to report certain Bills and progress of another Bill, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move, that you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of Supply; Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

(Page B-6 follows)

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Department of Public Works; Page 93.

Hon. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, before submitting the Estimates of the Department of Public Works for the coming fiscal year 1950-51, I would like to have the privilege of placing before this House a brief outline of some of the more important work items that have been provided for, particularly in connection with new construction work.

TREASURY BUILDING

Referring firstly to the proposed new treasury building;- I wish to explain that the government has given consideration to the crowded office conditions around the Parliament Buildings and the lack of adequate space provided for many of the departments that have very valuable and irreplaceable documents under their control, and it has been decided that a start will be made during the new fiscal year to erect an office building for the purposes of the Department of Provincial Treasurer on the south side of Grosvenor Street between Surrey Place and Queen's Park Crescent, on land already owned by the province. This proposed building will front on Grosvenor Street and will be faced with Canadian stone to match the existing east block. The new building will be six stories and basement in height and have a useable floor area of about 72,000 square feet and will be connected to the existing east block buildings by an underground passage.

OSGOODE HALL ANNEX

The proposed new Osgoode Hall annex is another important unit that will when completed relieve the present congestion at Osgoode Hall and provide better facilities for the courts and for the proper storage of important case

documents. A site has already been purchased for this building on the south-east corner of Queen and York Streets, and the new office building to be started this year will be of six stories and basement in height. The exterior of the building will be of brick with stone trimmings and will provide a net useable floor space of approximately 65,000 square feet. This building when completed will be occupied by the Public Trustee, the Official Guardian, Ontario Securities Commission, Department of Insurance, and the Ontario Municipal Board, and willrelease space in Osgoode Hall and Parliament Buildings for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE BUILDINGS

Such important work as the remodelling and fire-proofing of the east wing of the Parliament Buildings will be continued, and in the centre section a new fire exit tower stairway leading from all floors direct to the outside will be constructed, and jointly with this work two new modern elevators willbe installed to replace the existing elevators adjoining and to the east of the main staircase. It is also anticipated that a start will be made on the replacement of the present east wooden staircase with a new fire-resisting, fully enclosed fire tower stairway to serve all floors.

The whole program of fire-proofing and fire protection of the Parliament Buildings has been given careful consideration, and plans are under way with a view to installing a sprinkler system in certain sections of the buildings. It is also planned to increase the protection of the buildings against fire by extending the fire alarm system, Every effort is being made to take precaution against the menace of fire, both by way of improvements and alterations to the buildings as well as by the introduction of up-to-date fire protection services.

ENLARGED MENTAL HOSPITAL PROGRAM
FOR DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

This government has already made an announcement with respect to its intention to carry out a five year 4,000 bed expansion program for mental hospital construction and is at present formulating plans for the various stages of this work.

Generally the main part of this expansion of mental hospital accommodation will be carried out in,-

(A) The north westerly sectionof the province.

(B) The north easterly section of the province

(C) The Toronto-Hamilton area.

(D) The eastern central part of the province.

RE NEW ONTARIO HOSPITAL,
PORT ARTHUR

Progress will be made during the coming fiscal year on schemes for the above mentioned districts but it is expected that the first work of this class to be started will be the building of the first section of the new Ontario Hospital at Port Arthur.

The site for this hospital wasselected some years ago by a previous administration who erected an administration building and carried out other preliminary work. Further progress was halted by world war No. 2 and delayed further by material and labour conditions in the post war years.

The first section of the hospital to be erected at Port Arthur will consist of a group of three central buildings and a boiler plant and laundry, and will as a first stage provide accommodation for about 460 patients. Upon completion of this hospital many patients now accommodated in southern Ontario mental hospitals who were formerly residents of Northern Ontario will be moved to the new Port Arthur institution to be near

their relatives and friends.

RE ONTARIO HOSPITAL SCHOOL,
MONTAGUE TOWNSHIP (2,400 BED CAPACITY)

Now that men and materials are more readily available the construction program at the new Ontario Hospital School, Montague Township, will be considerably accelerated in an effort to get all the buildings under way during the coming fiscal year and completed as quickly as possible thereafter and provide a total bed capacity of 2,400 beds which may be regarded as another additional item in the mental hospital expansion program.

The buildings which may be described as group (A) and (A-1) of this hospital and which are practically finished at this date and are at the moment being furnished and equipped, may be enumerated as follows to give an idea of the magnitude of this project;

6 Patients pavilion buildings with total of 900 bed capacity (3 buildings for males and 3 for females)

4 Visitors and clothing buildings (2 buildin s for male and 2 for female).

2 Bathing and change of clothing pavilions (1Building for male and 1 for female patients).

1 Central dining hall and patients cafeterias (for male and female patients).

Central Kitchen and central refrigeration services, staff dining hall, central stores, bakery and pasteurizing center

By way of note it is the intention of the department of Health to accommodate 450 patients in group (A) and (A-1) buildings as soon as the contractor has completed the new outfall sewer.

The buildings now well under way which may be described as group (A-2) and (A-3) are a repeat of (A-1) group as previously described including the patients cafeterias but omitting the central kitchen and service building and adding the patients occupational and training building. This group when completed will also have a patient bed capacity of 900. In addition to the buildings of this hospital which I have just enumerated the following buildings will also be required as part of the set up at this hospital and it is planned that all of these will be started and as many as possible completed during thecoming fiscal year,-

ITEM

(1) Administration building.

(2) School and Assembly Hall,

(3) General diagnostic, clinical, treatment and surgical building.

(4) Hospital buildings for male patients.

(5) Hospital buildings for female patients.

(6) Female infirmary building.

(7) Male Infirmary building.

(8) Boiler house, laundry, etc.,

It is to be noted that the hospital group of buildings Items 4,5,6 and 7 which I have just enumerated for inclusion under those buildings which are to be put in hand during the coming fiscal year will provide a capacity of 600 beds.

RE ONTARIO HOSPITAL, AURORA

The De LaSalle College at Aurora purchased last year has been altered and made suitable for a mental institution, and this building is now being occupied by the Department of Health and will provide accommodation for 250 patients as an additional item in the mental hospital expansion program.

RE ONTARIO HOSPITAL,WOODSTOCK

At the Ontario Hospital,Woodstock, construction will be started on two patient cottages to provide 80 beds in each cottage this coming fiscal year and these will be similar in construction and will form part of the new group erected several years ago and may also form an additional item to the above referred to mental hospital expansion program.

RE ONTARIO HOSPITAL, COBOURG

The old Rowe House in the town of Cobourg will be altered and fitted to accommodate 60 mental patients as an annex to the Ontario Hospital, Cobourg, and as a further additional item to the mental hospital expansion program.

(Page B-12 follows)

MENTAL HOSPITAL FIRE-PROOFING

The fire-proofing program will be continued at the following mental hospitals: Brockville, Hamilton, Kingston, Orillia and Penetang.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE:

At the Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph, a start will be made on a new addition to the MacDonald Institute, and a new seed cleaning plant will also be erected.

At the Agricultural School at Kemptville work will be commenced on the construction of a complete new water supply system and a new sewage system, both to be connected to the water supply and sewage systems of the town of Kemptville. A start will also be made on the construction of a new agricultural engineering building to include classrooms and shops, as well as other smaller construction projects.

At the experimental farm at Ridgetown work will be continued on the construction of a new student residence and the erection of a new building will also be started to provide accommodations for classroom, laboratory, and offices.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL

A suitable building for district headquarters for the provincial police near London will be started during the coming fiscal year and consideration is also being given to the erection of a district headquarters at Fonthill to accommodate the transfer of No. 4 district headquarters of the provincial police from Niagara Falls to Fonthill.

The erection of lockups at Schreiber and Long Lac will also be started, and a cell block will be erected at Rainy River. The erection of a detachment office in Essex county will also be started.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND, BRANTFORD

Plans are now being prepared for proposed new buildings to be erected at the School for the Blind, Brantford. These plans provide for a junior school, an auditorium and a hospital unit, and tenders will be called for these buildings as soon as the working drawings have been prepared.

DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

The construction of entrance gates and gate houses has been started at Algonquin Park and will be continued during the coming fiscal year. A wild life museum will also be erected in this park as such buildings provide facilities and attractions for tourists.

Construction work for the Lands and Forests Department will be continued at,-

(a) the sylvaculture laboratory at Maple, and

(b) the fish hatchery buildings and ponds at Westport.

A large number of small and various sized projects spread at widely separated points in northern Ontario have been completed during the past fiscal year and many new projects of a similar nature will be undertaken during the coming fiscal year. Such projects will consist generally of small-type office buildings, work shops, warehouses, implement sheds and garages, fish hatcheries and bird farms, as well as residences and cabins for staff, new lookout towers and tower cabins, boat houses and docks, breakwaters, dams, telephone line installations, extension of bush roads and trails, and additions or extensions to services of a varied and miscellaneous character.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BOARD

In addition to the many large building projects already

mentioned herein, work will be commenced this year on the construction of a new head office building for the Workmen's Compensation Board. Since its inception the Board has been housed in rented quarters and it is now deemed desirable that a special building should be erected to take care of their head office administration. The site is bounded on the north by Fleet Street and on the south by Harbour Street and is situated between the administration building of the Harbour Commission and York Street. The main central section of the building will be five storeys high with a central penthouse, and the side wings will be three storeys in height. Provision will be made in the structure for two additional storeys for the future, so that the centre section will eventually be seven storeys high and the side wings five storeys. The building will be constructed of brick with stone base and trimmings, and the net useable floor area without the future storeys will be 131,000 square feet.

DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS

Construction work now under way at the Burtch industrial farm, and the Rideau industrial farm at Burritts Rapids, and also at the Guelph and Burwash reformatories will be continued. A new boiler house and a new building to provide dining room, kitchen, stores and bakeshop requirements will be started at the industrial farm, Burwash. The construction of new cell blocks will be started at the industrial farm, Monteith, and at the Ontario Reformatory, Mimico. The new hospital building now under construction at the Ontario Reformatory, Guelph, will be brought to completion, and many additions and improvements will be made to the service installations at the aforementioned institutions to provide for the enlarged requirements.

DEPARTMENT OF TRAVEL AND PUBLICITY

A new reception centre will be established at Sault Ste. Marie and landscaping work carried out for the reception centres already established at Cornwall, Fort Erie, Kenora, and Pidgeon River.

GRANTS - CONSERVATION

Under the Conservation Authorities Act passed by the legislature in 1946 twelve conservation authorities have been established, and arrangements have been made through the Department of Planning and Development for assistance to be given to various schemes under development by the authorities, and the sum of $2,250,000.00 has been placed in the estimates for this purpose.

AID - FLOODING, LAKE NIPISSING

Several times during the past few decades high water and strong westerly winds have combined to cause heavy property damage by flooding along the east side of Lake Nipissing in the vicinity of the city of North Bay and the township of West Ferris. After careful study of the situation the dominion and the province agreed to share equally the total cost of constructing a new controlled outlet channel from Lake Nipissing into the French River at Big Chaudiere Portage. This work is under way and will be continued and if possible completed during the new fiscal year.

AID - DREDGING, MUSKOKA

To assist navigation on Muskoka Lakes and the Lake-of-Bays the dominion has arranged to carry out certain dredging in the navigable channels, and the province has agreed to assist by contributing 50% of the cost of this work.

STORAGE DAMS

Consideration has been given by this Department to providing improved water storage facilities chiefly in the Muskoka area and in December 1948 a start was made on the reconstruction of twelve old lumbering dams along the big East River and its tributary streams and lakes. These are located in Muskoka and Nipissing districts with some of the sites within Algonquin Provincial Park. The work has continued since that time and about one-half of the project has been completed. It is expected that the remainder of this work will be carried out during the next two years.

These reconstructed control dams will also spring freshet waters to be held back to prevent property damage by flooding of the Lake-of-Bays and Muskoka Lakes. They will also provide storage of water for release in the late summer and fall to maintain proper water levels for navigation and generation of electric power.

In addition to the program just outlined in the Muskoka and Nipissing districts, the reconstruction of a number of dams is planned in the Parry Sount, Sudbury, Algome, Cochrane, and Rainy River districts to assist in the preservation of fish and wildlife and provide forest protection and tourist attractions. A water control scheme involving the construction of several dams in Amabel and Albemarle townships, Bruce county, is being worked out with the Department of Lands and Forests to help provide much-needed fish and wildlife protection and propagation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain that I have tried to refrain as far as possible from burdening you unduly with an overload of details and have for this reason only touched generally upon the larger items of work which are

presently under way or proposed to be started during the coming fiscal year. The time at hand does not permit me to enumerate the volume of details that would be necessary if I attempted to submit a full report of the work to be handled by all branches of this Department.

I sincerely trust that the foregoing explanations will clarify for the most part any of the more important features of the estimates which are to follow.

(Take C follows)

PUBLIC WORKS SYSTEM'

HON. MR. DOUCETT (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my great appreciation to the staff of the Public Works office who carry on a number of diversified jobs in this province and who have worked most intelligently in all the branches of the Department and they have not rested on a job which probably should have had a greater staff to complete the job they have done.

MR. E. PARK (Dovercourt): There are one or two points I would like to mention. I noticed in the press the criticism of the building housing the Ontario Labor Board. One says that it is rat infested and this should be cleared up. What is your intention about the Labor Relations Board?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: We will try to take you out there.

Vote 16;

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York, West): I see that a number of these buildings will be left to private contractors. I would like to know the policyof the government in respect to building contracts and in particular I am thinking of Mimico, Where brick and tile is processed. Is it found that the production of these materials is a saving in the various works in which they are used and how are they integrated with private contractors, or is that only for work done by the Department? I ask that because I would like to know what is the principle when we are told that the inmates of the Reformatory at Mimico, are learning bricksetting there, and that they can step out and get a job with good pay.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Is that not a good thing?

MR. MILLARD: I think it is good business, and if it isgood business, why should it not be undertaken that they even go in for cement to assist in these projects. What is the policy of the Department in regard to these matters?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I might say so far as the cost is concerned, you willhave to ask the Minister on that. They manufacture thearticles and we use them and I have not the available information for which you have asked. The brick turned out is very suitable for the work we are doing and if it had not been for a lot of that material during the past few years we would have been obliged to hold up a lot of our work.

MR. MILLARD: There isnot enough to go around for the projects such as you outlined?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: No, we have to buy.

MR. MILLARD: Willyou answer the other question. How do you use this material if you are letting to contractors, is there a stipulation to provide as much as you can?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: We provide practically all of the material. Inthat we are saving a lot of money for the government. We save in sales tax if nothing else.

Votes 164 to 166 inclusive agreed to.

On vote number 167.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) whether he would not agree to reconsider the decision already reached for the location of the Workmen's Compensation building in the area he mentioned earlier. I suggest that it would be wiser to erect that building in an area that is more easily accessible. Those of us who have to go to the Workmen's Compensation Board Now, always see a great number of injured workmen and they come in large numbers and very often they have to report back and the hall is usually filled with such people. I suggest it would be easier for them if the building was constructed closer to this Parliament, around the Crescent or on University Avenue and I suggest also that perhaps

a number of problems could be solved if the new building could not only be for the Workmen's Compensation Board but a sort of labor building where the Department of Labour could be housed and the Workmen's Compensation Board, a part of the Labor Department, and the Labour Board could be housed in the same building and it would make it more convenient from the point of view of reaching the several parties in the Labor Department and it could become known as the Labor Department Building. A suggestion has been made that it be called the Daley Building, I would like a building that would last for a long time. A Labour Department building located on University or onthe Crescent close to the Department and easily accessible.

I would also like to ask another questinn, and that is about our committee rooms downstairs. They are antiquated and unsuited for committee work and are far too small. They are either too cold or too hot, and to open a window is a matter of skill. To close a window you have to hang on to it with your whole weight and it will come down with your weight, but it might work in revers, a window might pull a person up. I think it is necessary to bring about some improvement there. We had an example this morning. The place was crowded and the members there had the same experience. During the Royal Commission on the Workmen's Compensation the place was jammed and members of the delegations and the press were crowding the Royal Commission out of the Committee room. The lighting is bad and cannot be remedied. I would suggest that the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) seek ways of bringing about an improvement earlier than otherwise planned. I would say that twocommittee rooms could be made into one committee roomfor large deputations and some otherplace could be found forone or two committees that are not obliged to accommodate crowds of such large numbers. This is a serious prob-

lem and I suggest that it be looked into. But particularly what I would appreciate is a reply to, is the construction of the Labor Department building to take in all its branches?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I never go out looking for buildings unless the Department asks me. The hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) has not asked. Regarding the location of this building, we do not select the location without first looking the situation over well and it is a most difficult situation as you know in Toronto to get a place within reasonable proximity to the buildings with a parking area and accommodation facilities that are needed, where many people who come areunable to walk in or out. In this location we have ample parking space for automobiles; you can get down from the east by street car, and you can come in by boat on the south side and on the west side there is an airport, so it is suited well for travelling facilities.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York, West): Is it not true that the cost of construction would be increased in that location as it is pretty well all made ground?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: No. The only other property there upon which we could put a building, would necessitate having to buy the building and tear it down and you would have the loss of the building as well as the cost of the property.

MR. R. SCOTT (Beaches): Would it not be necessary to drive concrete pillars into the ground? That would entail an additional expenditure.

(Take D follows)

And I just wondered what the reasons were for the difficulty in actually building the structure itself.

Vote 166 agreed to.

On vote 167.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, I notice there is an increase in the telephone service amounting to $2300. Would the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) care to comment on that, please.

MR. DOUCETT: Yes. I can answer that very well. The government services are rapidly increasing. For instance, we are taking over the great section of the old Christie St. Hospital, and we will have to have an operator there. Then, our police department is over at the former Academy of Medicine. It is a matter of expansion or government buildings to serve the public, and we have to have extra telephones and operators.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, before the vote is taken, I noticed the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) when giving his outline, made reference to the extensive alterations made around this building, and the need for improvements which, I gather, are aimed to make the place better protected against the possibility of fire. Has there been a recent inspection of this building by the Fire Marshal, and is there any report which could be made available?

MR. DOUCETT: I do not know of any report. I might say that the Fire Marshal is back and forth in this building every week. We have fire drills here, as you may know. We may call you out at any time.

Vote 167 agreed to.

On vote 168.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, on 168; I wonder if the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) has ever given any

consideration to giving Osgoode Hall a bath.

MR. DOUCETT: Inside or outside?

MR. MacLEOD: Well -- outside. It is just about the dirtiest looking building in downtown Toronto. I do not know how long since it had a bath; certainly not last Saturday night. After all, the building does have much to commend it architecturally. I suppose in many respects it is one of the most interesting pieces of architecture in Toronto, but anybody looking at it, when going by on a bus, would be more attracted by its dirty appearance than its architectural lines, and I think you might well consider having a sandstone job done on it, and clean it up a bit.

Secondly, I think you might well consider tearing down that brick fence around Osgoode Hall and removing the iron gates -- the cow pasture gates -- to make it possible for hundreds of people who live in rather crowded conditions in that area to sit down on benches on the green, in front, at the side, and behind that building. This actually could be made very pleasant for a lot of people who live in that area, If you would put in some benches, and make it a little square or park, it would serve a lot of people. What is the use of having that forbidding-looking fence around there? Nobody will molest the judges in that building. If you tear the fence down, it might bring the people a little closer to the law, and the law a little closer to the people. I advance these two proposals, and I think you should wash it up a bit, and take the fence down, and put some benches in, and on a nice you would have the pleasure of walking down there and seeing quite a few couples sitting on the benches, doing the things you ought to be doing.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) I might say that he is dealing with a very technical matter.

MR. MacLEOD: There is nothing technical about it. You ought to try it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DOUCETT: Osgoode Hall is not owned by the province of Ontario -- only a portion of it. I understand the wall and the fence, of which you speak, are things with which we have nothing to do. I do not know whether it would look very good to go down and wash one side of that building, and leave the other.

There are certain difficulties in the way. The gentlemen in Osgoode Hall are very touchy when you go to change anything, as they just want that building left as it is.

I remember when I first became the minister of Public Works, I had a deputation from the Benchers' Society come and see me, and they wanted me to enter into an agreement on behalf of the province of Ontario that if this building was ever burned, it would be replaced identically as it is today.

MR. MILLARD: Dirt and all?

MR. MacLEOD: I assure you I am not trying to drag this out, but I am not quite clear about one thing. Does not the province own Osgoode Hall?

MR. DOUCETT: No, only part of it.

MR. FROST: The Law Society of Upper Canada owns the land.

MR. MacLEOD: Then why are we spending $100,000. on it?

MR. DOUCETT: They pay part of that.

MR. MacLEOD: Surely, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has some influence with the Benchers, and perhaps he could get

them to agree that if we washed the face of the building, they will take the fence down. Would the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) make an attempt to do that?

MR. DOUCETT: I will ask them if they want it ot have a bath.

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. David): If the hon. member will remember, during the war when we wanted every bit of scrap metal we could get, I remember a group who were gathering scrap metal, attempted to get that fence. At one time, I believe they had the right to take thefence down, but there was such a protest against the removal of that fence, that eventually they gave up the effort, and the fence remains.

MR. MILLARD: The fence is nothing but old paint and rust; it is not much good for scrap metal.

MR. MacLEOD: We will give it Cyrus Eaton.

Vote 168 agreed to.

On vote 169.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) if the architect has completed the plans for the new mental hospital at the head of the lakes? Are the plans completed for that?

MR. DOUCETT: I would not say in their entirety, but they are fairly well on. We will be calling for tenders at an early date.

MR. MacLEOD: I would like to make this suggestion. As the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) knows, the modern trend in the erection of such hospitals is to get away from the old, custodial institution or prison-like type of building, and to make them in appearance more like hospitals. Out in British Columbia they have done some very outstanding work in this field, and the newer mental hospitals there are two-story buildings

with ramps, rather than staircases, so that the patients can move around freely and fraternize with each other.

I think it might be a good idea, if it is not too late, if the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) would get some information about these newer institutions which have been erected in British Columbia. Possibly we could learn something from them, as well as from some of the more modern buildings which have been erected recently in the United States.

MR. DOUCETT: I will be glad to do that. Of course, we have a very severa climate at the head of the lakes, which you would not have in some other places. However, it is well worth looking over.

MR. MacLEOD: I noticed a school we saw when we were on our trip, and it was only a two-story building, with lots of chance for the sun to get in, and I think the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) will agree with me that in view of the condition of the people who have to go into this class of institution, the more pleasant, the brighter and the more attractive we can make them, the better.

There is another thing I want to say. I have said it at least seven times since 1944, and every time I raise the question, the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) says, "Frankly, I have not thought about that since you asked it the last time". So I will ask it again. I am very much concerned about the people who come down to this Chamber and listen to the addresses, that they should have to sit on these "mourners' benches" in the gallery. People just cannot take it.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Perhaps it is the debates they cannot take.

MR. MacLEOD: Well, I do not know. It is hard enough to sit on these four-ply, horsehair cushions we have here.

May I say that the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) moves around the House quite a bit. He is the most perambulating hon. minister. One time he is here, and another time he is over there, and then he is somewhere else -- although he never comes over here. But in his excursions around, I wonder if he would try it out, in one of those two galleries.

MR. DOUCETT: That is how I got down here -- from up there.

MR. MacLEOD: I think something should be done about it. I do not think we should punish people like that. As the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) says, it is hard enough to sit here and listen to the debates, but why not let them listen in comfort?

There are chair companies in the hon. minister's (Mr. Doucett) own country in the eastern part of this province, who would be glad to get an order for the regular type theatre chairs, and you could take these things out, and it would be an incentive to the people to come in and take an interest in the public affairs of this province.

Finally, I think you should do something about the acoustics in these committee rooms. You just cannot hear anything. I am sure the Clerk of the House, and others, who have occasion to go down there, will agree that something should be done.

Commissioner Roach was fit to be tied when carrying on his hearings here. He could not hear a thing. It will only cost a few dollars, and I think it is largely a question of the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) taking five minutes to give the order to have it done. I am sure, now that I have raised this for the seventh time, that he will attend to it before we meet again.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Chairman, there is a matter which I think ought to be brought to the attention

of the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett). Apparently his department is responsible for the safety and construction of these various government buildings. I am thinking particularly of the Ontario Hospital, where the care of patients and so on comes under the Department of Health, but the construction and safety of these buildings comes under the present estimates, and it is with the present estimates we are concerned.

I would like to read to the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) a very short passage from a letter which I received, which came to me through a friend who is very much interested in this case, and has to do with the hospital at Woodstock, and has to do with fire.

The hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) in his introduction of the estimates today, has given us a very fine review of the situation, and what it is intended to do, regarding making this particular building more safe.

This letter says:

"Re my last letter to you --

this is signed by a person who is employed, and I think also is a patient at this particular institution. It says:

" Re my last letter to you and to give you some information about the fire hazard that exists in this institution. I must hurry as usual. I've been reading about so many fires in Toronto and to support your argument I thought I'd give you more details.

(1) There is no fire drill up here at any time.

(2) About 75 per cent of the attendants have not even had fire drill for years and have never been instructed.

(3) I'd hate to think what would happen if a fire broke out in any of the girls' cottages or wards.

(4) We have one small fire house and a hose on a reel and this is outside one of the men's cottages, but no one ever practices with it.

(5) In my cottage there are 82 patients, some cripples who can't even dress themselves and all the doors are locked at night and sometimes with only one attendant on duty and maybe he is either old, too fat or sometimes asleep. Now I can prove all I say about this.

(6) There is one main fire alarm. System -- a box outside the administration building that calls the fire Dept. at Woodstock, a distance of about, say, from Eaton's to Sunnyside Station and all up hill. Then they have to cross two railraod trakcs. If any fire inspectors come up here they are rushed around by the Supervisor and shown the nice easy and clean spots. (This is to support the fire at that boys' detention home and that garment factory fire in Toronto.)

The staff on night duty is always short in numbers."

Then he expresses the hope that something will be done about this very serious fire hazard which exists, and then there is a short P.S. which says:

"P.S. As you know, publicity and public opinion is what counts right now. A terrible panic could start if a fire broke out at night, seeing that there are so many beds in a room and cripples to dress and very few staff on duty. No one knows his post or position in the case of an emergency."

This is the Ontario Hospital at Woodstock, which is being criticized in this way.

I think you will agree from the wording of the letter that the man who wrote the letter seems to have the complete use of his faculties, and knows what he is talking about. He has been there for a number of years, and I believe is employed in the boiler room, or the power house, in connection with that hospital. I wonder if the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) would have some investigation made of this situation, and to take whatever precautions are necessary.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I may say that the hon. member (Mr. Millard) has raised a subject in which we have been very, very much interested. The matter of fire protection in this and other buildings is a matter of great importance, but we realize that to fire-proof this building is a matter of years.

The Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) has been engaged in fire-proofing this very building here, and obviously it is going to take years to complete. It takes a great deal of time to complete these things, and we have so many buildings.

(Take E follows)

The fact is that in the Commissioner's report on the Noronic fire, there need not have been any loss of life if there had been ordinary precautions taken. It was the human element that caused the trouble in that fire, and that is true also of the fire which took place here in Toronto in one of the factories, where there were ten or eleven people lost their lives. It was the intervention of human carelessness in the picture which caused that.

This building we are in is far from fire proof. In many cases it is just the reverse, but at the same time with care and understanding on the part of our people here we can obviate most or perhaps all such danger in our public buildings.

Starting last Summer, we got together the heads of various departments and we have had a committee of those civil servants who volunteered in the building and throughout the service to take care of that very important matter. We have placed the onus on those in charge of particular buildings in the province to see that fire drills take place and people know what to do and where to go and how to get out of the buildings in the event of any calamity, a flash fire or anything of that sort.

I would say the answer to my hon. friend's (Mr. Millard) question really comes down to a question of organization. The other day while the House was sitting here, I attended a meeting of the committee in charge of this building. As hon. members know, we have had fire drills here on frequent occasions during the last several months. We had one just the other morning. The effect of those fire drills is very carefully watched and carried out with the idea of improving things, the idea being to get people out of this building quickly and effectively and without panic. That is what we have been attempting to do.

We have here a very splendid organization of civil servants

who are in charge of the situation. We have issued specific instructions to the Fire Marshal's Department that every public building in Ontario is a direct charge in that regard of the superintendent or the person in charge of the building and that he must take every measure and everyprecaution, that theduty is on them to see that the hose works, the housekeeping of those buildings is good, conditions which might cause flash fires are removed, and above everything else that if there is any trouble, patients, inmates and other people working in those buildings can get out. The Fire Marshal and the other preventive sources that we have in our service have been instructed on that point and I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Millard) we have no intention of letting up on that point.

Some of my hon. friends will have seen the wooden structure out on thebalcony in front of this building. I know it may be said: "Well, here is a wooden structure in a building like this, why is it not metal or why is it not something else?" The fact of the matter is where it is located it isjust as good to have wood as anything else, because people can get out of the Press Gallery, which is a particular fire trap. They could get out of there quickly and onto that balcony and could then be taken down to the ground. Such things asthat are practical and reasonable. We are trying to do without waiting for expensive appliances and attachments.

Furthermore, as my hon. friend (Mr. Millard) said, with the buildings we have under way, we have every intention of taking everybody out of the fourth floor of this building, and using that floor merely for storage.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the opposition): Good.

MR. FROST: There are a lot of things we have done. We have moved, as hon. members know, the motion picture branch out of this building because of the highly hazardous nature of the

building.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): But you put us in where you took them out.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Is that where you are?

MR. MacLEOD: Yes.

MR. FROST: Well, I did not know. I do not think people would burn, anyway.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: In any event, we are doing things of that sort with the idea of removing the fire hazard. Again I say the lessons of the "Noronic" disaster is simply that there is nothing that takes the place of human care. The only way you can get around the human element is to keep constantly "digging" at people to keep them up-to-date. We have given the Fire Marshal andhis staff, and the motion picture branch and others connected with the preventive service , the fullest scope to go ahead with this thing to protect people and to see that our own services are on their toes and to see that our own employees know what to do both themselves and with other people under their charge. We have done a lot of work along that line the last six months.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, I assume from what the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) said, that in this case I have drawn particularly to your attention the two Ministers concerned, the hon. Acting Minister of Health (Mr. Goodfellow) and thehon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) will attempt to see that the apparatus is improved and that the people are trained in the use of that apparatus, in case of any incident occurring.

MR. FROST: Yes. I will say if my hon. friend (Mr. Millard) givesme the body of the letter---I do not want the name or anything---I will certainly refer it to our committee

and see they take action.

MR. MILLARD: Righto.

MR. G. T. GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the Ont rio School for the Blind in Brantford. In connection with the fire hazard there, recommendations were made in 1943 and conditions are still very bad. The hospital of that institution is on the third floor as is also the assembly hall, with a wide wooden staircase leading there. They have only a circular fire escape to get out, and I do not think that is very good for blind people. It is a very serious fire hazard.

The Brantford School for the Blind is situated at the western entrance to Brantford. It has a very large frontage on No. 2 highway and also a large frontage on St. Paul's Avenue, and is in a very fine residential district. The grounds of this institution have been neglected for years. I have correspondence here that goes back to 1943 in this connection. If itwere not for the beautiful trees in those grounds, it would look like a cow pasture and certainly is not a credit to this government or very nice for the people of Brantford to gaze upon from year to year.

I have a letter here which just came to me the other day, th writer of which I may say is a very good supporter of the government, and is in fact a member of the executive:

> "It seems to me that Brantford has been sadly neglected no matter what Government has been in power particularly in respect to the School for the Blind, the only Government Institution in Brantford, situated as it is on #2 Highway at the Western entrance to Brantford and also a considerable frontage on St. Paul's Avenue.
>
> "Years ago we could refer with pride to the grounds

"as they were kept in Mr. Dymond's day but I am afraid such is not the case today. When the St. Paul's Avenue frontage is cut with a horse-power mower, perhaps twice during the summer season, one cannot help believing that the Government considers they are dealing with the blind.

"Perhaps the expenditure authorized at Belleville for the deaf is more warranted from a political standpoint for at least they can see.

"You are at liberty to use this information in any way you may see fit and in conclusion my only thought is that the Government should give more attention to this institution than in the past."

In 1945 they thought they had a solution to their problem in Brantford, when the people of Brantford elected a representative to this government, but nothing was done even then. Here is a letter written tothe Department in 1945:

"My object in writing you was with the idea that some thought might now be given to beautifying the grounds of the School for the Blind. I have often thought that if Mr. Dymond, who I understand was largely responsible for the planting of the trees throughout the grounds, and I believe there was a plan at that time, might turn over in his grave if he knew the lack of attention that has been paid to the grounds since he passed on.

"This is not the first time that I have referred to this matter. As I recall on one occasion talking to Mr. Race and, in fairness to him, he intimated at that time that if I knewthe difficulty he had in securing even sufficient funds to even properly care for the oval in front of the institution I would

"know his difficulties.

"---I was prompted to write on that occasion as some one from the Agricultural Society at Guelph had addressed an organization in Brantford regarding spreading of weeds. It is apparent from the appearance of the grounds from that time on that no action was taken.....

"Realizing that perhaps in the past you encountered the same difficulties as Mr. Race, and now that governments will try to find work for returned men the time would be opportune to approach the proper authorities asking if funds could be provided to make the groundsof the School for the Blind a beauty spot and one which the government would be proud of.

"Beyond this I have no special suggestions.

"Realizing the Legislature will meet in another week or two I took the opportunity to drive our member elect through the grounds and he was astonished at the appearance and he intends making reference to the situation when he is in Toronto attending the first Session of the new Legislature.

"I trust that you will treat this matter in the spirit in which it is written,that is,that I am hoping that some day the grounds of the School for the Blind can be turned into a beauty spot."

I make this suggestion, Mr. Chairman, hoping something will be done to make the grounds of the School for the Blind a credit to this government and something the people of Brantford will be proud to look upon.

Vote No. 170 agreed to.

On vote No. 171.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey, South): I wonder if the hon.

Minist r (Mr. Doucett) co ld tell me how much was expended last year under 171 in the provincial grants to aid in drainage?

MR. DOUCETT: We overspent our estimate last year somewhat, Mr. Chairman.

MR. OLIVER: You have not the figures?

MR. DOUCETT: I have not the exact figures, but not a lot, anyway.

Vote No. 171 agreed to.

On vote No. 172.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, in that regard, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) if that $25,000 includes showing at the big Winter Fair and the Canadian National Exhibition, or the smaller fairs as well?

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, there is an item there to provide for the installation of exhibits for the Canadian National, for Ottawa and for any other fair we show at.

Vote No. 172 agreed to.

On vote No. 173.

MR. C. W. COX (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minist r (Mr. Doucett) does the $12,000,000 odd item for new buildings include the proposed construction of some of the new mental hospitals, including the one at the Lakehead?

MR. DOUCETT: What item are you under?

MR. COX: 173. "Construction of new public buildings." Does that item include the construction of the mental hospital about which my hon. friend to the left (Mr. MacLeod) asked a question?

MR. DOUCETT: No. I might say under 173 for health we have an item there for projects during the fiscal year, $3,500,000.

MR. COX: Then might I inquire what the $12,000,000 odd

refers to?

MR. DOUCETT: The twelve which?

MR. COX: $12,000,000. Public buildings. That is merely a summary, it is recapitulated down below. Item 173.

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, that has to be voted for this year, $12,230,000.

MR. COX: Yes, but I was asking if there is included in that item the proposed construction of the mental hospitals which were referred to by my hon. friend to the left (Mr. MacLeod). Is that included in the item, the mental hospitals?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, the hospitals would be in that, started.

MR. COX: The mental hospitals?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes. We have that divided in health, education, Attorney-General's, as I have mentioned.

MR. COX: I think you answered a question for my hon. friend, it is proposed to anticipate a start on a mental hospital at the Lakehead this year.

MR. DOUCETT: That is right. Sure.

MR. COX: Would you care to give an estimate? Perhaps that hasnot yet been determined, the amount which might be spent there this year. Perhaps it isnot yet determined.

MR. DOUCETT: It is quite possible we might have to pay this year for the amount they would get on with, probably $1,500,000 or $1,750,000 or it might be $2,500,000.

MR. COX: But it is proposed to start it?

MR. DOUCETT: Oh, yes.

MR. COX: Thank you.

Vote No. 173 agreed to.

On Vote No. 174.

MR. R. A. McEWING (Wellington North): Mr. Chairman,

on 174, "Dams, dooks and drainage works," I see there is $200,000 for storage dams and docks. That do cenot include the proposed scheme of the Grand River at all, I presume?

MR. DOUCETT: No. That is under conservation.

MR. McEWING: That comes under 175, does it not?

MR. DOUCETT: The Grand River?

MR. McEWING: The Grand River Conservation.

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, $2,250,000.

MR. McEWING: Yes, that isthe item. Well, perhaps I had better wait till we come to that item.

Vote No. 174 agreed to.

On vote No. 175.

MR. McEWING: In connection with that item, Mr. Chairman, could the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) give me the breakdown of that, or is that just an estimate, or do you know, is there anything definitely settled regarding the Conestogo Dam or the Luther Marsh Dam? A lot of reports have appeared in the paper andone is that the provincial government is prepared to assume the full cost of the Luther Marsh Dam and that they are sharing with the Federal in the Conestogo Dam, which is being held for the time being. Am I right in that or what is the program on that?

MR. DOUCETT: Well, of course there are some which the Federal government arenot anxious to go on with at the present time.

MR. McEWING: What about the Luther Marsh?

MR. DOUCETT: I might say, Mr. Chairman, in connection with the Conestogo, the total cost is estimated at $3,812,000. The grant promised is 37½% and we have estimated for this year $550,000.

MR. McEWING: Then what about the Luther, that is not on

the Conestogo, you see, that is the Luther Marsh.

MR. DOUCETT: In the case of the Luther, the total cost is estimated at $200,000 and we have provided this year for $75,000.

MR. McEWING: $75,000 would build the one at Luther Marsh entirely, I think.

MR. DOUCETT: I beg your pardon?

MR. McEWING: I think about $75,000 would build the dam at Luther Marsh entirely.

MR. DOUCETT: Of course I am just giving you the engineers' figures, which are $200,000. I hope it is built for $75,000, it willsave that much money.

MR. McEWING: Well, it is mainly a clay dam, with the gates of course, but it is not anything in comparison with Conestogo or the Shand Dam---nothing like it. It is simply a ten or fifteen foot clay dam mainly, with a gate, of course. I do not see where there would be any such amount as that expended.

MR. DOUCETT: I might say, Mr. Chairman, it is a matter for the Commission. We have that amount set up and it will not be paid until the expenditure isproperly investigated.

MR. McEWING: Is it the intentionto go ahead with that this year?

MR. DOUCETT: As far as we know. If the Commission wish.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, something similar to this, I think, was inserted im last year's Estimates for Public Works, and I think little if anythingwas spent. I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) could tell usif the Federal Government is prepared to go ahead with this?

MR. DOUCETT: Which item?

MR. BROWN: I am talking about the item of $2,250,000. I think this is dependent upon the Federal government participat-

ing, is it not?

MR. DOUCETT: That is quite true.

MR. BROWN: Is there any assurance they are going to do that this year?

MR. DOUCETT: I could not say definitely. I could read you a letter I have received from the hon. Minister of Public Works, who says:

> "With reference to your letter of May 9th from the Secretary of the Council of the Department of Public Works, Ontario, with regard to the Dominion Government assisting the South Nation River Authority in a proposed scheme to relieve flooding conditions on the Upper Thames River:
>
> "On consideration of this request, it is found it falls in the same class as a number of others that have been presented to the Department fromtime to time, that is to say it is strictly a flood control measure. During this year there should be a Federal-Provincial Conference at which it ishoped that questions of this nature will be studied. In the Fall perhaps I will be in a better position to discuss the subject matter of your letter.
>
> "This reply might also be considered to apply in connection with similar approaches made to this Department for contributions to work on the Etobicoke River, the South Nation River, concerning which you wrote me last year and your Mr. Woods wrote the Department recently."

That is the latest I have.

MR. OLIVER: Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) give the date of that letter?

MR. DOUCETT: March 9th.

MR. McEWING: Of this year?

MR. DOUCETT: Of 1950.

MR. McEWING: One more question; if I remember right, you had a letter last year, you were enumerating the projects in the last paragraph on which you wrote last year, that it does not say anything about Conestogo. I think you read a letter here last year with reference to the Conestogo.

MR. DOUCETT: I think that is right.

MR. McEWING: I am just wondering whether they have lost sight of it, when they made reference to the other ones without it.

MR. DOUCETT: Well, he says here "In connection with matters similar," which might mean anything. However, we are preparing, if it is necessary, to go ahead.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) could tell us approximately what was spent last year in the ten months actual and two months estimated under this $1,700,000 item?

MR. DOUCETT: No, I have not those figures with me, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DENNISON: The point I would like to make is that the year before last there was $300,000 contributed by the Legislature and only $37,149 actually spent. Yet if I am not mistaken, that was the year we set up the Humber Valley Authority and they had plans ready to go ahead that year and had the consent of the municipalities to pay their share, but the province would not give them funds to initiate the plan they had developed. At that time they could have purchased land on the

upper reaches of the Humber much cheaper than they can today. They had options on a good deal of land on the upper reaches of the Humber that year, and I understood from the press---

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): They had to cancel it.

MR. DENNISON: Yes. I understood from the press hearings that the reason the province refused them was that the money was not available, you just could not afford to give them the money, or that funds for that purpose were used up. Now it turns out the funds were not used up at that time and the Humber Valley Authority has had to cancel those options since that time, and today, to get the same options, it may cost a good deal more money.

It seems peculiar or rather amazing that, with $260,000 there, you could not have at least given the Humber Valley Authority something to help them at least a little. They were not asking for a great deal, but you could have started that Valley Authority off with more encouragement from the provincial government than you did.

MR. DOUCETT: That was not a drainage problem at all, that was for beautification.

MR. MILLARD: Oh, no.

MR. DENNISON: Well, it involved both beautification and drainage. It involved the planting of a good many trees on the head waters of the Humber, which certainly would have affected the flow of that river.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) is surely not suggesting that conservation is all drainage.

MR. DOUCETT: No, no, but this scheme they wanted to go into, reforestation, was something which did not figure into the conservation scheme. It was a park. They wanted to set up a huge

park.

MR. MILLARD: I think, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) is a little bit mistaken in this particular item. The proposition the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) was discussing was the upper reaches of the Humber Valley Authority, where they intended to secure swamp land for the purpose of retaining the run-off waters in the Spring and letting it go down slowly.

I would like to remind the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) on this occasion that the hon. Minister of Planning and Development at that time (Mr. Porter) said in my presence shortly after the election of 1948 the Humber Valley Authority could proceed with the assurance that whether or not the Federal government was induced to supply their 37½% of the cost of the undertaking ---it was to be divided 37½% each way, provincial-dominion, and 25% municipal---I heard the hon. Mr. Porter give the assurance of the Ontario government that whether or not the Federal government was ready to proceed, they would undertake responsibility for the entire 75%.

Afterwards, particularly in the hearings of the Conservation Committee report this summer, the same valley authority's representative, who is chairman and secretary, was forced to report to the Conservation Committee of this House that the provincial government had fallen down on that particular obligation which they undertook in, if I am not mistaken, August 1948, shortly after the provincial election.

Frankly, the question which was raised by the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) requires further clarification, because obviously there was money there and there was the promise and obligation undertaken by the government, and yet

they did not come through. And that undertaking has been set back, I do not know how many years, and created more expense because the money was not put forward at the right time to take up these options that were secured by the Authority.

MR. DENNISON: May we have some assurance from the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett), now we voted you $300,000 before and only $37,000 was spent on this most important item in the Estimates; we are now going to vote you $1,700,000 and $550,000 for the Grand River Valley porject. It seems to me in the first place that at the time of the Estimates I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) should have a schedule to put before us to indicate how the money is being spent, or how it is proposed to spend it before he asks for lump sums of that kind to be disposed of as the government sees fit.

MR. DOUCETT: I can tell you how we propose to spend it, if you wish.

MR. DENNISON: You have a list of proposed projects, have you?

MR. DOUCETT: Definitely.

MR. DENNISON: We would be very glad to have it.

MR. DOUCETT: Well, as I said to the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McEwing), we have $550,000 set up for Conestogo; $75,000 for the Luther; $28,000 for---the Napanee Authority $28,000; the Upper Thames, $900,000. The total cost of that, is $5,000.000. Mitchell flood control, $75,000; Ingersoll flood control, $53,000,---will finish that; Port Franks, $65,000, and that makes your total Estimate.

In the matter you are speaking about, I do not think my Department has ever refused to bring an order in council forward for 50% of the 75 total cost, if the Federal government enters into it, and any conservation project.

(Take F follows)

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): The hon. member for West York (Mr.Millard) suggested that the former hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr.Porter) had assured this authority that the province would pay their share whether or not the Federal department did.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York, West): That they would pay the 75%.

MR. DENNISON: In the Hamilton Spectator of January 27th 1950 there was an article suggesting that the Humber River Authority be disbanded because of alleged government failure to lend financial support to its first big project, a model conservation park. Doctor Langford resigned in 1945 as director of the Planning and Development Department.

These river valley authorities must depend onthe effort of a great many people. This project put forward by the Humber Authority had the support of all the people in this area. They were all behind it and it is a tragedy that the money and necessities were not freely given.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the opposition): I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) whether the project to be undertaken by the Humber authority differed in any way from the projections by the conservation branch of the Department of Planning and Development when they did a survey for the authority? I am asking that question and I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) can answer it. My information from the Authority, who have spoken on the point, is that what they proposed to do on the Humber was precisely that which was outlined in the survey by the Planning and Development Department. I am asking the question because I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) should tell us if it is possible to dismiss the logical beautification plan, a project surveyed by the Planning and Development Department. We have not created a conservation project to dream

up beautification schemes but to advise on projects which can be undertaken by the river valley authority acting under legislation by which it is created. I don't think that the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) can brush it aside so easily. I don't think the matter can be brushed aside so easily as it has today and I would like to hear more fully about it.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I don't think it ever came to a state of conservation settlement. I never had any requests other than a letter from the Reeve and some interview with him regarding this matter. I would suggest to the hon. member for South York (Mr. Jolliffe) that allthis information will be forthcoming and that he will getit.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This is the properplace to discuss it. I am suggesting to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) that there must be sufficient organization between the government and the department to answer a question. We are informed by the Humber Authority that the project in which they thought grand project number one of Planning and Development. It must be correct or incorrect. Which is it?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I think it is incorrect. No one has asked for an estimate on Humber Valley.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): What is happening with the Humber is equally important for authorities throughout the province. You have to maintainthe interest of the public who are concerned in these authorities or else you would be better not to have formed the authorities. It seems to me in forming these authorities the Minister (Mr.Doucett) should work out some approach to the problems in each locality. If for nothing else than to keep the interest of the public at a high ebb. I think it is important from a public relations point and I don't like to hear the hon. Minister (Mr.Doucett) dismiss the liability of this

department of government on the basis that the Dominion would not come in on the participating scheme. It seems to me we cannot expect the Dominion to provide 37½% on all phases of the scheme as applied to the different authorities. It may be that at the Dominion-Provincial conference the Dominion will agree to pay 37½% on these huge reservoirs or dams, but I do not hold out much hope that the Dominion will pay 37½% on all the other phases of development on that conservation authority.

Vote 175 agreed to.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Page 58, Vote No. 90.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): This would be the time to mention any criticism in connection with the $36,000,000 housing, and of which only $3,000,000 is to be voted by this Department. I would like some explanation from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) or from the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) what justification there is for excluding from the vote of this legislature $36,000,000 out of $39,000,000. When you compare this with the Department of Lands and Forests there is $10,000,000 there and only $8,000 is statutory. I think there is an explanation due to the hon. members of this House why it is that one department does not compare with another. With the exception of the grants which are made to the municipalities and with the grant that is made to the city of Niagara Falls, every cent contained here is controlled and I think it should be subject to the vote of the hon. members of the legislature.

HON. MR. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): For the information of the hon. member (Mr. Brown), it was in the 1920's when the Highway Improvement Fund was introduced and it was for all branches of the Department of Highways and that is as near as I can go. Probably this House would like to have that absorbed. I am studying it and next year we will discuss it.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): I do not know who was responsible to start this, but it does not seem sound. Take the Public Accounts, highways, from 1944 to 1950, that is not statutory and it is not up for discussionat all. I think it is the right of thehon. members of this Legislature to have the opportunity to criticize these expenditures and I think that the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) would like to be in that position.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): In the last couple of years we have discussed several times the matter of having this money voted and doing away with the fixing of a Highway Improvement Fund. It was brought in around 1920 by the late Mr. Biggs and it was brought in to put in all the profits on gas and other taxes and paying for highways out of that.

The purpose of the Act was forgotten for a number of years and in the meantime there were debts incurred and the interest and the servicing of these debts has come into the general picture, and I may say that the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) and myself discussed the matter of abolishing that and I am interested in how the hon. members opposite feel about the matter. Perhaps we could look after that next year.

MR. J. D. BAXTER (Prince-Edward-Lennox): On the 24th of February I noticed an item in the paper saying that from the 1950 license plates the Crown would be removed. It would seem to me that when a cold war is on it might be a great deal of comfort to us to see the Crown remain on the plates to show the harmony of nations. I have the greatest respect for the patriotism of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett), when he walks down the hallway he has a regal bearing and one would think he belongs to the nobility. But I would suggest that if it is not too late and in the interests of Empire that the Crown should not be removed from the plates.

(Take G follows)

It might well be, in the years to come, that the crown would be as emblematic of this province, as the word "Ontario" itself. It was a former Conservative Prime Minister of this province who developed the slogan "King's Highways", and we are always proud as we go along the highways, to see the signs "King's Highway No. 1", "King's Highway No. 2" and so on.

In 1939 we made a patriotic gesture when Their Majesties were here in Canada, when we opened this beautiful highway known as the Queen Elizabeth Way, and had Her Majesty the Queen open that highway. I do think that possibly a little more consideration could have been given before this particular time, to see that the insignia of our great association in the Commonwealth, that is, the Crown which should not be removed, and I hope the hon. minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) will find it possible to reverse his position, because I think it would meet with general approval amongst many people.

MR. McLEOD: Mr. Chairman, I was only making the suggestion but it might help our discussions of these estimates, if the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) would make a statement, by way of introduction of the estimates, to bring us up to date on the things that he is going to do. Then the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Newman) would not have to get up and ask for the road from Port Arthur to Atikoken. Why does not the minister (Mr. Doucett) tell us what he is going to do now.

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. Davids): Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on the first item. I would like to draw the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) attention to the fact that in a report he read in the House to question No. 93, which was asked by the hon. member for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Thornberry) to the

number of convictions in Ontario in the past year of motorists who were found guilty of dangerous driving and of careless driving, the careless driving figure was 3,588, and the dangerous driving was 1,651 motorists.

Now, the additional question was asked "How many of these investigations in each year did the police reports indicate that the motorists involved had been drinking, or were in any degree under the influence of alcohol?"

And the answer to the question was "Information not available".

It seems to me that some department of this government-- surely the police make such a report-- should have that information. That is ordinary statistical information that should be produced by any department of government, and it seems to me a grave situation when the police, if they fail to find out whether a person was under the influence of drink, or negligent. I cannot believe they are. That information must be on the police records.

We voted a good many thousands of dollars to the statistical branch in this department. If no other branch of the department is prepared to compile that information, then why not give to the statistical branch the job of compiling that information.

Certainly in the interests of public safety, if we are going to discuss it with the Highway Department, in regard to law enforcement, and what we should do to better conditions on our highway, that information should be available to the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) and should be available to the House. How can the hon. minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett)

run his department and make decisions on how to handle the dangerous driving in this province if he does not know the influence that drunkenness has in that connection.

Will the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) please answer.

MR. DOUCETT: What do you want answered?

MR. DENNISON: In what proportion of the convictions, do the police reports show that the drivers were under the influence of alcohol.

MR. DOUCETT: After all, you were talking about drunkenness and convictions. We gave you the convictions. The police may take a man into court, and say "I will charge him with drunken driving" and if he did, the court has the right to say of what offence he will convict. We have given you the convictions. There is no other record they have given us. The information is not available of the the other question. That is the best we can do. We gave you all those who were charged with drunken driving, and I think have given them for a number of years.

Page G-4 follows.

MR. DENNISON: You mean to say --

MR. DOUCETT: You are asking if people who were supposed to be drunk but were not convicted.

MR. DENNISON: No, no. We are asking for the number of those who were found guilty on these charges, where the police record indicated that there had been drinking, or that they were in any degree under the influence of alcohol. It seems to me the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) of this department should be more interested in what causes the accidents than just to enumerate the number of convictions.

MR. DOUCETT: We have given you the convictions, and we can give you in connection with each accident, what the driver was convicted of. But you are asking now about how many people have not been convicted, but who may have been drinking. The fact is that we do not have a record of that. That is all in the hands of the police departments. If a man is brought up some place and charged, and found not guilty, there is no record sent up. It could be compiled, probably but it would be quite a job.

MR. DENNISON: But the question asked definitely dealt in connection with the convictions, and in how many cases did the police records indicate that the motorist involved had been drinking, or was in any degree under the influence of alcohol.

MR. DOUCETT: Have we not given you the figures?

MR. DENNISON: No.

MR. DOUCETT: The figures are here, of the number convicted.

MR. DENNISON: The number convicted of dangerous driving under the Criminal Code, and the number convicted of careless driving. We would like to go beyond the convictions, and find out in how many of these cases alcohol was involved. It

seems to me the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) should have that information himself. He should know the cause of these convictions, and in what percentage of the causes, alcohol was involved. If he is going to bring laws to rectify this condition, you must have information as to the causes .

MR. DOUCETT: We have given you the figures of the convictions.

MR. J. L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, I want to return to the question of the overloading on the highways. I have been trying to trace how many convictions have been made for over-loading on the highways. I think the highways department should have their own inspectors, so they could do a real job. There is a great deal of damage being done in this province through overloading, and since I spoke in this House on this question, I have received information of three large companies who are consistently overloading their trucks. Between ten and twenty and thirty tons have been carried in loads on the highways in the Hamilton district. That is the advice given to me. I have the names and I will send them over to the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett). I think it is time that they should be checked, if they are putting thirty tons of material on these loads and constantly breaking the law. I think we should have a proper inspection service, under the direction of the Department of Highways, and I think we should include in this estimate an amount for having an inspection branch, which would be answerable to this department and not have it done by the police department.

MR. DOUCETT: I might say we have the P.C.V. inspectors on the road, checking the different types of loads, and so on, to keep within their licenses, but the police are looking after any general overloading. I will be very happy, however, to check in to this particular case.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, it seems we spend quite a deal of time on these estimates, and I sometimes think it is a waste of time, because accordingly to the statutory estimates for the year 1950, the vote was $ 35,500,000. yet the actual expenditures was $68,986,000., a difference of $33 million. Then this year we are asked to approxe a statutory amount of $46,657,000. How much over that estimate, are we likely to spend?

MR. DOUCETT: Are you talking about ordinary or capital?

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Construction as well.

MR. DOUCETT: I think you are a little mixed up there.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Last year it was $35,500,000.; this year it is $68,986,000.

MR. DOUCETT: You are talking about ordinary?

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Statutory.

MR. DOUCETT: I was talking about the details.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): There is a difference there of about $33 million. How much will we have to pay over that amount this year. The hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) has a great deal of latitude. We have no say in the matter at all. These things just go on.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to make an explanation on that. Highways are something very difficult to keep within a few dollars --

MR. JOLLIFFE: Or a few million.

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, or a few million. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) explained in his Budget Address this year we had gone several million dollars over the estimated amount last year, and we thought it was good business to do so. When we set up our yearly programme, we can do one of two things; either, such as last year, we let a large amount of work

which we considered would be carried out by the end of the construction year, and yet keep within the Budget estimates. But the fall of 1949 was an unusually fine, dry fall, and the contractors proceeded much later in the fall, and much more rapidly than either we or they anticipated. Of course, we could have shut them down, but that would not have been advisable, in the nice weather. There were men to be employed, and roads were needed, and so on, and so we continued and went over our estimate. This year we might have a season which will be just the opposite to last year, and instead of finishing the work fairly well, we might have a large carry-over. It is very seasonal. We could, as I say, have closed construction down, but we did not think it advisable.

MR. J. I. DOWLING (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) this question. He is speaking of saving money, would he tell me why license plate number C-10 is not manufactured?

MR. DOUCETT: Why is C-10 not manufactured?

MR. DOWLING: I understand we were to have a special license plate, and I wrote you a letter and asked what "C-10" means. You know what C-10 is, when you look at it on the license plate.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, I want to say something kind to the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett). I have been very happy at the opportunity during the last year or so, of spending some time at the camping grounds which the Department of Highways maintains at certain parts of the province. As a matter of fact, the one I enjoy the most is in the hon. minister's (Mr. Doucett) own constituency at Silver Lake, on Highway No. 7. I was going to suggest to the hon. minister that there is not a great deal of information available about

these camps. There is a great deal of publicity given to various phases of the work of the Department of Highways, but apparently very little is given to this particular phase.

For example, I asked the Department on one occasion to supply me with a list of camps in Ontario. There is quite a number of them, mostly in northern Ontario. It took them some time to get me the list, and when I got it, it was merely a mimeographed list, and no promotional work obviously had been done on the thing.

These are the attractions which should be exploited. Perhaps if not directly by the hon. minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) then by his associate in the Cabinet, the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity (Mr. Cecile).

I would like to suggest to the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) that he extend these facilities into southern Ontario. There are a great many camps in the north country, but not very many of them in southern Ontario. There may be a few in south eastern Ontario, but not very many in south western Ontario, and I would like to see a few more of these camps developed, and I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) if he has any plan along that line, for the future.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I will say we have plans going forward for developing camps in as many places as we find them attractive, as are the larger camps we have at the present time. We are also going to develop the roadside tables and we hope this year we will be adding to the 1200 we already have, at least another 250 tables.

(Page G-9 follows)

At the present time you can get first of all the camps of the Highway Department, or the Department of Travel and Publicity.

For the information of the House, I am very happy to say that many of the larger camps, have carried on a voluntary registration, as a number of the hon. members know. At Silver Lake, the one mentioned by the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) last year 6,000 registrations; at Brown Bay there were 12,000; at Compton Park, there were 3,500 and so on.

We hope to get new roads in, and are going to start on them at the earliest possible date, and whenever we see a nice looking setup, or an appropriate site, it will be acquired and kept for the use of the travelling public.

MR. R. A. McEWING (Wellington North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) with regard to the roadside tables, because they are very essential to the motoring public today, and they presented a very good article for roadside tables. They are well made, and apparently in good shape.

The question I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) is this: there is some doubt in the minds of the public regar ding the half ton trucks being driven on Sundays. Is there any regulation with respect that? Do you make any restriction on that.

MR. DOUCETT: No. I think a half ton truck can travel when it likes.

MR. McEWING: You allow them to travel on Sunday?

MR. DOUCETT: The Department of Highways just licenses them.

MR. Mc EWING: There are a lot of people who have not a truck and a car. If it is not in your department, it must be in the Police Department, as I understand they have been prohibited from using those trucks.

MR. DOUCETT: Are you suggesting that they should be, or that the people want to use them? Which is it?

MR. McEWING: Have you any regulation concerning that?

MR. DOUCETT: No, none whatsoever. They can travel where they like. They are not prohibited from travelling day or night. There are no restrictions.

MR. McEWING: There has been some doubt about it.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Do you lose many of these roadside tables, may I ask?

MR. DOUCETT: Not very many that I know of. The odd one, I think. I think probably we lose more by people putting fires under them before going away. A few young people think that is good fun.

MR. W. L.HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, does the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett)contemplate doing any work on the west side of the Queen Elizabeth Highway, between Niagara Falls and Fort Erie? I understand the east side is blake covered, and I wqs wondering if the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) intends completing the west side of the highway.

MR. DOUCETT: I do not know. I thought you were going to be as vague in your question, as the question you asked on the Order Paper the other day.

For the coming year, I would not want to make any promises. I rather think we will not be developing the other side of that highway this year, until we have given the other

side a thorough check, as to traffic.

MR. HOUCK: May I impress upon the hon. minis ter (Mr. Doucett) but more so on his deputies, whom I see sitting at the rear of the chamber this afternoon, that I cannot expect the minist er to know every crossing in the province, but there is one, at Crossing Corners, where a stop light is very badly needed. That is situated on the Queen Elizabeth Highway. A magistrate was in my office recently and impressed me with the fact that I should ask the Highway Department if they could possibly place a stop light at Crossing Corners. He said there is hardly a week goes by that he does not have one or two accident cases before him.

I think that is the only crossing between Toronto and Fort Erie which has not a stop light. I think the Department has been petitioned in regard to that, and I hope they will be paying some attention to it.

Before I sit down, may I ask if hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) has made up his mind what he is going to do about the Burlington bottleneck?

Page G-12 follows.

MR. DOUCETT: No. That is a matter upon which we are going to make a very careful check and survey. It is a huge job, and one that involves many millions of dollars, and we will have to be very careful.

With regard to the stop light; the Department of Highways now has a safety engineering branch, and we will be very happy to refer that matter to them.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): I have a little pamphlet here in regard to billboards along the highways. We are all aware of the sorry mess the billboards and signs make on our highways. What is the attitude of the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) toward those signs? Are you going to take any of them down? Some of them are a great unsightly mess.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in reply to the hon. member (Mr. Thomas, Ontario) that we hope to move toward improving our highways, as far as signs are concerned, and will consider the question of the unsightly matters, such as the hon. member (Mr. Thomas, Ontario) mentions.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): On the new highway from Highland Creek to Oshawa, there are no houses, or any sign of life at all, and this last week I have seen three accidents down there. There are no telephone booths of any kind there. Would the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) consider putting one or two telephone booths out there? In a case of emergency, they would be of great help.

MR. DOUCETT: That is up to the telephone company. They put the booths up themselves.

MR. C. W. COX (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) if it is contemplated making any start on one of the roads to Atikokan Mine? I understand a petition has been very widely circulated, and you have been

visited by some rather important deputations. There are several thousands of people in that locality, who have no means of access to the Trans-Canada Highway. We know something of the importance of Steep Rock to Canadian industry. We have heard quite a lot about Cyrus Eaton. I am wondering if the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) could not give us some idea if it is his intention to make a start in the not-too-distant future, to give this large number of people access to the outside world.

MR. DOUCETT: In referring to the matter raised by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) I may say I have had several petitions and deputations. Just yesterday I had a deputation, and I think the consensus of opinion from them is that the road go by Shabandawan through Atikokan and on to Fort Frances. This road will involve quite a sizeable expenditure, and is one which will require a very careful survey, and consideration of other possible routes. That is as far as I can go at the present time. We are going to look this over. There is no doubt the day is not too far distant, when this town of Atikokan will have a road, but it is an engineering problem, and one of which we are going to make a very careful survey.

MR. COX: That is not the only rather important locality which needs a road. I do not know whether the hon. members of the House have learned anything about Pickle Crow Mine, which is a very important place, far removed from civilization. They are at least 150 miles from anywhere. I think there are between 1000 and 2000 people in the Pickle Crow Mines. Has any thought been given to putting a road into that area, Mr. hon. minister (Mr. Doucett)?

MR. McEWING: Use helicopters.

MR. COX: The hon. member (Mr. McEwing) says to use helicopters. Wait until I get in touch with the hon. Minister

of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) about that. I have to go there by plane when electioneering. To give you hon. members an idea of the distances, it is 250 miles from one side of the constituency, to the other.

MR. DOUCETT: Is it worthwhile going up there?

MR. COX: Well, they elected me. Sure it is worthwhile. There are 2000 people at Pickle Crow. The only way they have of getting out is by plane, or by a water route which is very difficult during the summer months. It is quite a substantial and quite an important industry. I have heard some rumours from time to time that it is contemplated making a start up there. I think it has possibilities not unlike Red Lake, to which a road was put in a few years ago.

MR. MacLEOD: Peter Heenan built that road.

MR. COX: It is there, anyway.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I am very happy indeed to inform the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) that he had better get in there and see that part of his constituency. It must have been slightly neglected because we have been building a road in there now for over a year. It was only one day this week we let a contract for the gravelling of it, and I hope by the time another election comes around, he can drive from Savant Lake, right into Pickle Crow Mine.

MR. COX: I have watched that development, but I thought it would be long, after I was out of public life before you got that road in.

MR. DOUCETT: You are still in public life.

MR. COX: You are very optimistic about my possibilities.

MR. DOUCETT: We will have it done before the next election.

MR. COX: I knew something of the start which has been

made, and I want to thank you for the re-assuring statement that some definite action will be taken.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) this question? Supposing his enginners were to start a survey of the area betwen Fort Arthur and Atikokan, and they would arrive at a decision on a suitable route; would the appropriation you have in the estimates now, for the five-year period be sufficiently large to cover the expenditure of the size which would be required to be used there?

MR. DOUCETT: Oh yes.

MR. MacLEOD: It would cost, I believe, about $5 million or $6 million to build that road.

MR. DOUCETT: I think that is about right. I would have said from $5 million to $10 million, would be closer.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, speaking as one of the hon. members of the delegation who visited that area under the patronage of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott), I think it is only proper that something should be said about the strong representations that were made to that delegation by the Chamber of Commerce at Atikokan, and other public bodies there, and I think it is the general view of the hon. members that the case was a very strong one, and that the request for a road out of that locality, from Port Arthur to Fort Frances, is entirely reasonable. That community is going to grow with new areas which have been leased to the Inland Steel. That is going to be a pretty large community in the next two or three years. We may have 5000 or 7000 people in Atikokan. Goodness me, you cannot lock a community of that size up, and not give them access to the main highway. These people are suffering a very extreme inconvenience

because of their inability to get out.

I am rather surprised at the indefinite answer which the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) gave, because in conversations I had with people, they gave me the impression that the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) had increased their hopes that something would be done, and fairly quickly.

(Take H follows)

MR. DOUCETT: I always do that.

MR. MacLEOD: What is that?

MR. DOUCETT: That is just a little characteristic I have.

MR. MacLEOD: Well, you should never lead people up onto a high mountain and then dash them down on the rocks.

MR. DOUCETT: No, we keep them there.

MR. MacLEOD: I want one of the hon. members who visited Atikoken to make a very strong plea to the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) to accede to their request for a highway and not to wait until after the next election to do it. I would like to see it built in your time.

Some hon. MEMB ERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: I would like to see it done in your time, and I am afraid--

MR. DOUCETT: I think we can assure you of that.

MR. MacLEOD;--if it is held up, but you may lose the credit. You are extremely popular up in that part of Ontario, as you are in all parts of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: People think a great deal of you, and I urge you to earn the undying gratitude of the very splendid people who live in that town by getting a highway underway very quickly.

All of this is said, of course, without taking back a single word that I said about Cyrus Eaton five or six days ago.

HON. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I

thought you were building him up.

Mr. G.B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) a couple of questions in connection with highways in Essex County.

First I would like to know whether the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) would be prepared to give us some indication of whether or not they plan on any improvement on highway No. 39, leading from Windsor out to Gull River along Lake St. Clair. That is where the two very ancient bridges are, one of them two hundred years old-- well, if it is not two hundred years old, at least they are very dilapidated and I am sure the hon. minister will agree they are high traffic hazards. I would like the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) to give us some indication of what may be done on that highway this year and in the very near future.

Also I wonder if he would give us a statement with respect to what his plans are for the development of the new dual highway from Windsor to Toronto during the coming year.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, it is our intention, as I have said before, to go forward as rapidly as possible in replacing as many of the old structures as is possible and ones which are more hazardous than others, at as early a date as possible. I do not think it will be within our power this year to replace probably all the bridges we would like to, do to several things. One is that steel is not in too plenteous supply yet, but I think we will be able to take care of quite a few structures.

I know the road mentioned, I was over it last fall when I visited the County there, and while I cannot promise

definitely what we will be able to do this year we hope to have some of these structures improved first.

Page B-4 follows.

MR. ELLIS: Just the two there.

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, there two there. As to the new highway, I can only repeat what I have said on different occasions which you have read in the press, that during the coming year we hope to start the new road. The first thing of course is the service and I hope by this time next year we will know more about that and proably be able to give you something definite at a much earlier date this next Session.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Chairman, speaking of replacing hazardous structures, can the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) say what the Department plans are for replacing the bridge on Highway #21, the Bluewater Highway at Southampton?

MR. DOUCETT: Which highway?

MR. CALDER: Highway 21, the bridge at Southampton. I think you will agree with me it is a hazardous structure indeed. What I am interested in is, willthe bridge be rebuilt downstream or upstream, and at what date?

MR. DOUCETT: That is a bridge on which there is quite a controversy as no doubt my hon. friend the member for London (Mr. Calder) knows). As I have said, I inspected it last Fall. We have taken certain precautions to improve it and it isone of the matters in which we hope to meet the townand see the new location issatisfactory to the majority concerned. I have agreed to meet them and hope to be able to put thebridge in a place which will be satisfattory. There are a lot of surroundings circumstances to be considered, with the very serious erosion that isgoing on, and as you know, some of the road had to be abandoned and the people have moved back hear the town. All those things willhave to be takeninto consideration in arriving at the new location.

MR. CALDER; Mr. Chairman, may I urge the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) to explore to the fullest the room for cooperation with the Federal Department of Transport there, so that the harbor improvements may possibly go hand in hand with your bridge work? -- to the improvement of both.

MR. DOUCETT: We always make a complete survey of all those possibilities. We have agreed with them, and I do not think we have had any trouble in the way of meeting the requirements in those places. We would not think of building a bridge where there was navigation.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (Temiskaming): I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) could give me any idea as to when he contemplates the completion of the Matachewan-Kirkland Lake highway?

MR. DOUCETT: That is one of the roads I mentioned. We have built half of it up to the present time and while I cannot promise the hon.member (Mr. Taylor) definitely this year, it is in our new five-year program. I am sure it will be developed in due course. It is one of the roads we figured in that section.

MR. TAYLOR: I would like to remind the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) it has been in there three years now.

MR. DOUCETT: I beg your pardon?

MR. TAYLOR: It has been in this five-year plan for three years now.

MR. DOUCETT: No, the five year plan was only announced a month ago.

MR. TAYLOR: Oh, this is another five-year plan?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting for the five-year plan to come up. I was wondering in what respect the five-year plan got into these Estimates. There does not seem to be much five-year plan figures there.

MR. DOUCETT: The five year plan is in the Estimates.

AN hon. MEMBER: Where?

MR. DOUCETT: If you read the statement which I made in the House and also in other places, I suggest that this must be kept in a more or less fluid state and for the first year I suggest the spending or the increasing of our former expenditure, by $15,000,000---ten or fifteen million was the figure I used---and the next year by another five or ten million and so on until we got into the last two years. This year that is about what we figur in the Estimates it would be, about $15,000,000 in new construction this year.

MR. WISMER (Riverdale): You would have $120,000,000 to spend in the last three years?

MR. DOUCETT: Pardon?

MR. WISMER: You would have well over $100,000,000 in the last two years, on that basis.

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, you willhave over $100,000,000 in the las two years.

MR. C. W. COX (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member (Mr. Doucett) another question, perhaps two? I was very glad to hear what he said about the Pickle Lake,Road, that it was going to Savant Lake. I am wondering if any decision is made when you reach Savant Lake---when you get there, you are not getting anywhere, that s like the end of the world.

MR. DOUCETT: You get onto the railroad then.

MR. COX: I beg your pardon?

MR. DOUCETT: Can you get onto the railroad?

MR. COX: Well, the people at Atikokan are on a railroad now but they are trying to find a way out.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): They will go on to

conquer new worlds then.

MR. COX: It would appear to me it would not be very prudent to spend all the money you propose to spend, and it is difficult country to build a road in, from Savant Lake to the mines and then once you get to Savant Lake, not to give the people an opportunity of continuing out to the Trans-Canada Highway or some other route. There are several alternate routes. I do think it would be a very great mistake to spend all the money that will be necessary to build a road from Savant Lake into the mines and not continue on from Savant Lake, which would be comparatively easy.

I am wondering, and the people are interested, they do not want to go all the way from Pickle Crow out to Savant Lake and then find all the trains are ten hours late. Where would they go on from there?

The same situation exists at Atiokkan. They have a railroad service, but they want a way out. I am wondering if there has been any answer to that, and any canvass made?

When you are talking about the Atikokan Road, I presume the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) knows it is a rather long and difficult road to build from Shabanawan to Atikokan, through rather difficult terrain; and no doubt he knows it would be possible to build a road from the old Bonheur Trail into the Atikokan Mine. I am not suggesting that be done, but it is only 40 or 50 miles in there and probably could be built for $5000 to $10000 per mile of road. That is something which might be considered, but I am just wondering if there is an answer, after you have gone from Pickle Crow to Savant Lake, if any consideration has been given to where you will go after Savant Lake, to let the people out.

MR. DOUCETT: No.

MR. COX: Nothing?

MR. DOUCETT: No. Mr. Chairman, there has been no consideration on continuing the road from Savant Lake, in fact this would be a very, very costly job.

MR. COX: From Savant Lake out?

MR. DOUCETT: I might say to the hon. member (Mr. Cox) this is a road which will let them take supplies to the mine during the Winter months. Now they are going to have to get a new ferry or something, as I understand it is about worn out. However, when we are talking about those places in which we are most interested and anxious to get roads, within a reasonable time, we sometimes should think of some of the places that have been shut off as far as highway traffic is concerned from the outside world for many years. For instance, we in fact this year just completing a road from Chapleau, which has been a town for many, many years. We are going ahead, as I say, and this government is quite anxious to do so, but as far as building a road from Savant Lake to---

MR. DUNBAR: Pickle Crow.

MR. DOUCETT: Well, we have it to Pickle Crow, but to one of our King's Highways, that is not a project that is anticipated in the immediate future.

MR. COX: If the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) says that is difficult road to build, a difficult country to build a road through, I might say I am not unfamiliar with the country and I cannot agree with him in that statement. I am not

suggesting it should be done. However, I know a little bit about building roads myself, I lost $30,000.00 in building a road, and that is a good way to find out.

MR. SALSBERG: Why did you not geet Franceschini, he knows all bout that.

MR. DOUCETT: We will take on a few fellows like you any time.

MR. COX: I beg your pardon?

MR. DOUCETT: I say if we can get some fellows who want to spend money like that, we will take you on.

MR. COX: I am only suggesting I think I know something about the terrain. I do not think it would be a very expensive road to build from Savant Lake out to the Trans-Canada Highway.

(Page H-10 follows)

MR. A. A. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) could tell me offhand--perhaps he has not the figures here--what that road into Red Lake cost?

MR. DOUCETT: Approximately six million dollars.

MR. COX: Six million?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes.

MR. COX: I wish I had had that job.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: Do you think it was worth it?

MR. DOUCETT: Well, it was better worth it than some of the roads that are suggested here.

Mr. MacLEOD: What did you say about the building of that road when you were in opposition? Were you for it?

MR. DOUCETT: When I was in opposition the Red Lake road was never mentioned.

VOTES 90 to 92 inclusive agreed to.

On Vote No. 93.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, on 93, The Gasoline Tax Branch, I wonder whether the government has given any heed to the request of the municipalities to share in the gasoline tax? That is a sore spot in practically every municipality, and requests for the sharing of the tax have been made on a number of occasions. I suggest that request is a very sound one, a meritorious one and an urgent one. The City of Toronto, like every other centre that has King's Highways leading into it and through it, is spending millions annually for the maintenance of the city streets and the highways, for the benefit of motorists, yet the city gets practically no return, or rather no share of the millions collected by the provincial government.

It is true that demands on the Highways Department are increasing from year to year, but I do suggest it is becoming urgently necessary for the government to grand the request of the municipalities and share the tax. If you were to do that, you would provide the cities with the money they are entitled to, because most of it would be spent as it is now withour your assistance, on the maintenance of roads for automobiles, whereas at present they are obliged to get all of it from the property-owner. They would then, under such an arrangement, be getting the money from the people who are using it, namely the automobile owners and the purchasers of gasoline.

I am sure the cities would be very happy to learn that the government is prepared to grant their demand, and I assure the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) that his popularity would rise very markedly in the large centres -- not that it is not high now -- it would rise still higher if he were to utilize this opportunity to make that important announcement which the cities have been praying for for many years.

MR. MacLEOD: And he might even win some Toronto seats.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, for many years -- in fact only three years ago did the cities receive any share of the gasoline tax and today they are getting a subsidy on the money expended on their roads.

MR. SALSBERG: It is a temporary arrangement, is it not, for roads, on receipt of your approval? Local construction?

MR. DOUCETT: No, it is not a temporary arrangement, it is in the Act.

Vote No. 93 agreed to.

On Vote No. 94.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not want to cause the hon. minister

(Mr. Doucett) to rise except when absolutely necessary. He has been doing it for a few hours now, and that is quite an exercise. However, on the subject of the Motor Vehicles Branch I would like to raise a problem that most hon. members, I am sure, are conscious of.

There is general, universal approval of the efforts of the Department to reduce the incidence of highway accidents involving motor vehicles. We all agree with that. I do suggest, however, that many innocent and very careful drivers get into unnecessary difficulties that we should try to remedy.

For instance, last winter I encountered the problem of a motor vehicle owner in my constituency, one of the most careful of drivers, who backed out of his lane and either he was hit by a car or he touched a car. No serious damage occurred, and it could happen to almost any person, but the result was he was charged with and convicted of backing out too rapidly. His insurance was cancelled and he could not drive his car. It necessitated a search for a special policy that cost a lot of extra money and, furthermore, it was not every insurance company that was willing to give him the extra insurance, in fact the company which handled his insurance turned him down. A number of agents tried to get him insurance and failed to do so; he could not use his car for a number of weeks and then, finally, I took it up with Mr. Bickell and he undertook to get somebody to handle it.

I am wondering whether the Department could not provide that service for people of that sort. This man is not a reckless driver, he is not an irresponsible person.

It was a minor accident, and yet he and his business suffered for weeks and weeks because of the conviction on a very minor infraction of the law.

Furthermore, I wonder if something could not be done to save such people the unnecessarily high expense incurred? I think some insurance companies are overcharging when people come to them for this extra insurance. It would be quite proper, perhaps, for the Department to provide this extra coverage, whether out of this special fund you are establishing or by adopting some legislation to prevent the overcharging which insurance companies are indulging in toward innocent people of the sort I am describing.

You are a hard man, Mr. Minister (Mr. Doucett).

Vote No. 94 agreed to.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Lands and Forests.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Department of Lands and Forests, Page 65, Vote 106.

HON. H. R. SCOTT(Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, it is not going to be a long speech I am going to make.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. MR. SCOTT: Following on the Estimates of the hon. minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett), I would just like at this time to pay a compliment to him and his Department for the excellent co-operation they have given our Department in the construction of dams which have washed out and of the necessary buildings for the housing of our air force and other departmental officials in the north country.

Some reference has been made to hon. members' trip through northern Ontario last summer.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear , hear.

HON. MR. SCOTT: I was very happy to have the hon. members get some idea of the extent of the "empire", as has been suggested which comes under the Depar tment of Lands and Forests and at the same time for them to get some idea of the type of man we have in our Department who so ably administers the affairs of the province in the north.

I might say I have had letters from various organizations and municipalities in the north country congratulating the hon. members who took part in that trip for the interest they displayed in the tour.

(Take "I" follows)

Now this conservation report; I would like to congratulate the Chairman and the hon. members of the committee on the amount of ground they covered. I do not know whether I should c ongratulate the various hon. members yesterday on the amount of ground they covered, because they seemed to direct most of their fire at the poor Minister of Lands and Forests. In fact, at times I think while I have authority to bring in a closed season for moose, I really should see if there is any authority to bring in a closed season for the Minister of Lands and Forests because he seems to be sniped from all sides.

MISS AGNES MacPHAIL(York East): Oh, he is a very popular hon. member.

MR. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Yes, we like him.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): I will not dwell at any great length on these introductory remarks, but you will notice that our forest inventory is now in its fourth year. I had recently intended 165,000 square miles in the survey. We have now a period of 156,000, and the surveys and the growth studies are following along as we expected they would.

Following this, will come the forest management, based on information which has been obtained from the forest inventory. We cannot reset up a forest management until we know what we have, and with the completion of this inventory, we will then be able to set up a forest management properly, right across the province.

At the present time we have already started the initial steps in the areas in which the inventory in its three stages

has been completed.

Reference is made to the use of helicopters in our forest fire prevention work. We experimented with the use of these for two seasons. We hired them. We had suggested to Ottawa that their use combined with our work, would give their pilots good experience. One feature is the lack of their ability to carry any great weight. I think they would be a necessary adjunct to our present aeroplanes in ferrying from the nearest lake on which the conventional plane could land, to the scene of the fire, but we hesitate as yet to make the necessary investment-- the capital investment-- in the planes and the parts necessary to maintain them, in the training of pilots-- because the pilots have to have an altogether different system of training-- and the mechanics who will service them.

I can assure the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) that we are very keenly aware of their desirability, and when we consider that such an expenditure will be justified, we will consider adding them to our existing air fleet.

Our air fleet now consists of forty planes, of which twenty-eight are the new Beaver type, and we have an additional five of the Beavers on order. This will give us excellent service. We have been using them in northern patrol work, and with a metal skin they do not suffer so much damage as the canvas covers did. We find that we can get men in and out of lakes, in case of a fire, very quickly.

This past year we had over 1,800 fires, but the average acreage burned was very much down from last year. We would like to think that was owing to the increased efficiency of the

department, but, on the other hand, we know that weather conditions sometimes do play a part in the extent of the fires.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest we go on with the estimates, and if there is any particular item on which the hon. members wish to ask questions, I will be happy to give them whatever information is possible.

MR. C. W. COX (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, I have some items which I would like to discuss item by item. The hon. minister (Mr. Scott)made some reference to a trip to Northern Ontario. I want to offer again, on behalf of the people in the north, my sincere congratulations for making that rather educational trip possible.

I think every hon. member who went on that trip enjoyed themselves, and all of those with whom they came in contact were very pleased at meeting them. This was something we have been looking forward to for a long time, and we do indeed feel deeply grateful to you for making tha t trip possible.

Page I-4 follows.

We hope you will come back again.

I have been associated with the lumber business for some considerable number of years, sometimes in a somewhat critical capacity. I am glad to hear what you say with respect to consideration being given to the use of helicopters. I might there repeat what I said this morning, that I know the difficulties you may encounter in establishing a service -- a provincial service of your own. You thoroughly realize that fact, I have some knowledge of it myself. The Dominion have the facilities for such an arrangement, and I cannot think of anything more important, nor anything which will be more likely to bring productive results, than some co-operative arrangement, between the Dominion and the province, so that these helicopters can be put into practical service, in order that their feasibility may be tried out.

You made some reference, Mr. minister (Mr. Scott) of the inability of these helicopters to carry weight. I do not know how much they can carry, but let me tell you a little story -- I seem not to be able to get very far from the line of conversation. The first experience I had with helicopters was down at Miami, some 15 years ago. I stayed at a very palatial hotel, known as the "Biltmore", 10 miles from Miami Beach. They had another hotel at Miami Beach called the "Coral Gables", and much to my amazement they had a helicopter in front of the door of the Biltmore , and they picked up three people, and took them right down to the hotel at the beach. That was 12 or 15 years ago.

As I pointed out the other day, a few men can extinguish a fire with chemicals shortly after it starts, but an army of men, as you all know, would have difficulty in getting it out, once it makes headway, so I doubt very much if we should

defer the trying-out of these machines, because I am quite sure, from my own observation, that they can carry a limited number of people and a sufficient quantity of equipment to extinguish a fire shortly after it starts.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) say that he will take some steps in order to give the helicopters a trial.

From my own practical observation, I would think it would be one of the most effective means of controlling fires before they make any headway.

There are some items I would like to go over, item by item, but in a general way I think something should be done to encourage the revenues which the Land and Forest Department receives.

I perhaps should be one of the last to suggest an increase in dues. I think I gave your department $30,000. myself, and I hope you do not increase that.

I do not think the people of Ontario are getting enough for their timber dues. They are doing, as a matter of fact, nothing else but high-grading the shore. What I mean by "high-grading the shore" is there is not anybody ten miles from the shore -- nobody. When you realize the extent of these limits, I think the photographs which I brough out the other day have been confirmed. There are 23,000 square miles. Some of these concessions owned by these paper companies extend 40 miles from the lake -- 40 miles from transportation, 40 miles from any communication.

Now, it seems to me, Mr. hon. minister (Mr. Scott) -- and you can correct me if I am wrong -- that the same rate of dues now applies to timber 40 miles from the lake, as it does two miles from the lake shore. Surely, apples are worth more one mile from Toronto than they would be in Windsor,

I think there should be a grading scale. If the timber is in ten miles from the lake shore, the department then should receive, for argument's sake, two dollars per cord; in the same ratio, 40 miles from shore you would have to pay the company a bonus for taking them out.

By any standard of economy, the pulp wood you are selling in northern Ontario -- particularly to the pulp and paper mills -- is simply ridiculous. There is no yardstick by which you can justify such a price. Take the State of Wisconsin; timber is not of as good a quality, as our timber, and not so easily accessible, nor so easily taken to the mills, and yet they get $4, $5., $6. per cord for wood which is not as good as the Canadian wood, and the Canadians are paying $2. per cord, in Canada.

I think by any yardstick of economy that anybody could argue if you were to get proper due, you would receive a revenue of from $1 million to $2 million more in dues from that part of Ontario alone.

I do not think there is a business man, if he cares to hold these areas in northern Ontario, would object to the increase, and it would bring $2 million at least into the revenues of the province.

That is why I asked you to come to northern Ontario, to see for yourselves what we are getting for these areas. We are simply giving them away for a mere bagatelle. Let me point out again what I have said already, and I think I am correct, that many of these limits were sold years ago! Those conditions, we realize, are out of existence today. I do not know of anything during the war which did not increase in price, except people's assets. Everything else went up. I do not know of any commodity used by human beings that did not go up during the war, but there was very little, if any, increase in the

assets which belong to the people of Ontario.

It has always seemed strange to me that there has not been some grading scale in relation to the dues charged for timber, so that the man getting timber within ten miles of the shore would pay a greater price than the man who is getting it 30 miles from shore.

There are two matters which I think are unfair. I have found these large concessionaires are paying a very low ground rent. I may ask later on to produce the figures, but, for argument's sake, we will say the company which control 2300 square miles -- but I do not think there are many of them -- are paying ground rent on 2300 square miles, which is very low, and I do not think they are paying the regulation rate, which is $11.40 per square mile . The small operator pays it, but my understanding is that the larger companies do not pay the $11.40 per square miles, and whatever rate they pay, does not include the entire areaa

I said I would like to go into some of these items, item by item. I notice a very substantial item in connection with the airplane service, as much as that is required. I have seen these planes flying around in the winter, myself. The cost is enormous, and may I ask if the results justify the cost? It must be terrific. I have seen these large planes going out on work that I think was of an inconsequential character. It would seem to me better to send out a smaller plane. It is a good deal like sending the Queen Mary out on a job, where an outboard motor could do the work. I feel that substantial savings could be effected in the airplane service, and an enormous amount of money would accrue to the province as a result of a grading scale of dues, and in connection with ground rents, there should be no discrimination between the big man who controls huge areas, as against the small man, operating in a

limited way. I think I will close with these few observations. I may go over them with you from time to time, and perhaps you will be in a position to answer some of the questions which I have been asked by people recently!

In concluding my brief remarks, Mr. Chairman, at this time, I would only say again that we are indeed most grateful to the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) for bringing these eastern hon. members to the north, and we hope you will bring them back again. It was indeed a pleasure to have you there, and we appreciate having them with us.

On section 106.

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. David): I understand the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) was going to answer a question in this first vote. Does the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) wish to answer the question by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox), or would he prefer to have all the questions?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): If there is something on the vote, I would be glad to answer the question.

HON. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): Which vote?

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, I submit that is rather difficult, because there are many matters which have been brought to the attention of the hon. members of this House during the past six or eight months, and we find it a little difficult to deal with any more specific items. The hon. minister (Mr. Scott) is well aware that some of the hon. members of this House have been inundated for the last six months with memoranda, documents, questionaires, specimen debates we might make in this Legislature, on lands and forests, if we were inclined to do so. We have had letters from legionnaires, and people who mentioned, dealing with lands and forests, and we have received copies of briefs which have

been presented to the government. We have received telegrams. I think I have no less than 90 documents which have come to me in the last six months, and most of them come airmail special delivery.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York West): And a lot of figures.

MR. MacLEOD: Yes. As we all know, this is not unconnected with what the Star Weeekly calls "the battle of the giants", the battle between the Great Lakes Lumber Company and the pulp and paper companies. As far as I am concerned, I do not have very much interest in the private quarrel that is going on between Mr. Johnston and the pulp and paper companies.

But matters have arisen in connection with this controversy which certainly affect public opinion in the province of Ontario, and I would have thought, knowing the amount of punishment the hon. members of this House have taken from the head of the lakes, in the form of submission, and so on, that the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) would have said something about it.

MISS MACPHAIL: Did you read them all?

MR. MacLEOD: Yes, I did read most of them. The point is this; we cannot escape the fact that the people in Fort William -- and you will excuse me if I deal with the constituency of the hon. member (Mr. Cox) -- as I say, we cannot escape the fact that in the city of Fort William today there is wide-spread concern over the curtailment of operations, and the threatened closing down of that mill, and the people there have the impression that the mill is being forced to close down as a result of some delinquency on the part of this government, and the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott). I am not saying that is true, but that is the impression. It seems to me that in view of the fact that this controversy has

received so much attention in the public press, and the hon. members of the House have had it brought to their attention, that the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) of Lands and Forests should bring us a little up to date, and say straight where others may be trying to lead us astray.

Only a couple of days ago I received a letter from the London Council of Churches. The controver y has even reached into that staid, conservative, backward city of London, Ontario. We have a letter addressed to us here by distinguished clergymen -- so I am told -- in the person of Professor Ewart E. Grange, in which he lists nine questions he has submitted to the government. They are rather important questions. I cannot believe there is any outside influence brought to bear on the London ministerial association; surely they would not lend themselves to anything that was selfish, but they sent us this letter addressed to the hon. Leslie Frost, Prime Minister, the hon. Howard Scott, and I presume -- yes, to all the hon. members of the Legislative Assembly, and I think it is only fair that the honl minister (Mr. Scott) should tell us about this.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): He will, if you give him an opportunity.

MR. MacLEOD: Just a minute, and I will be through. I hold in my hand a brief presented to the hon. Prime Minister, on December 9th, 1949, and on the last page of this memorandum, they claimed if the government of Ontario would do the things suggested in this brief, they would create employment for 128,900 people.

MR. COX: At Fort William?

MR. MacLEOD: At the head of the lakes.

MR. COX: You must have got your figures mixed. Not 128,000?

MR. MacLEOD: No, I have it right here "128,000". It says here, "primary and secondary wood conversion industries in the province of Ontario" -- excuse me -- "Resulting from 1,000,000,000 feet of diversified timber products could provide employment for 128,000 people."

Now, is that nonsense?

MR. COX: Yes.

MR. MacLEOD: The hon. member (Mr. Cox) is not the Minister of Lands and Forests. This is the claim of a man with whom my seat mate has more than a speaking acquaintance; we could put it that he is a colleague of his just in this industry. This was submitted to the government of Ontario by a delegation representing organizations from the head of the lakes.

MR. COX: Absolutely fantastic.

MR. MacLEOD: From the Trades and Labour Council, Veterans' organizations, the City Council of Fort William --

MR. COX: Not while I was mayor.

MR. MacLEOD: -- from the Fort William Chamber of Commerce and other Fort William business men's organizations. Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) take five minutes to make a brief statement on this, so that henceforth we can understand the situation.

This comes from the city hall in the city of Fort William, and do you think they would send out a lot of cheap propaganda which bears no relation to the truth? If that is the case, I think the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) should tell us. If there is something in these representations made to the government, tell us that, and let us from this very important department of government get some understanding of what it is all about. We do not know. Could you tell us?

MR. COX: Perhaps I should answer for the hon Minister (Mr. Scott) --

MR. MacLEOD: No, please do not.

MR. COX: I cannot answer one question. Perhaps the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) can.

MR. MacLEOD: What is it all about?

MR. COX: Perhaps the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) should speak first.

MR. MacLEOD: I object, Mr. Chairman. I addressed a question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott), and I would like to hear his answer.

MR. COX: I want to say something in defence of the department.

MR. MacLEOD: No, they do not need it.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Mr. Chairman, I rather expected that a question along this line would come up. The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox), who has been in this business for many years, can correct me if I am wrong. We have an area up there in which, in the past, there have been sawmills. Some of them have not operated with any great financial success. During the war there was a demand for lumber, and a mill was built, and there was an application made for 30,000,000 feet per year, and they asked for our permission to be granted. The license was for 30,000,000 feet a year to be cut. Under the pressure of war, the requirements of the mill was speeded until today -- and the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) may be right that they could employ 128,000 people but the old capacity was 75,000,000, 90,000,000 and 125,000,000 feet per year. In part of that area, the saw log-sized timber runs from 15 per cent to 30 per cent. The conservation committee reports showed yesterday that in the past

we have had mills going in and cutting off all the existing timber. Communities grew up around the mills, and when the timber was cut the owner got out, and all you have left was a ghost town -- a village which ceased to live.

What I am afraid of in the town of Fort William is if we grant rights to operate a mill with 90,000,000 or 125,000,000 feet, it will mean that mill will run to capacity for a few years, and then all the available saw log timber will be cut off. In the meantime, to justify that extended capacity of the mills, families move in, creating further hospital and school problems and if, as a result of the shortage of the timber, the mill has to shut down, other types of industry will have to absorb those costs.

I went up to Fort William -- or Port Arthur -- about two or three months ago and I pointed out we had been talking in connection with this particular industry always in terms of "thousand doyle measure, and we were looking at an area which was possibly 80 per cent pulpwood. Therefore, we should forget to speak in terms of 1,000 feet board measure, or doyle measure, and we should speak in terms of cords. In other words, it was my suggestion that an area should be set aside which would develop so many thousand cords of wood of which approximately 20 per cent would be saw log size for the mill, the remaining 80 per cent of the production of that area would be exchangeable with the other pulp operators, for the saw log size which they would develop in their operation.

In the past all the set-ups for the sale of logs from pulp operation and saw logs, have been priced on a basis of so much per thousand. These prices per thousand were always the cause of lengthy arguments and debates, how much the head office should be assigned of the cost of producing these logs.

Therefore, I figured it was a more sound basis to put them on a exchange, log for log.

You have all read the propaganda which was sent down here. This thing existed long before my time. I inherited it. I think at the present time to bring us closer to a solution is to do what we have done.

I have been in conference with the pulp and paper people and the Great Lakes Company. I had my last meeting with them last Thursday, and we have exchanged memoranda on it and we are not very far apart, and I hope very shortly the solution will be worked out.

MR. COX: I was going to say something, Mr. Chairman, particularly about the statement made by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) --

MR. MacLEOD: I did not make any statement. I was quoting what other people said.

MR. COX: I must say that these statements are utterly fantastic --

MR. MacLEOD: They were made by people from your constituency.

MR. COX: I hope none of those people voted for me. They are utterly fantastic. That is all there is to it. People who make statements like that make us wonder at times if we do not need a mental hospital at the head of the lakes.

I know something of this controversy myself, but I have not taken any particular part in it. I know a little of the ramifications, and I do not think the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) nor the department should be unduly criticized for the attitude they have taken nor for the policy they have adopted. I do not think they have been unduly fair in the whole matter. I have often said -- and I have been in business there longer

than anybody -- that it is not a saw log country. During the time I have been there I have watched 25 saw mills go under. If it was such a lucrative thing, there surely would be some of them there today. I am not saying there is not a place for some kinds of saw mills there. There will always be a place for the smaller saw mills --

MR. MacLEOD: Did not the government of which you were a member encourage the building of those mills there?

MR. COX: For a special purpose. It had nothing to do with me. I did not. If you want to see saw logs you had better go to the Pacific coast. That is where they are. Northern Ontario is no saw log country.

You all know -- and the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Newman) will agree with me -- that for 20 or 30 years there was a large saw mill operating in Fort Frances --

MR. NEWMAN: In Rainy River.

MR. COX: But I am referring to an entirely different specie of timber to what the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) is talking about.

I just wanted to say a word in defence of the department. They are coming in, I think, for a great deal of unjustifiable criticism, and I think they are adopting a reasonably fair attitude, and I think perhaps there will be some solution to it. That there is a place for a very large sawmill is unquestionable, and there is a place in northern Ontario for small mills, which could operate for an indefinite period. But by the wildest stretch of the imagination, can anybody come to the conclusion that these operations will offer employment for a hundred thousand men. That is utterly fantastic and ridiculous.

MR. MacLEOD: Does the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) agree then that the head of a large paper concern at the head of the

lakes is prepared to invest $10 million for the extension of a mill can be dismissed as "nonsense"? The proposal is that there are people prepared to invest $10 million for an all-purpose mill, using the great lakes mill as a nucleus.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): I do not know what paper you read it in, because I have not seen it.

MR. MacLEOD: I heard it said in a meeting at Port Arthur, at which the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) spoke.

MR. COX: Perhaps I am speaing too much, but the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) must be under a misapprehension againl Surely nobody is going to add $10 million to a mill that is already there.

MR. MacLEOD: That is what they say.

MR. COX: I am extremely doubtful if that is practical or possible. I have heard some conversation about spending some nebulous sum, but that was associated with an entirely different project . It is a mill -- some project which might be part and parcel of an industry for the Department of Resources in the north. I do not think it is contemplated spending any amount of money to enlarge a mill which is already there. There has been some talk about putting in some kind of an establishment which might make sulphite or groundwood, or some other kind of paper. But it is not logical to think that anybody is going to spend $10 million to enlarge a mill already established.

MR. FROST: If the hon. members opposite feel like letting these estimates through, I would be very glad indeed. But if they feel that any discussion is wanted --

MR. COX: I would like to have an explanation from

Some of them.

MR. FROST: Then I think we had better call it six o'clock.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Some of us are interested in some other matters after this vote. We have been waiting for thehon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) to settle the question.

MR. FROST: I move the Committee do now rise and report a certain Bill, and progress on another.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report it has come to a certain resolution, and moves for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Before moving the adjournment of the House, Mr. Speaker, may I say that tomorrow, we plan to have a night Session, a night Session on Thursday, and to meet at 11.00 o'clock on Friday morning. On Friday we will sit from 11.00 a.m. to 1.00 o'clock, and from 2.00 o'clock to 4.30. I will bring in a resoltuion concerning Friday later on.

Tomorrow we will go ahead with government Orders and estimates.

Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.08 of the clock, p.m.

/ / / / / /

- - - - - -

Mar. 29.

SEVENTH ERRATTA.

VOL. 18; Page E-4; line 20 et seq: After line 20, and after the word "that" therein, insert the following.

> That the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word 'that' and substituting therefor , the following.
>
> "This House does not approve of civil marriage, and should not give second reading to Bill no. 87, The Marriage Act, 1950, unless and until the government agrees to strike out Section 25."

- - - - - -

Vol. 28; page A-11; line 8: Chan e the word "trap" to "plant".

- - - - - -
- - - - - - -