DEBATES & PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

2nd. SESSION OF THE 21st. LEGISLATURE

OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

1945

VOL. 3

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIRST DAY

Toronto, Ontario,
March 15, 1945.

SPEAKER: Honourable William J. Stewart, C.B.E.

The House met at 3 o'clock.
Prayers.
MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Daley, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Forest Fires Prevention Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

MR. GARFIELD ANDERSON (Fort William): Would the hon. Minister explain?

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to bring up to date the Forest Fires Prevention Act. The Act is amended to remove conflicts and clear some technical details. There is no change in the principle involved. The Act is brought into line with modern fire protection.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr.

Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Thompson, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Factory, Shop and Office Building Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Would the hon. Minister give a word of explanation?

MR. DALEY: Yes. In explanation, Mr. Speaker, it is just a bill to rectify a condition. In the passing of the Liquor Authorities Control Act last year there were restrictions to certain standard hotels under the early closing, and this is to remove the restrictions placed on them
2. by early closing.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. the Minister of Highways, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Public Vehicles Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

MR. ROBERT D. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Would the hon. Minister please explain?

MR. BLACKWELL: This is to clarify a provision of the Act with regard to the issuance of bonds and insurance policies with regard to public vehicles, and brings the statuatory provisions in line with the practice that the Department feels is desirable.

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. the Minister of Highways, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Commercial Vehicles Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

MR. JOHN H. COOK (Waterloo North): Would the hon. the Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) give an explanation?

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, the same explanation as I made to the bill which I just introduced applies to this one.

MR. SPEAKER: Further orders.

Before the Orders of the Day, I have granted the privilege to several hon. members to rise.

MR. JOSEPH B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege.

"The Globe and Mail" of Saturday, March 3, 1945, devoted its leading editorial to a statement which I made in this House regarding the mounting crisis in labour relations in Ontario, which calls for the strengthening of the labour relations' laws in the Dominion and in the province of Ontario.

In that editorial I and others are accused of being "in the business of stirring unrest by hurling wild accusations hither and yon, always hiding behind the bush of value generalities." The CCF are called "accomplished accusers".

I wish to unhesitatingly refute this unwarranted charge of the "Globe and Mail". It is common knowledge in the labour movement, and it is undoubtedly known to Government departments dealing with labour problems, that the Labour Progressive Party and its followers adhere to a no-strike policy. Furthermore, we do not charge all employers with following a reactionary, strike-provoking labour policy.

In a radio speech which I delivered recently, which was reproduced over local stations in four Ontario communities, and which was also printed in a pamphlet form,

I stated, when referring to Federal Collective Bargaining Regulation, P.C. 1003, as follows:

> "Many employers did abide by the new regulations. A number of critical industrial crises were peacefully solved as a result of P.C. 1003."

But I did say, further, in that speech, that

> "Undemocratic and provocative firms refused, under one pretext or another, to conclude Selective Bargaining agreements and to recognize the Trade Union of their workers. Obstructionism was elevated into a science, and every legal trick was employed to violate the spirit of the Act and to prevent the attainment of improved labour relations."

But "The Globe and Mail" editorial further states as follows; and I quote from "The Globe and Mail":

> "Mr. Salsberg did not limit himself to lamenting the unenlightened attitude of this minority. He accused it of actions which, if true, have serious implications for every employer, every worker, and, indeed, every citizen of the province and every customer beyond. That some employers should deliberately set out to promote strife and destroy the effectiveness of labour legislation, which means create a condition of industrial anarchy, is not to be tolerated.
>
> "On the face of things, the Labour-Progressive member must be held to his charges. He should name names and give facts, so that a full and open investigation of his charges can be held."

And the editorial ends as follows:

> "If Mr. Salsberg has a less partisan basis for his latest charges, he will speak out. He either knows the facts or he does not. If he does, he will say so. If he does not, then he is guilty of worse than he charges."

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the "Globe and Mail" editorial, that the existence of conditions to which I referred "is not to be tolerated." I am, therefore, listing a few, but only a few of a much larger list, of examples to prove my charges. I sincerely hope that the "Globe and Mail" and other newspapers will, as proof of the existence of a free press, and as a service to the country, reproduce my charges in which I, in response

to the "Globe's" request, "name names and give facts".

Name and Fact No. 1: - Ford Motor Company of Canada.

The experience of approximately 900 office workers employed by the Ford Motor Company in the Windsor area, the majority of whom joined the United Auto Workers' Union, and who tried to achieve democratic collective bargaining, is an outstanding example of the kind of blind provocative opposition which many groups of workers have to contend with, and which frequently leads to drastic action.

The majority of the Ford office staff joined the U.A.W. in 1943. They approached the management, but were denied recognition. The Union then brought the case to the then existing Ontario Labour Court.

I ask the hon. members to bear in mind the following dates:

October 22nd, 1943:- First hearing took place before the Ontario Labour Court. The Court ordered a vote.

November 15th, 1943: - The vote took place. Union received a majority, but company challenged the vote.

January 7th, 1944:- Second hearing took place before Ontario Labour Courts. Another vote was ordered.

February 25th, 1944:- Second vote took place. Union majority was bigger than in the first vote.

March 17th, 1944:- Union was certified as bargaining agent.

March 27th, 1944:- Union wrote the Company, asking that negotiations be opened. The Company found excuse that the Union letter was not properly worded.

April 5th, 1944:- Union wrote again. Again the Company found that the Union used the word "request", instead of "require", and therefore would not meet.

April 29th, 1944:- Union wrote a third time, again asking commencement of negotiations. Again the Company found a technical flaw in the Union's letter.

May 6th, 1944:- Union's fourth letter was evidently flawless, and no longer provided an excuse for the company.

May 19th, 1944:- Negotiations opened and were continued on May 30th, June 1st, June 6th, July 12th, August 31st, September 6th, September 8th, September 11th, and September 29th, at which time the Company broke off negotiations.

October 21st, 1944:- Union appealed to government board for intervention, in view of the Company's opposition.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): What government board?

MR. SALSBERG: The Regional Board.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): It would be the Labour Relations Board, not the Regional Board.

MR. SALSBERG; The Labour Relations Board.

November 1st, 1944:- Hearing took place before the Regional Labour Relations Board.

December 1st, 1944:- The Regional Labour Relations Board referred the case to the Federal Minister of Labour, recommending the setting-up of a Conciliation Board.

December 20th, 1944:- The Ford Company appealed the Regional Labour Relations Board's decision to the National Labour Relations Board.

January 29th, 1945: Hearing took place before the National Labour Relations Board, and the appeal of the company was dismissed.

March , 1945:- National Labour Relations Board re-

commends setting-up of Conciliation Board.

This, Mr. Speaker, is an example of the flagrant disregard of spirit and intent of regulations. This is in line with traditional opposition which the Ford Motor Company maintaned against legitimate trade unions throughout its history. This is a continuation of that Company's policy in the past, when it employed Labour spies against its own workers.

This is the company that placed doom-predicting full-page advertisements throughout the country on the eve of the vote which was to take place in its plant, for its workers to decide whether or not they choose the United Auto-Workers C.I.O. The present action of the Company in serving notice of the termination of its existing agreement between the Company and the Union, which covers all plant employees, is another act to provoke strife. The Company is taking advantage of the Union's policy to avoid strikes in wartime, and is obstructing every action taken by the Union to achieve harmonious relations.

The Ford management, like the management of other powerful industrial concerns, in Canada, which are branches of the United States parent companies, refuses to introduce the labour relations policies which exist in the parent plants in the United States and refused to sign agreements with the same union with which the parent company had contractual relations in the United States.

(Page No. 1368 follows.)

If industrial strife is being averted in the Ford Motor Plants, it is only due to the restraint, the self-discipline and responsibility of the leadership of the Auto Union and its members.

Name and Fact No. 2: Gold Mines of Northern Ontario.

The Gold Mine owners of Northern Ontario offered violent resistance to the democratic process of collective bargaining and the acceptance of trade unions as a permanent feature in its relations with the miners. The Miners' Union, to avoid conflict and in compliance with ever law and regulation, refrained from using their organizational strength to enforce such a democratic procedure and entrusted their case to a Conciliation Board headed by the former Justice McTague. But the mine owners refused to abide by the recommendations of that Conciliation Board thus provoking the unfortunate Kirkland Lake strike in 1941.

Since then individual gold mine owners have challenged and resisted the miners' attempt to gain recognition for their union. They compelled the miners to follow a prolonged and tortuous path necessitating the removal of barrier after barrier which these companies and their lawyers set up, before they won what is universally recognized as the essence of democracy, namely, the recognition of the miners' union as the collective bargaining agency.

MR. SPEAKER: It is against the rules of the House for a Member to read his speech.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I am giving facts, in answer to the Globe and Mail's editorial. I am reading the facts and dates as I cannot remember them.

The latest of these obstructions are the actions of

[illegible]

abide by the [illegible]
[illegible] provoking [illegible]
1941.

Since [illegible]
[illegible]
for their [illegible]
protested [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
of the [illegible]

Mr. [illegible]
for a [illegible]

Mr. [illegible]
answer to the [illegible]
the facts are [illegible]
the [illegible]

the Wright-Hargreaves Limited and Sylvanite Gold Mines Limited, who appealed the decision of the Ontario Labor Relations Board and who have secured the infamous decision from the National Labour Board which has already been condemned by all parties in this House a few days ago.

If there are no strikes in the gold mines, it is due only to the fact that the miners and their union, the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers International Union -- C.I.O., -- rigidly adheres to a no-strike policy.

Name and Fact No. 3: Canada Bread Company, Toronto.

The Canada Bread Company employees of Toronto exercised their democratic rights and formed themselves into a trade union which is affiliated to the Canadian Congress of Labour. This union was certified a year ago by the former Ontario Labour Court as the bargaining agency for the employees of the Canada Bread Company. The Company has been following a deliberate delaying tactic in their negotiations with the union. It rejected the union's proposed agreement. It countered with an agreement of its own making. The union offered to accept the agreement which the Company itself prepared only to find that the Canada Bread Company refused to consumate the negotiations by signing that agreement which it, itself, had drawn up.

Anxious to avoid a strike to compel the Company to abide by the decision of the Ontario Labour Court, the union sought permission to prosecute the Company according to the law, but was advised to seek instead the setting-up of a Conciliation Board. To this day the Company evaded signing an agreement. If there is no stoppage of the production of bread in this large baking plant, it is only because of the desire of the workers to avoid

industrial strife in wartime though the provocation is almost irresistible.

Name and Fact No. 4: Canadian Westinghouse Co., Hamilton.

The employees of this large firm joined the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America -- C.I.O. -- the same uninn which has contractual relations with the Westinghouse firm in the United States. The Canadian Company refused to deal with the same union.

December, 1943 -- The union made application for certification to the now defunct Ontario Labour Court.

January 3rd, 1944 -- Summons served on Westinghouse Company.

January 31st, 1944 -- Labour Court proceedings began.

February 4th, 1944 -- Court adjourned.

April 18th, 1944 --Vote conducted in company's plant with the result that 2386 workers voted for United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers Union and only 592 for the so-called independent or company union.

June 5th, 1944 -- Westinghouse Company filed a submission of objections.

June 16th, 1944 -- Objections rejected and the union properly certified.

August 1st, 1944 -- Negotiations opened and continued on August 3rd, September 11th, September 20th, September 30th, October, November 2nd, and December 9th, 1944.

On September 30th the Company submitted its own proposed agreement which the union, after two conferences with the Company, was prepared to accept. The Company, however, insisted that the union forego its rights to take any wage question to the War Labour Board. The union could not possibly accept

industrial st[illegible] in [illegible] without irresistible.

More and more [illegible] the [illegible] tion.

The employees of [illegible] Electric [illegible] Electrical Radio [illegible] the same union which [illegible] Westinghouse firm in the [illegible] party refused to deal with [illegible]

December, 1940 -- [illegible] certification to the new refused [illegible] Company.

January 3rd, 1941 -- [illegible]

January 31st, 1941 -- [illegible]

February 14th, 1941 -- [illegible]

April 18th, 1941 -- [illegible] with the result that 2500 workers [illegible] Radio and Machine [illegible] independent or company union.

June 5th, 1941 -- [illegible] mission of objectives.

June 16th, 1941 -- [illegible] property certified.

August 1st, 1941 -- [illegible]

On August 3rd, [illegible] October, November 3rd, [illegible]

On September [illegible] posed agreement which the [illegible] Company, was rejected [illegible] that the union force [illegible] the War Labour Board. [illegible]

such restrictions but offered to sign the agreement on all points which had been agreed to. The Company then reversed itself and stated that it wished to present the agreement, which it, itself, had prepared to its own legal department for study. On December 9th, the Company presented an entirely new agreement which was totally unacceptable to the employees and which convinced the employees that it was prepared solely for the purpose of preventing an agreement being signed.

The union could easily have ordered a stoppage of work in the face of such unmistakable obstructionism and provocation. After a year and a half of effort the union, because of its adherence to the no-strike policy, appealed for a Conciliation Board which is now being set up. But there is no assurance that the company will not continue to sabotage the Conciliation Board or that it will abide by its recommendations.

Name and Fact No. 5: - Electro Metallurgical Company, Welland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that some Hon. members will consider that this is taking quite a bit of time, but this is a serious question, and a very important newspaper challenges a member of this House to produce facts.

On April 6th, 1944 the union of the company's employees, United Electrical Radio & Machine Workers of America -- commenced negotiations with the company for the renewal of an existing agreement. The union requested the inclusion of a union security and check-off clause which was flatly rejected by the company.

April 28th, 1944 -- The Union made application to the Ontario Relations Labour Board for intervention in the

hope that the issue would be solved peacefully.

July 4th, 1944 -- Board of Conciliation held its first meeting and continued for some time.

December 7th, 1944 -- Board of Conciliation recommended maintenance of membership and irrevocable check-off. This was not quite all that the workers desired.

December 14th, 1944 -- Union notified Labour Department that it accepted the majority report and requested a meeting with the company.

December 20th, 1944 -- Dominion Labour Department notified union that company rejected recommendations of Board of Conciliation.

Ninety-five per cent of workers of this firm are members in good standing of the union. The workers insisted that the company abide by the decision of the Conciliation Board. There was a strong sentiment among workers to stop work if the company should refuse to abide by the decision of the Conciliators.

(Page 1373 follows)

[illegible]

hope that the [illegible] be [illegible] 1944.

July 4th, 1944 -- [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] in first meeting [illegible] conducted [illegible] was [illegible]

December 7th, 1944 -- Board [illegible] of [illegible] recommended maintenance of membership and [illegible] [illegible] off. This was not quite all that the workers [illegible]

December 14th, 1944 -- [illegible] Conciliation [illegible] Department that it [illegible] and the majority [illegible] and requested a meeting with the company.

December 20th, 1944 -- Conciliation [illegible] [illegible] ment notified [illegible] that company [illegible] to recognize [illegible] of Board of Conciliation.

Ninety-five per cent of workers [illegible] [illegible] members in good standing [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] stated that the company abide by the decision of the Conciliation Board. There was [illegible] workers [illegible] workers to stay [illegible] company [illegible] by the decision of the Conciliation.

(Page 1473 follows)

The Company was aware that the mood of workers may lead to stoppage of work in this most essential war production plant. Furthermore, the company was aware of the fact that if work should stop in that plant and if furnaces were allowed to cool it would put the plant out of commission for many, many weeks. Yet the management retained its defiant attitude and refused to abide by the recommendations of a government appointed Conciliation Board.

January 17th, 1945 -- The Dominion Department of Labour sent in a special representative to meet with the Company but the Company remained adamant in its refusal to accept the decision of the Board.

Only the patriotism of the workers and their responsibility as soldiers of production finally led them to the decision not to use their organizational strength; not to strike even though they legally could do so; not to disrupt essential war work which the company was prepared to permit and they signed an agreement without achieving what they set out to achieve, what they were able to enforce; what they were democratically entitled to but which the company refused to grant peacefully.

Name and Fact No. 6: Halifax Ship Yards.

The employees of that key ship yard in the country, members of a Canadian Congress of Labour Union, asked of the company the acceptance of a union security and check-off clause in the agreement. The company defiantly rejected this legitimate demand. After prolonged negotiations the government set up a Conciliation Board. The Board recommended in favour of the union but the company recklessly rejected the recommendation of a government appointed Conciliation Board. Unfortunately, the union leadership could not resist

The Company was aware that the mood of workers may lead to stoppage of work in this most essential munitions plant. Furthermore, the company was aware of the fact that if work should stop in that vital plant masses were allowed to cool ... at the plant ... of commission for many, many weeks. Yet the management retained its defiant attitude and refused to act on the recommendations of a government appointed conciliation Board.

January 17th, 1943 -- The Ionkin Conciliation Board of Labour sent in a special report entitled "Strike Ties Up Company" but the Company remained adamant in its refusal to accept the decision of the Board.

Only the patriotism of the workers and their responsibility as soldiers of production finally led them to the decision not to use their organizational strength, not to strike even though they legally could do so, not to disrupt essential war work which the company was prepared to permit and they signed an agreement with ... receiving what they set out to achieve, what they ... to enforce, what they were democratically entitled to but which the company refused to grant peacefully

Name and Fact No. 6. Hall & Ritchie.

The employees of that key ... in the ... City, members of a Canadian Congress of Labour ... the company the acceptance of a union security ... in the agreement. The company defiantly rejected this reasonable demand. After prolonged negotiations the ... set up a Conciliation Board. The Board ... in favour of the union but the company ... the recommendation of a government appointed ... Board. Unfortunately, the union leadership ... not ...

the pressure of the shipyard workers, and the company's provocative actions led to the regrettable strike in the Halifax shipyards.

Name and Fact No. 7: Imperial Optical Company.

The employees of this firm are members of the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers Union.

July 1st, 1944 - Union approached management of that company with the request to open negotiations but found management most uncooperative.

July 20th, 1944 - Union asked management to agree to a mutually consented vote. Company refused that request.

July 27th, 1944 - Union applied for certification to the Ontario Labour Relations Board.

July 28th, 1944 - The O.L.R.B. posted its notice.

August 9th, 1944 - Company filed affidavit stating union did not represent majority.

September 20th, 1944 - O.L.R.B. ordered hearing for October 2nd.

October 25th, 1944 - Union officially certified by O.L.R.B.

Company refused to meet with bargaining committee until November 22nd, 1944, just three days prior to the thirty-day period provided by P.C. 1003.

Throughout negotiations since then, company blocked every attempt to arrive at agreement.

January 2nd, 1945 - Union applied for permission to prosecute company for violation of section 10(2) of schedule A of the Labour Relations Act.

January 18th, 1945 - Company replied to union's application for permission to prosecute by giving verbal agreement to negotiate in good faith.

Union leadership had to exercise maximum restraint

the pressure of the employed workers and the conservative provocative position led to the regrettable strike in Halifax earlier.

Wire and Face Nos. [illegible] Imperial Oil [illegible] company, the employees [illegible] United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers [illegible].

July 1st, 1944 - Union [illegible] that company with the request to open negotiations [illegible] found management most uncooperative.

July 20th, 1944 - Union asked [illegible] to a mutually consented vote. Company [illegible] that request.

July 27th, 1944 - Union applies for certification to the Ontario Labour Relations Board.

July 28th, 1944 - The [illegible] posted [illegible].

August 9th, 1944 - Company [illegible] affidavit stating union did not represent majority.

September 20th, 1944 - O.L.R.B. orders meeting for October 2nd.

October 25th, 1944 - Union [illegible] certified by O.L.R.B.

Company refused to meet with [illegible] until November 22nd, 1944, [illegible] three days [illegible] thirty-day period provided by [illegible].

Throughout negotiations [illegible] every attempt to arrive at agreement.

January 2nd, 1945 - Union [illegible] prosecute company for violation [illegible] of the Labour Relations Act.

January 18th, 1945 - [illegible] application for permission [illegible] to negotiate in good faith.

Union representatives [illegible]

upon workers to prevent tie-up in production of essential war material in face of company's obstructionism and violation of the spirit of the Labour Relations Act.

Agreement has not yet been achieved.

I do not wish to burden the House any longer with additional "names and facts." Unfortunately I must admit that I can provide this House and the Globe and Mail with many additional "names and facts," similar to those I have mentioned. In presenting them I am not trying to make a case against our Ontario Labour Relations Board. I am simply proceeding to prove the correctness of the charges and I know that there are hon. members on the Opposition side who could add many, many more examples and perhaps more striking illustrations of the kind of obstructionism and violation of the spirit of the Act that has been mentioned, with which the labour movement has to contend. I have taken the time of the House in order to provide the Globe and Mail with the "names and facts" they asked for, and in so doing I hope that it will lead to a swifter realization of the need for immediate action from our federal government to amend P.C. 1003 and from our provincial government to enact an effective provincial Labour Code in the shortest possible time.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the following:

Report of the Department of Labour for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1944.

Report of the Department of Public Works, for the twelve months ending 31st March, 1944.

Annual Report upon the Prisons and Reformatories for the year ending 31st March, 1944.

Report of the Distribution of the Sessional Statutes of Ontario, 1944.

Annual Report upon the Ontario Training Schools for the year ending March 31st, 1944.

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements of the Royal Ontario Museum for the year ending June 30th, 1944.

MR. DREW: Order No. 3.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resuming adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for the consideration of the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the Session.

MR. ROSS A. McEWING (Wellington North): Mr. Speaker and hon. members of the House, in rising to participate in the debate on the Speech from the Throne I shall follow the time-honoured custom of congratulating the mover and the seconder of the motion for the consideration of the Throne Speech. I have a particular pleasure in doing so because I am personally acquainted with them both, particularly the mover, the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Martin). I do not think the Government could have chosen two men who are more popular and better liked by the members on this side of the House. I happened to sit on the other side of the House, geographically speaking, and became well acquainted with the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk and I found that regardless of our political leanings he as well as other hon. members opposite are members with whom I have something in common.

I wish to express my sympathy to the hon. member over the loss of his son overseas. It is difficult to find words, Mr. Speaker, on such an occasion. It is only those who have drunk the bitter cup to the dregs, who have lost their only son themselves, who can fully appreciate the loss

he has sustained. My prayer would be that his sacrifice has not been in vain.

I also sat last session quite close to the seconder of the motion, the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Scott), and was with him for a considerable time last fall. We, too, have become well acquainted. I congratulate him upon the speech he delivered and upon the theme of his address. I agree entirely with many of the things he said. I am only sorry that his opinions do not seem to have influenced the leaders of his party; at least they have fallen on deaf ears so far.

I agree whole-heartedly with the point which the hon. member for Peterborough made that we should get down to the business of this House and not waste so much time in dickering when there are so many matters of importance to attend to. I wish you would convey that thought to his federal leader as well as to his provincial leader, for after all we must admit that Mr. John Bracken, his federal leader, has developed the earmarks of a nazi propaganda agent in his attempt to play politics in recent months. Regardless of the mistakes that may have been made by any government during wartime, and there are bound to be some, it does not help our cause and the cause of our allies to be airing to the nazi countries any weaknesses that we might happen to find in our own conduct of the war. We want to finish the war as quickly as we can --

MR. DREW: I interrupt because I think it is my duty to do so, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is discussing something that is entirely outside of this chamber. I would only point out that the man to whom he is referring in such a contemptible way has three sons overseas.

MR. McEWING: It does not alter the fact nevertheless.

MR. DREW: It just marks you for what you are.

MR. McEWING: That is the kind of thing with which the Premier of the province of Ontario opened the debates of this House. He has lowered its tone more than any other man. He is the man who started this sort of thing, and I am glad that many hon. members have not followed his lead. I was disappointed with the Premier because I expected something better from him.

I still maintain what I said a moment ago, that anybody who spreads propaganda that is of advantage to the hostile nations who are opposing us in this war is doing an injury to the cause of Canada and of the allies.

Last year, as I have said, I sat on the other side of the House, geographically speaking. I have been moved over to this side this session. I had no choice in the matter one way or the other, but I must say that I did enjoy the associations of those sitting over there. There are some fine fellows amongst them, and I had hoped that we would develop a cooperative atmosphere in our political life, which this present government had the opportunity to do, working for the benefit of the country instead of for the benefit of a political party. If the government had followed that course they would still have the cooperation of many members of the House. But I find it difficult to cooperate with those who do not want to cooperate with you. It is hard to cooperate with a neighbour even if he does not want to cooperate with you. If you work with him one day and the next day he stabs you in the back, it is difficult to go back to him, and that is practically what we have been having here. The Government had the opportunity because many members of the House were anxious to cooperate, but it is evident that we are going to fall

back into the old system of political patronage and what is best for the party, instead of what is best for the country.

I am not condemning all the Ministers in this Government by any means because some have conducted themselves in a manner with which I could find no fault whatsoever. They have been gentlemen and have treated me fairly, but I cannot say that of all of them, because when you go back home and find that a number of officials who have been giving good service have been dismissed, you just wonder what is going on.

The announcement was made by the Premier that no dismissals of civil servants except for inefficiency would take place. Well, it is not hard sometimes to find some little excuse for dismissing a man, and I will give the House an example of one excuse.

There is a man who has been acting as an official in my riding. He was appointed on the recommendation of the Veterans' League. One of the political bosses on the Government side visited this man's place one day and started a discussion with him and made some disparaging remarks about me. The official defended me. He said that he believed I was going ahead all right and representing the people. A few days later he got word that his services were no longer required. He is a returned veteran. He has two sons and a daughter in the army. But he was dismissed because he expressed his approval of me as a member.

MR. DREW: Will the hon.member give the names?

MR. McEWING: I shall be glad to give the names.

MR. DREW: Will the hon. member give them now, please? What is the name of the official?

MR. McEWING: Mr. Thomas Hutchinson, of Harrison,

back into the [illegible]

be [illegible] to [illegible]

[illegible]

Government by any [illegible]

serves in a [illegible]

soever. [illegible]

fairly, but I [illegible]

when you go to [illegible]

who have been [illegible]

you just [illegible]

The [illegible]

no claims [illegible]

would take [illegible]

find some little [illegible]

give the [illegible]

There is [illegible]

official in the [illegible]

membership of the Veterans' [illegible]

possess in the Government [illegible]

one day and [illegible]

disparaging remarks [illegible]

me. He said that he [illegible]

and representative [illegible]

that his services [illegible]

turned veteran. He [illegible]

army. But [illegible]

approval of me [illegible]

MR. [illegible]

MR. [illegible]

THE [illegible]

please? [illegible]

MR. [illegible]

Examiner for Drivers' Permits. The Premier smiles and may think it does not amount to much, but it just shows the kind of small potatoes that is being indulged in. There are a lot of other cases too. This is not the only one by any means. I think you could find similar cases all over the province. Some members of the cabinet have not been guilty of that at all; some of themhave played the game. I do not want to name different members of the cabinet because if I started to do so it might only result in confusion for there are so many George's in the cabinet -- George 1, George 2, George 3, George 4, George 5, even the new Liquor Commissioner is a Geroge, I believe. His initials are Wm. G. Would not "G" stand for George?

MR. WEBSTER: No.

MR. McEWING: Had the Speaker of the House been named George he might have found a place in the cabinet.

Mr. MacLEOD: George III is in the right place.

MR. McEWING: There are other George's who are not in the cabinet, but there are rumours going around that the other George outside sometimes sits in the cabinet meeting, and I would advise any of you fellows who want to get into the cabinet to be sure you have the name George.

I am not going to go over all the pledges which the Government made when they were seeking office, but I am going to say why I am not enthusiastic about supporting the Government as I did last year. I will give some reasons. The main reason is this: It is because of the way agriculture has been dealt with in this province. I represent an agricultural riding and I think I can speak for agriculture. I think I know something about it.

First and foremost let me say that we are all glad to see the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy)

back in the House. I have no wish to say anything disrespectful of him because I have the highest regard for him. He is a splendid man. But I do say that the Government loaded him down with a lot of pre-election promises which they should not have made. It was impossible for a man in his condition of health to attempt to carry them out, and I will show why.

Any remarks I make on this subject are not directed to the Minister of Agriculture personally in any way whatever. But during the last election campaign we heard a good deal about the 22 Points. I shall not deal with them all but certainly they have not all been carried out, unless in the way suggested by the Attorney General at a meeting not long ago when he said, "We have at least implemented the spirit of the promises." Just what that means, whether the shadow or the real thing, I do not know. Certainly the Government have not gone all of the way in implementing their promises.

MR. MacLEOD: That was the Minister without Portfolio that he was talking about.

MR. McEWING: I shall deal with only two or three points and not touch upon those promises which have not been fulfilled at all, despite the statements we hear about them having been fulfilled. We have been told lots of times that many of the promises have been fulfilled, and we have had a lot of "dares" thrown at us by some of the Ministers, daring us to do this or that.

I should like to deal with Point 4, which provides for the setting up of committees of outstanding farmers in each county with authority to plan production and promote the processing and distribution of farm products; to take over all stock yards and operate them as a publicly-owned

enterprise so that speculation and manipulation may be stopped and fair prices assured to producer and consumer. I do not know of any point that appealed more strongly than that to rural Ontario unless it was the Government's pledge to assume fifty per cent of the educational costs.

One of these committees was set up in the county of Wellington. I think it was the second committee in Ontario. Peel county had the first, I believe. That was some time ago. The committee in Wellington county has met once and organized and they do not know what it is all about. They are going to have another meeting -- they decided to meet every three months -- to try to find out what it is all about. All they know is this, that the Premier came back from England and told us lovely stories of how agricultural production had been increased in England. Even Beverley Baxter made the statement recently that we were several times ahead of England in the way of using machinery in agriculture. I had a man who came from the old country, worked for me six or seven years ago, and he was amazed at what I asked him to do. He said of one particular job that it took three men to do it in England. We were going to haul in, and he said that in England they would go out with a cart and if the load was too big they would hitch up another horse ahead and one man would be required to drive that, and another man to drive the second horse, three men altogether to do the job. So it is certainly time they organized their agriculture to get increased production. It was necessary for them to reorganize their methods to catch up with the pace at which we are travelling.

In Ontario we produce more in the way of foodstuffs than they do in England. Every man here is doing

everything he can to produce as much as he can.

The men on these committees know that they cannot go out and tell the farmers very much on how to produce more. The setting up of these committees has not been of much value. I believe that half of Ontario has set up these committees, but if they have not done more than the committee with whose work I am familiar, I can only say that it has been a great waste of time and money to set up these committees.

We have had an agricultural commission of inquiry, and we would like to digest their report to find out if there is any meat in it. I hope it contains something about marketing, for that is sadly needed. If it does not, the report will be a disappointment to me.

We also had an agricultural committee of this House which served a very useful purpose. I could give some examples of what that committee accomplished. What has become of it, under a government that is going to do everything for agriculture? Why have we not heard of it this year? It met once or twice last year but it has not met at all this year. There has been so much talk of what the Government is going to do for agriculture, but actually there is not a thing being done. I could bring to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture many things that ought to be done.

The latter part of Point 4 of the 22 Points deals with the stockyards. A lot of people thought at that time that when the stockyards were taken over, that it would solve all our problems in the marketing of our livestock. ~~there would be increased price for live stock~~. But talk to the men who are dealing in live stock to-day if you want to find out the facts. I believe it was in July that the Government took over the operation of the stockyards. Financially

[illegible] ever [illegible] me [illegible] introduce [illegible] is [illegible].

The [illegible] these [illegible] [illegible] go out and tell the farmer [illegible] how to produce [illegible] The setting up of these committees [illegible] seem of much value. I believe that [illegible] has set up these committees, but it they have [illegible] more [illegible] the committee with whose work I am [illegible], I can say that it has been a great waste [illegible] and money to set up these committees.

We have [illegible] [illegible] and we would like [illegible] to know if there is any [illegible] [illegible] keting, for that is an [illegible]. In [illegible], the report will be disappointing [illegible].

We also [illegible] [illegible] committee [illegible] House which served a very [illegible] purpose. I could give some examples of what [illegible] accomplished. What has become of it, under a government [illegible] is going to do everything for [illegible]? Why [illegible] not [illegible] this year? It met once or twice [illegible] but it has not met at all this year. There [illegible] [illegible] the government is going to do [illegible], but [illegible] there is not a thing [illegible] attention of the Minister of [illegible] [illegible] one to be done.

The latter part [illegible] with the stockyards. [illegible] that when the stockyards [illegible] increased price [illegible] are dealing in live [illegible] the facts. I believe in [illegible] government took over the [illegible] [illegible] Eleanorsville

problems in the meantime

they took them over in the fall at a price that was settled, I believe, by arbitration, and it took some time.

(Page 1385 follows)

This was a company which has been operating for quite a while. Not so very long ago I know of some stock that changed hands at $70.00 a share, but once the Government proceeded to take it over, and the lawyers began to work on it, it was finally settled at $133.00 a share. That was something that I think certainly could have been bought for $100.00 or less, but the public money was spent at the rate of $133.00 a share. Well, what did it do? We have not heard anything about what it has done. Has anybody visited the stockyards? Has any member of the cabinet been in the stockyards since it was taken over?

MR. DOUCETT: I have been there.

MR. McEWING: Then you can vouch for what I tell you. I understood when it was being taken over, and a price was arrived at, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr.Kennedy) said they were going to form a stock company, to finance this, and the Government would back the bonds, but evidently he thought the Government was so rich that a little later on they decided they would not do that, but that the province should pay for it. So it was paid for and purchased.

Now then, we have got the stock yards. The thing is this; have they helped the farmers? I say emphatically no, and I will try to explain to you why. Were the ~~seeds~~ any fees less? Hay at $36.00 a ton, and the farmer gets $12.00 or $14.00 for a Government owned affair, and then is charged $36.00 a ton. Have they removed speculation? No. Have they removed manipulation? No, they have not. It has resulted in a good deal of confusion. I have visited the yards several times, and have talked to many who have been

This was a company [illegible] quite a while. Not so [illegible] stock that changed [illegible] the Government proceed[illegible] began to work on it, [illegible] share. That was something [illegible] have been bought for [illegible] money was spent [illegible] what did it do? We have [illegible] has done. Has anybody [illegible] member of the cabinet [illegible] taken over?

MR. [illegible]:

MR. McF[illegible]: [illegible] you. I understood [illegible] price was arrived at, [illegible] (Mr.Kennedy) said they were [illegible] to finance this, and the Government [illegible] but evidently he thought [illegible] a little later on they decided they [illegible] that the province should [illegible] and purchased.

Now then, we are [illegible] this; have they helped [illegible] and I will try to explain [illegible] lease? Hay at $[illegible].00 a ton, [illegible] $14.00 for a Government [illegible] $36.00 a ton. Have the [illegible] they removed manufacturers [illegible] resulted in a [illegible] yards several times [illegible]

there for years, and it certainly has not done that. Conditions were never as bad since these stockyards became a yard of major importance, as they have been since the Government took them over.

In regard to the condition of the yards, and the manner of handling the stock; the Government says, "Well, we appointed a Board, and they are doing the best they can." Well, the Chairman of the Board was appointed and sent over by the Chicago stockyards, and he is still there, acting as Chairman.

They have made some regulations last fall in an attempt to control the markets which have failed. Now, I will try to explain some of these things.

Ordinarily there is about 70 percent of our good calves going direct to the packing houses, and in all these reports which come out about the number of cattle which have arrived at the yards, none of them contains the number which have gone to the plants. I would like to draw the attention of the Department of Agriculture and of those interested, that these reports should contain the number of cattle consigned to the plants, as well as to the yards, and then the farmer will know what has really been the supply. All he knows now is what arrives at the yards; but there are about 75 percent of the good cattle going to the packing plants, so there is a lack of knowledge of what the supply really is.

The stockyards Board decided to have regulations last fall, so that everything would go through the yards, and they would have some knowledge of it, and there would be some competition, and they would know what was going on.

Well, that was very good. While that regulation was in order, fifty percent of the good cattle still went through without being sold in the yards, and without any competition whatever, notwithstanding that regulation. It just simply means that they were sent in and were consigned to a pen -- at the expense of the farmer -- and the farmer had to pay the yardage, had to pay a commission farm $36.00 a ton for hay, until the packer was ready to take them over and kill them, and if any of them died of the fever in the meantime, the farmers lost them, not the packers. When they got home, they had to pay their feed bills, and perhaps had some dead animals on their hands.

There was a regulation which said that all cattle which came in first must be sold. I know, Mr. Speaker, there was cattle in there, with thousands of head in the yards, and some of them had been there for three weeks, yet these cattle came in and went right through and went to the packing plant. They had an arrangement, notwithstanding the regulations. That shows you how the regulations certainly do not work, and were of no advantage to the farmer.

Now then, what was the result? The result was they ran in on Monday all the cattle they could. Then the order was, "No more this week," and the farmers were taking cattle in there on Mondays which they would not have taken in until Wednesday, and if there was a run, he would not have got in, so he slipped in on Monday, or he would not be able to get in at all. He had to pay the feed bills, and take a chance on sickness. The result was that as much as 11,000 cattle came in on Monday mornings, and it also resulted in the fact that there were cattle

standing in the yard four weeks, and I have talked recently to one of the commission farms, and on that day they had weighed over the scales 120 head of cattle that had been in there over three weeks, and they had to pay for the feed; they had to pay for the shrink and the loss on the dead animals, and there never was as heavy a mortality of deaths as last year.

Hundreds of head died. This farm alone lost 130 head, and so far the Government has not compensated the farmer; the farmer has to take the loss.

There was another commission farm which had 70 head go over the scale, which had been there for three weeks. Do you think cattle can stand in yards for three weeks without shrinking? Does anybody know about the conditions those yards are in? On the last Monday in February the conditions were so bad that gates would not go shut, and the boys who driving the cattle down the alleys had to climb along the fences to drive them down. That is a fact. And cattle which come out of stables such as they are kept in now -- do you think they can go into that filth and dirt for weeks, and lie around there for two or three weeks and then be sold to advantage? I think it is a disgrace for any government, the conditions the stockyards are in here in Toronto. If I operated my stable that way, the Humane Society would have me up in court, and I think the magistrate in our county would likely send me to jail. There is one fellow -- and I can use his name -- who said, "I have been there for years and never have seen conditions like this."

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Provincial Treasurer): May I ask the speaker a question? Is not Mr. Scott, the head of

the United Farmers' Co-operative Company on that Board, and is not the Board entirely composed of farmers?

MR. HARRY C. NIXON (Brant): If the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) would answer the questions on the order paper, we would know who is on the Board.

MR. FROST: Well, it is all over Ontario. There is a Board of farmers, and the head of the United Farmers' Co-operative Company is on it, and I think the hon. member from Gray is on that Board, and if there is negligence -- well, I think it is ridiculous.

MR. McEWING: That does not alter the situation; how many men are there on the Board?

MR. FROST: Go down and ask Mr. Scott, he will tell you. He is one --

MR. McEWING: I do not have to ask him. I know about it. This is owned and controlled by the Government.

MR. FROST: It is run by the farmers of Ontario themselves.

MR. McEWING: That is a way to shove it off on the farmers of Ontario.

MR. FROST: All right, you are shoving it off, yourself.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): They cannot "take it"; they cannot "take it."

MR. McEWING: You have not been down at the yard. Some of those fellows have said, "If we had some of those Cabinet Ministers here, we would show them something."

MR. MacLEOD: They probably would not get out of the stockyards.

MR. McEWING: Will you name the Board? The question is on the order sheet, and we have not got an answer yet.

Are you unable to find out who they are, or what is the trouble? I would ask the hon. member this; is the Chairman of that Board a naturalized Canadian citizen, or an American citizen? You find that out.

MR. A. A. CASSELMAN (Nipissing): That is the sixty-four-dollar question.

MR. FRED W. WARREN (Hamilton-Wentworth): This is getting to look like a Quiz program.

MR. McEWING: Now, the manipulation of the market: that was the thing they were going to remove, and that is the most serious thing we are up against, that is, the manipulation of the market, and there is not one thing done to prevent the manipulation by this Government. Things exist and continue as they did before. If you doubt of their existence, you have only to take the evidence that was given by the Price Spread Committee, which was taken under oath. I gave some extracts to the hon. members of this house last year, but no doubt they have forgotten them, and I can give them again. Under oath, these men who worked for the plants, former employees of the Canada Packers -- said that they and representatives of the other packers got together and decided on the price of beef. Has the Government done anything to stop that? No. Still the same manipulation goes on. All you have to do is to talk to some of the drovers and some of the farmers who go there. Conditions are worse than they have ever been, and that is backed up by men who have been there, for thirty years. ~~these~~. I think until something is done, that will remove that manipulistic control -- these large interests, packing firms have control of the beef and bacon and mutton, and are trying desperately hard to get control of the poultry

and ~~poultry~~ dairy products, and when they do, what has the farmer got left? They will squeeze him until he is pretty near choked, and then slacken up, and let him have his wind again. That is the way this Government is attempting to assist the farmers.

MR. FROST: You were in power for nine years, and what did you do about it? Nothing. Not one thing.

MR. McEWING: We did many things. But you were elected definitely on that plank to do ~~it~~ this and you have not carried it out, I am pointing out, and the excuse that the other Government did not do it, is no excuse at all, any more than the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Dunbar) the other day said, "You are there and we are here, because your Prime Minister said it before." It is adopting the same thing, and it does not mean anything.

MR. SPEAKER: May I respectfully remind the House that we are in Session, and not in Committee.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Now, Mr. Speaker, since my name has been drawn into this, I would like to ask the hon. member (Mr. McEwing) to go easy, because I am afraid that powerful speech he is making, when it goes to the country, is going to defeat the Government.

MR. NIXON: Nothing surer in the world.

MR. McEWING: I think you made a speech in Windsor the other day -- you spoke about making a speech some place and getting fine publicity. I think you made a speech in Windsor, and the publicity was not so good.

MR. DUNBAR: Was it not?

MR. McEWING: No, forty people got up and walked out.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): All of his speeches are about his other speeches.

MR. DUNBAR: Seeing you are getting a little dirty, would you like me to reply to that?

MR. SPEAKER: I must respectfully ask the hon. members to address their questions through the Speaker, and let us get back to an orderly procedure.

MR. DUNBAR: I want him to make a statement about the speech. I have never said anything in this province I am ashamed of, but you make a statement.

MR. McEWING: The only way --

MR. DUNBAR: Go on; have the courage of your convictions.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Clear the decks for action.

MR. McEWING: Here is another point I am going to deal with --

MR. DUNBAR: You have not made a point yet.

MR. McEWING: The hon. Minister said the other day the points are boomerangs. Now, I will deal with point No. 19. Over there is a saying, "Let George do it" -- I think it should be --

HON. LESLIE G. THOMPSON (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing) a question?

MR. SPEAKER: If he cares to answer it at this time. Does the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing) care to answer a question?

MR. McEWING: Yes, I will try to.

MR. THOMPSON: The question is this: the hon.member for north Wellington (Mr.McEwing) has spoken to manipulations of the market. Is it right or is it wrong that the Federal Government has a ceiling on beef prices, and a floor? Do they mean anything or not?

MR. McEWING: I will answer that; those regulations were there when you fellows made the promises, the same as what I am going to point out right now.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, the question is still unanswered.

MR. JOSEPH B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Lots of questions are unanswered in this House.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Acting Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to interrupt the speaker, but if he would like to answer, I would like to ask him a question. He made a statement about which I was very concerned, in that I am the Acting Minister of Agriculture. He said to the hon. gentleman for Victoria (Mr. Frost) that the Deputy Minister was not a Canadian citizen --

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. DOUCETT: That is what he said.

MR. NIXON: He said the Chairman of the stockyards Board.

MR. SPEAKER: I think he addressed the question with regard to the Chairman of the stockyards Board.

MR. McEWING: You see, you are not listening.

The other point I was coming to was point No.19 which says -- and I think I have it here some place --

> "To assure the public an adequate supply of fuel, milk and other necessities."

and that interested agriculture quite a bit, and I will

explain why. We have a situation, and it seems to be general in Ontario, where the fuel for brooder houses is almost impossible to obtain. I know that Government men say, "Well, that is under Federal control." Well, it was just as much under the Federal control in 1943, when you made wonderful promise, and it means about as much now as it did then, however you like to take it.

Here is the situation; there is no hard coal for brooder houses and chicks. There is a great industry up there with regard to poultry, and in the beginning of the year when those people want to order their chicks they have no assurance, particularly with regard to coal. They ordered their chicks on the understanding, "If we do not get coal, we will not take out chicks." Some of these chick hatcheries were a month late getting started.

The coal which was supposed to come through was countermanded, I understand, by the United States Government, and the Fuel Controller in Canada substituted a portion of chestnut coal from domestic use, replacing with coke for ~~for a chestnut coal for domestic use, coke from our own~~ our own domestic sources. ~~domestic sources.~~

Now, what has happened? The coal ~~coke~~ is not going out to the outlying places. It is not going out to the rural sections. Now, you say, "There is nothing to it." Well, if there is nothing to it, why did the hon. member from St. David (Mr. Dennison) have to make a motion that a Fuel Controller be appointed up there, and why has nothing been done? The hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Dunbar) laughs, as if it does not mean anything. I will tell you what it means. I talked to a chick hatchery operator over the week-end, and he told me that thousands of his chicks have been gassed, because they have not got the coal. ~~coke~~.

MR. DUNBAR: I was not even looking at you, I was looking at the Speaker when I smiled. Do not get such a high opinion of yourself, and think that everybody is looking at you.

MR. McEWING: The Ministry in Britain has asked that the production of eggs be advanced a month earlier. How on earth can that be done with production being cut down 25 percent, and this Government taking no action?

MR. FROST: Use electricity.

MR. McEWING: You cannot use electricity when you have not got it. Everybody is not wired up.

MR. STANLEY L. HALL (Halton): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to ask the speaker a question, but for information only, I would like to say, do not blame this Government for not obtaining coal. I have been a coal dealer for five years, and I will defy any hon. member of this House to say there was ever a brooder house in this province which has suffered for lack of coal.

(Page 1396 follows)

EE-1 MR. HALL: I would also say this: Do not blame the Federal Parliament for that.

MR. McEWING: I think you are quite right.

THE SPEAKER: I am going to ask the members to follow the rule of sense, one speaker at a time.

MR. McEWING: I won't delay you very long. There is one more thing I would like to deal with and it is that of Lands and Forests. I have nothing to say about this George; he is a native of my own riding and I think he is trying to do a good job, and I want to commend him on what he has done. I asked last year that some steps be taken to allow the rural ~~neighbouring~~ municipalities to re-forest small areas ~~of bush~~ for reforestration, to set aside small area of land for that purpose. Before they were not able to do it. Now, he has arranged that and passing legislation to enable municipalities to do it. I wish to express appreciation for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Thompson) for having done it.

Following that I would ask that something be done in regard to the destruction of bushes in older Ontario. We have a situation where lumber companies come in and they will buy a farm and cut the whole bush off. One half of the bush is good growing stuff - it has 25 or 30 years of growth, but they are just cutting it right off, destroying the whole thing, and then the municipality comes along and asks a man to reforest. How can you get a man to reforest alongside a farm on which they have cut everything down. Now, it may take a little while and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that people take this thing serious enough that they will in time pass legislation and people be conscious of it, so that [illegible] the proper sized stuff according to the kind and density

of the forest be thinned out and the rest be left as good timber. We will be years ahead and it will be very valuable for the future. Now, I hope you are as successful at that another year or so, Mr. Minister, as you were with the other request.

I have a word or too Mr. Speaker, in regard to our postwar period, dealing with Farm Labour and industry. I am becoming thoroughly convinced that farm labour and industry has got to sit down at the table together and solve this postwar period problem. We cannot no longer shut the door and say "Labour, you stay out," nor labour can no longer shut its eyes and say "do as you please, we are going ahead." Labour is about two jumps ahead of agriculture and I asked them last year to wait a little until we caught up. I still think it is the fact. Farms cannot produce and get their share of the national income if the hours are going to be as short as they are and holidays as long as they are and pay for them all. Agriculture under present conditions won't stand it, and we must get together and sit down and agree on this thing. I am more convinced than ever it is going to be necessary to do that. There are a lot of things that we did not see a few years ago we are going to have to,and it is up to this Legislature to do it and I would appeal to labour and C.C.F. group that is here for to have patience and sit down and solve this problem agreeably. It can never be by strikes. It can never be solved by throwing mud at one another. We are going to all live here and we want to make this a better Canada and I hope I can meet the Honourable Provincial Secretary (Mr. Dunbar) and sit down and have a meal together sometime and talk this thing over. I have

not any animosity. I do not wish to say any degrading remarks about anybody individually and I hope I have not as far as that is concerned.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LESLIE HANCOCK (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I note with pleasure that it has been my privilege to follow my colleague from North Wellington (Mr. McEwing) this year the same as last year. We have so far had a very pleasant relationship in the Wellingtons and I trust they will continue.

In extending the usual congratulations to the mover and seconder of the reply to the Speech from the Throne I must say in congratulating the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr.Martin) that it is a source of amazement to me how such a courteous pleasant and liberal minded gentleman can belong to such a party. Also in regard to the Hon. member for Peterborough (Mr.Scott) He certainly intrigued me, with his guileless desire for a new social order without changing anything, is certainly quite an idea. He must have been one of the original Port Hopers, so naive was his picture of a Utopia without any socialism in it.

And the other speaker, I would like to say in regard to the Hon. Lady member for York East (Miss Macphail) I wish I had her poise and her ability to speak. Anything that I have has come to me the hard way. I am not naturally a speaker and I certainly find it difficult - you may not think it right now - to stand up and address this gathering.

I wish that the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) was in his seat because I had some rather pertinent remarks to make about him. Whatever other opinions the hon. members

may have in regard to the Liberal leader (Mr. Hepburn) I think we can all agree that he is a very entertaining speaker. I noticed he received considerable criticism for his party's record in regard to the Lakeview reliefees. Though I am not in any respect wishing to call up old grudges I could not but sit in silent shame when I remembered that as a citizen of Toronto township how bitter those experiences were to us, when we struggled to get a works programme for these reliefees, and they themselves wanted a works programme but could not get it. I cannot,however, concur with hon. members opposite in dwelling too much on the past. I was never one to be fond of post mortems and, Mr. Speaker, I might say we have noticed at least two of the hon. members opposite have confessed that they have been sinners,and I - well, I always can warm up to sinners and particularly repentant sinners, much more than I can to those who stand with their eyes cast to the heavens and say "I thank Thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, liars, communists, or even as this Hepburn.

I think perhaps, Mr. Speaker, to be serious that we should in this time of dynamic change realize the tremendous responsibility and privilege that is ours of being members of this Legislature. This Legislature, to those of us who have come in more or less fresh, is one which does not legislate exactly as thought it would. We found that the ministers are the legislators, and that the opposition has the onus of pulling their programmes to pieces and it is a sort of show put on for the benefit of the public. Now, if we of the opposition were a team I think we could put on a much better show than we have had so far,but because we

are divided, why, we are all at cross purposes. Truly Shakespeare was right when he said

> "All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players. They have their exits and their entrances and one man in his time plays many parts."

HON. MEMBERS: So we see.

MR. HANCOCK: That is all right. May be you will see what happens.

Now, this Legislature is also like a shooting gallery. The government brings out these targets, and the rest of us all take pot shots at the target and very few of the members get bulls eyes; most of us a little wide of the mark. Might as well be frank, we get about one out of four that really makes a centre shot. We notice also that the Legislature is something like a cockpit, and you know each old party at the game throw in their favourite bird into the ring and the rest of us sit around breathless to see which of the two are going to be the first to draw blood.

All of which, Mr. Speaker, is aside from the real subject of the debate.

Now, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has dealt very exhaustively with the government's programme. I would like to deal with some of the departments.

I noticed that last year the Speech from the Throne was a statement of what the government intended to do. This year it was more or less a compilation of the reports of departments - what the department had done or what they thought they had done. The hon. the Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) quipped me the other day

quipped me the other day about pious declarations. Well, Mr. Speaker, on my reading the Speech from the Throne I thought it was full of pious declarations from one end to the other. There was nothing there that you get your teeth into and so in reply to the said speech and in dealing with the departments I must bring forward those particular points which I am anxious to impress upon the House.

First, I would like to speak about welfare. This department is very important to one who represents a mixed riding, and I must say that our attitude towards the department of Welfare is one of more hand- outs to those who are unfortunate enough to rely upon the department. By comparison with the incomes of salaried persons I would say that this Department - at least under its present set-up - might be better called the Illfare Department. It is beyond comprehension to me how we can be so mean towards people who are unfortunate enough not to be able to earn their own living, who, through age or other reasons, find themselves upon the state. We can and we do build our rate of remuneration or our rate of compensation upon an actuarial basis apparently. That is, we determine just how much in cents, in dollars, how much in cents it will take to keep a man alive or a woman alive for one month. Now this, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is not a very generous attitude for the State to take. I will give you the figures of an old couple in Guelph who are unfortunately on relief - not quite seventy, cannot qualify for the old-age pension; the man is almost totally crippled with arthritis. It is not a family; it is a man and his wife. They get each for food $9,57 per

month. This is for the month of October last. For coal they got $4.20, and for Clothes, each of the old folks, imagine, gets 65¢ per month, and Light is figured at 50¢ per month, and rent is $7. per month. Now, there is nothing they are allowed - nothing as far as I can gather - for depreciation of furniture, nothing for towels, soap or bedding. As they go along and the stove wears out and the chairs wear out they either do not get any more, or they have to figure any way at all. I do not know how they do it but this couple who gave me these figures have very little left in the house, and with tears in their eyes they told me how they had to part with their last piece. Now, I submit there should be something for a magazine, something for a show. Surely, the old folks because they are in this situation should not be denied shows when the children and boys are getting all the shows they want. There is not anything left and it seems to me if we have made an actuarial computation for $9.57 for food - we think in terms of salaries - $2,500, $3,000, $4,000, $8,000 or $10,000 but in this matter why cannot we say either $10 or $12 or $15. Let us fix on some figure like that, but set it at some point actually above the actuarial figuring and then there would be a slight margin for these old people.

Now, in speaking of welfare, I might say that I consider the whole field of social service needs a complete revision. I made the suggestion to the Minister of Welfare (Mr. Vivian) in a letter that we should do that in regard to these things in thinking out that this would solve the situation possibly where a person needed government help, but could not qualify under any one department, so that they

either fell to the wayside or if we had a capable department they would be properly cared for. I made the suggestion if we had a Minister of Social Service with officers in each municipality that they could determine- - for instance, take a man who was unable to work because of injury, a certain proportion of his keep to go to the Workmen's Compensation. Any balance that is necessary to bring his income up to a human standard of living could be charged to other departments, to the municipality or the like. You all have had the experience, as I have, that there is a lack of complete information between the various departments and they do not know exactly where they stand unless the people give the information.

Now, since I am speaking of social services and the need for social service minister might I say that I cannot concur in the Government's attitude on the question of family allowance, that they should be held over until we have reviewed the whole field. We could set up our social services department at once and the family allowances should not be obstructed because that department is not set up. It could be later assumed by arrangement with the Dominion Government in the years to come. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we have heard the last of this opposition to the Family Allowance Act. It would appear that the dragon who would devour the children's portion has been slain and that any further obstruction to it exists only as an illusion in the mind of the Prime Minister. I find, in looking over the literature in regard to this obstruction, at least 22 reasons why we should uphold this Legislation and I submit Mr. Speaker, that none of those reasons were the real reasons.

None of those reasons were the real reasons why the present government opposed the legislation. I will give you the reason in my opinion. Their reason for opposing this legislation is that if the general level of social security is raised, it can only be done at the expense of the abnormally privileged. Another fear is this: that if we get such a general level of well being throughout the country there will be less point in living on one's investments. No purpose will be served I submit, Mr. Speaker, in the years to come when the duties and privileges of citizenship are so well understood, there will be no further point in having a progressive-conservative party.

Now, under education I wish only to touch on one subject and that is the present controversy over religious training. I know some of you would not touch this with a ten foot pole. To me it does not matter. I was always fond of sticking my neck out and so far it has not been chopped off. It seems to me if we have not a racial quarrel we have to have a religious one. Is this a new devil's brew stirred up to get people off the real issues?

At this point, Mr. Speaker, it is my duty to read a telegram from the Ministerial Association of Guelph. They have asked me to read this,and I could not give it before I took my turn in the Throne's Speech debate.

> "Mr. Leslie Hancock. Parliament Buildings. That whereas the Ministerial association of Guelph have conducted Bible teaching in the Guelph Public Schools for two years and no complaints have been received in that time and that the work has been highly commended by our Board of Education, be it therefore resolved that the Guelph Ministerial Association heartily approves of biblical instruction and requests that you as our member of Parliament give expression to our opinion in this matter to the Legislature forthwith."

Well, I have no quarrel with the gentlemen at all as I will show. Let me make it perfectly clear that in my opinion a course in Christian Ethics in public schools is a very desirable thing, particularly, Mr. Speaker, if you teach the children how to implement the Golden Rule in an economic sense, but I would be sorry to see a return to the days when religious controversy occupied the major part of the mental activity of our forbears. Well do I remember- some of you here - do you believe in freewill, or do you believe in predestination. Does the soul go immediately to heaven or does it sleep to await the Day of Judgment. Is the Pope infallible &c. &c. Also I remember those days on Sundays we could not have any books but those which were to bring us along the good and narrow way and my tender years were regaled with such books as Dante's Inferno on the one hand and Bunyan's Pilgrims Progress on the other. One book representing what happened in purgatory, what happened after purgatory and the other book depicting how the good decent Protestants should proceed on the road to Heaven. This is not levity at all, Mr. Speaker. We have far more important problems to solve at this time. Far more important problems to solve than developing political controversies over mystical matters. There is a growing conviction in the mind of many of us - it was a suspicion but it has become now a conviction- that there is a group raising religious controversy in this war as a means of throwing the people off the real issue. There is a growing suspicion amounting to a conviction that the pros and cons of politics want the people to become tangled in the pros and cons of religious dogma, so that they will have less time and energy to study organization for their social good. The

people must work out their own economic salvation.

I would like to say a few words about the Department of planning and Development. I see the minister is not in his seat,but if he were I would congratulate him on having implemented in his department the programme that I recommended to this House last year, that of River Valley Development and Soil Conservation. I am not, Mr. Speaker,an expert in financing of these projects, but I do believe that city, town and township planning, over all planning in this respect, inrespect to the geography of our country is the key to saying Development. There are those who believe that the Department of Planning and Development should also be sompletely responsible for industrial plants, industrial development. Whether that is true or not they have made a good start and it will at least be half the battle.

I cannot let this opportunity pass entirely without saying something about Agriculture and something about Labour, particularly as I have the temerity to be known in this House as an indepenent farmer- labour member. However, in both of these fields I recognize there are people in this House who know more about the subject than I do. However, I can contribute something. In regard to the Ontario Agricultural College I am glad to note that the Alumnae Association of the College, of which I have the honour to be a member and have taken an active interest in this new development. The Board of Governors has been asked by the Alumnae for many years and now they are about to see the fruition of their desire. I have too, one comment. The Board of Governors I believe, according to the recommendations

of the first Board, was or is to be composed of nine members, three appointed by the Governors and six appointed by the Alumnae. Now I think, that this could have been improved upon. Though I, of course, do not believe in not sticking up for my own group, but at the same time I think it would be better if the Federation of Agriculture had the appointing of three of those members.

I know that at least one is to be a practical farmer. We should have at least three on there, people who are successful, practical farmers. Of course this may happen, the O.A.C. Alumnae could be raised into a majority of practical farmers, who not only know what the programme of the college should be, but how it should be developed. I only hope that that will be the case, and I think in a lot of these things there is no use getting suspicious. We can have a friendly consultation, and we can arrive at very desirable results, such as the O.A.C. Board of Government, and I believe it is a forward step, and one for which this Government should be commended.

2. I would just like to say, in regard to the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Duff), in his remarks on the demonstration farms he mentioned he thought it would be desirable to have in each municipality, or each county, one demonstration farm. I think the House will remember last year I raised, during the Budge Estimates, and spoke, about the question of estimates for certain Government farms. We have already in Ontario several of these demonstration farms. The point I made last year, and I reiterate this year, is that these demonstration farms, to be effective, genuine demonstration farms that the farmers can get any good out of, must be run on a separate basis. There is too much tendency in our appointments, in the provincial appointments, to give a bureaucratic basis and listen to the people who make a recommendation and say, "has to have his salary, and that men be paid, and we will see what we can do, part from the farm, and part from the salary." This is not the way to show the hard-working farmer how he can better his practices

unless you can show him you have made a farm pay, and paid the salary, and still have something left. I suggest to this Government, or the incoming Government, this must be the cardinal point in the policy of agricultural affairs. Should they not make a "go" of it, then we will get the "bunk" out of the thing.

The trouble is, there is so much money spent in places, that is not accountable, not actually, in the terms of production, that we cannot get to the bottom of our costs.
3. So, the struggling farmers go along, and if they do not make some success, they say, "He is not efficient." And that is not true in many cases.

Now, in regard to labour, I would like to say, -- I do not pose as an authority, but I can be a good student, and I am trying to be a good student, -- taking the view of my colleagues on the opposite benches, and my colleagues for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) and St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), I would like to say, in regard to Labour, I know this, that we spend millions annually for the furtherance of successful agriculture, and rightly so, - somewhere in the neighbourhood of six million dollars. I see nothing to quarrel with in that. Only by scientific research can we gain progress and can the people benefit and find methods which will make life better and richer for all of us, but I also know that the Department of Labour has a budget of less than one tenth of the amount we spend on agriculture. I know, too, from past records, that forty-eight per cent. of the working population of this province are in industrial Labour, whereas Agriculture has some thirty per cent.

Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, in view of the growing

importance of this field of industrial Labour, that we must reconsider -- we must get an entirely new vision of what the Department of Labour should comprise.

Now, the workers are interested in three major things.

First of all, of course, is the rate of pay that they receive.

The second point that they are interested in is their working conditions.

And the third point, the last, but not least, is the continuity of employment.

Now, the Unions, as such, can look after those first two, - the rates of pay and the working conditions, if the Government of the day will give them a chance. They cannot do much about the continuity of employment. This is definitely the responsibility of the Governments, both Federal and Provincial. I know this concerns all of us, and I am quite sure the hon. Ministers in the Government Benches are very much concerned about this subject. The Department of Labour should be so well organized and forewarned of any future surplus or shortages of Labour in any given industry or area that they can arrange alternative work projects right where the labourer is
4. domiciled.

How often have we heard the jibe, (I have, in Toronto Township, and you have, in every township in this province,) - "These people have no stake in the community." How can you, if you do not know, from one month to another, how long the job will last? How can you have any stake? If youwant the people to become contented, to have a stake in any community, you will have to organize the industrial

activity of the country by regions. Otherwise, you will have drifting populations.

Say a man has a little home in a community, - take, for instance, working in small arms, - and due to the war coming to an end, the small arms' plant closes up. In the meantime the Department of Labour should know ahead, at least two or three months ahead, of the small arms' closing-up. They should know approximately how much labour will be released, and some governmental or private projects should be arranged for these people to go to. If a department was organized for that purpose, it would be worthwhile, it would pay dividends, if you can keep these people in their homes instead of pulling up their stakes and drifting to Winnipeg or going to British Columbia, looking for a job. We do not want that to happen again.

I say if we have regional planning in the labour field, if we have regional reports in the labour field, great advance will have been made.

Now, I would like to refer, (and I think public men have to be responsible for their utterances, wherever they are made, whether they are made in this House, or anywhere else,) - I would like to refer to the hon. Prime Minister's speech at the Speaker's Banquet.

Mr. Speaker, I must confess to a sense of disappointment in that speech. There was actually no genuine progressive note in the speech, unless it was the progress in armaments. We were all intrigued by the Premier's description of the development of the tank and the modern fighter planes, and, last of all, when he described being in my home county, where he saw what he termed a magnificent

barrage put up to fight off enemy planes, all of which is very necessary at the present time, but certainly nothing
5. to be proud of. I was one, I might say, Mr. Speaker, who was present at the second battle of the Somme when the first tank ever made went into action. That was in July, 1916. We heard that some wonderful, new invention was going to be used in the war, but we did not know what it was. Rumours were going "thick and fast" all over. They said it was to be a great new invention. They called them land dreadnaughts, only the French called them "le tom". In our Anglo-Saxon language, we could not think of anything better than "land dreadnaughts". When we did see them, they were great, slow-moving, clumsy, slug-like things, with a chain going all over the top, as you know, and very much like a great slug, and they made the maiden speed of six miles an hour.

In an attack in which I took part, a few hours after these machines went up the line, I saw two of them knocked out of action. The first one had a blackened hull, the door was open, and inside were seven charred
6. bodies. A little further on was a big, wide German trench in which the second tank had nose-dived, and there it was uprighted in the air, I suppose to stay there until the end of the war.

Overhead, at night, we would see the forerunners of the present modern fighter planes, and I well remember the Hun plane coming over and in the apex of two giant beams of searchlights it was held like a golden bird, motionless, in the sky, and a few minutes later our guns had ranged it, and it came down in flames.

The Premier described to us how these relatively

imperfect inventions have been brought to their modern pitch of efficiency. Not once did I detect, in the hon. Prime Minister's voice, any note of concern that those war machines are geared to civilization-destroying scientific inventions. I am not wishing to shed crocodile tears, but I recognize we have got to the stage that we have to do what we have to do, but, at least, it is high time that public men recognize that there is and must be an end to this kind of insanity in support of the people's well-being. His only regret was not to its being created, but that we have effective measures working out.

I saw a cross embodied in that speech. Whether that cross was twisted, or not, I did not notice, but I still noticed that the people are still to be crucified on that cross. World War III was in the offing, as far as I could see, in that speech. The proud British Empire, which put up the magnificent barrage in this war a few years ago, was not able to employ, for one week's employment, the poor pogey reliefees. That is the only picture the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario could give us.

I would like to say something about the recent conferences of Teharan and Yalta. Do not get excited over there. I am not naive enough to think that these conferences are going to solve the world's problems, but I do know that a heroic effort is being made to stop further war, and when one of the high contacting parties of these negotiations, these agreements, is the head of the federated, socialist soviet republics, it is high time we had done with the petty tactics we have had here in this House in the last few weeks.

There are very few members over in the Liberal benches, unfortunately, but I am glad to see that the Liberal-Communist drive affected the Liberal leader about as much as water on a duck's back.

What of the opposition? For two years we have witnessed fifty-two representatives of the people presumably unable to act, to do anything to implement their ideas, -- that is perhaps a little too strong, but I mean to say we are not particularly effective, and we are a majority of the members. History has a way of giving names to Parliaments, and I could give a name to this one but it would not be complimentary, even though it is the Twenty-First Legislature.

What is the reason for this? It is not hard to seek. We of the opposition are divided against ourselves. It has been the record of history that the most anti-social, the most reactionary and selfish influences are consistently united. It is the progressive elements, those who have something of a vision of the future, which are the most divided, the most destructive and the most non-cooperative.

I am glad to see from the report of the address of the Hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that the members are beginning to realize that if we are to make genuine democratic progress, those who believe in that progress must demonstrate unity.

For what reason on earth are we divided, when we hold in our hands the torch of human progress?

Now, there have been, in the last fifteen years, amazing changes in the fiscal arrangements. New forces have come into being, new expressions of the people's will

for a change for the better. I have for years advocated that these new forces must maintain and build unity; and that is the reason, Mr. Speaker, I am here to-day, and not because I had any particular political acumen or ability. I am here because I stood for that, and I will stand for it.

Now, I regret to say, -- and this is not a direct challenge but it is an indirect challenge, -- I know it will not be considered a direct challenge, -- I know that my former party has rejected my outlook, not once but many times, in its short history. The present confusion and disunity of this House is, I think, the direct outcome of my former party's folly. There is this differentiation to make, that is that uniformity is not unity, and never can be unity. They tried uniformity all down through the ages but uniformity will not work. You have to be strong enough in your point of view and your friends will cooperate with you.

My friends to my right, the two members in the House and myself represent a political trend which is a direct result of the authoritarian views of the C.C.F. theory, and not because of any peculiar queerness, that we cannot cooperate.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are happy, if you are.

MR. HANCOCK: The brain trusters of the C.C.F. are like the cowbird in the nest, throwing out those who are not quite of their own policy. Twice has opportunity knocked at the door of my friend's party in Opposition, and twice it has been turned down; which is very bitter proof of the truth of what I have said.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that these things are too

deep and too serious to be laughed at at all. We may be, in a few days, possibly, counting ten over the fallen administration. I do not know how long it will take, but it is not far away. The Hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) last fall pointed out in a radio broadcast that this fall of the government need not result in an election; and I am glad now at this time to remind him of this fact. I shall expect the C.C.F. leader to accept the challenge and form a new Government when this government falls; but I would suggest that he must genuinely attempt to govern with the cooperation of other elements now in opposition, or be responsible for contributing to the holding of an election in wartime, which he now does not want.

Mr. Speaker, these things are too deep and too vital to the people's welfare. Let us not fiddle while Rome burns. The next five years are weighty with good or ill for the people of this Dominion. Progress is not automatic, as some would have you believe. Progress can only be assured in direct proportion as we are faithful to the best that is in us.

In our upward climb toward a better social state, the words of Sir Owen Seaman are particularly appropriate:

> "Ye that have faith to look with fearless eyes
> Beyond the tragedy of a world at strife
> And trust - that out of night - and death - shall rise
> The dawn of ampler life -
> Rejoice! Whatever anguish rend your heart
> That you may tell your sons who see the light high in the Heavens - their heritage to take!
> I saw the powers of darkness take their flight -
> I saw the morning break."

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I gathered from the latter part of the previous speaker's address that he was heaping coals of fire on his former colleagues' heads, and with that part of his address I am in entire agreement.

On rising to add my contribution to the speech from the Throne, naturally I will follow, as has been said so many times, the custom of congratulating the mover and seconder; and I will not say very much about it other than that we just happened to pick those boys, -- we could have picked any others in the party over here, and they would have done all right.

MR. GEORGE I. HARVEY (Sault Ste. Marie): So could we.

MR. DALEY: That is what I am afraid of. I am going to speak mostly on the question of Labour and my viewpoint on it; but, before I come to that, I would like to express some of my opinions about things that have transpired up to this time in this House.

The leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has spoken at considerable length, and he carefully reviewed each of the twenty-two points. In my opinion he did a very good job for the Government. I do not think anyone on this side of the House could have done better, for he substantiated to a great extent the government's claims that it had fulfilled all its obligations. But, in almost every case, he agreed, in his opening remarks, to a certain point, that it had to a great extent fulfilled, or some such statement as that, and then he would try to argue himself out of that opinion, for instance, to just mention one of them, that fifty per cent cost of education. He could

not, of course, say that we had not paid the fifty per cent as promised; but with true C.C.F. attitude, he tried to belittle, by pointing out what a small amount it appeared to be on a thousand dollar assessment, some three dollars, or an amount such as that. But one just has to, from day to day, read the papers and the budgets that are being brought down and approved by the municipalities, showing reductions in tax rate of from two and one half to as high as seven mills, in addition to other advantages such as increased pay for teachers, and so on, to realize what a tremendous effect this piece of legislation had in reducing the cost of services charged against real property in this Province.

Now, I am sorry that the Hon. leader of the liberal party is not in the House, but I think I will proceed just as though he were here, because I am going to say this: Since the beginning of this Session, I have, and at times with considerable boredom we have listened to speakers who were speaking in this House.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL: (York East) We shared the same thought.

MR. DALEY: And I regret that the Leader of the Liberal party is not here.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON (Brant): I can perhaps send for him and bring him in but I will not take the responsibility of bringing him in here.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): The Hon. member forgets that the Leader of the Liberal Party in the House is seated in here now.

MR. DALEY: The chief concern of the Leader of the Liberal party in his remarks seemed to be that the Prime Minister had not elaborated enough on the policy of the Government, on the 22 Points. I can appreciate that the hon. member would not be able to understand that. What he cannot comprehend is that the Drew Government is not a one-man government.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, no?

MR. DALEY: The Prime Minister does not crack the whip and his ministers fall like tenpins in a bowling alley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I must ask hon. members to give the hon. member who has the floor the opportunity to speak and to desist from these asides and interruptions.

MR. WILLIAMS: They are perfectly good natured, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Labour does not object.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I do.

MR. WILLIAMS: I know.

MR. SPEAKER: You just take your seat, please.

MR. BROWN: We are getting a lot of information from the Minister in this way.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not wish to name an hon. member but I ask them to desist from these wise-cracks. Please let us get on with the debate.

MR. DALEY: Might I crave the indulgence of the House to start over again. I was going on to say that I thinkit is a bad thing in a legislature such as this that we have to go through the procedure of addressing each other as "the hon. member for so-and-so." When I want to address the hon. member for Elgin across the floor

I would much prefer to call him Mitch. It would sound a little more friendly, when I am trying to be unfriendly.

The hon. member for Elgin could not understand why the Prime Minister had not elaborated more on his policy in speaking in the debate on the Speech from the Throne. What he could not understand is that this is not a one-man government. The Prime Minister does not crack the whip over here and have the ministers fall all over the place. There is no in-again out-again policy over here because the Prime Minister holds the ministers responsible for their respective departments, though he is willing to be of help at any time with counsel from his great fund of knowledge and experience. But he does not ride rough-shod over the ministers here. He does not usurp all the limelight. If something has to be said in regard to any department the Prime Minister expects the minister in charge of that department to have the say. That is why he did not go into detail on every point because he had faith that those who are responsible for the various departments would be quite able to take care of themselves. Is there anything wrong with that? That is democratic government in action. There can be no occasion over here for a triple play such as was witnessed under the former government, from Hepburn to Conant, to Nixon, only to have the ball fumbled and we witnessed the Prime Minister in the end picking up the ball to complete the play. That, to me, is a very amusing incident, in view of what seems to be transpiring now.

I was in Ottawa at one time on official business for this Government and met a high ranking official there. I do not need to mention names. He was about my size, stout, with a round face like mine, and he came up to me

and said, "I understand that you are Mr. Daley, the Minister of Labour for Ontario?" I said, "Yes." Then he said, "Sit down and let us have a talk." We sat for a few minutes and then he said, "How do you get on with that man Hepburn?" I said, "Well, I have always got on very well with him. I do not, of course, have a great deal of association with him, but when I see him he is friendly and nice." "He is a terrible man," he replied. "He used to get so mad when he would tear me apart that I would never answer him." He went on to say, "He has done more to put the Liberal party where it is to-day than any other man in the country."

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): I think you had better tell us who the man was. Was it Mr. King?

MR. DALEY: Mr. King, yes.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): I just want you to repeat that so that we can verify it. Mr. King said that?

MR. DALEY: Yes, that is what the man said. He said that.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): Did you shed any tears at the time?

MR. DALEY: No, I did not.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): I would not want to hurt your feelings -- I like you too well.

MR. DALEY: It amuses me to hear the Leader of the Liberal party in Ontario call this a Rump government, for being a farmer he should know that the choice cuts come off the rump.

Now I am afraid that I have to get a little nasty because I am going to refer to my friends to my right. The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) certainly made a lengthy speech and I considered it a pretty vicious one, but

I found very little in it to comment upon except the quotations. He quoted everybody I think except Confucius. But he was very careful never to quote Tim Buck and what he had said.

MR. MacLEOD: Go ahead and give it to us now.

MR. DALEY: I do not make quotations. I give my own opinions. "Quoting MacLeod" is what the hon. member will be known as, I think, in days to come.

The Communists are certainly making a great effort to line up with somebody. They tried it first here, then they tried it there, and then they tried it there, with what success I am not prepared to say. While it would appear that there is some line up between the leaders of the Liberal party and of the Communist party I am unable to bring myself to believe that the sound thinking members of the Liberal party over there are in agreement with the Communists in their philosophy. A leopard does not change his spots nor does a Communist change his philosophy.

I can recall when I was mayor of St. Catharines at the time of the visit of Their Majesties the King and Queen to this country. Our town for weeks was full of provincial and federal police who had been sent there to check up on every Communist in the area so that the police would know right where they were on the day the King and Queen were in St. Catharines.

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to point out to the hon. Minister that there were members of the Communist party in the official parties receiving Their Majesties the King and Queen; many of them, in fact, were members of city councils and on the reception committees that met the King and Queen. So there was no need for this mysterious hunt.

MR. DALEY: But there was a hunt.

MR. MacLEOD: By the Tories.

MR. DALEY: It was no Tory government that sent the police there to hunt them.

MR. SALSBERG: It was not the mayor of St. Catharines?

MR. DALEY: No, he had nothing to do with it.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): It seems like a case of going down into a dark cellar on a dark night and looking for a black cat that was not there.

MR. DALEY: Something I find very hard to understand is why a great Jewish population in the district known as Bellwoods -- I am given to understand that there are a number of very fine Jewish people there -- would select a little pipsqueak thing like this to represent them in this Legislature.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I demand that that offensive remark be withdrawn by the Minister.

MR. DALEY: I do not know what pipsqueak means but I like the sound of it.

MR. MacLEOD: I insist, Mr. Speaker, that that remark be withdrawn.

MR. DALEY: What is it he wants withdrawn -- pipsqueak?

MR. MacLEOD: Withdraw the remark you made.

MR. DALEY: Do you object to it, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. DALEY: O.K. I withdraw it. These Jewish people in the riding of Bellwoods are an independent people, with great business ability. They are people who, I thought, wish above all things to retain their freedom.

MR. THORNBERRY: I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister should refer to Canadian citizens and electors as Canadians and not as belonging to a particular religion. What he is doing would produce anti-Semitism.

MR. SPEAKER: Reference has been made to various religions quite fairly, I think. The Minister is speaking in no objectionable way, I think.

MR. DALEY: A number of my best friends are Jewish, and I cannot understand how they would make a selection like this over here.

MR. HANCOCK: The mind is the standard of the man.

MR. DUNBAR: So that is the party over there!

MR. DALEY: To go from the ridiculous to the sublime, when I listen to the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Duff) addressing the House last night it was like hearing a robin in the springtime because he was so constructive in his remarks. I appreciated his address very much. He is not only a fine citizen but I wish him nothing but success. He is nice and quiet and --

MRS. LUCKOCK: Why not take him as an example?

MR. DALEY: Much has been said here about the attitude which this Government has taken in regard to the Civil Service. I do not doubt that here and there in certain places changes have been made for causes which have been indicated. It was stated that changes would be made for inefficiency or something like that. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has tried to be fair with the Civil Service, in an effort to build a civil service that will enjoy a greater sense of security and have a more efficient personnel. For one thing the Government has created minimum and maximum salary rates for the various

classifications in the Civil Service. It has also established the principle of annual increases until the maximum salary is reached, and it has adopted the principle of promotions, which I think deserves mention here. No longer will civil servants be held in the same position from year to year without being given a chance to progress if better jobs are available, but of course they must have the necessary qualifications to fill any vacancy that arises. The net result has been that many people are now holding better jobs in the Civil Service than they had a year ago, and no longer are civil servants held back while others are brought in for various reasons, political or otherwise, to pick off the cream of the jobs. That is a statement that any hon. member can check.

MR. SALSBERG: Would the Government allow the civil servants to organize themselves into unions?

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member to address the Chair.

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to ask a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: There is a proper way.

MR. SALSBERG: May I ask a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: If the Minister cares to answer.

MR. SALSBERG: Is the Minister prepared to say on behalf of the Government that the employees of this Government in the Hydro, for instance, and the Liquor Control stores, may proceed to organize themselves into trade unions, and will they be recognized if they so do?

MR. DALEY: The hon. member knows as well as that he is sitting there that I made it possible for the Hydro employees to organize themselves into any union they chose. That is their privilege. The Prime Minister has said that he wants the best labour laws for Ontario.

Now, there can be differences of opinion as to what is the best Labour law. No matter what my sympathies are, and which I will say are pretty well known, as I have said on many occasions, I am in favour of properly organized, properly run unions. The fact remains that there are thousands of workers in the province who from choice do not wish to belong to a union, or who are not eligible for membership, foremen, or above the rank of foremen, office workers, and thousands and thousands in the armed forces who at present have no voice in union matters--

MR. A. A. CASSELMAN (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I would like, for your information to advise the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) that office workers may join the union, and many, many thousands, do belong to them.

MR. DALEY: Retail business people who might be adversely affected when trouble takes place in industry; they are not in unions and they might be very seriously affected. There are many others which can be most seriously affected, if we are not careful to have what the hon. Prime Minister said "A sound, sane, Labour laws, laws that protect the workers but do not give them overall power which might be used unwisely, to the detriment not only of themselves, but to industry as a whole."

Now, we are at the present time hearing much of union security. Union security and job security, in my opinion, go hand-in-hand. Of what use is union security if there are no jobs for its members? As an illustration of the point I am trying to make -- and I hope that my listeners will believe this as true, because it is true -- a great industry in this province invited me to hear their president discuss the post-war plans of that company.

I accepted, and I was amazed at what they had in mind.

The first remark he made was that this company has, and recognizes that it has, an obligation to the workers who now work for the company, and 1,500 boys overseas, and he said, "We are going to do our best to make it good."

He then outlined the plans completely -- definite plans -- and they called for some millions of dollars to be spent in plant expansion and new equipment to make products not formerly made in this country, and to create new jobs. And then what happens?

Now this company has a union, and it has an agreement; less than a year ago an agreement was bargained for and at that time the union said that it was one of the best agreements they had ever been able to make with anyone.

Then the union security broke, and, mind you, Mr. Speaker, this union security was not a consideration last year; it was not brought out last year, when the present agreement and the Code they were working under was formulated. Union security was not in the picture then; it is new since then. And since the union security idea has come forward, that union has approached that company to change an agreement of some hundred or more clauses, and they want thirty-eight of them changed in an agreement they agreed to not more than so many months ago, after claiming it was the best agreement they had been able to negotiate with anybody.

MR. BERTRAM E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): May I ask the hon. Minister a question?

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Minister wishes to answer

at this time.

MR. LEAVENS: What objection have you to what the union did in that particular case?

MR. DALEY: I have no objection whatever, but you should hear everything I have to say. I do not want you to pick out a certain point. I cannot write my talk that way. In what I am saying, I am not condemning the union, I am trying to bring out a point.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFE (Leader of the Opposition): What was the name of the company?

MR. DALEY: I will tell you, but I do not think I will disclose it to this House.

MR. LEAVENS: We would like to know.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders.

MR. DALEY: The reason I mention that is because in my opinion union security and job security go hand-in-hand, and I do not know what he thinks this present condition is going to have on that company, but I know they are confused and I know they are thinking of whether it is really worth while to go ahead with all these plans, and that is why I brought that point out.

MR. CYRIL OVERALL (Niagara Falls): May I ask a question of the hon. Minister, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: If the Minister cares to answer.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to present all this talk --

MR. JOLLIFFE: You are doing all right.

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest to hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Overall) that he wait until the speaker has finished, and then ask his question.

MR. DALEY: I am not trying to tell unions their

business, nor am I trying to tell industry its business. In my capacity as Minister of Labour, I feel I am supposed to be, to the best of my ability, a sort of levelling influence. I have had a lot of dealings with union members of the Opposition, and I do not think any one of them can say I have ever been anything but fair.

MR. M. F. HEPBURN (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me correctly, the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) once told one of the hon. members to "go to hell" in the opening paragraph of a letter.

MR. DALEY: That is fair, and that was the answer he deserved.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It was purely a presumption.

MRS. R. M. LUCOCK (Bracondale): I do not think that is quite fair, Mr. Speaker, and I think the hon. members should be called to order, for saying a thing like that --

MR. HOWARD E. BROWN (Welland): How about the Government on the other side over there?

MR. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Brown) to respect the Chair and wait until the present speaker has concluded.

MR. DALEY: As I say, in my capacity as Minister, I have to deal with the War Regional Board, the Industrial Labour Board, the Compensation Board --

MR. GARFIELD ANDERSON (Port Arthur): That is too many.

MR. DALEY: --In regard to difficult cases. There are thousands of cases have gone through this Board without ever coming to my attention, but the contended ones, and the difficult ones, do.

MR. GEORGE I. HARVEY (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker,

may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) a question?

MR. SPEAKER: May I remind the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Harvey) that the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has requested that he be allowed to complete his remarks. I have asked two other hon. members to refrain from asking questions until he has concluded, and I am making the same request of you.

MR. HARVEY: This is not fair to the rank and file of all labour, for him to make a charge against labour. I would like him to name the union, against whom he is making a charge.

MR. SPEAKER: I can assure the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Harvey) that as soon as the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has completed his address, and made his presentation, I will give you an opportunity to ask your question.

MR. DALEY: Now, there are many unions in this province to-day who have a union security. The union to which I belonged when I learned the carpenter trade is still in existence, still going strong, better than ever. They had a union security, because they have throughout the years conducted their business in a manner that has sold the employer on the desirability of having his men organized, and that can be done to-day. The unions have survived because they were good, not because of some Act of the Legislature.

The very nature of the Canadian people resents being driven into a corner, and being told to too great an extent what they must or must not do. Isolation as between coun-

tries, as between municipalities, is past, and also the isolation between employer and employee. They must co-operate, each with the other, and work for the benefit of the other.

Industry must realize that profits cannot be too high when wages are too low. Yet there must be a profit, and the workers must realize that wages can only be what the traffic will bear, leaving a reasonable profit, after the goods produced are sold in the markets of the world, for we are a selling nation. We must remain competitive, because, while we are an industrial province, we are only a spot in the industry of the world; we have not got a corner on all the skill and initiative.

Now, I dwelt at some length on P.C.1003, while discussing the Labour Relations Board. Since this debate in this House on that Act, I have talked with Ottawa, and they realize that Ontario has, as I said at that time, more opportunity to administer and see the strength or weaknesses of this Act, and recommendations from this province will receive very careful consideration.

Then I might say to the hon. member, that is the only way that change can be made to 1003.

Now, I claim that much progress has been made, which was proven by labour under the Act as it stands, and I am perfectly happy if some sensible changes can be made in it, and I hope to have recommendations from the Labour Relations Board very soon, and with them, if this can be improved, it will be improved and organized. Labour must not forget that under the present Act as it stands to-day, 287 unions have been certified. That is a tremendous step

forward in so short a time.

In my opinion both the unions and management are suffering from growing pains. Industry, which carried on successfully for years without organization, suddenly finds itself organized. Naturally it resents this intrusion, until they are shown by organization that co-operation can be of benefit to both the parties.

MR. A. A. CASSELMAN (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, as a matter of privilege, I feel I must make this statement. I have stood up before and supported organized labour very many times, and in the last ten minutes, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) has said two things. One of the things was that the company resented this "intrusion". Well, it is no intrusion if members of this company want to organize. I would ask that that be clarified.

The other was that people resented being driven into a corner as if organizing a union was driving some people into a corner. I just could not swallow those things, as a union man of eighteen years' standing, and I am surprised that some of my friends on this side have not said something.

MR. WILLIAMS: We obey the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Will you please be good enough to reserve your questions until the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has finished?

MR. CASSELMAN: It is not a question. It is a matter of principle.

MR. DALEY: But the unions, in their enthusiasm, are reaching for more power, and if they can get it, by proving themselves -- which they have for years -- unionism is not

new in this country -- they can have this security, but the thing, in my opinion, which is required to-day, is more attention and more tolerance, both on the part of management and labour. Tolerance must be the factor. Unions must grow stronger, not only in numbers, but in wisdom, which can only be acquired through time and experience, and industry must come to realize -- and I think they are -- because the good unions that are in this country -- that a union is not an Octupus that is going to strangle them, but which is going to help them, and it is education and tolerance which has to be achieved, and that cannot be done overnight, because written regulations which arbitrarily control either management or labour do not mean a thing, if there does not exist a spirit of co-operation as between the two parties, and it can only lead to passive resistance of rules, and destroy the very things we are trying to accomplish, full-time employment, under fair conditions, and an equal "break", -- or a little better than an equal "break" -- for the boys who are coming home; a continuance of free enterprise where courage and skill and initiative bring their own reward.

I believe -- that I say this rather humbly -- that the Department of Labour has enjoyed considerable success in protecting the workers from unfair treatment, and to maintain stability. As long as I am here, I intend to follow those principles, because I believe the future continued prosperity of this country depends, not as many seem to think on post-war planning, on roads, we can build and that kind of thing, -- but the prosperity of the future depends upon the continuance of profitable industry, and the trade

we are able to develop and to maintain in the nations of the world.

We must be sane, as we must be progressive, and with our natural resources and our industrial capacity and our newly-found sciences, we can build a standard of living for the people of this province, that even our fathers never dreamed of.

All our thoughts seem to be directed to-day toward organization, which leads me to draw your attention to considering for a moment another type of individual in the province, who might, I would say be considered as the "forgotten man". I mean the small business man. He is the man who, by his own courage and zeal and initiative, has acquired a stake in this country. To-day, with his fixed charges on goods and chattels, his controlled prices, his inability to acquire goods to sell, and his controlled profits, have left this type of citizen in a bad way.

Who mans service clubs which are doing such a splendid service in this country? Who supports the churches and schools? Who develops playground facilities? The small business man. Never do you see a card in their stores saying, "Please do not ask for contributions." He is expected to support everything from the Humane Society on, and not only does he give his time in organizing, but his money to benefit anything that might be for the community service. In passing legislation -- and when we are thinking of legislation -- let us remember these individuals because they have been the backbone of this country.

Along the line that the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) was speaking on last night in regard to the care for the aged. No one could dispute any of that. I am

in entire agreement with the thought she brought up, but I will say that the system we worked under for so long can be corrected, not to-day, nor to-morrow, but in time, so that these people not be in such straightened circumstances, unless because of some unforeseen or terrible amount of sickness that should befall them.

In my opinion, there is too great a difference to-day between the low-paid man and the high-paid man.

4 SOME HON. MEMBERS: Period.

MR. DALEY: I would not take much longer, Mr. Speaker, but if it is your wish, I will move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: I promised three hon. members the opportunity of asking questions and I now declare it six o'clock.

The house recessed at 6.00 p.m.

AAA1

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

EVENING SESSION

Toronto, Ontario,
Thursday, March 15, 1945.

SPEAKER: Honourable William J. Stewart, C.B.E.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

HON. CHARLES DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I think when I left off in this debate, I was discussing a question that had been raised by the Hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) about the additional care that should be provided for the aged people. I said that I was in entire agreement with that statement; but I think, to get at the core of it, we had to go a little deeper into our economy.

It seems to me it might be quite easy to provide some different accommodation for these people, now, but we can go on having this very job for people who require this assistance, unless we change something, in perpetuity. I also said that I thought that there was too great a difference between the man who is called unskilled, -- often wrongly called unskilled, -- and the skilled labourer or worker. I can recall working in the building business, and on these jobs there would be mechanics drawing possibly a dollar or a dollar ten an hour. Taking the plasterer's helper or the bricklayer's helper, what were they getting? In those days about fifty cents, or maybe forty-five cents; and I always thought that that man was as skilled as the man who was termed a skilled workman, and he worked as hard, if not harder; and at the rate that he was, according to our present system, stabilized at, he could never hope to raise his family and ever get in a position of being, at least, a little or

reasonably independent in his old age.

I know that the skilled tradesman would say, "Oh, we only work part time." But, when they do not work, the labourer does not work either, and he is penalized still further. And I have thought, and have always thought, and I have talked to construction men about it, and they agree that there is too much of a difference between them. And if we can clean some of that stuff up we will gradually eliminate the expense of to-day of having to care for people who were getting a little old and unable to care for themselves.

Now, to get back to the question of Labour Legislation. I am going to repeat again, the Prime Minister said "sound legislation"; he did not say C.C.F. legislation, nor socialistic legislation, but he said "sound labour legislation".

AN HON. MEMBER: The same thing.

MR. DALEY: I know that the members in the opposition group will smile when they compare our legislation with the legislation in Saskatchewan, -- and I think I have the right to mention Saskatchewan, because it has been mentioned here many times. It sort of reminds me of an old story, where a lady went into a butcher shop, and she wanted a pound of hamburg and the butcher said, It is twenty-five cents. She said, Across the street it was only fifteen cents. He said, Why didn't you get it when you were over there? She said, They didn't have any. And he replied, When I have not got any, it is fifteen cents too.

Now, the point which I am trying to make, but which I did not make very well, was to point out that Saskatchewan, with very little industry, could experiment, and you would expect them to with a C.C.F. government. Certainly you would expect them to experiment, because it was obvious that they

could do little harm and possibly no good. In my opinion it was a political move with a view to impressing the workers of this country with what the C.C.F. would do for Labour.

But I think the situation in this Province is entirely different, and must be handled entirely differently. We are the largest industrial Province in the Dominion, -- at least one of the two greatest industrial provinces, -- and we must deal with this matter in an entirely different light. We can lead the way, but we cannot get too far out of the way with our competitors in our own country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe this government and the Liberal Government that preceded it in this House, under whose present and former administration such remarkable progress has been made in regard to social security and better Labour-management relationships, better standards in living, and I mean that because I think we have as high a standard of living here as you will find anywhere, that we have accepted the responsibility, perhaps not to the extent that we should in taking care of those people who, for some reason or other, find themselves unable to care for themselves.

Now, I am dealing nearly everyday with labour. I see the Hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) here this evening, -- I do not think he was in this afternoon, -- and I have had some dealings with him in connection with labour matters, and I want to say here now I know some people think that the Hon. member gets quite out of line at times. I will say this to my own people and to the members of the opposition, that in all cases when I have had to deal with him he has been very fair, very consistently fair, to deal with in regard to labour.

It rather amuses me that the opposition seems to be trying to impress the people that they are the only people who have accepted any responsibility, or have any thoughts of the interests of labour at heart. I think this government has labour's interest at heart. That is why we have broadened and improved the workmen's compensation Act to protect a continually greater number of working men, And do not forget that it was the "reactionary tories" as we are sometimes called, that brought this most important piece of legislation into existance long before there was C.C.F. or Communists.

AN HON. MEMBER: You have heard of Allen Studholm?

MR. DALEY: Yes. That is why we are planning schemes to restore returned veterans to their rightful places in commerce, and lessen unemployment and prevent anything coming against them, to retain them in industry, and let them make their own choice, when they return.

That is why we set up the Labour Board to supervise bargaining arrangements in any plant in our regulations, leaving absolute freedom of action to the labourers themselves. That is why we established the forty-eight hours a week and a week's holidays with pay; and it would be interesting to remark here that it is estimated that eight hundred and seventy thousand dollars will be paid out this year for holidays to employees in the building trades alone. We have over thirty thousand stamp books out at the present time, for this particular type of industry.

AN HON. MEMBER: May I ask the Hon. Minister a question?

MR. SPEAKER: Wait until the Hon. Minister is through. There are a number ahead of you.

MR. DALEY: We established for this particular industry, the building industry, a book of stamps system whereby the employee will be assured of two per cent of his annual pay for his holidays. We are the only Province in Canada with a holiday Act. We do know that the Saskatchewan Act, following the usual line of policy, they followed with two weeks' holidays with pay but this Act has not been proclaimed, unless it has been done within the last two or three days. So we are the only province in the Dominion with a Holiday Act with pay; and we are arranging to extend this system of pro rata pay with holidays, to all workers, so that if a man happens only to be able to work, for some reason, it may be through no fault of his own, only six months for one firm, he will not be penalized to the extent of his holidays with pay credits.

(Page 1440 follows)

BBB1

We are leaving the minimum wage in, so that all men who work in this province will be assured a reasonable minimum wage, which will guarantee to everyone a reasonable living.

MR. BERTRAM E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): What is the reasonable rate?

MR. DALEY: We have not decided. We have held consultations. We are not doing this thing just out of the hat. We actually have had a survey made of this entire province as to what it costs to purchase in one location and another and what the difference is. We are trying to be fair and trying to bring down something that is fair and reasonable.

MR. LEAVENS: That has been done so often, it is funny.

MR. DALEY: We have a tentative appointment with Ottawa on this very question, so that something Dominion-wide may be enacted. That is why we have enlarged the Factory, Shop and Office Building Act, to remove the hazards and reduce the injuries to the workmen and to improve their health.

These things are actualities based on facts. They are not just dreams, such as some people do dream. I think I am fortunate that I belong to one of the old parties. I say that sincerely. We can point to real accomplishments of building and developing the country as the best place in the world to live, and one of the parties that still live in a democracy.

The labour laws I have initiated, and those in effect before my time, are based, entirely, on these principles, to assist and help workers get a fair return for their efforts,

We are in the beginning [illegible] who work in this province [illegible] a reasonable minimum wage, which will [illegible] everyone a reasonable living.

MR. HEAVENS: [illegible] What is the reasonable rate?

MR. DALLEY: [illegible] decided. We have held [illegible] conferences. We are not doing this thing just in the dark. We actually have had a survey made [illegible] province as to what it costs [illegible] and another and what the difference is. We are trying to be fair and trying to [illegible] something that is fair and reasonable.

MR. HEAVENS: [illegible] then, it is funny.

MR. DALLEY: [illegible] with Ottawa on this very [illegible] wide may be enacted. [illegible] factory, Shop and Office [illegible] and reduce the [illegible] health.

These things are [illegible] are not just dreams, such [illegible] I am fortunate that I belong to [illegible] say that sincerely. We can point [illegible] of building and developing [illegible] in the world to live, and [illegible] in a democracy.

The labour [illegible] before my time, [illegible] assist and help [illegible]

to encourage initiative, and to encourage expanding of capital, to create more jobs for more people. I might frankly say I am not trying, and never had any thought of trying, to oust
2. the CCF. In closing, I would just say this, that in all cases of amending acts, or making regulations, it has been my policy to call in those people interested, both labour and management. Out of these discussions I have attempted to legislate, for the people of this province. I think I am a servant of the people, of all the people.

I am putting this down, because I want to give the other hon. members all the time that I can. I would just say this, that as the developments that have taken place in this House, and what appears to be perfectly obvious is going to happen, - and at this point I am only speaking for myself, and no one else, - my association here with all of you has been most pleasant. I think I can say, without exception, that the hon. members of the opposition groups have been very friendly to me.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Is this a farewell message?

MR. DALEY: My only regret is that when we reconvene this House so many of you will be missing.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Niagara Falls asked permission to ask a question.

3. MR. CYRIL OVERALL (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) a question concerning the company that he referred to as the company that revealed certain post-war plans, and this company had expressed disappointment that union security was now being asked.

MR. DALEY: I did not say that.

to encourage [illegible] of capital, to create more jobs for more people. I [illegible] sincerely say I am not trying, and never [illegible] to oust the CCF. In closing, I [illegible] that in all cases of amending acts, [illegible] it has been my policy to call in [illegible] labour and management. [illegible] I have attempted to legislate, for the [illegible] service. I think I am a servant of the people, [illegible] the people [illegible].

I am getting [illegible], [illegible] the other hon. members all the time [illegible]. I [illegible] say this, that as the [illegible] that have taken place in this House, and what appears to be [illegible] is going to happen, - and at this point [illegible] myself, and no one else, - I [illegible] with [illegible] has been most pleasant. I think I can say, with [illegible] exception, that the hon. members of the opposition [illegible] have been very friendly to me.

MR. EDWARDS: [illegible] (Leave [illegible] granted).

Is this a farewell message?

MR. DALEY: [illegible] is [illegible] this House so many of [illegible] will be [illegible].

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. [illegible] has asked permission to ask a question.

MR. CYRIL [illegible]: [illegible] would like to ask the [illegible] a question concerning the [illegible] company that reveals certain [illegible] company had expressed [illegible] now being asked.

MR. DALEY: [illegible]

MR. OVERALL: The question is, How did the number of employees that the company now employs -- how will that number compare with the number of employees that the company contemplates employing after the war?

MR. DALEY: There will be 1,500 more. They have obligated themselves to place back in employment 1,500 soldiers, and they are accepting that obligation, and trying to plan to retain the people they now have, and give an extra 1,500 men work. I am not in the company. I am telling you what I have heard said.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Welland (Mr. Brown).

MR. HOWARD E. BROWN (Welland): Mr. Speaker, in line with the same question, I was wondering, when the hon. Minister for Labour was talking, if this was through some efforts of the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Porter) that the company was expanding, or was it the wish of the company itself?

MR. DALEY: I am sorry. I did not just get that question.

MR. BROWN: Was the expansion of this company a result of the efforts of the hon. Minister of Planning and Development, or was this company expanding under its own plans?

MR. DALEY: I think I can honestly say the Minister of Planning and Development knew nothing about this. I have never spoken to him about it until this afternoon.

MR. GEORGE I. HARVEY (Sault Ste. Marie): I must preface my question by qualifying the reason for it. I am quite concerned about the prestige of the hon. Minister of Labour when it becomes known publicly that he spoke

MR. [illegible]: The question [illegible] number of employees that the company now employs — how will that number compare with the number of employees the company contemplates employing after the war?

MR. DALEY: There will be [illegible] more. They have obligated themselves to place back in employment 1,500 soldiers, and they are carrying out that obligation, and trying to plan to retain the people they now have, and give an extra 1,500 man work. [illegible] company. I am telling you what I have heard said.

MR. [illegible]: The hon. member [illegible] and Mr. Brown).

MR. [illegible] (Welland): [illegible], in line with the same question, I was wondering, when the hon. Minister for Labour was talking, if this was brought some effort of the hon. Minister of [illegible] and Development (Mr. Porter) that the company was [illegible], or was it the wish of the company itself?

MR. [illegible]: I am sorry [illegible] that last question.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] company's result of the efforts of the hon. [illegible] of Reconstruction and Development, or was this company [illegible] its own plans?

MR. DALEY: I think I can [illegible] say the Minister of Planning and Development [illegible] time. I have never spoken to him on [illegible] until [illegible] afternoon.

MR. [illegible] (Dundas): [illegible] preface my question [illegible] I am quite [illegible] of labour when [illegible]

in the derogatory about the Trade Union Movement.

MR. DALEY: I did not.

MR. HARVEY: That is my impression, and I am afraid the public may get the same impression. The question I want to ask is, Will the hon. Minister name the union, the trade union that required union security?

MR. DALEY: A trade union that required union security?

MR. HARVEY: Yes.

MR. DALEY: You know the trade unions that work toward union security.

MR. HARVEY: I have reference to the ones you mentioned in your speech, after having a satisfactory agreement for so many years, had requested the company to introduce into its working agreement a security clause. I do not want the public to think you are against trade unions or thinking or speaking about that kind of thing. I think the public should know if you are opposed to any one trade union.

MR. DALEY: Certainly they should, if I am, but I prefaced my remarks by saying, and I have said on many occasions, I am in favour of organization. The point I tried to make throughout my speech was there is a sane and sensible line to follow, and do not let the unions or managements become unreasonable, and I named both of them.

MR. ROY SMITH (Parry Sound): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister mentioned Ontario was the only province in Canada with an Act covering a holiday with pay. I quite agree with that, but I want to disagree with him if he says it is really in effect, because I find it is not mandatory. We passed the bill in the House last year. T[illegible]

The question I would like to ask the hon. Minister is whether it is or is not mandatory. I find, by talking to different union members, especially many junior members, the younger members of unions, they find it is almost impossible for them to get one week's pay clause in their union agreements. I thought when we passed the bill it was mandatory and legislation that was going to be carried out. I want to know whether it is.

MR. DALEY: Name one case.

MR. SMITH: The C. P. R. freight and express handlers.

MR. DALEY: Yes, I knew that was what you were going to say. I knew that is what you were going to ask about. You know, and I know, the railway organization is almost completely organized, and this is an agreement, - I do not know that it was a saw-off, but the policy adopted was after two years, if I recall correctly, they would give two weeks' holiday with pay, but not one week the first year. That is an agreement between the union and the company, and I hesitated to go in there and try to break that agreement down.

I have discussed it with the company, and I am discussing it with the union members on Tuesday morning. I do not know what the result will be. If the organization of union people want to make an agreement that will get them two weeks' instead of one weeks pay, after one year's waiting for it, I do not know that that is too far out of line, that we should go overboard and say, "You cannot do that." It is a matter that the unions will decide now.

MR. SMITH: If I may, I wish to ask something

further. You said, a moment ago, --

MR. SPEAKER: You answered the question, and this is not an argument.

MR. SMITH: Yes, but to correct a misunderstanding, the hon. Minister mentioned after two years they get two weeks' holiday.

MR. DALEY: I say that from memory.

MR. SMITH: In the second year they get one week's holiday, and after three years they get two weeks' holiday. I would not have any complaint, but I thought when we passed the legislation it said they must get one week's holiday a year, and I think we must be consistent and see that it is carried out.

MR. BERTRAM E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): I want to make a correction, and add an addition to what the hon. member for Parry Sound has said. The trade union agreement with one week's holiday at the end of two years' service puts them into the third year of service before they get one week's holiday with pay and four years of service before they get two weeks' holiday. I told the hon. Minister that before the Labour Board, and we got the same explanation. I asked if it was a statutory labour law governing this union, and I believe the hon. Minister said it was, but I asked him to-day, and he said he is taking it up with the Union. Do you have to take up statutory law with the Union? That is my question.

MR. DALEY: I am not going to debate this question.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): In regard to lessening the number of dependent, aged people, if I understood you correctly, you said there was too great a spread. I thought, before dinner, the hon. Minister said there was too great a spread between the lowest and the highest-

paid worker, and then after dinner he defined what he meant, and he only means among what we call the working people. What I want to ask the hon. Minister is, Does he think there is too great a spread between the lowest-paid and the highest-salaried person?

MR. DALEY: Yes, I will absolutely agree with that. What I said before the House was adjourned was in the records, so it is all there.

MR. CALVIN H. TAYLOR (Temiskaming): Might I ask a question? I am not in agreement with what he says about the plasterer's labourer. I know something about them, and they are more skilled than most people give them credit for. He says there is too great a difference between the plasterer and the plasterer's labourer. Does he propose the plasterer's labourer's rate should be increased, or the plasterer's rate should be decreased?

MR. DALEY: I would answer that very simply,-raise the lower fellow up.

5. MR. WILLIAM C. RIGGS (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, in participating in this debate on the Speech from the Throne, I wish to pay my respects to the mover and seconder of this debate. They had quite a heavy load to carry, twenty-two points, but I think they did a pretty fair job. Before commencing the body of my speech, I would like to pay attention to some of the statements and remarks made by the opposition members to this group here. To the hon. Minister of Labour, I would like to say he is one with whom I have had many pleasant relations at many times in the year. I have had the opportunity of visiting his office, and I do feel that the hon. Minister of Labour has been a very genial gentleman to me, and we will be sorry to see him go,

[illegible] workers, [illegible]

and so on [illegible]

When I went [illegible]

there is no [illegible]

[illegible] possession [illegible]

Mr. [illegible]

What I [illegible]

[illegible], [illegible]

[illegible]

restoration [illegible]

the place [illegible]

they are [illegible]

the sage [illegible]

er and the plaster[illegible]

plasterers [illegible]

plasterer's [illegible]

Mr. [illegible]

the lower [illegible]

Mr. [illegible]

Speaker, [illegible]

the Throne, [illegible]

secondar[illegible]

carry, [illegible]

job. [illegible]

to pay [illegible]

by the opposi[illegible]

Minister of [illegible]

have had many [illegible]

I have had the [illegible]

feel that [illegible]

mental gent[illegible]

if something does happen in the future. But, nevertheless, I think that I should point out to him, and also the hon. members opposite here, that he speaks about bringing down this legislature among the highlights of the Progressive Party. No doubt it has been important, but what has taken place in the past, as far as the old-line parties are concerned, I would like to point out to this house, when you have thirty-two CCF members sitting over here, you are bound to get different legislation, even though we are in the opposition.

Now, before we adjourned, the hon. Minister was talking about good unions and bad unions. I am not sure of the bad unions, but he did put a certain higher rank on some other kinds of unions. But, we have two interpretations of unions. One union is a legitimate union, and the other is a company union. We only see two kinds, - the legitimate union and the company union. Those are the only two we recognize, so I do not know which one the hon. Minister was referring to. I would like to take up one further argument the hon. Minister was using, and the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) was, also, in his speech on the Throne Debate, in talking about expanding the economic system under capitalism for some time yet, and the hon. Minister of Labour was pointing out that if we have continuous profitable industry, (and I would gather from that remark that if private industry or private enterprise stays in the saddle, we will be all right,) -- And, in regard to that, I want to bring forth some evidence to dispute that contention. The first one I will bring forth as evidence to dispute the fact that private enter-

prise is going to be able to do this job after the war, is a survey put out by MacLean's. This was put out in all pride by MacLean's. They thought they had something. This was 2,400 firms employing fifty men, or more, and these 2,400 firms sold sixty per cent. of the manufactured products in 1939. What are their figures for after the war? They take 1939 as 100, 1943 as 140, and the first year after the war, it is 125. In other words, this survey shows there will be a fifteen per cent. reduction in man power.

If that is going to be one story, from 2,400 firms, well, the boys coming back have not much to look forward to.

The next one I want to bring forth, - I think it was quoted by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard), when he was participating in the debate, but I would like to quote it also, because I think these things should be pointed out to this House, - and this is from Dr. James, the Principal of McGill University and Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Reconstruction. I would like to quote this:

> "The report in effect states that the ability of the Canadian economy to expand and maintain full employment and an adequate level of national income will depend, in the last analysis, upon large Government expenditures in these fields. 'Private enterprise', alone, cannot do the job."

That is from Dr. James, and I think you could consider he is an authority in the field on what will happen after the war is over, because he gave quite a bit of study to it.

The next one I would like to bring forth as evidence is a recent survey taken by the Dominion Government, by the Resources and Statistical Divisions of the Depart-

[illegible] is going to [illegible] do [illegible] to [illegible] a survey [illegible] This was [illegible] pride by Mason [illegible] was 7,400 firms employing [illegible] 8,100. Firms said sixty [illegible] premises in [illegible] were [illegible] They [illegible] 40, and [illegible] years after the war, [illegible] shows there is [illegible] paper.

It [illegible] well, [illegible] to [illegible] to.

The [illegible] was quoted by the [illegible] when he was [illegible] to quote in [illegible] pointed out to [illegible] the tribunal [illegible] Advisory Committee [illegible] quote this:

"The report [illegible]
The Ganadia [illegible]
employe [illegible]
come [illegible]
[illegible]
'Private enterprise [illegible]

That is from [illegible] consider he is a [illegible] happen after the war is [illegible] of study to it.

The next [illegible] done is a recent [illegible] by the Research [illegible]

ment of Labour. This was the Dominion Government, as you know, and they took a survey of the industries employing two hundred men and over, and the result of that survey, I will take my quotation from the "Montreal Standard":

> "The Government feels that it would not be in the interests of the public to make the contents of the report known at this time."

That is from the Montreal Standard, January 7th, 1945. I did notice, when this came out, that the Federal Government did say that the survey has not been finished, and they were going to take a survey of these industries under two hundred, but it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, when we have the big industries over two hundred being in the category that is brought out in this report, it does not look very hopeful for the employment which we will need.

Now, I want to bring this home by stating one industry in my home city, (and that industry, that same company, was quoted this afternoon by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), The Ford Motor Company of Canada. Now, I think that is a typical industry that we could analyze, and see what will happen to that industry
7 after the war is over, because, as I go into the body of my speech, I am going to make suggestions that would probably help that. That is a very serious condition, and I want to say how it does effect Windsor. Now, at the present moment the Ford Motor Company employs between 14,000 and 15,000 men. Now, I would say set the comparative figures at 14,000, and they have 5,000 men in the

[illegible]

Armed Forces. That is a total of 19,000 men. Previous to the war the Ford Motor Company's average employment was 8,000, and I am generous when I say 8,000, and since that time, as you know, the war does a great job on motor-vehicle invention, and, also, it does a great job in inventions in the field of business, and I would say the auto industry has progressed like any other industry in finding quicker and newer ways of doing a job. That means, they have 19,000 men that will need employment, - 14,000 and 5,000 in the Armed Forces, - and take off 8,000, and that leaves 11,000 men that jobs will have to be secured for one way or the other.

(Page No. 1452 follows.)

I would like to carry that argument a little further. The Ford Motor Company operates in three different fields. The Ford Motor Company in the United States looks after the needs of the United States and South America. In Britain the Ford Motor Company looks after Britain and European countries, and the Canadian Ford Motor Company looks after Canadian requirements and those of the empire. I understand that before the war forty per cent of the cars manufactured were exported. Australia was one of our biggest markets for automobiles, but since the war Australia has become one of the great steel producing countries of the world, and it is very doubtful if after the war we can secure the market there which we had before the war.

That is the situation so far as the Ford Motor Company is concerned and it is one to which I suggest the Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Porter) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) should give attention. I shall have some suggestions to make in that regard later on.

So far as my suggestions are concerned I am doubtful whether they will be followed because my argument will be along the lines followed by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Duff) last evening, to use the agricultural resources of Essex County to establish industries there. I have been informed that certain interests in the east are not in favour of having an establishment of that sort, so I am not sure that my suggestions will be followed in my own riding.

I think it is usual when a member is making his first speech in the House to pay some attention to his own riding. While I do not wish to restrict my remarks to my own riding I shall devote some attention to it and also to that section of southwestern Ontario from which I come.

I want to discuss this question as a labouring

man. I was in Windsor in the depressed '30's. One of the unfortunate things about having an automobile industry in a city is that motor cars is one of the first things people stop buying in a depression, and consequently during the depression years there was a great amount of unemployment in Windsor, and as the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) said the other day the city did go into default. One reason was that we had more than our share of unemployment at that time. Because of that fact thousands of our people lost their homes. I want to bring that home by giving a few figures on unemployment in the city of Windsor. As of November, 1944, the employment figures for Windsor show that 26,289 people are employed in the automobile group of industries, and the number in non-automotive employment was 12,537.

This figure of 26,289 is double the yearly average of 1939, and two and a half times the level of 1929. In the non-automotive industries the increase is 85 per cent over 1939 and 30 per cent over 1929. Analysing these figures it can readily be seen that Windsor requires more diversified industries, for of course it is not a good thing to put all your eggs in one basket. That is why I shall in my remarks to-night go beyond my riding and take in southwestern Ontario.

I should like to quote in this connection from an editorial in the Windsor Star as far back as May 23, 1938. It said:

> "Southwestern Ontario is the greatest corn-growing area in all Canada. It is one of the best corn belts in the world. It is capable of producing enough corn to satisfy the demands of the whole Dominion. There has never been any doubt that its product is equal to the best grown anywhere. However, due to the lack

> of proper storage, grading, drying and other facilities it has not been able to reach its true destiny as a corn-producing district."

I should also like to quote a statement by the Chemurgy Committee for postwar planning of the Windsor Chamber of Commerce. Chemurgy has to do with the industrial use of farm products. The Chemurgy Committee stated:

> "In all Canada if a single small area were to be chosen where Chemurgy could be practised to the greatest possible degree, that area would certainly be the district of south-western Ontario. It is known as the corn belt of Canada. It is the home of soy bean production, which, though now only in its infancy, is bound to prosper and increase. In fact, this particular section of Canada possesses climatic and soil conditions which enable it to produce a greater assortment of cash crops than any other part of the Dominion."

I might add that many distinguished residents of the City of Windsor are on the Chemurgy Committee, which has been functioning for quite a long time.

In its report the Chemurgy Committee makes mention of soya beans. Since the war commence soya beans have proved a very useful vegetable for industrial purposes, many new uses having been found for this farm product. There was a demand to have an industry established somewhere in our locality, but I notice that recently a mill to process soya beans was established in the city of Toronto at a total cost of $2,000,000. That is the Victory Mill, a subsidiary of Canadian Breweries, which is headed by E. P. Taylor, the Washington representative of the Department of Munitions and Supply in this country.

I agree with what the hon. member for Bruce said last night that industry should be established where these products are grown. Pelee Island in South Essex riding

is one of the greatest producers of soya beans in this country, and I am in agreement with what the hon. member for Bruce said as to establishing industries where such products are grown. I shall have something to suggest on that later on. It would provide employment near the place where the vegetable is grown.

The statements I have quoted show that with proper planning and organization of the farmers, this part of southwestern Ontario has an opportunity to greatly improve its position. At the present moment, with the scarcity of water transportation, very little corn is being imported into Canada. The corn growers were asked to increase their acreage to supply, as far as possible, Canada's needs. I consider they did a magnificent job while the corn was needed. But they are worried about the future. They fail to understand the remarks of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Reek, who, speaking at Cottan last February 25th, stated that with the ending of the war there will be importations of South African and United States corn.

It is not only these importations with which our corn growers are faced but with the importation of corn grown in other countries too. The farmer is alarmed at the surpluses which Argentina is piling up. Argentina in thematter of corn is like Canada in the matter of wheat. Argentina is a great corn-growing country. It has always been a large exporter of corn and during the last three or four years the government of that country has purchased millions of bushels of corn from the producers there and burned it. So naturally the corn-grower in Ontario is greatly afraid of what will happen after the war is over.

I should also like to quote from an article in

is one of the greatest producers [illegible]
country, and I am in agreement with what the [illegible] member
for Bruce said as to establishing industries where [illegible] on
products are grown. I shall have a word [illegible] to suggest
on that later on. It would provide employment [illegible] the
place where the vegetable is grown.

The statement I have quoted shows that with
proper planning and organization [illegible] the farmers, the
part of southwestern Ontario [illegible] can greatly
greatly improve its position. [illegible] it,
with the scarcity of water transportation [illegible], very little
corn is being imported into Canada. The [illegible] growers
were asked to increase their [illegible] as much as possible, so that
as possible, Canada's needs. I [illegible] they did a
magnificent job while the war was [illegible] but they
are worried about the future. They fail to understand
the remarks of the Deputy Minister [illegible] quoted [illegible],
Mr. Reek, who, speaking at Kettle Lake [illegible] stated that with the ending [illegible] be
importations of South Africa and United States corn.

It is not only these [illegible] that
our corn growers are faced [illegible] the importation of
corn grown in other countries. [illegible] at the surpluses which [illegible] large [illegible]
in the matter of corn in like [illegible] in the matter of wheat.
Argentina is a great competitor [illegible] been a large exporter of corn [illegible] three or
four years the government [illegible] millions of bushels of corn [illegible] and
burned it. So [illegible] is
greatly afraid of what will happen [illegible]
I should like to [illegible]

the Commercial Intelligence Journal of January 27, 1945, a weekly publication of the Department of Trade and Commerce, Ottawa, because it gives a picture of the corn situation in the Argentine. It says:

> "Due to the war, no corn could be exported, and the government has been buying up the crop and reselling it within the country to be used as fuel or feed. In 1940 the government bought 211,400,000 bushels at 30 cents a bushel and resold at a loss of $51,300,000. In 1941 it bought 275,000,000 bushels at 24.8 cents a bushel and resold at a loss of $54,000,000. In 1942, 169,700,000 bushels were purchased at 21.6 cents a bushel and resold at a loss of $27,100,000."

That is the condition which the corn grower of southwestern Ontario is going to have to face in the future.

What the farmer needs is encouragement in organizing. This government is definitely on record in this regard. The Prime Minister, speaking at St. Catharines on November 27, 1942, stated that farmers should have control of agricultural production, with distribution and marketing by the farmers themselves.

Point 4 of the 22 Points is also clear that the Conservative party favour organization of the farmers.

That is why I cannot understand why the Essex-Kent Corn Producers Cooperative Association has received the treatment it has not only from this government but from the former Liberal government. It should have received more consideration in its efforts to establish some kind of organization down there and be given a chance to operate. This Cooperative was organized in February of 1940. After an extensive membership drive, over 1500 farmers purchased shares in the Cooperative.

the Commercial Intelligence Journal [illegible]
weekly publication in the Department [illegible]
Commerce, Ottawa, because it [illegible] letter of the [illegible]
situation in the Argentine. [illegible] says:

> "Due to the way, [illegible] could
> be exported, [illegible] the [illegible]
> [illegible] the crop and [illegible]
> it altogether [illegible] country to be used [illegible]
> fuel or food. In 1940 the [illegible]
> [illegible] 2,300 [illegible]
> a brewer and [illegible]
> [illegible] In 1941 [illegible]
> [illegible] 000 [illegible]
> brewer and [illegible]
> [illegible] In 1942 [illegible]
> [illegible] were produced [illegible]
> [illegible]
> [illegible]."

That is the reality [illegible]
southwestern Ontario [illegible]
[illegible].

[illegible]
[illegible]ing. [illegible]
[illegible]. [illegible]
on November 27, 1941, [illegible]
control of agricultural product [illegible]
and market [illegible]
[illegible]
a desirable party [illegible]
That is why I [illegible]
Kent Corn Producers Co-operative Association [illegible]
the treatment it was [illegible]
from the Farmer Liberal [illegible]
ceived more [illegible]
some kind [illegible]
to operate [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

They applied to the Farm Products Board for a marketing scheme, but were turned down at that time. I do not wish to weary the House with details but the history of corn growing in South Essex is a long story, and a lot of politics has entered into it. I do, however, want to say something about the vote that was taken last March when the Cooperative did finally secure permission to take this vote.

Before the vote was taken there were conflicting statements -- one by Mr. Reek, the deputy minister, at Cottan on February 25th, which appeared the next day in the Windsor Star, namely that Essex County farmers should go back to dairy farming as artificial fertilization will not do. Against this assertion by the deputy minister was the statement of N. J. Thomas of the Guelph Agricultural College, speaking at Chatham. The Chatham News reported him as saying:

> "Crop rotation was necessary to maintain the productivity of the soil. He stated Crop rotation with applied fertilizers and legunes was better than using livestock as a medium of fertilization."

These statements, together with the faulty distribution of the ballots, I suppose had something to do with the unsatisfactory vote.

I hold in my hand an envelope and a letter. The letter is dated March 15th and the envelope is postmarked March 27th, as third class mail. I understand that some farmers did not get their ballots in time to vote, and that is one of the reasons why a number of people did not vote.

I would like to place on record the result of the vote.

They approve [illegible] Protocol [illegible] or [illegible] setting
scheme, but [illegible] boiled down as it [illegible] [illegible] not with
to wear the [illegible] with details but the [illegible]story of corn
growing in [illegible] the Essex is a long story. [illegible] if
politics has got [illegible] [illegible], [illegible], never, want to
say something [illegible] the vote that was [illegible] last March
when the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
take [illegible]

[illegible] vote was [illegible] there were [illegible]
ing statements -- [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible],
at Cotton [illegible] February 25th, [illegible] [illegible]
in the midwar year, namely that [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
should go back to dairy farming [illegible] artificial fertilize-
tion will not do. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible]
minister was the statement of [illegible] [illegible] the Ontario
Agricultural College, speaking at [illegible]. The Chatham
News reporter [illegible] as saying

> "Crop rotation [illegible] necessary to
> [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible]
> [illegible] stated for fertilizing with [illegible]
> fertilizers and legumes was [illegible]
> than using live stock as a [illegible]
> fertilizer."

These statements, together with the [illegible]
distribution of the letters I [illegible]
do with the [illegible] vote

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
The left [illegible] dated March [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
marked March 27th, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
some farmers did not get their ballots [illegible]
and that is one of the [illegible] [illegible]
not vote.

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
vote.

4 MR. DOUCETT: The hon. member stated that the letter was dated March 15th. Would he be good enough to give us the year? Was it 1943 or 1944?

MR. RIGGS: March 15, 1944, this last March. There were 9,450 ballots sent out and the ballots were to be returned by March 31, 1944. The number of ballots cast totalled 1,981 or 21 per cent of the total distributed. Of the ballots cast, 1,800 or 90.9 per cent were favourable to the scheme and 8 per cent or 9.1 per cent were opposed. As a result of these returns the Farm Control Board announced "that due to an unfavourable ballot by the growers concerned, the proposal for a commercial corn marketing scheme had been dropped."

Prior to the taking of the ballot my information is that Mr. Perkins, chairman of the Farm Products Control Board, at a meeting in Chatham, made the statement that the result would be decided by the majority of the votes cast. I think that principle is sound. I think it will be agreed that many of us in this House to-night do not represent the majority of the electors of our respective ridings. But I consider that the principle is sound.

I would like, however, to suggest that if the Board is considering taking another vote it be confined this time to the commercial growers of corn. I understand that this suggestion was given some consideration before the first vote was taken.

Another suggestion that I would like to make is that the corn growers be permitted to choose whether they would rather have the Cooperative as their marketing agency or have an advisory committee set up. It seems to me as a union man that the advisory committee smacks of company unionism while the Cooperative stands for a

4 MR. [illegible]: The [illegible] letter was dated March [illegible]. Would [illegible] the years. Was [illegible]?

MR. RIT[illegible]: March [illegible] were 9,[illegible] turned by March [illegible] totalled 1,[illegible] of the total [illegible] of the ballots cast, [illegible],000 [illegible] 90.9 per cent were [illegible] to the scheme and [illegible] per cent or [illegible] per cent were opposed. As a result of these returns the [illegible] "that due to [illegible] unfavourable [illegible] ed, the proposed [illegible] been dropped."

Prior to the taking of the [illegible] is this Mr. Perkins, [illegible] Board, at a [illegible] in Chatham, [illegible] result would be decided by [illegible] I think that principle is sound. I think [illegible] agreed that many of [illegible] sent the majority of the electors [illegible] But I consider that the principle is [illegible]

I would like, however, [illegible] Board [illegible] this time to the commercial [illegible] that this suggestion was [illegible] first vote was taken.

Another suggestion [illegible] that the corporations in [illegible] would rather have the Ontario [illegible] agency or have a advisory committee [illegible] to me as a [illegible] of company [illegible]

legitimate union.

As a representative of an industrial riding I know, Mr. Speaker, that I may be accused of spending too much time on a matter that concerns agriculture. But many of my people are interested in agriculture and I also am interested in it as a member from an industrial riding because I feel that I have something to offer in regard to agriculture which will be of assistance to the industrial district of Windsor.

In Windsor at the present moment we have our local planning committees preparing for the postwar period. Just recently in Windsor a meeting was held and at a meeting held on February 14th, which industrial, commercial and financial organizations attended, Doctor Faludi, who is recognized as an authority on town planning, is reported, according to the press, as follows:

> "Dr. Faludi was optimistic over the future establishment in Windsor of industries connected with the agricultural products produced in Essex County such as corn and soya beans. He felt that plants processing these products could be established here. This would mean the development of the waterfront area, the erection of warehouses and construction of factories, near these warehouses. He asserted that the physical equipment and transportation facilities of this city are attractive to outside industries of this type and that Windsor should have an industrial representative to try to bring such industries into the city."

I have quoted that, Mr. Speaker, because it has a bearing on the point I am trying to get over, that consideration should be given to utilizing the agricultural products of Essex County for industrial purposes, leading to the establishment of industries in that city.

DDD
file

Now, I notice the Minister who has charge of the Department of Planning is not in his seat this evening, but he has not visited Windsor yet. I was talking to him the other day and he promised to pay a visit to our City and I feel he will be given a welcome, and his visit is overdue there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to summarize, I consider that proper organization of the farmers in Southwestern Ontario, and support for new industries which will process the products of the farm will be beneficial to both the farmer and labour, and I would suggest to this House that if anybody knows the history of corn and what has gone on in the past in regard to those who bring corn in from outside, and it is in the local field we are trying to do a job, the Canadian people, this vote for co-operative by some kind of organized marketing in Essex County should not be long delayed. The operators of the foreign corn are well organized and backed by good resources and the only safeguard to home grown corn is also to have a strong organization.

DR. R. HOBBS TAYLOR (Huron): Mr. Speaker, I believe it is not necessary for me to make a compliment to my desk-mate for the excellent speech he made in seconding the Throne Speech because the press is already doing that very well. Also to the mover. While I was unable to be in the House when both of these members opened this debate, apparently they did a very good job. I was unable to be present through conditions over which I had no control when the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) gave his most voluminous oration in this debate and in which he charged the Government for failure of carrying out their 22 point programme.

Now, I notice the Minister was not one of the "art" of planning is not in his seat in a [illegible] not visited Windsor yet. [illegible] taking to him the other day and he promised to pay a [illegible] our City and said he will be given a welcome, and his visit is overdue there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to summarize, I do trust that proper organization of the farmers in Southwestern Ontario, and support for new industries which will [illegible] products of the farm will be beneficial to both the farmer and labour, and I would a guest to [illegible] that if anybody knows the history of corn and what has gone on in the past in regard to those who bring corn [illegible] and it is in the local field we are trying [illegible] Canadian people, this vote for co-operation [illegible] of organized marketing in Essex County should not be long delayed. The operators of the Tri-County are well organized and backed by good resources and [illegible] guard to home grown corn is also to have a strong organization.

DR. R. [illegible] TAYLOR (Huron): Mr. Speaker, I believe it is not necessary for me to make a compliment to my [illegible] for the excellent speech he made in seconding the Throne Speech because the press is already doing that very well. Also to the mover. While I was unable to be in the House when both of these members spoked this morning, [illegible] they did a very good job. I was [illegible] conditions over which I had no control was [illegible] of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) gave a [illegible] ration in this debate and it will be [illegible] for failure of carrying out their [illegible].

I must say I compliment the Drew Government on the fearless way in which they have gone down the centre of the road and followed each point and did something about it notwithstanding the sniping from other political groups in this Legislature, who at the same time promised to give co-operation but by their actions developed a great deal of opposition. I have here, Mr. Speaker, the first section of the re-print of the Speech of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) I read it very thoroughly and I might say that it is well prepared, very nice reading, which I would expect from a man of his attainments,but I fail to see where there has been one constructive idea in the whole speech presented by the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). But there are portions of his address which I agree with and I am going to quote one of them.

> "We believe the Right Hon. Prime Minister of Canada to be wrong in refusing to call the Conference of the Provinces of the Dominion at this time."

I agree with him thoroughly and I think it is correct. Now then, going over further in the copy of his address I agree with him but I donot think he meant it exactly the way I am going to take it. He takes to task the government of this province for failure to implement the first one or two points in the 22 point programme. As you will remember, point No.1.

> "We will maintain British institutions and strengthen the British partnership by every means within the constitutional power of the Government of Ontario."

Now then, I believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) takes issue with that. He mentions what he takes as British institutions when he lived in Britain some years

I [illegible] day [illegible]

on the [illegible]

centre of the [illegible]

something about [illegible]

political [illegible]

[illegible] Jomiden [illegible]

developed a [illegible]

Speaker, the [illegible]

of the Leader of the [illegible]

it very [illegible]

prepared, very [illegible]

man of his [illegible]

been one of [illegible] ideas [illegible]

by the hon. member [illegible]

Jolliffe). But [illegible] are [illegible]

I agree with [illegible]

"We believe the [illegible]
Canada to be w[illegible]
defence of the [illegible]
at this [illegible]."

I agree with his [illegible]

Now in, not [illegible]

I agree with his [illegible]

way I am [illegible]

of this provision for failure [illegible]

two points in [illegible] point [illegible]

point No.1.

[illegible]
[illegible]
by [illegible]
power of [illegible]

Now then, I believe the [illegible]

Jolliffe) [illegible]

as British [illegible]

ago and to quote a portion of this--he is talking about British institutions:

> "The supremacy of Parliament and the consis-
> "tent respect for that probably with a
> "responsible government acting as servant
> "and agent of the Parliament and not
> "as its master."

Now, I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that is not a criticism of the Drew Government but is very excellent criticism of the Government of Canada.

MR. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Were you here last year, by any chance?

MR. TAYLOR: I was, sir.

Now then, never in the political history of this country or any other country has a Government consistently tried and succeeded to carry out its pre-election promises to the extent to which the Drew Government has accomplished it. The Drew Government- and I do not think anybody can contradict this successfully - has by its action recognised the supremacy of the people and also the supremacy of the elected members and representatives of that people. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support a Government which in the short space of 18 months has carried out so successfully the points that were promised the people of this province.

Looking over again a copy of the address of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) no where do I find - and I read it very carefully -one categorical denial that the Drew Government has failed to implement one of its promises.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, yes. Cannot you read?

MR. TAYLOR: I can.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, read it again.

MR. TAYLOR: At the same time I have failed to see one

ago and to [illegible] section of [illegible] a good British Institution:

> "The supremacy of Parliament [illegible] a [illegible] "test to see for that probably with a "responsible government [illegible] "and agent of the Parliament [illegible] "as its master."

Now, I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that is not criticism of the New Government but is very excellent criticism of the Government of Canada.

MR. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Were you here last year, by any chance?

MR. TAYLOR: I was, sir.

Now then, never in the political history of this country or any other country has a Government consistently tried and succeeded to carry out its pre-election promises to the extent to which the New Government has accomplished it. The New Government - and I do not think anybody can contradict this successfully - has by its actions recognized the supremacy of the people and also the supremacy of the elected members as representatives of that people. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support a Government which in the short space of 18 months has carried out so [illegible] fully the points that were promised the people in this province.

Looking over again a [illegible] of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) [illegible] and I read it very carefully [illegible] that the New Government has failed to implement one of the promises.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, yes. Cannot [illegible]

MR. TAYLOR: I am.

MR. JOLLIFFE: [illegible]

MR. TAYLOR: At the same [illegible] the

concrete suggestion for the betterment of the province of Ontario. I also fail to see any broad principle of his party enunciated in his address. Of course, he, having difficulty to find some criticism of the government, resorted to the subterfuge of assumption and generalization.

While I am drawing attention, Mr. Speaker, to some of the promises of the Drew Government, some of the concrete promises and action, I should mention the matter of good faith as demonstrated by this government in planning for the postwar period - the excellent preparation of plans of the Department of Highways. This is comcrete and ready to go into effect the moment that the green light is given. Furthermore, in the last two or three days we have seen the result of the courageous fulfilment of the promises to the people of this province. You cannot deny, anybody in this Legislature, that the Government of to-day promised to absorb 50 per cent of the educational costs of the primary and secondary schools. This they have done. This they have been fighting with certain groups within this House in the last few days to get permission to give to the school board of this province its first cash grant as an evidence of good faith.

An.Hon.Member: Surplus of two years ago.

MR. TAYLOR: It was accomplished. It was not just the effervescent thinking of a disordered mind; it is a comcrete fact.

An Hon Member: You had better get rid of that one.

MR. TAYLOR: I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I had hoped to read in the Speech of the Chieftain of the Ontario C,C.F. some broad principles of their party because I believe that when a political party is aspiring and claiming the support of the electors of this Province they should at least

concrete suggestion for the betterment of the people of Ontario. I also fail to see any broad principle of his party enunciated in his address. Of course, he, having difficulty to find some criticism of the government, resorted to the subterfuge of assumption and generalization.

While I am drawing attention, Mr. Speaker, to some of the promises of the New Government, some of the concrete promises and action, I should mention the matter of good faith as demonstrated by this government in planning for the postwar period - the excellent preparation of plans of the Department of Highways. This is concrete and ready to go into effect the moment that the green light is given. Furthermore, in the last two or three days we have seen the result of the courageous fulfilment of the promises to the people of this province. I do cannot deny anybody in this Legislature,that the government of to-day proceeded to spend 50 per cent of the educational costs of the primary and secondary schools. This they have done. This they have been fighting with certain groups within this House in the last few days to get permission to give to the school board of this province its first cash grant as an evidence of good faith.

An Hon.Member: Surplus of two years ago.

MR. TAYLOR: It was accomplished. It was not just the effervescent thinking of disinterested minds; it is a concrete fact.

An Hon Member: You had taken out 1/3 of that.

MR. TAYLOR: I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I had hoped to read in the speech of the Lieutenant-Governor C.C.F. some broad principles of their party because I believe that when a political party is [illegible] claiming the support of the electors of this Province they should at least

let them know what they had in the back of their minds.

An Hon Member: Have not we?

MR. TAYLOR: But it seems to be the policy of the Leaders of that party throughout Canada to soft pedal and change their policies, depending upon what section they happen to be speaking in.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You should talk to the Conservatives in Quebec.

MR. TAYLOR: However, Mr. Speaker, what I have said I could repeat again with greater conviction and greater emphasis because it is the truth. There is a tendency at this time for muddled thinking and in political lines.

Mr, Speaker, I see that I can get applause from any side. But there is also chaotic thinking induced by different ideologies by ivory powered boys and brain crushers of new political faiths, which have a tendency to come out of the labour room of the brain crusters, and with some fantastic ritual to change our economic view, but I feel that the people of this province and this country should take time to consider and realize - considering that we have one of the best countries on the face of the earth - and realize that political parties which emphasize some of the sore spots and ignore the good spots of the country and fail to give them just an idea of what they intend to do if they ever get into power - and God forbid - the people of this province will have to realize that the party in official opposition, all we could get from them . . . in fact, they published a book in 1935 - I have it and read it. They gave another edition in 1938. I have that in my library.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What is the name of it?

let them know what they had in the back of their minds.

An Hon Member: Have not we?

MR. TAYLOR: But it seems to be the policy of the leaders of that party throughout Canada to sort-of and change their policies, depending upon what section they happen to be speaking in

MR. JOLLIFFE: You should talk to the Conservatives in Quebec.

MR. TAYLOR: However, Mr. Speaker, what I have said I could repeat again with greater conviction and greater emphasis because it is the truth. There is a tendency at this time for straddled thinking and political lines.

Mr. Speaker, I see that I can get applause from any side. But there is also concrete thinking induced by different ideologies by lively bowsers and brain crashers of new political faiths, which have a tendency to come out of the labour room of the brain crusters, and with some fantastic ritual to change our economic view. But I feel that the people of this province and this country should take time to consider and realize - considering that we have one of the best countries on the face of the earth - not realize that political parties much emphasize some of its sore spots and ignore the good parts of the country and fail to give them just an idea of what their lineage is. If they ever get into power - and God forbid - the people of this province will have to realize that the party in [illegible] opposition, all we could get from them [illegible], they published a book in 1936 - I have it [illegible] read it. Then, we another edition in 1938. I have that in my library.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What is the name of it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. TAYLOR: Planning for Canada, that is the gist of it - social planning for Canada. Now then, in both of these books the brain crusters of that party felt that they could go a little bolder than political expedients will let them go to-day. I have tried to buy a copy of the 1938 issue of the C.C.F. bible but it is off the press. I would like to get many of those to pass around to the citizens of thiscountry and let them peruse them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Will the member answer a question? I think it is only fair that he should tell the house what book he is referring to because when we refer to 1938 book I have no idea what he is talking about and I have no idea of book being being published by the C.C.F. in that year.

MR. TAYLOR: I am sorry as leader and chieftain in that group you have failed to know all the books your party published.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I know them, but you do not.

MR. TAYLOR: They did publish a book in 1935.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What was the name of it?

MR. TAYLOR: Social planning for Canada.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Who published it?

MR. TAYLOR: And also a new edition of that same book.

THE SPEAKER: Let us have one at a time. He is asking the name of the book published in 1938.

MR. TAYLOR: The 1938 book is entitled The same as the 1935 only a more up-to-date edition, And then again.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Once again, Mr. Speaker, the hon.member has mentioned two books. He is apparently unable to tell us who published them or what the names were. Now, I know his

MR. [illegible]: Order, please.

MR. TAYLOR: Planning for [illegible], that is the gist of it - social planning for [illegible]. Now then, in both of these books the brain trusters of that party felt that they could go a little cooler [illegible] experiments will let them go to-day. I have tried to buy a copy of the 1938 issue of the U.S.F. [illegible] but it is off the press. I would like to get many of those to pass around to the citizens of this country and let them [illegible].

MR. JOLLIFFE: Will the [illegible] answer a question. I think it is only fair that he should tell [illegible] book he is referring to because when we refer to [illegible] book I have no idea what he is [illegible] and I have no idea of book being published by the [illegible] in that year.

MR. TAYLOR: I am [illegible] as leader and chairman in that group you have failed to know all the [illegible] your party published.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I know the [illegible]

MR. TAYLOR: They did publish a [illegible].

MR. JOLLIFFE: What was the name of [illegible]

MR. TAYLOR: Social [illegible]

MR. JOLLIFFE: Who published it?

MR. TAYLOR: And at [illegible] of [illegible]

THE SPEAKER: Let us [illegible] one [illegible] time. He is [illegible] the name of the book published in 1934.

MR. TAYLOR: The 1934 book is [illegible] the 1935 only a more up-to-[illegible] edition. And then [illegible]

MR. JOLLIFFE: Once again, [illegible] has mentioned two books. He is [illegible] who published them or what [illegible]

sense of accuracy cannot go so far as to state who did publish the book,what their names were.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, in answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) across the road, I wish I had brought the two editions with me. The 1935, the publisher I cannot give you from memory but it was published just the same and again, we have an issue of 1938.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Published by whom?

MR. TAYLOR: The same people I think. Then, again, I will bring that issue for your perusal, if you wish.

Then I remember an occasion when the hon.member (Mr. Jolliffe) visited the City of London to address the Academy of Medicine. I am going to say something more about that later on - and in his most efficient way he gave in that discourse a propaganda talk, political propaganda of his particular party.

(Page 1467 follows)

sense of accuracy cannot go so far as to state who did publish the book, what their names were.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, in answer to my [illegible] friend (Mr. Jolliffe) across the road, I wish I had every [illegible] the editions with me. The 1858, the pub[illegible] number I cannot give you from memory but it was published that the same and again, we have an issue of 1858.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Published by whom?

MR. TAYLOR. The same people I think. [illegible], again I will bring that issue to your personal [illegible] if you wish.

Then I remember an occasion when the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) visited the City of London to address the Academy of Medicine. I am going to say something more about that later on - and in his most efficient way he gave in that discourse a propaganda talk, political propaganda of his particular party.

(Page 1457 follows)

And I do not think he would dispute this; he said, "We have now got a more up-to-date book published, I believe in 1941 or 1942." The publishing company I do not know, but I do not think you will.

MR. OVERALL: I would like to ask the hon. member the name of the publication --

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Have you a question to ask?

MR. OVERALL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member the name of the publication in which that speech was published, which was made in London.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor) care to answer at this time?

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): Yes, sir. The speech I presume you refer to is the one in which your honoured leader addressed the Academy of Medicine in London.

MR. OVERALL: Then what publication was it in?

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): The Medical Review of the same year.

MR. OVERALL: The official organ of the Medical Society?

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): One of the papers of the Medical Society. I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) will agree that the report of his speech as published in the Medical Review was accurate.

And he did say -- and I was there, and I heard him -- that we now have a more up-to-date book, and I have bought that book -- it cost me one dollar -- because I believe --

AN HON. MEMBER: The best investment you ever made.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): --That as far as the people who are interested in the welfare of this country should endeavour to know what a public man who hopes to lead and form a

And I do not think [illegible] would [illegible] that I [illegible]
have now [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
1941 or 1942." The publication [illegible] I do not know. [illegible]
I do not think you [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: I would like to ask the [illegible]
the name of the publication --

MR. [illegible]: Order. Have [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] Mr. [illegible] I wonder [illegible]
the hon. member [illegible] the publication [illegible]
speech was [illegible], which was made in [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] the hon. [illegible]
Taylor [illegible] to answer [illegible]

MR. [illegible] (Burgeo): [illegible] Mr. [illegible]
you refer to is the one in which [illegible] addressed the society of [illegible] in [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: Then what publication was [illegible]?

MR. TAYLOR (Burgeo): The Medical Review.

year.

MR. [illegible]: The official [illegible]
society?

MR. TAYLOR (Burgeo): One of the [illegible]
society. I think the hon. [illegible]
Tolliffe) will agree [illegible] the [illegible]
published in the Medical Review [illegible].

And he did say -- [illegible]
-- that we now have a more up-to-date book [illegible]
that book -- it does no one good [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: He been [illegible]

MR. TAYLOR (Burgeo): [illegible]
are interested [illegible]
[illegible] to know [illegible]

Government to govern the people, are thinking about.

MR. LEAVENS (Woodbine): They have "book" fever.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): I got it from you, across the road.

But I may say, Mr. Speaker, that in this excellent address of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) I had hoped -- sincerely hoped -- that I would find, and the people of this province would become made aware of -- just what your group means by some of your phraseology, which can have a half a dozen meanings, but it was barren.

Mr. Speaker, with all sincerity, this is the type of Opposition which if you make one remark that is not complimentary to them, they show the iron hand --

MR. L. G. ROBINSON (Waterloo South): Of Mr. Bennett.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): --And their intolerance to other peoples' opinion.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): You taught us.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): You can see that to-night.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are an apt Tory student.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): I think the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, are beginning to realize and absorb the obvious fact that if we have a socialistic government in Ontario, or in the Dominion of Canada, that we can expect expulsion of Government, domination of the people, and expropriation of their assets.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Absolutely false.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): Now we have some evidence from where there is a socialistic regime in power, in one of our provinces. We see -- and there is fear that is coming down

to us in Ontario -- evidence about the masked attempt to educate the people of that province along the line in which that Government expects them to think. And the man who was appointed to that post, in charge of that, upon being questioned, said that he would not be interested in giving the other viewpoint. In other words, Mr. Speaker, that is evidence of what socialistic government will do. They want the people to think en masse as they would have them think.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to represent a large portion of the county of Huron. The people in the county of Huron are made up of farmers, to a large extent. It is dotted over with small towns, villages, and hamlets, which are populated by small town business men, lawyers, doctors, storekeepers, ordinary labourers. These people of Huron -- which I think are the salt of the earth, and the average Huronite will condescent to admit that it is at least one of the best counties in the province -- they are perturbed, alarmed, about the political trend, and the attempts of certain political parties to produce chaotic and muddled thinking. They are worried at this trend, emanating from political groups, that this country is a large Christmas tree; in fact, surrounded with a pot of gold, into which everybody can stick their hands and pull out a nugget, without doing any labour, or replenishing the same.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Whose theory is that?

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): You can expound it in your next speech.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): That is in a book published in 1938 entitled "Democracy Needs Socialism"

-- remember?

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, it is not in any such book.

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor) is fair enough to admit that the facts are as follows: In the fog in which he was speaking, he was referring to a book published in 1935 --

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): Right, sir.

MR. JOLLIFFE: --And a very good book, but one which does not represent the official policy of the C.C.F., and was not published by the C.C.F.

And the same is true of the other book, the name of which he could not remember, which was published in 1938, to which the hon. Prime Minister has just referred, which was not published by the C.C.F., nor does it represent the official policy of the C.C.F., although there is much of value in it.

These inaccuracies mean very little to the hon. member (Mr. Taylor), but they should be drawn to the attention of the House, and there is nothing in either book, nor in any book published by the C.C.F., to give any basis for the amusing statement the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor) has just made about a "pot of gold". As a matter of fact, as everyone knows, the C.C.F. philosophy is opposed to making anything out of nothing.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to know that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) now agrees with my original statement, and he remembers the two books to which I alluded. Furthermore, while he is -- as all lawyers are -- able to split hairs in regard to both of those books, his party was proud at that time to claim some alliegance to them, because both were presented to me by

a prominent member of his party.

MR. L. G. ROBINSON (Waterloo South): If you keep on reading, you may be converted.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): So I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has now remembered what I was referring to.

Mr. Speaker, I have made no inaccuracies in any statement to-night.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, yes, you have.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): If my good friends across the way do not like some of these things, they had hoped to be kept hidden, being brought to the light of the electors, I cannot help it. But, still and all, I refuse to admit that they are inaccuracies.

We know, Mr. Speaker, -- and I do not think anybody can successfully refute this statement -- that there is a trend throughout not only this province, but this Dominion, instituted by political beliefs, by a political party which loves to call the other two parties "old and decrepit", and they do give to the unwary voters in their efforts to snare many of them, the impression that if they got into power everybody will get more for less, or get something for nothing.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add --

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. DENNISON: I just want to add --

MR. SPEAKER: Have you a question you want to ask the speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to be fair to both sides. We are not making any progress with everybody talking at once. And I appeal to both sides of the House that if an hon. member is speaking, and someone has a proper question to put, it should be put through me, and I will ask the speaker if he cares to answer. I do ask you to co-operate with the Chair and stop this cross-fire. Has the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) a question?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not think he will care to answer this question.

MR. DENNISON: Yes, I want to ask the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor) if he will at least admit that no member on this side has ever gone back to his riding and promised his ward healers nine jobs, because he was elected.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Eight out of nine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: May I say that I am presiding and I will be obliged to change you if you persist in doing what you are doing in the future. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor) has been asked a question. Does the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor) care to answer the question now?

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): Gladly, gladly. I presume that the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) is alluding to what was said in the maiden speech of your Chieftain last year. I think it is only fair I should make you keep up-to-date. I do not believe in being a ninety percent man, when we have the one hundred percent.

Now, so there will be no misunderstanding about the type of things I was attempting, that ninth appointment,

that seems to bother you, was the creation of a new position which did not then exist. It was the creation of a police magistrate for the County of Huron, which had been asked for for ten years from the previous Government by the Social Agencies in the County of Huron. Through my efforts, and the granting of this request by the Treasury Benches, we got that appointment.

Now, one thing more -- and I am sorry I have not the book here -- just to show what is in the back of the mind of the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) that he he is not interested in the question of patronage -- oh, no. Not only to correct his impression, but to show the insincerity of your group, I think you will agree with me that your party hit its zenith last June, when it took over the Government of the province of Saskatchewan. You will not contradict that?

The following morning, over the Associated Press wires this came across, -- and I think you will agree with me that you all claim alliegance to the Dominion leader, Mr. M. J. Coldwell. Am I correct in that assumption? Well, over the Associated Press wires your Dominion mentor stated, "When the new C.C.F. Government takes over power in the province of Saskatchewan, there will be a complete clean-up of all civil servants" --

MR. JOLLIFFE: I suppose, Mr. Speaker, it is futile to attempt to deal with such a string of inaccuracies. In the first place, there is no Associated Press in Canada, and in the second place, Mr. Coldwell made no such statement.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): It was published, coming over the wires of the Canadian Press. I am sorry about the

"Associated Press". But it has never been contradicted by you or any other member of your party --

MR. JOLLIFFE: It was never said before.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): It was published on the 9th or 10th of June last.

MR. JOLLIFFE: In what paper?

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): I will bring you a copy of it.

MR. ROY SMITH (Parry Sound): Public opinion, I presume.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): No, but it might have been in The Star. I did clip it out, and I wish I had it with me to-night. But the fact is that it was carried as a Canadian Press issue, and there has been no refutation by anybody in your party --

MR. JOLLIFFE: No such statement was ever carried.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): I still repeat I believe what the Canadian Press has said.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I challenge the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor) to produce such a statement in any paper last June.

MR. ROBERT D. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe that according to the Rules of the House if an hon. member makes a statement, he has to back that statement up, with authority, or retract it.

MR. SPEAKER: No, that is not the fact.

MR. THORNBERRY: I challenge him to produce that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor) proceed?

[illegible]

[illegible] any [illegible]

MR. [illegible]

MR. [illegible]

[illegible] of [illegible]

MR. [illegible]

MR. [illegible]

MR. [illegible]

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]

The [illegible]

so-right [illegible]

Cross [illegible]

in your [illegible]

MR. [illegible]

MR. [illegible]

the [illegible]

MR. [illegible]

member for [illegible]

in any [illegible]

MR. [illegible]

speaker, [illegible]

the [illegible]

he has [illegible]

it.

MR. [illegible]

MR. TUCK: [illegible]

statement.

MR. SPEAKER: [illegible]

[illegible] proceed.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): I will be pleased to do so --

MR. GARFIELD ANDERSON (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I do not take up much of the time of the House, but I think this is a case where we should have a retration of the statement. He has quoted that the leader of the C.C.F. in Canada made a statement to the effect that all civil servants would be discharged. That is not the case, and he should withdraw that statement, or tell us where he has the authority for making such a statement.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) objected, and asked that the statement be produced or the remark withdrawn. I understood the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor) to say that he would produce it at a later date.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): That is correct, Mr. Speaker, -- at a later date I will be pleased to do so.

MR. JOLLIFFE: When will you produce it?

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): To-morrow.

MR. A. A. CASSELMAN (Nipissing): We will remind you of that.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): You do not need to. It will be a pleasure for me to. It will be a pleasure for me to produce it.

MR. L. G. ROBINSON (Waterloo South): Don't you stay away to-morrow now.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): Mr. Speaker, to repeat, or to go back, may I say that I have the honour of representing a good, solid, stable Canadian people situated in the County of Huron. These good people, situated in the County of Huron, as I said before, are perturbed regarding certain

issues that are being thrown around by certain political groups, whose only idea is to grasp political power.

(Page 1477 follows)

I might say, Mr. Speaker, I am in public life for one purpose only, ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, Oh.

MR. TAYLOR: It would be very hard for my friends across the aisle to believe this, because it is so foreign to their nature.

.... to contribute in one way or another to the best of my ability to the building up of this Province. It is hard for them to believe that, as I have said, because it is very foreign to their ideas. And I will not be a party to fantastic schemes from the ivory tower boys, to create a change of ills that may exist, cracks which do exist in our economic structure ....

AN HON. MEMBER: Then there are some cracks?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, sir. But the good people, and I think there is an ever increasing body of public opinion which is disturbed by the trend of myoptic taxation costs.

HON. MEMBERS: Myoptic?

MR. TAYLOR: Now, for my friends across the way, --

AN HON. MEMBER: Louder.

MR. TAYLOR: No doubt they have consulted their optician to get corrections in their glasses for short-sightedness. We do have; and there is evidence that taxation schemes are being advocated that are indeed myoptic or short sighted.

I might say this taxation myopia gives a false security while in reality we are discounting our future.

We hear to-day a certain fallacy, that we can raise war loans, which we are doing, and if we can raise billions in war loans, which it is our duty to do in time of war, yet, nevertheless the economic factor is such is that we are discounting our future by so doing, -- that we can raise the same

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

to their nature.

.... So convinced [illegible]

my ability to [illegible]

for them to [illegible]

very foreign [illegible]

fantastic [illegible]

change of [illegible]

our economic [illegible]

Mr Sec. [illegible]

Mr. [illegible]

I think [illegible]

which [illegible]

Hon. [illegible]

Mr. [illegible]

Mr Hon. [illegible]

Mr. [illegible]

optimism [illegible]

significance. [illegible]

schemes [illegible]

signed.

[illegible]

While [illegible]

We have [illegible]

war loans, which [illegible]

[illegible]

nevertheless [illegible]

country [illegible]

amount in billions for peace.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why can't you?

MR. TAYLOR: Will your group and the people in the factories and on the farm buy victory loans or buy peace bonds under the same pressure that they do buy war bonds? I doubt it.

We are seeing to-day a little shrugging of the shoulders, a little irksomeness caused by the system under which we buy war bonds, but, remove the common enemy from the thoats of all of us, and we have possibly the starting of peace, I doubt very much whether you can organize citizens throughout this country to go out and successfully get people to buy bonds, as they do buy war bonds.

AN HON. MEMBER: I would like to ask the Hon. member (Mr. Taylor) if it takes very much pressure to make him buy victory bonds?

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. TAYLOR: I do not know whether I should answer that question?

HON. MEMBERS: No, No.

MR. SPEAKER: Go on with your address. It would not impress the gallery.

MR. TAYLOR: The people in this Province are beginning to feel this trend of throwing around bonuses, or whatever you like to call them, these promises of an Utopia based upon less work, less honest toil, less sweat and more pleasure, as if money was created as leaves on bushes, or descended from Heaven as manna.

Last year, in the budget debate, I heard one of the Hon. members across the way taking the government to task for having a surplus, and he made this statement, --

[illegible]

[illegible]

Mr. TAYLOR: [illegible]

factories and on the [illegible] see
funds under [illegible]
I doubt it.

[illegible]
shoulders, a little [illegible] used by [illegible]
minor we by [illegible], [illegible] the [illegible]
the thanks of all [illegible]
of peace, I [illegible] very much [illegible]
throughout this country to go out [illegible]
people to buy bonds, [illegible]

Mr. Hon. [illegible]
(Mr. Taylor) [illegible]
by victory bonds?

Mr. [illegible]

Mr. TAYLOR: I do not know [illegible]
that question?

Hon. [illegible]

Mr. [illegible] not impress the [illegible]

Mr. TAYLOR: [illegible]
giving to feel [illegible]
whatever you like to call it, [illegible]
based upon less work, [illegible]
pleasure, as if money [illegible]
descended from heaven [illegible]

[illegible]

the Hon. member [illegible]

task for having [illegible]

I suppose some of them will be on their feet in a few moments to deny it, -- that when they got on the treasury benches there would be no surpluses but they would look after the good of the common man.

AN HON. MEMBER: Have you much of a surplus now?

MR. TAYLOR: I think it is better, Mr. Speaker, to realize that this country was built up to its present greatness by our forefathers and the rest of the people by toil, by honest sweat and intelligent foresight. They did not think in terms --

AN HON. MEMBER: I would like to ask the Honourable member if he does not believe in holidays with pay?

MR. TAYLOR: I definitely do; but I object to the preaching of ideas that they are going to do very little work and have a millionaire's life.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is your idea.

AN HON. MEMBER: The only people who do that is the Conservative party.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the troublesome times that lie ahead it behooves all people in public life, and those who are not so designated, to have very clear thinking on everyone's part. Unquestionably, and I think I will get agreement here, we have economic ills. But too frequently there are attempts to foster some elaborate plan born in the mind of some professional economist, which is dolled up with a glamorous cachou, and which is now being attempted to be sold to a wearisome people.

It might be well, if all the brain trusters and political agencies were herded on a boat, and the boat were taken out into the Atlantic Ocean and sunk.

It seems strange that in other walks of life, if

something is wrong it is cast aside. If a case of typhoid fever breaks out in the community, it is the duty of the medical officer of health to trace its source and find the source of that infection. He takes the water supply and has it tested, and, if there is nothing shown there, as frequently is the case, he continues his search until he finds the cause of the outbreak.

Why cannot we follow the same procedure when we are going after the difficulties in connection with our economic ills? Instead of somebody agitating a scheme based on imagination and dolled up as a pill for the unwary voter?

If some law is put upon the Statute Books, which is only there as the exhibition of political chicaneries and economic ignorance parading in the pious vestments of concern for the common man, while in reality it is but an instrument which will eventually crucify him.

Earlier in this Session we heard a great deal about the family allowance Act of 1944. I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to take much time on the policy of family allowances. I realize that there is something to be said for family allowances. To illustrate, if two men work in a chair factory, and one has no family, while the other one has a large family, it is quite obvious that each man can only put in a certain amount of ingenuity in the production of a chair, -- in all probability equal. Yet the man with a large family has several more mouths to keep. Now, I feel that something should be done to help that man but not at the sacrifice of the other man and lower his standard of living without substantially raising the standard of living of his more prolific friend.

[illegible]

[illegible] is going at its [illegible] pace. It [illegible] special level forces. It is the [illegible] family, it is the [illegible] the modern [illegible] family [illegible] find the [illegible] of [illegible] industrial. We know the [illegible] supply and how it [illegible], and [illegible] shown there, [illegible] in the [illegible] search until we find the cause of the [illegible].

Why [illegible] follow the [illegible] going after [illegible] difficulties in connection with an economic [illegible] Instead of [illegible], [illegible] based on [illegible] and [illegible] for the [illegible] very water?

In [illegible] is [illegible] one, which is only there as [illegible] and economic [illegible] concern for the [illegible], which is an instrument which [illegible].

Family [illegible] the family [illegible] the [illegible], [illegible] market, to [illegible] I realize [illegible] allowances. To [illegible], [illegible] factory, and we [illegible] no family, [illegible] large family. It [illegible] put in a certain amount of [illegible] a chair, -- [illegible] a large family [illegible] several [illegible] feel that [illegible] not at the [illegible] of living with [illegible] living at [illegible].

Now then, there is a thought which I have not noticed very much, it is true. Family allowances is one of those measures, which, as I said previously, was put in in the guise of helping the common man. As far as this Province is concerned, it actually will take about sixty-seven million dollars a year, annually, out of the tax payers' pockets of this Province outside of the Province. But that is not anything particular that I want to complain about, for I realize that, as one of the wealthiest Provinces in the Dominion, it is but common humanity to help the weaker provinces; and I have no quarrel with that. But the fact remains that, completely out of the Province of Ontario every year will go over sixty-seven million dollars, over half of what we now spend for the total services of the Province.

The one thought that is most disturbing to me, and I think it should be brought up here, -- nobody has, but I suppose from my particular training I am the one whom it would hit most forcibly, -- I bring it up to show that certain Acts can be put on the Statute Books without full thought for the benefit of the common man.

We have approximately thirty-five thousand homes in the Dominion of Canada in which the people of these homes are unfortunate individuals who are of a lower mental calibre than the more fortunate people; and under this cash subsidy, without any restrictions, I am perturbed as a medical man, that from that class of people we will have seventy-five thousand new progeny annually; and I hope my good friends across the way will not think I am too radical when I make the statement that this should be considered, because, from the action of the Family Allowance

Now then, there is a thought [illegible] I have not noticed very much, it is true, [illegible] of these measures, which, as I said previously, will put us in the guise of helping [illegible] common man. [illegible] this province is concerned, it actually will take about sixty-seven million dollars a year, annually, out of the tax payers' pockets of this province outside of the Province. But that is not anything particular that I want to complain about, for I realize that, as one of the results of Provinces in the Dominion, [illegible] common [illegible] to help the weaker provinces; and I have no quarrel with that. But the fact remains that, completely [illegible] the revenue of Ontario every year will go over sixty-[illegible] million dollars, over half of what we now spend for the total services of the Province.

The one thought that is most disturbing to me, and I think it should be brought up here, -- [illegible] has, but I suppose from my particular training [illegible] the one whom it would hit most forcibly, -- I think it up to show that certain note can be put on the [illegible] books without full thought for the benefit of the common man.

We have approximately thirty-five thousand people in the Dominion of Canada in which [illegible] of these people are unfortunate individuals who have or a lesser mental calibre than the more fortunate people. [illegible] cash subsidy without any restriction, I am [illegible] as a medical man, that from that class [illegible] have seventy-five thousand new [illegible] hope my good friends across the [illegible] radical when I make the [illegible] sidered, because [illegible] of [illegible] allowance

Act, in this particular field, we can, and undoubtedly will, have an increase of more morons or feeble minded people in this Dominion to support.

AN HON. MEMBER: May I ask the Hon. Member a question? The Hon. Member has made mention of the fact that there will be seventy-five thousand new progeny also that some people will be paying out at the expense of those who are more prolific. Is the Hon. Member taking a roundabout way of suggesting that we should have sterilization?

MR. TAYLOR: As a doctor, I am not averse to the question applying definitely to mental defectives, for the good of the country; because we have enough of mental defectives, unfortunately, and I feel sorry for them. But why should we, with an Act brought out in the guise of helping the common man, crucify the common man by every year increasing the cash bonuses for those people? It will mean we will have to build more mental institutions for those people.

AN HON. MEMBER: I would like to ask the Speaker a question. He just stated that the more fortunate appeared to be more intelligent. I would like to know how it is that the more unfortunate will raise the larger families?

MR. TAYLOR: I did not quite catch the question.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, I understand the Hon. Member to say that he was sorry to say that these less fortunate people were not quite as intelligent as the more fortunate.

MR. TAYLOR: No, I am talking about the mental defectives. Any medical man of science knows that in that group they do not have the control of the individual like you

act, in this [illegible]

will, have an [illegible]

people in [illegible]

AN HON. MEMBER. [illegible]

question? [illegible]

that there will [illegible]

also that some people [illegible]

of these [illegible]

ing a resolution [illegible]

sterilization?

MR. TAYLOR [illegible]

the question [illegible]

for the good of the country [illegible]

mental defectives, unfortunately [illegible]

them. But any [illegible]

guise of helping [illegible]

by every year increasing [illegible]

people? It will [illegible]

institutions for these [illegible]

AN HON. MEMBER: [illegible]

a question. He [illegible]

ed to be [illegible]

in this the [illegible]

MR. TAYLOR: [illegible]

AN HON. MEMBER: [illegible]

Hon. Member to say [illegible]

fortunate to the [illegible]

more fortunate.

MR. TAYLOR: [illegible]

factives. [illegible]

group [illegible]

have in your own family, or I have in mine. That is only the natural law; and there is nothing in Bill 61 to control that. And I, as a medical man, know what medical men have to put up with now in handling those poor unfortunates, and what this country has to put up with in connection with them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has not yet answered my question. He says the more unfortunate in this country ....

MR. DREW: I think the time has come to call a halt to these wholly misleading and unfair questions. The Hon. member, if his hearing is good, knows perfectly well what the speaker was saying. And he is asking questions which are intended for only one purpose, and that is to create a false impression in this House.

We might as well clean up a few things. The extremely complacent leader of the opposition had some rather harsh words to say about the quotation from Mr. Caldwell. Let me read an outline of it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Where from?

MR. DREW: From the Telegram, a Canadian Press Despatch:

> "'They will be cleaned out,' he said. 'There is no question about it, we are going to have a real house cleaning and those we clean out will be replaced by those appointed by the Civil Service Commission on a non-partisan basis'"

(Page 1484 follows)

have in [illegible] family, [illegible]
[illegible] the natural law, [illegible]
to commit [illegible]
medical men have to [illegible]
poor unfortunates, and we [illegible]
with in connection with them.

[illegible]
has not yet answered my question [illegible]
fortunate in this country ...

Mr. DREW: I [illegible]
a halt to these [illegible]
The Hon. member, if he [illegible]
well what the speaker [illegible]
questions which are [illegible]
that is to create [illegible]

We might as [illegible] up a for [illegible]
extremely complicated [illegible] the criminal [illegible]
rather naval work [illegible]
Oakwell. Let me read [illegible]

Mr. JOLLIFFE: [illegible]

Mr. DREW: From the [illegible]

Hansard:

"There will [illegible]
[illegible] a certain [illegible]
a real house of [illegible]
[illegible] released by [illegible]
[illegible]

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): The House heard what the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor) said. I understood him to quote Mr. Coldwell that the Saskatchewan Civil Service is going to be cleaned out. I have never heard of any such statement having been made, although I was in Regina with Mr. Coldwell on the night of June 15th, and I travelled with him from Regina to Toronto on June 16th. The hon. Prime Minister has quoted from the "Toronto Evening Telegram", and I am asking --

MR. R. HOBBS TAYLOR (Huron): May I ask a question?

MR. SPEAKER: I have to ask the hon. members to cooperate. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is making a statement, and has the floor. I would ask the hon. members to refrain from interrupting, and let us have just one at a time.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Since I have never heard of this report, or seen this report, and since I was with Mr. Coldwell that day and the day before, I think the hon. Prime Minister should read the report of the "Evening Telegram", from which he has quoted only a few words, - in fact, only the headline.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Certainly, I will be glad to, when we get this back to normal. We will recall that the speaker spoke of not hearing the statement that Coldwell had predicted to clean out all the civil servants.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I wish to thank the hon. Prime Minister for reading the report, which makes it perfectly clear the quotation made by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor) was a misleading quotation.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON (Brant): May I rise to a point of order? When did the House become so sensitive about words

[illegible]

[illegible] House been [illegible]

[illegible] (Mr. [illegible]) said. [illegible]

[illegible] conferences [illegible]

[illegible] have never heard of any such [illegible]

although I was in [illegible]

June 15th, [illegible] travel [illegible] from Toronto [illegible]

Toronto on June 16th. [illegible]

from the Toronto [illegible] Telegram [illegible]

MR. [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] to cooperate. [illegible] leader of the [illegible] statement, and [illegible] to refrain from interrupt[illegible] at a time.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] I have [illegible] port, or seen this report [illegible] since I was [illegible] that day and the [illegible], I think [illegible] should read the report of the Liberal [illegible] which he has [illegible] only a few [illegible], - [illegible] reading.

HON. [illegible]: [illegible] (Prime Minister) [illegible], I will be glad to, [illegible] recall that the speaker [illegible] that Goldwell had predicted [illegible] servants.

MR. [illegible]: I [illegible] for reading the report, which [illegible] quotation made by the [illegible] a misleading [illegible].

MR. [illegible] [illegible] order. [illegible]

that may be offensive to fellow leaders in this country? As I recall the rules, they say an hon. member may not say anything offensive to another hon. member, but surely we have come to a pretty pass.

MR. SPEAKER: I would rule the hon. member for Brant's (Mr. Nixon) point is very well taken. My understanding is it is not an offence against the rules when a person makes an uncomplimentary remark in general, but remarks directed to a Party are out of order.

MRS. R. M. LUCKOCK (Bracondale): I would like to ask the hon. member if he feels the people of Ontario will be particularly interested in paying their taxes for what is going on here to-night.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bracondale (Mrs. Luckock) has asked a very good question, and I think she has somewhat repeated what I said. I am appealing to both sides of the House to get down to serious consideration and business, and fore-go the amusement.

MR. R. HOBBS TAYLOR (Huron): If you recall last week, the other two leaders in the opposition groups that sit side by side, one House leader brought in a sub-amendment to the amendment of the official Opposition, and in the Liberal sub-amendment they criticized the Government for the change in the religious exercises in our public schools. I have many good friends amongst them, and I am going to quote what their House leader said, "that rumpy portion" of their Party. I wonder if those sitting behind the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn), who moved the amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) had been consulted before this amendment had been tabled on the floor of the House, because, knowing

that may be offensive to fellow [illegible]
As I recall the motion, they are [illegible]
anything offensive [illegible] we
have come to a [illegible] case.

MR. [illegible] I would move the [illegible] remarks
(Mr. Nixon) point is very well taken. My [illegible] is
t is not an offence against [illegible] when a [illegible]
discussing [illegible] general, but [illegible]
Party are out of order.

MRS. A. T. HOCKEN (Stanmore): I would [illegible]
the hon. member if he feels the peo[illegible] would be
particularly interested in paying their taxes [illegible]
going on here to-night.

MR. SPEAKER: The [illegible] member [illegible]
Hocken) has raised a very good question, [illegible] he has
somewhat repeated [illegible] a mild. [illegible] an [illegible]
of the case [illegible] serious consideration [illegible] business,
and forego the amusement.

MR. [illegible] (Burwood): [illegible]
week, the other two leaders in the Opposition [illegible]
sit side by side, one [illegible] leader [illegible] amendment
to the amendment of the official Opposition [illegible] liberal
sub-amendment they criticised the [illegible]
in the religious exercises in our [illegible] many
good friends amongst them, and I am [illegible] it
House leader said, "[illegible]
wonder if these sitting [illegible]
Hepburn), who moved the amendment, [illegible]
for Grant (Mr. Nixon) had been [illegible]
had been tabled [illegible]

many of these good citizens across the hall in this corner, I feel that if they support this particular portion of the amendment it will be difficult for them to ratify themselves with their constituents. I wonder, when I look at those good friends, if they are against the religious idea of the Canadian way of life. It is evident that in these times, in this country, we need a conception of good, Christian thought, and in the young mind, at a time when it is most impressionable. I agree with the idea that we should not take away the responsibility of the home or the Church, but I feel that our life is not as simple a life as our fore-fathers had, in that it is a more jumpy, concentrated sort of life, where we cannot shirk the responsibility of bringing to these children of the people who wished, at the time when a child is most impressionable, that Christian principles underlie every-day principles of citizenship, and we would be doing a disservice to the future Canadians of our country if we gave them straight non? sectarian schools, which would give them the thought that every-day life was divorced from a Christian conception of life.

If my friends over there feel that way, I think they should vote for a settlement, but if they feel, as I do, then you cannot divorce from the education of a Canadian child the principles of Christianity. My good friends of the Roman Catholic Church have recognized this for many years, and I think they, in speaking to many of them, agree with me that those of other faith, who wish it, should have the same privilege that they themselves have in allowing their children to have religious education in the schools.

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, in the second paragraph the

Government has been taken to task for its so-called immigration policy. Last week we heard a great deal of ridicule, some of it humour, about Ontario House, but I feel it is the duty of a government of this province, or any other province, to bring before the different markets of the world the industry of our people, the resources of our province, and make friendly relations, and when there is an opening-up of the transportation of commercial enterprises throughout the world, Ontario will not lag due to the fault of the government in failing to bring before the different people of the world the good points of this province.

I cannot see that the Government should be blamed if it did not do that. One more thought, I would say to the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn), - I am sorry he is not in the House at present, - he was most perturbed about the immigrants coming into this province. We are going to have immigration into this province, whether he likes it, or not, or whether I like it, or not. I say to my Liberal friends across the way, Are they going to stop the type of immigration that is taking place right now, the English and Scottish brides of our returned soldiers? They are immigrants. Are you not going to welcome them when they come to our shores? That is the form of immigration I say to the hon. Leader of the Liberal Group (Mr. Hepburn) that he might be perturbed, somewhat, about, the question of immigration or the exodus from this country of those people on which the state has expended some money, on their education.

I repeat, irrespective of criticism due to the patriotic

type of political language has become too rampant throughout Ontario. There is a tendency among certain groups of our Canadian citizens to move to another country. I want to illustrate this by an illustration. I have one of the noon day study classes set up in the city of London some years ago. I have been president and past-president, and all the rest, and they meet every Wednesday at the Y.M.C.A., with the exception of the two summer months. The essential duty of that club is to bring certain subjects of benefit to the junior members of the profession. It has been the policy in the club to entertain a graduating class of the Medical School of the University, and this was done last spring. Some fifty-one graduates were entertained, and I asked them if they had any plans for when the war was over, where they might locate, and, Mr. Speaker, I was amazed with the unanimity of the answer that I received that they were not going to locate in Ontario, or Canada, if they could help it. My next question was "Why?" -- and it might have been due to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) when he addressed the Academy of Medicine, (this graduating class was there, and heard him give the CCF socialized plan for medicine,) -- and they came back at me, and they said, "Doctor, as a young man or woman in the profession, would you start up where you did not know whether you were going to be regimented, whether you were going to be sent to the North Country, or somewhere else, or that your soul may not be your own?

I think we should give some consideration to the possibility of thinking of that type.

[illegible]

MR. FRED W. WARREN (Hamilton-Wentworth): Was it a question of money or service?

MR. TAYLOR: There is one thing else I want to mention. We have, in this House, Mr. Speaker, a lot of political dynamite floating around. We have not only within this House, but throughout the country, many political factions, one vying with the other for political power. We have had recision back to the days after the last war for certain political parties, and, I say this most kindly, that may be due to their constructive thought when they have resorted to the silly practise of name-calling.

(Page No. 1494 follows.)

MR. [illegible] question of money or services?

MR. [illegible] reality. [illegible] political dynamic [illegible] within [illegible] political functions, [illegible] power. We have had recession [illegible] last [illegible] most kindly that [illegible] when they have resorted to [illegible] calling.

(Reg. No. [illegible])

I remember that after the last war the people were branded as Bolshies, Reds or Pinks or some other kind of animal for advocating social changes, and that continued until Russia came into the war. Then the cry became Fascism. And now in 1945 we hear political leaders calling it Reactionary Toryism. In fact in this House only a week or so ago one of the leaders said that he was not going to be crucified on the crooked cross of Tory reactionism, whatever that may be.

I should like to show just what these reactionary Tories have done in the past, Mr. Speaker. The Progressive Conservative party believes and always has believed in rationalized socialism. Where the need has arisen they have never hesitated to take a forward step.

Long before we ever heard of the CCF party, long before we ever heard of this party to my right which has changed its name so often --

MR. SALSBERG: Not as often as the Tories.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): Long before we ever heard of these new parties, Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest socialist schemes ever put into effect in this country was introduced by the Tory reactional government of James P. Whitney, and that was the Hydro Electric System of Ontario.

One of the greatest transportation improvements ever brought about in the province of Ontario, the Toronto Transportation Commission, was also brought about in reactionary Tory Toronto.

What has made the financing of this war possible and done as well as it has been done? It has been due to the creation of the Bank of Canada, and who, Mr. Speaker, brought the Bank of Canada into being? It was the reactionary

[illegible]

[illegible] more drastic as [illegible] of animal for advertising [illegible] until August [illegible] Feasian. [illegible] it Reactionary Tory [illegible] or so [illegible] be crucified on the red cross of Tory [illegible] whatever that may be.

I should like to know, [illegible] Tories have come [illegible], Mr. [illegible] Conservative party believes [illegible] rationalized socialism. [illegible] have never hesitated to take a [illegible]

Long before we by [illegible] before we ever heard of this party [illegible] changed its name [illegible] --

Mr. [illegible]

Mr. TURCOTTE (Nor[illegible]): [illegible] of these new parties, Mr. [illegible] socialist schemes ever put [illegible] was introduced by the [illegible] P. Whitney, and that was the [illegible] of Ontario.

One of the [illegible] ever brought about [illegible] Transportation commission, [illegible] reactionary Tory Toronto

That has made the [illegible] and done as well as it has [illegible] the creation of the [illegible] produce the [illegible]

Tory government of R. B. Bennett.

I could go on and give instance after instance to show that the progressive Tory party, when it believes that it is necessary to use the socialist principle does not hesitate to use it, but it does not believe in socialization for the sake of socialization. It believes that the individual should retain his soul free, keeping within the bounds of the law.

MR. ANDERSON: If I may ask a question, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has referred to some public enterprises of which we are all very proud. He mentioned the Toronto Transportation Commission. Would he say that the Toronto Transportation Commission have lost their liberty or their souls which he would have us believe that you do lose when you adopt socialism? That is a question I would like him to answer.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): Rationalized socialism does not take the soul, but socialism just for the sake of socialism does.

MR. SALSBERG: Would the hon. member tell us what he means by rationalized socialism?

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): I should be glad to do that, Mr. Speaker, but the time is getting late and I have a few other things to say and I must say to the hon. member for St. Andrew that it would take me more than the closing hours to explain the whole matter to him.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Speaker --

MR. SPEAKER: I ask the cooperation of all hon. members to let the hon. member finish. These questions are only being asked for the purpose of interrupting.

MR. BROWN: No, Mr. Speaker. I was going to ask whether it was socialization for the sake of socialization

[illegible] government [illegible] B. Bennett:

I [illegible] show that the progressive Tory party [illegible] it is necessary to use the [illegible] hesitate to use it, but it does not [illegible] for the sake of socialization. [illegible] should retain his soul free, [illegible] law.

MR. ANDERSON: If I may ask a question [illegible] the hon. member has referred to some [illegible] which we are all very proud. [illegible] Transportation Commission. [illegible] Transportation Commission have [illegible] souls which he would [illegible] adopt socialism. [illegible] to answer.

MR. TAYLOR (Burton): [illegible] not take the soul, but [illegible] just for [illegible] socialism does.

MR. ANDERSON: [illegible] he means by nationalization [illegible]

MR. TAYLOR (Burton): I should [illegible] Mr. Speaker, but the time [illegible] other things to say and I must [illegible] it. Andrew that it would take as much [illegible] hours to explain the whole matter to him.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Speaker --

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] members to let the hon. member for [illegible] only being asked for the sake of [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: Yes, Mr. Speaker. [illegible] whether it was a criticism [illegible]

when the government took over the Toronto stockyards?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. TAYLOR (Huron): The other day when the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) was speaking in this debate I was amazed at the language he used in his accusations against the Drew Government. I like the hon. member for Elgin personally; we have had many good times together. I thought that he must have been up in the blue hills of the Gatineau visiting his master at Kingsmere because everything we heard in denunciation of the Drew Government from the hon. member for Elgin that night was what we have heard so often from that other source. He accused this government of creating disunity. Yet while ht prattled about unity he was carrying the torch for the very things that produced disunity in this country.

It has been my good fortune in the past to live in the province of Quebec. I have many good friends in that province to-day. That friendship has been built upon mutual respect, mutual liking and absolute confidence in each other. Ifeel that in this country no political leader has the right, just for the purpose of consolidating one portion of the electorate to gain power, and separating that portion of the electorate from the rest of the country, to make statements that actually cause disunity. I was surprised that the hon. member should be guilty of that, because I as a Canadian feel that he as a Canadian wants this country to progress to the destiny where its rightful place is.

There are two main ethnic groups in our Canadian life and unity can only be brought about and preserved when there is self respect by one group for the other and absolute confidence on the part of each in the other. It is not

when t[illegible]

MR. [illegible]

MR. TAL[illegible]

member for Elgin (Mr. Peck[illegible]

I was amazed at [illegible]

against the Free Lar[illegible]

Elgin personally [illegible]

I thought that is [illegible]

of the witness [illegible]

everything as I [illegible]

from the [illegible]

heard so often from [illegible]

government of [illegible]

about unity he was [illegible]

that produced [illegible]

It has been [illegible]

in the province of [illegible]

that province to [illegible]

upon mutual [illegible]

in each other. [illegible]

leader has the right, [illegible]

one portion of [illegible]

that portion of [illegible]

to make statements that do [illegible]

surprised [illegible]

because I am a [illegible]

this country [illegible]

place is.

There are [illegible]

life and unity [illegible]

there is such [illegible]

confidence [illegible]

based upon a bonne entente. It is based upon equal sacrifice and equal benefits, and with these two great races joining hands together I feel that this country can reach the heights where its destiny lies.

MR. F. W. WARRN (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, let me first compliment the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Martin) and the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Scott) on their addresses in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I do not know that I can add much to the compliments that have already been paid. I would like to say that they may consider themselves fortunate in having the opportunity to speak at all from that side of the House, where I have noticed that the speaking is practically confined to the front benches.

Like sixty-one other members of this Legislature I was a newcomer here last year. I followed with deep interest the debates of this House and arrived at certain conclusions. One was that many of the legislators here take their work seriously, while others make a burlesque to be done. The work of this Legislature, as you know, Mr.Speaker, is the spending of over $100,000,000 of money and looking after the welfare of three and a half million people. That is big business and should be handled in a businesslike way.

I would like to express my disappointment at the level of debate which some hon. members fall into. I am not particularly directing my remarks to the speaker who preceded me this evening. I have in mind rather what happened in this House last week and the week before. If the proceedings of this House are broadcast, as I hope they will be in the not too distant future, many of the shadow boxers who now occupy the time of the House will find

[illegible]

MR. F. G. WARD ([illegible]): [illegible] "The Speaker" [illegible] Let me [illegible] (Mr. Martin) [illegible] on their [illegible] I do not know [illegible] have already been [illegible] comrades [illegible] away at all [illegible] method that the [illegible] front benches.

Like sixty-one [illegible] I was a member [illegible] interest are debases [illegible] conclusions. One [illegible] take their work seriously, [illegible] to be done. The work [illegible] Mr. Speaker, in the [illegible] and looking after [illegible] people [illegible] a business [illegible]

I think like [illegible] the level [illegible] I am not particularly [illegible] who preceded me this evening [illegible] happened in [illegible] the proceedings [illegible] will be in [illegible] boxers [illegible]

themselves left at home, where they can waste their time as they see fit.

In this House, of course, many different opinions are expressed, and I respect those opinions which differ from mine so long as they are honest opinions, but I have nothing but contempt for those who put the good of their party above the welfare of the people they represent.

Last session the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) introduced a health bill into this House. It took the hon. member a considerable length of time to draft the bill, which was prepared with great care after a great deal of thought on his part. The introduction of that bill caused a flurry in the government ranks with the result that the government hastily brought in a bill of its own and in spite of strong opposition from the members on this side of the House the bill was passed. The only satisfaction we have is that the predictions which were made at that time are coming through and the Government has admitted that its bill will not work, and they propose, I believe, to introduce a new bill.

I should like to give another example. Last year a bill was introduced into this House by myself to provide for planning and housing. At the time the bill was introduced there was a most serious housing situation throughout the province. A great many people had no place to lay their heads. There was overcrowding and generally a very bad housing situation existed. The Government saw fit to take the responsibility of defeating that bill and the result was that many cities, including the city of Toronto, were badly handicapped and were unable to carry out the things they would have liked to do and as a result they are bringing in a bill this year to give them the very

themselves left at home, where [illegible]
they see fit.

In this [illegible]
are experiment, and I regret [illegible]
from time to time as they [illegible]
nothing but [illegible]
party above the welfare of the people [illegible]

Last session the hon. member [illegible]
Dennison) introduced a Health Bill [illegible]
took the hon. member [illegible] interested [illegible]
the bill, which was prepared with [illegible]
deal of thought on his part. The [illegible]
caused a flurry in the government [illegible]
the government healthy growth [illegible]
spite of strong opposition from [illegible]
of the House the bill was passed [illegible]
we have is that the predicti[illegible]
time are coming through [illegible]
that its bill will not work, [illegible]
to introduce a new bill.

I should like to give [illegible]
year a bill was introduced [illegible]
provide for planting [illegible]
was introduced there was [illegible]
throughout the province. [illegible]
to lay their hens. There [illegible]
a very bad [illegible]
fit to take the responsi[illegible]
the result was that [illegible]
Toronto were badly [illegible]
out the things [illegible]
they are [illegible]

power which was asked for in the bill of last year. Hamilton was in the same position, and I believe Ottawa. They could not form their committees because they had no power to do so.

It may be good political strategy for the government to defeat bills of that kind, but personally I do not approve of such tactics.

To-night the question has been raised in this House about the civil service in Saskatchewan. I would like to read an article headed: "Saskatchewan Civil Servants Praise Policy of CCF Government," which reads as follows:

> "How Saskatchewan's CCF government has won the confidence of provincial civil servants is described in a letter written by G. F. Dawson, general secretary of the Saskatchewan Government Services Association, to civil service groups outside the province. Says Mr. Dawson:
>
> "'At the outset let me say that since the establishment of our CCF government, we have been given ample reason to believe that they are determined to carry out their pre-election promises to take the civil service out of politics; to raise the standard of salaries; to improve working conditions in mental hospitals and such institutions; to arrange a complete classification of the service, with security of tenure, promotion on merit, automatic increases, etc; and re-establish an independent public service commission of not less than three persons -- the Association having asked that we be given the privilege of nominating one representative thereon.
>
> "'Very few persons have been requested to resign and, in every case which has come to our attention, we consider the government was fully justified and many employees have intimated that in this one respect, the government has not gone far enough. Furthermore, without a single exception, some employee of the department or branch concerned has been promoted to the vacancy created by such resignation. Under these circumstances, you will understand why our civil servants are beginning to have a great deal of respect for this government.
>
> "'Five days after it was sworn in, our Association officers had a very satisfactory interview with Premier Douglas, and presented the skeleton of a brief relating to matters

> desired by the civil service -- all of which had been presented to previous governments. The Premier merely glanced at the paper, turned it face down on his desk, and then proceeded to tell our president what was wrong with the civil service, and what his government intended to do about it. In doing so, he touched on more than half of the matters referred to in our brief. He is the most approachable and understanding Premier we have ever had, and declares freely that he and his ministers want the employees to bring their problems to the government.
>
> "'About one week ago, after many special meetings of our central executive devoted to the preparation and study of material, our final brief, giving complete details of all matters affecting the service, was presented to the Premier, and we were advised that the government most certainly intends to adopt most of our suggestions, and that in some cases members of the cabinet, or special committees appointed for the purpose, are studying these matters in order that the government may bring forward the necessary legislation at the regular session in the New Year, if not dealt with at the special session in October.'"

The Saskatchewan government has been severely criticized but I think that article speaks for itself.

I am sorry that the Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Porter) is not in the House because I have some remarks to address to him.

During the last session there was a new department of government created, the Department of Planning and Development, with the Hon. Dana Porter as Minister charged with the responsibility of administering the department. The other ministers stepped into departments already existing and functioning and it was simple for them to carry on. Indeed, it has been said that it is the deputy ministers who do the work and that the cabinet ministers get the credit. Whether that is true or not I am not prepared to say. We have not been in that

postion yet but we may be before very long.

The Minister of Planning and Development had a difficult job on his hands in starting out. He had to start from scratch, or perhaps I may say he started out and had to scratch. Anyway he had no precedents to guide him like the other ministers had, and there is no doubt that he had difficulties to overcome.

But now this new department has been in existence for nearly a year, and I am anxious to know what it has done. We are keenly interested in postwar work, and I find by reading the details of ordinary expenditure that the Department of Planning and Development spent over $91,000 last year. They must have something to show for that expenditure, and perhaps we shall be given a report later on showing how that $91,000 was expended.

I am disappointed, too, at the finding in the budget forecast the amount of $100,000 allocated to that Department of Planning and Development. How does that department propose to make a showing, the kind of showing I think it should make, on the sum of $100,000. We have got a job on our hands in making our postwar plans for employment, and we should be making them now. I do know that the Minister has gone up and down the country suggesting to the various municipalities that they make their plans for postwar work and make them now. I compliment him on that. But I would like to see him do more. It is the finest kind of work that any Minister could do, making plans now to take care of the after-the-war period.

(Page 1502 follows)

[illegible]

The [illegible] difficult [illegible] start from scratch [illegible] and had [illegible] that he had [illegible]

But [illegible] for [illegible] done. We are [illegible] this by [illegible] the Department of Planning and [illegible] $91,000 last year. They [illegible] that expenditure [illegible] later on about [illegible] that [illegible].

I [illegible] budget for [illegible] $[illegible],000,000 [illegible] Department of Planning and Development [illegible] department proposes to take [illegible] I think it [illegible] got a [illegible] applicant, and [illegible] that the [illegible] getting to the [illegible] plans for [illegible] rule on that. But I [illegible] is the finest kind of [illegible] making plans [illegible]

We are going to have a job on our hands we never had before, and it will take a lot of planning and I would like to emphasize as strongly as I can that we should make those plans and make them now.

I would like to point out that one of the worst problems we have on our hands is the lack of housing, and that problem has not been thrust into our laps because of the war. That condition existed before the war. It was caused, I would say, because of the inability of people to build houses during the hungry thirties. They could not meet the natural demand for housing in those days, and when the war came upon us and there was a shifting of the population, we had a real problem on our hands in these munition centres.

I have gone into this question of housing, and I am interested in building. I do not want to worry you with statistics, but I would like to point out that if we are to meet our housing shortage, we will have to build forty thousand homes per year, for the next ten years. We need to make a comparison when we use a figure like that. "Forty thousand" does not mean much unless you can bring it back to earth and make a comparison. I will point this out, that in 1929 we had our peak year for the building of homes, and in that year, in this province, there were approximately 11,000 homes built, so it just means that we have to build approximately four times as many homes as we built in our peak year, each year, over a period of years, to meet the demand for homes. You can see the tremendous problem which we have on our hands. And what we consider is that, so far as the Government is

[illegible]

... it will [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] now [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

the [illegible]

[illegible]

to [illegible]

meet the [illegible]

the war came upon us and [illegible]

population [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

an interest in [illegible]

with [illegible]

are to [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] need to make a [illegible]

that. [illegible]

[illegible]

point this out, that in [illegible]

building [illegible]

there were [illegible]

means that [illegible]

many [illegible]

a period of years, [illegible]

see the [illegible]

And what [illegible]

concerned, they are doing nothing to meet this condition. I think the hon. members of the Opposition here are entitled to criticize. I like to be fair in any criticism which I may offer, and I do not intend to deal with any personalities in regard to anyone, or to any party in this House. But I think we are here for the purpose of criticism, and I would like to criticize the Government for lack of planning in the housing field.

Now, this is a matter which has to be worked out, and in order to be carried out it will have to be worked with the Federal Government, and I think we should bury the hatchet and get down to brass tacks, and get in touch with the Federal Government, and see what we can do, and make the necessary plans to meet this shortage after the war.

Now, during the last Session, there was set up in this House a Committee to study the question of coal, and this Session we have set up another Committee to study the question of labour. I think this question of housing is of sufficient importance so that we should set up a special Committee in this House to study that question, and report to the House.

There is another subject I would like to touch upon, and that is the question of schools. I think I know something about schools. I happen to be an architect and I have had the privilege of building, probably two million dollars' worth of schools in various parts of the province, and I think I know something about the subject.

I would like to pay my compliments to the Government of about eight years ago -- to the Liberal Government which

was in power in those days, for I think they made one of the finest contributions along the educational line, when they introduced manual training and home economics into our rural High Schools. Now, the people in the cities probably do not understand what that meant to those people, but up until then, something like 93 percent of the population going through High Schools did not go any further than High School. They had a curriculum designed for University education, but out of about 100 percent of the pupils, only 7 percent went on to the University. I think that was a mistake, particularly in the rural sections. These boys were being educated away from the farms, and when these subjects were introduced into our High Schools, it kept the boys and girls there, and I do not know of anything which has taken the imagination of the boys and girls more than those two particular courses. Not only do they follow that work with a greater interest, but it has been proven that their marks are higher in other courses, because they are now interested in the whole work, to a greater degree, since these courses were introduced.

I know a number of schools where the boys at four o'clock, instead of going home, go into the manual training room and stay there until they are sent out of the school at six o'clock. When I went to school, I could not get out of school fast enough, and I think that may apply to most of the hon. members here. Conditions, of course, are different to-day. These boys and girls are interested in the work. I should like you to see the girls in some of the home economic classes. They make their own dresses, and they make the clothing that the nurses wear, and it was a wonderful contribution, particularly to the rural sections,

because they had it in the cities, and I believe have had it for some years. I know they appreciate it in those sections, and I am glad our hon. Prime Minister of Education (Mr. Drew), is carrying on that work.

There is one thing I would like to point out in connection with that work, and that is that the Government gave a maximum grant of twenty thousand dollars towards the building of those two rooms, and an additional grant for equipment. I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that since those figures were established, building costs have increased at least fifty percent, and I would like to suggest that this grant be increased to thirty thousand dollars from the twenty thousand dollar figure. I think it would help to cover the costs, and I would like to see that step taken.

Now, just to show how popular these classes are. I know of one school in the province where there were six busloads of pupils coming from miles around to attend that school, and the revenue which was derived from the extra payments was almost sufficient to cover the extra costs of the debentures, with the result that a high school was built, which cost over one hundred thousand dollars, and it only increased the mill rate by one mill. They received enough grants from the rural schools to practially carry the cost of the debentures. That, I think, speaks well for the system, and it shows it is a success.

While I am on schools, I would like to bring up one detail, which I think the hon. Minister of Hydro (Mr. Challies) is interested in. I spoke to him the other day and I would like to see something done about it. In

these schools, we are trying to bring them up to the highest standard possible, and one of the details we have to contend with and attend to, is the artificial lighting in these schools, and I have found that in many schools, particularly the rural schools, the lights are not lit for a long period during the day. Just in the wintertime they are used for a few hours, but in the summertime the lights are practically not used in the class-rooms in many places, but they are charged a service charge, depending upon the size of the lamps in the fixtures. And I further found that some of these Boards, in order to reduce their service charge, put in smaller lamps than were actually required. I would like to see in all schools this service charge wiped out -- for a public building, such as a school. I have found, since speaking to the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) that in some schools there is no service charge, and I would like to see that carried into all the schools, because I believe it would make a contribution towards the lighting of these schools, and operate to the benefit of the pupils.

In the Speech from the Throne, reference was made to a study of schools, in order to see if something can be done toward decreasing the cost. I am in agreement with anything which can be done along that line. I had the privilege of speaking with the hon. Prime Minister on the subject, and I learned something from him of what he has in mind, and I would like to say at this time that I agree with what he is doing along this line.

We are spending -- I cannot hardly say it is too much, until I can prove a satisfactory school can be built

for less -- but I would like to see some investigation made, because I think there are possibilities. You spend, say, one hundred thousand dollars for a school with probably eight or ten rooms, and that school is only used five hours a day, for five days a week, that is twenty-five hours a week. I think we have put too much money in those schools for such a short period of usage, and whether or not we can reduce the cost, I think we should give consideration to the use of these schools for a much longer period of time. I would like to see some thought given to the question of adult education. I believe our people are keenly interested in education, even after they are married, as well as before, and I would like to see more thought given to adult education, because I think there is a great field there to be developed, and I have found if you give people a subject in which they are interested, and provide somebody who can present that in a way from which they will benefit, they will take an interest in it, and I believe if our Department of Education would follow that up, we would make real progress along educational lines.

It is hard for me to stand here and criticize the Government on the fifty percent grant. I was one of those in the motion yesterday to make this preliminary payment, but I did not want to speak then, as there were a great many who were to take part in that debate, but I have been so often with School Boards in the spring of the year who had payments to make and the only way they could get money was to borrow it from the bank, and I think the payment of this money at this time will be a real contribution, parti-

cularly in the rural school boards. In the cities, they seem to have lots of money, but in the rural sections they are not so well financed and a payment at this time will come in very well with them.

And regarding this fifty percent grant. It would be natural to expect criticism from this side of the House. One thing I have not been able to understand is this; that we are talking about paying fifty percent of the costs. I will not say anything as to whether Toronto gets less than fifty percent, and some place else gets more, but in one breath they say, "We are going to reduce the taxes," and in the next breath they say, "We will increase the schools and the equipment in the schools." I do not see how they can have their cake and eat it too. If all that money is going towards the reduction of taxes, then nothing will be left to improve the building, or to improve the teachers' salaries. If they are going to divide it up, why not say so? I think we should know just where we are standing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I see the hour is getting along, so I will conclude.

MR. FARQUHAR R. OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Provincial Treasurer): I move the House do now adjourn, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Would the hon. Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost) inform us what we shall be doing to-morrow and I think he could also inform us whether there will be any danger of a

[illegible]

[illegible]

Mrs. [illegible]

[illegible]

House. [illegible]

[illegible]

the [illegible]

[illegible]

more, [illegible]

the taxes," [illegible]

increase the [illegible]

I do [illegible]

If all [illegible]

taxes, [illegible]

or to [illegible]

to divide [illegible]

that [illegible]

Well, Mr. [illegible]

so I will [illegible].

Mr. [illegible]

I move the [illegible]

Motion [illegible].

Mr. [illegible]

the House to [illegible]

Mr. [illegible]

would the [illegible]

us what we [illegible]

also [illegible]

night sitting? I do not suppose there is, but we would be interested to know.

MR. FROST: No, I think the intention is to proceed with bills to-morrow. I think there was some desire on the part of the hon. members to get the Throne debate cleaned up, and possibly the intention to go on to-morrow. The hon. Prime Minister is here now, and I will let him speak for himself, but I think the intention was to go on with bills to-morrow.

MR. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): As I heard it, as I came in, the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Frost) has stated we will be dealing with bills to-morrow. That is my intention. We have a number of bills to present.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You and I have a date to-morrow night?

MR. DREW: Oh, yes, that is right.

MISS MACPHAIL: Why can we not all go to the spelling bee?

MR. DREW: That would be fine, I think.

Motion agreed to; the House adjourned at 10:55 p.m.

- - - - - - - -

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND DAY

AFTERNOON SESSION

Toronto, Ontario,
Friday, March 16, 1945.

SPEAKER: Honourable William J. Stewart, C.B.E.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. WILLIAM DUCKWORTH (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the first report of the Select Committee appointed to direct the expenditure of a sum set apart for art purposes, and move its adoption.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: "The Select Committee appointed to direct the Expenditure of a sum set apart for art purposes begs leave to present the following as its first report: -

"Your Committee recommends that the Department of Education be requested to consider the inclusion in the bursary system operated by that Department the assistance by way of bursaries of deserving students at the Ontario College of Art.

"Your Committee recommends that one painting by a representative Ontario artist be purchased during the present fiscal year, and that the policy of purchasing at least one picture by representative Ontario artists be adopted for future years; and that the Ontario Society of Artists be asked to nominate a number of paintings, from which nominations a painting shall be selected by your Committee.

"Your Committee recommends that ex-Premiers Hepburn and Nixon be authorized to have their portraits painted by artists selected by them for inclusion in the portraits of all ex-Premiers of the Province.

"Your Committee recommends that ex-Premiers Hepburn and Nixon be authorized to have their portraits painted by artists selected by them for inclusion in the portraits of all ex-Premiers of the Province.

"Your Committee also recommends that the Government consider the advisability of organizing annual exhibitions of works by Ontario artists, including all samples of such works now owned by the Province, to be displayed at different centres throughout the Province, and that the Department of Education be authorized to make the necessary arrangements."

Motion agreed to.

HON. DANA H. PORTER (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Daley, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to provide for the establishment of conservation authorities for the purpose of conservation, restoration and development of natural resources, other than gas, oil, coal and minerals, and for the prevention of floods and water pollution," and that same be read now the first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL (York North): Would the hon. Minister kindly enlighten?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the establishment of authorities in water-shed areas of the province, conservation authorities which will have the functions of formulating a scheme for the conservation of natural resources and any other projects that would have to fit in with that for the purpose of controlling floods and controlling, insofar as possible, and restoring the under-ground water supply.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he would mind telling us what funds are being set aside for the fiscal year now coming for this.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Public Works):

Mr. Speaker, if permitted by the hon. Minister of Planning and Development, as this is under the Department of Public Works, I will be pleased to answer that. This is a scheme that has been set up by certain municipalities, and they have the right to enter into an agreement with the Dominion and Provincial Governments, who may set a percentage that they are willing to pay.

The last scheme, which was the Grand River, was 37 1/2% by each Government, and the balance by the municipalities interested, as proportioned by the engineers.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Further bills.

Motions.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Trustees' Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Would the hon. Attorney General tell us what the effect of this bill is?

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, this bill is to amend the existing provision of the Act, which enables trustees to loan money up to 50% of the value of a valuation, to increase that amount from 50% to 60%.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, and seconded by Mr. Blackwell, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act," and that same be now read a first time.

2. Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MR. ROBERT D. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Would

the hon. Minister explain?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to extend the provisions of sub-section 3 of Section 10, which has to do with the clearance of lands. The two Acts overlap. In the one it said they must have, and the other "not", so this is rectifying that in the former Act. The other has to do with the speed limit of fifty miles an hour being extended to firemen attending fires and policemen when pursuing emergency cases.

There is also another item in this which was brought to our attention during this last winter, where vehicles in towns, parked on side streets and on main streets, and at many times on the highway, were unable to continue their course. This Act permits the corporation or Department of Highways to remove those vehicles, so that the street or road can be cleared.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

The hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) has asked to rise before the Orders of the Day.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, and hon. members of this House, I wish to speak on a matter of privilege arising from certain charges made in this House on Wednesday last by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Mitchell F. Hepburn).

Let me preface my remarks by saying that as all the hon. members well know, the wholesale distributors of gasoline act as the collecting agents of the Government as to gasoline tax. Most of these vendors are of the highest financial standing, but for the protection of the interests

of the Government the necessity for a general protective policy became apparent. It seemed necessary to require all vendors to file security bonds, or equivalent negotiable securities, with the Department, to make entirely sure that all gasoline tax collected should reach the Treasury. This plan, as with all such plans, required general application.

On August 11th, 1943, after the Government headed by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) had been defeated, but before this Government took office, certain vendors, whose bonds were considered insufficient, were requested to bring their bonds up to proper and determined standards.

At this point, may I say that with the permission of the House I shall table copies of certain letters and memoranda to which I shall refer.

When the present Government took office the matter in hand had not been finally disposed of. On September 24th, 1943, memorandum from J. L. Zoller, assistant to the Deputy Minister, addressed to my Deputy Minister, was brought to my attention. It was pointed out that certain companies had deposited securities, others had filed guarantee bonds, and still others had merely given a so-called personal bond or undertaking admitting responsibility. Mr. Zoller recommended that a guarantee bond, or equivalent securities in an amount up to 80 per cent. of any one month's tax collections be required, in which recommendation the Deputy Minister concurred, and which recommendation I approved and so indicated in my memorandum of October 4, 1943.

On October 7, 1943, D. E. Strong, Chief Inspector of Gasoline Tax at that time, advised the vendors of the

departmental decision, putting all vendors, great and small, on a common basis in this respect.

Following Mr. Strong's letter, a committee representing themajor oil companies called at my office to discuss general features relative to security bonds, resulting in suggestions involving a group plan. Following this meeting the committee, with my approval, carried on negotiations with departmental officials, requesting them to obtain data as to possibilities of underwriting group plan bonds. This data was secured. Chief Inspector Strong and Mr. Zoller during this period consulted a representative of the A. E. Wilson Company, Ltd., regarding a group plan. A period then ensued, occupied by negotiations and investigations, and by April, 1944, a detailed plan had taken form.

Mr. J. H. Robinson, who by this time had succeeded Mr. Strong, drafted a letter, secured the approval of the Deputy Minister on April 6, 1944, and forwarded this communication to those vendors whose security was sub-standard, over his (Mr. Robinson's) signature. This is the letter which the hon. Member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) read in this House on Wednesday last.

On April 13, 1944, Mr. Jos. McManus of McManus Petroleums, Limited, of London, accompanied by M. F. Hepburn, M.P.P. for Elgin, called on Mr. Robinson, asking that the McManus Company's bond be allowed to remain at $25,000.

MR. MITCHELL F. HEPBURN (Elgin): I deny that emphatically.

MR. DOUCETT: You have a chance, under the Public Accounts. Mr. Speaker, I hope to discuss that. I do not know, but that is the information as I have it. And may I repeat, accompanied by M. F. Hepburn, M.P.P. for Elgin, called on Mr. Robinson, asking that the McManus Company's

repeat, accompanied by M. F. Hepburn, M.P.P. for Elgin, called on Mr. Robinson, asking that the McManus Company's bond be allowed to remain at $25,000. None the less, this company on April 24, 1944, filed a bond from the London Guarantee and Accident Company, Limited, for $45,000, the amount being determined under the general plan.

Mr. Robinson, and Mr. J. D. Millar, the Deputy Minister, are two conscientious, capable, and hardworking public servants whom I hold in the highest esteem. They co-operated with all interests concerned in working out a satisfactory plan of bonding the companies affected. They cleaned up a situation which had, from the departmental viewpoint, become in definite need of revision.

The hon. the Member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) told this House that he had spoken to Mr. Robinson alleging the latter had told him that in writing the letter which was read in this House the other day he had Ministerial approval. Now let me say, without any qualification, that I was not aware that any such letter was being sent out. Let me say further, that in the proper time and place the hon. the Member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) will have the opportunity of sustaining under oath his claim that Mr. Robinson told him any such thing. Let me say further that under no circumstances did I or would I have approved of such a letter. Let me also say that when knowledge of this letter came to my attention a second letter to remove all misapprehension was approved by me on May 6th, 1944, and was despatched to recipients of the first letter. Let me also say that a copy of this letter was sent to McManus Petroleums, Limited, and I have little doubt that when the hon. the Member for Elgin was making his charges in this House he had in his possession

a copy of the second letter, which should remove from the mind of any fair and decent citizen any misapprehension possibly carried by letter number one.

(Page No. 1518 follows.)

In other words, the Hon. member stands convicted of telling only half the story in this House, or else his friend and companion, McManus, is guilty of double-dealing in telling the Hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) only half the truth. This is a matter for the Hon. member or Mr. McManus, or both, to explain. This angle I deposit on their doorstep. Let me now read the letter of May 30th, 1944:

> "We wish to further clarify our letter of April 6th regarding surety required in accordance with your Gasoline Tax Collectors Articles of Agreement.
>
> At the request of vendors, the Department undertook to obtain information regarding a group plan. Data was received in accordance with the Canadian Underwriters' Association and this plan outlined to you in our letter of April 6th. It was also stated that participation in the group plan was optional.
>
> Please note that a bond may be furnished by any bonding company approved by the Department of Insurance; or you may submit Dominion of Canada or Province of Ontario bearer securities in lieu of surety bond.
>
> We trust this fully conveys to you the attitude of the Department in the matter."

And there is a list of the companies which it was forwarded to.

MR. HEPBURN: May I ask the Honourable the Minister who signed that letter, -- the same gentleman?

MR. DOUCETT: The same gentleman, the Inspector of the gasoline tax.

Now, let me say a word as to the A. E. Wilson Company, Limited. They are a large and favourably known firm of insurance brokers. They carry on business throughout the whole of Ontario. For more than ten years, I have conducted my own insurance business as a general insurance agent on my own behalf. I have placed insurance in the ordinary course of business with the A. E. Wilson Company and with several other insurance

companies. I am not financially interested, directly or indirectly, in the A. E. Wilson Company, Limited. Even if this business had been placed with the A. E. Wilson Company as the result of the letter flourished so dramatically by the Hon. member for Elgin the other day, I could not have benefitted directly or indirectly by one cent. I am informed, and have every reason to believe, that the Departmental officials who drafted this letter had no knowledge of the fact that as an insurance agent I had business contacts with the A. E; Wilson, Company, Limited. And, finally, in speaking of the A. E. Wilson, Company, Limited, let me say that not one of these gasoline vendors' surety bonds was placed with the A. E. Wilson Company, Limited, nor is there one dollar of Ontario Government insurance held by that company.

Now, let me say a word about the McManus Company. During the eight years or so that the Hon. member for Elgin was Prime Minister of this Province, the McManus organization rode high, wide and handsome in its dealings with the government of the day. Sometime ago it came to my attention that the McManus Company, expanding its operation at Fort Stanley, had acquired a building site and had planned to erect bulk storage tanks almost under the eaves of the historic Christ Church (Anglican), the tanks to be supplied by a pipe-line laid on a portion of the highways department property. I investigated this pipe-line proposal in some detail, and I found pronounced opposition to what was considered and unnecessary desecration of one of the oldest religious sites in our Province. I was importuned by the Hon. member for Elgin in my own office, in his role of McManus' personal ambassador, on this proposal. I was told by him that in his opinion I

was acting on poor legal grounds. I informed the member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) that I was only a humble farmer, and not a lawyer, but I now add that to date the McManus pipe-line is not in use. The Synod of the Diocese of ~~London~~ Huron is now seeking protection of its rights in the Courts. I happen to have been brought up to respect our churches. I have seen no reason to change my mind and I have never attempted to ride rough-shod over those who get in my path.

I repeat, the letter read by my hon. friend was despatched without either my approval or my knowledge. Had I known of it, no such letter would have been forwarded. Even the hon. Member for Elgin admits making mistakes. In this instance, certain valued officials of the Department were in error, as they freely admit, and as they will doubtless testify before the Public Accounts Committee. And I wish to make it clear that I am not shifting the blame; I am not dodging responsibility; I am merely reciting the facts.

Whether the Hon. member for Elgin wishes to admit now that he told but half the story, or whether he was imposed on by his friend McManus, are disclosures we shall await, and with interest.

Personally, I am not in my present honourable position for either money or for glory. I am in politics for one reason and one alone, to render what service I can to the people of this Province. And if there is one duty which has borne heavily on this Administration, it is the task of restoring some semblance of dignity and decency in the conduct of the business of the Province of Ontario.

I now table the following documents relative to my Hon. friend's charges, if I may dignify them by that term, and I can assure him that he will be held to strict account in

the Public Accounts Committee of this House, at any inquiry which is necessary to clear the air and which will be more welcome to me than to the Hon. the Member for Elgin. (Mr. Hepburn)

Now I think, Mr. Speaker, in justice to this statement, that I should, while I am taking some time of this Honourable House, -- and I cannot be blamed for taking up your time, I should read to you the letters which I file with this statement.

I will call this Exhibit A, dated at Toronto, August 11th, 1943, which was the letter I mentioned sent out after the defeat of the government of the Hon. member from Brant (Mr. Nixon) and previous to this Government taking office. This copy is addressed to the McManus Petroleums Limited, 225 Rectory Street, London, Ontario:

> "Dear Sirs: Please be advised that it will be necessary for you to increase your surety bond in favour of His Majesty the King, as represented by the Minister of Highways for the Province of Ontario, in accordance with the Collector's Agreement, from $15,000 to $60,000.00. This increase should be effected immediately on receipt of this correspondence.
>
> Please acknowledge receipt of this letter and advise this Department when the increased bond may be expected."
>
> (Signed) D.E. Strong,
> Chief Inspector Gasoline Tax."

Exhibit B is a memorandum, dated September 24th, 1943:

> "Memorandum for Mr. J. D. Millar:
>
> I am attaching a list of gasoline tax vendors who are under agreement with the Department for the collection of the gasoline tax. You will notice on this list that most of the companies have supplied a bond from the recognized insurance companies. Others have deposited securities and the larger companies have just given their personal bond that they would be responsible for the amount of tax collected. This personal bond is of no value in so far as guaranteeing the payment of the money collected for tax is concerned. I would suggest that those

"companies who have submitted personal bonds be asked to supply a regular bond or deposit securities up to 80% of any one month's collection.

I might also recommend that those who have been requested to increase their bonds be made to do so.

(Signed) J. L. Zoller,
Assistant to the Deputy Minister."

"Recommended
J. D. Millar."

Exhibit C, dated Toronto, October 4, 1943:

"Memorandum for Mr. J. D. Millar:
Re Bonds for Gasoline Tax Collectors

Following our conversation of sometime ago and Mr. Zoller's memorandum, I wish to be very emphatic about this matter and we must have a policy for large and small alike of 80 per cent. surety bond or securities. Personal filing is not sufficient. Kindly see that this is done at the very earliest date so that I can assure the companies that feel that they are unfairly treated that they will be put on an even basis.

(Signed) Geo. H. Doucett,
Minister of Highways."

Exhibit D, dated October 7th, 1943. This is addressed to The British American Oil Company Limited, Royal Bank Building, Toronto, Ontario:

"Attention H. H. Bronsdon, Secretary-Treasurer
Dear Sirs: The minister of Highways for the Province of Ontario has directed me to forward a request that your company furnish to the Department of Highways a bond in the amount of $600,000.00 to assure payment of your collections of the Ontario Gasoline Tax, as provided for in Item 7 of the Gasoline Tax Collector's Articles of Agreement.

The guarantee may take the form of a surety bond in favour of His Majesty the King, in the right of the Province of Ontario, in the form prescribed by the Department, or Dominion or Province of Ontario bearer securities deposited with the Province.

Will you kindly acknowledge receipt of this correspondence."

And this list of the Companies to which that letter was sent. And the letter was signed "D. E. Strong, Chief Inspector Gasoline Tax."

Then comes Exhibit E, which was the letter read

by the Hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) the other day, which it is not necessary for me to read at this time, I believe.

MR. HEPBURN: Read it.

MR. DOUCETT: Exhibit E is a draft:

(Page 1524 follows)

Draft

"I have been instructed by the Minister of Highways to advise you that, in accordance with the gasoline tax collector's articles of agreement, your company is required to furnish this Department with a bord for $... to assure payment of your collection of the Ontario gasoline tax.

"The Department has just completed negotiations with regard to the matter of premium charges. Satisfactory arrangements and underwriting conditions have been made available by an understanding that all collectors' bonds be handled through one source. To this end, arrangements have been made with the A. E. Wilson Company, Limited, Lumsden Building, Toronto, at the following rates:

First	$ 10,000.00	premium	$10.00	per	$1,000.00
Next	40,000.00	"	5.00	"	1,000.00
"	50,000.00	"	3.00	"	1,000.00
"	100,000.00	"	2.00	"	1,000.00
"	200,000.00	"	1.00	"	1,000.00

"Participation in this group plan is optional. However, may we point out that, where the group plan is not adopted, and bonds are obtained elsewhere, the premium rates may be higher.

"Dominion of Canada or Province of Ontario bearer securities may be submitted in lieu of the above plan.

"Will you kindly advise this Department at your earliest convenience as to your arrangements in this regard."

Perhaps I do not need to read Exhibit "F" as it has been read before.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): Read it.

MR. DOUCETT: I should be glad to do so. It is as follows:

Exhibit "F"

Draft

"We wish to further clarify our letter of April 6th regarding surety required in accordance with your gasoline tax collectors Articles of Agreement.

"At the request of vendors, the Department undertook to obtain information regarding a group plan. Data was received in accordance with the Canadian Underwriters' Association and this plan outlined to you in our letter of April 6th. It was also

stated that participation in the group plan was optional.

"Please note that a bond may be furnished by any bonding company approved by the Department of Insurance; or you may submit Dominion of Canada or Province of Ontario bearer securities in lieu of surety bond.

"We trust this fully conveys to you the attitude of the Department in the matter."

That letter was sent on May 30th and May 31st to the firms listed at the foot of the letter.

Then comes Exhibit "G", a memorandum to Mr. J. D. Miller, the Deputy Minister, as follows:

Exhibit "G"

"Mr. Mitchell F. Hepburn, M.P.P., and Mr. J. McManus, President, McManus Petroleum Limited, London, were in my office this morning regarding increase of bond from $25,000.00 to $45,000.00. They felt that, during the ensuing year, gasoline tax collections would be materially reduced owing to the large gallonage sold to farmers, tax free; and it would therefore appear unfair to them to be asked for an increase in the amount of bond.

"For your information, I herewith submit particulars of gasoline tax collections received per month from McManus Petroleum Limited, together with commission received. The amount of bond is generally based on twice the value of the highest month. In this connection, the amount of tax received for the month of June was $40,658.35, whereas the average monthly collection for the year amounts to $21,805.15. From this summary, it would not appear that the requirement of $45,000.00 is excessive. For this company to provide a surety bond in the amount of $45,000.00 would cost them approximately $300.00 under the group plan scheme. You will note that their commission for the year amounts to $3,318.84, or an average per month of $276.57. Considering the commission received, it is not felt that the premium that they would have to pay for this assurance is out of line:"

Then follows a schedule showing the payments per month, which it is not necessary I think for me to read, unless the House desires. I can summarize it. The

average monthly payment is $21,805.15 and the commission $276.57, and the letter is signed by J. H. Robinson, Chief Inspector, Gasoline Tax, under date of Toronto, April 13, 1944.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker and hon. gentlemen, for your indulgence.

MR. M. F. HEPBURN (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) has made a very valiant attempt to becloud the whole issue.

I want to get at the meat of this thing. First I had on the Order Paper a notice of motion:

> "That there be laid before this House a return showing copies of all letters written by officials of the Department of Highways to any collectors of the gasoline tax in Ontario suggesting that their bonds be handled through one particular source."

There are two courses open to me. The first one is to deal with this matter on a question of privilege. The other is to ask the Prime Minister to call the notice of motion, and then I shall address the House on this subject.

MR. DREW: I will call the motion.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Hepburn moves:

> "That there be laid before this House a return showing copies of all letters written by officials of the Department of Highways to any collectors of the gasoline tax inOntario suggesting that their bonds be handled through one particular source."

MR. M. F. HEPBURN (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, as I said, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) has made a very valiant effort to becloud this whole issue. I deny many of his allegations.

Let me refresh the memories of hon. members. Some time ago I asked on the Orders of the Day that there

be tabled a reply to the question:

> "Has the Minister of Highways issued instructions that all gasoline tax collectors' bonds be handled through one source?"

The answer to that question was no.

MR. DOUCETT: And that is definitely correct.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): Yes. The only reason I visited the office of Mr. Robinson was to ascertain whether he was correct when he said in his opening sentence:

> "I have been instructed by the Minister of Highways to advise you that, in accordance with the Gasoline Tax Collector's Articles of Agreement, your company is required to furnish this Department with a bond for $.... to assure payment of your collections of the Ontario Gasoline Tax.
>
> "The Department has just completed negotiations with regard to the matter of premium charges. Satisfactory arrangements and underwriting conditions have been made available by an understanding that all collectors' bonds be handled through one source."

MR. BLACKWELL: Read on.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): It goes on:

> "To this end, arrangements have been made with the A. E. Wilson Company Limited, Lumsden Building, Toronto, at the following rates:"

MR. BLACKWELL: Read on. Let us have the whole truth.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): Then the schedule of rates is given, which has already been read. The letter goes on:

> "Participation in this group plan is optional. However, --"

and here is the qualifying statement:

> "-- may we point out that, where the group plan is not adopted, and bonds are obtained elsewhere, the premium rates may be higher."

The Minister seeks to dissociate himself from that letter, but I say that I visited the office of Mr. Robinson

and asked him whether he had the authority of the Minister before he wrote that letter.

MR. DREW: Mr. Speaker, I do not like to interpose, but in all the length of time I have been here, never have I seen anything so low and contemptible as the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) in now quoting this letter written by a civil servant. The hon. member will have the opportunity of testing the accuracy of the statement in question under oath, and he will be under oath himself.

MR. HEPBURN: (Elgin): When it comes to getting low, the Prime Minister himself struck an all-time record in that respect, so he does not have to worry about anybody else getting low.

The significant thing is that the Minister of Highways admitted that he had been agent for this company. It is not difficult to put two and two together in that respect.

Now we are to have this matter investigated under oath, and I say that I welcome the investigation.

The Chief Inspector of Gasoline Tax wrote:

> "I have been instructed by the Minister of Highways to advise you that --"

and so on, and he confirmed that because I really could not believe that the Minister would do a thing of that kind. But the Minister had been an agent for the company and so it is understandable.

The Minister of Highways has had a lot to say about the McManus Company. Mr. McManus is a very reputable citizen. He is head of Imperial Fuels and of McManus Petroleums. He was born and raised in the county of Elgin. He comes from a fine old Irish family.

When he received this letter from the Chief Inspector of Gasoline Tax he reported the matter to his insurance company, with the result that there was a furore throughout the whole of Ontario over this unprecedented action.

When the Minister was caught in his effort to assist his company --

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member should withdraw that statement. I have presented the facts to the House in an honest way and I have given the hon. member my word for what I have said. I think as a member of this House he is obliged to accept my word in that regard and to withdraw his statement. I was not caught. As I have already explained, this letter was brought to my attention after it had been written, and the matter was then attended to, as I have already explained.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): How is the Minister going to reconcile his position with the statement of his chief inspector? The chief inspector wrote:

> "I have been instructed by the Minister of Highways to advise you --"

to place your insurance with a certain company.,

Let us follow this thing through. A lot of very unkind things have been said about a very reputable business man of the City of London who carries on business in the county I represent in this House. He is the head of Imperial Fuels and handles hundreds of thousands of tons of coal over the dock at Port Stanley. In order to punish this gentleman I want to tell the House what was done by the Minister and it is the most sordid story ever heard in the history of Ontario politics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): Hon. members will not laugh when I get through with this business. They may think it funny now but they will not think it funny then.

I happen to be a farmer and live near the village of Port Stanley. I buy gasoline and oil from McManus Petroleums and I know that this company is very much concerned to keep down the price of gasoline. It is a fact that the independent oil companies are the only protection we have against the big oil companies of Canada. So Mr. McManus decided to do what? He decided to build storage tanks at Port Stanley and to bring gasoline and oil in by tankers, which would be a guarantee that the farmers of that district would not be exploited by the big gasoline companies.

So he proceeded in the usual way. But having hanging over his head the rap of the Minister of Highways until the Minister, I repeat, was caught, in an effort to direct certain insurance to his own company --

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I think that is a most unfair statement for the hon. member to say that I was caught because I was not in any such position. I have been fair with the hon. member and I ask him to withdraw that statement. I think an hon. member of this House is obliged under our rules to accept the word of another hon. member.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): That was after McManus had made public the letter which he had received from Mr. Robinson who, rightly or wrongly, said in his opening sentence of the letter that he was instructed by the Minister of Highways to advise accordingly. Now it is very seldom that a civil servant will take the responsibility of saying he is speaking on the authority of the Minister

without having that authority. Anyway, McManus had hanging over his head this rap by the Minister of Highways until the matter was exposed and another letter was sent out a month or so later suggesting that they could place their insurance any place they wanted. Anyway, McManus was under a cloud because of the fact that he had made public this letter.

MR. DOUGETT: There was no knowledge on my part that McManus had made public this letter, no knowledge whatever until the hon. member had made the matter public.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): I do not believe in fairy tales; I do not believe in Santa Claus. When this letter went out there was a furore in the insurance world. The thing was unprecedented and it was common gossip on every street that the Minister should have undertaken to do a thing of that kind.

I want to tell the sordid story of what happened after McManus incurred the rap of the Minister. McManus wanted to build storage tanks so that he could bring in gasoline and oil by tankers. So he proceeded in the regular way. I will just rehearse some of the things he did in order to show the House that his every move was perfectly legal and proper.

First he applied to the village of Port Stanley for permission to lay the pipe line, and a by-law was passed making that perfectly legal and valid.

Then he got the consent of the Dominion Department of Transport.

Then, probably with the knowledge of the Minister of Highways, except that he wants to dissociate himself from a lot of things done in his department, McManus got the permissionof the Highways Department to lay the pipes along the highway. I will quote the authority for that, which was

dated October 20, 1944. It is from the Department of Highways and addressed to Mr. Jos. McManus, President, McManus Petroleums Limited, London, Ontario. It reads:

"Dear Sir,

"Re: Pipe Line - Port Stanley, Highway No. 4

"We have for acknowledgment, with thanks, yours of October 19th, enclosing certified copy of letter from the Clerk of the Village of Port Stanley, authorizing the work which you are undertaking in the said village in connection with the operation of a terminal for petroleum products."

That refers to the by-law which had been passed by the Village of Port Stanley granting permission to lay the pipes to the storage tanks. The letter goes on:

"Enclosed please find Permit from the Department of Highways granting permission to run your pipe line as therein stated.

"This will also acknowledge receipt of the fee of $10.00 which accompanied the application.

"Yours truly,

(Miss) A. V. Rochemont
Legal Officer."

So there McManus had the authority of the Dominion government. He had also the by-law which had been passed by the village of Port Stanley, and he also had the permission of the Highways Department to lay the pipes along the highway.

As the Minister has pointed out, some disagreement followed because the storage tanks were to be erected close to an old church that has been standing there for about one hundred years. In order to overcome that objection which developed Mr. McManus purchased a 65-acre farm, removed some distance from the church itself.

The council approved of this new location, and Mr. McManus received permission from the Department of

Transport to lay the pipe lines through the village.

Then Mr. McManus proceeded, with the full consent and approval of the Highways' engineers to lay the pipe lines. Then he received notice from the Department of Highways, in order to punish him for having made public the letter of Mr. Robinson, to remove all the pipe lines which he had installed "within two weeks from this date."

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like the hon. member for Elgin to be fair in his statement. I have already told him and the House that I knew nothing about this letter being made public by Mr. McManus until the hon. member for Elgin mentioned it in the House. He has had my word of honour on that. There was no thought of this matter being connected with the other. They were two separate things.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): The Minister may deny it, but the members can draw their own conclusions.

MR. DREW: They have a right to.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): I want to repeat that McManus had received the permission of the Department of Transport; he had this by-law which had been passed by the village of Port Stanley giving him permission to lay the pipe; and he had full authority from the Department of Highways to lay the pipes. Then without a word of warning he received notice by registered mail from the Legal Office of the Department of Highways to remove all the pipe which had been installed up to that time.

That was done to punish Mr. McManus for exposing the Minister. Make no mistake about that, and I say it was one of the most dastardly things that have taken place in the political history of this province.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for

Elgin has made that statement with the full knowledge that it is untrue.

MR. DREW: Hear, hear.

MR. BLACKWELL: It is inconceivable to me, in view of the intimate association that exists between the hon. member for Elgin and Mr. McManus, that the hon. member for Elgin can have the sheer effrontery to stand before this House and make that statement with the full knowledge that the people of Port Stanley had taken legal advice as to how they could thwart this public nuisance that would deteriorate their property.

I am going to suggest that the hon. member for Elgin probably knows that these people came to my office as Attorney General to see if they could obtain from me consent, in the public interest, for me to bring the matter before the courts to prevent that outrage.

I took the position, much as my sympathies might have been with the village of Port Stanley, that it was not a proper case for the intervention of the crown legally, and I suggested to those people that the very best test was the test of public opinion in the municipal election that was about to take place there. And, Mr. Speaker, such was the attitude of the people of Port Stanley towards that council that had made that deal with McManus that in the ensuing election every single councillor of the village of Port Stanley was defeated.

In view of those known facts, I say that the hon. member for Elgin made the statement he made with the full knowledge that it was untrue.

MR. WEBSTER: I should like to add a word to what has just been said by the Attorney General.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Elgin has the

floor.

MR. WEBSTER: Have I permission to say a word?

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): I said quite frankly that there was objection in the first instance to the tanks being located within close proximity to the church.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Elgin has the floor, but if he does not object the hon. member may say a word.

MR. WEBSTER: Within the last ten minutes I have had a conversation with the reeve of the village of Port Stanley, the reeve of the newly elected council, because the villages rose in their wrath and turned the council out, body, soul and breeches, for maladministration in connection with this matter. I am told by the reeve of Port Stanley that the former reeve admitted under oath this morning in London or St. Thomas that he had received $350 from the McManus corporation.

MR. BLACKWELL: To get the by-law passed.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): There are certain doubts in my mind regarding the accuracy of the statement just made by my good friend from London (Mr. Webster). The point I want to make is that there were originally objections because of the proximity of the tanks to the church, and I stated that the McManus Company purchased sixty-five acres of land, and that removed that objection.

The position of the McManus company now is this: Having permission from the village of Port Stanley through a by-law properly passed, having permission from the dominion Department of Transport and from the provincial Department of Highways, having expended $40,000 in laying the pipes to fill these tanks, the company is now called upon to remove the pipes within two weeks,

which had cost the company $40,000 to lay down.

I would ask the Minister why he permitted this work to begin, under the supervision of the Highways engineers, and after the company had posted the necessary bonds with his company, the Minister having actually disagreed with his own deputy minister with regard to what should be done. Why did the Minister take this attitude if it was not to punish the McManus company?

MR. SPEAKER: Do you want that question answered?

MR. DOUCETT: I would really like to answer it, Mr. Speaker, although I think my colleague the Attorney General answered it fairly well. I do want to say that I have noticed the hon. member with my deputy minister regarding this matter. Furthermore, Mr. McManus had notice previous to his completing the job, or probably before he started, and he went ahead and laid the pipe after this notice was served on him. I think the hon. member should withdraw his statement that I have any quarrel with the deputy minister, because he will clarify that matter himself if you want to bring him before the Public Accounts Committee or anywhere else. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I will welcome a complete investigation of the McManus dealings with this Government in the Public Accounts Committee.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): That suits me perfectly, so there is no use prolonging this debate in the House. Let us take it to the Public Accounts Committee and get Mr. Robinson there and your Highways engineers who supervised the work until it was concluded even after this arbitrary notice to remove all the pipes installed within two weeks. The Minister abitrarily told him to remove the pipes, pipes which had been laid by the McManus Company

in good faith, having deposited a bond, and having the authority to proceed,from the Highways Department. He did that, going over the heads of almost all his officials, just to give vent to his wrath. The McManus Company consulted the deputy minister, Mr. Miller, asking what they should do because they were within four days of completing the job and the contractors were anxious to move on to another job. The McManus Company offered to put up another $5,000 bond if necessary to indemnify the highway in case of any damage. That is the only interest the Department of Highways could have in the matter -- damage to the highway. The Department had no interest in the building of the tanks at Port Stanley.

Mr. Miller suggested to the McManus Company that they leave a $2,000 guarantee with the Middlesex County engineer, and advised his Middlesex engineer to allow the company to proceed.

Even after the Minister, in order to give vent to his wrath, had given these people two weeks in which to remove $40,000 of pipe lines already laid, his deputy minister gave the Company permission to go ahead again. He allowed them to proceed. Mr. Evans, highway department assistant engineer, remained on the job until the pipe was all laid and road repaired according to his instructions.

Now see what happened. The Minister took the ball in his own hands in order to get even with McManus. Mr. McManus appealed to Mr. Miller, the deputy minister, who said that he could proceed, and the work was proceeded with under the supervision of Mr. Evans, the Highways engineer.

These pipes and tanks were being built for the benefit of the consuming public in that district, the users

of gasoline and oil. The Minister like Mohammed lies suspended between heaven and earth. I welcome the opportunity of appearing before the Public Accounts Committee and having this matter investigated.

MR. DREW: The hon. member will get an investigation of this matter. Most of the time has been taken up by the devices of the hon. member for Elgin to air his views here, following a simple statement. ~~I do recall~~

> "I do recall that in referring to the Government led by the man in Ottawa, whom he now follows, he said of it that it is the only lunatic asylum operated by the inmates, themselves. We do not intend to let such a situation arise here through the actions of the hon. member for Elgin."

~~of the hon. member for Elgin,~~

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): If the Premier wants to put himself in that category, that is up to him. I dissociate myself from anything of that kind. This matter arose very simply out of a question I put on the Order Paper asking whether the Minister of Highways had instructed that the insurance should be placed with a certain company, and his answer is no.

MR. DOUCETT: That is right.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): And we have on the record this letter from Mr. Robinson stating that it was upon the instructions of the Minister the letter was written, which the Minister denies. I shall welcome an investigation.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) asked whether his notice of motion for a return would be accepted, and he has spoken to that motion. May we have an indication from the leader of the Government what his position is with respect to the motion before the House,

a return showing copies of all letters written by officials of the Department of Highways to any collectors of the gasoline tax in Ontario suggesting that their bonds be handled through one particular source.

Speaking for myself we welcome the statement of the Minister of Highways that the whole question should be investigated by the Public Accounts Committee. The hon. member for Elgin also wants it investigated by the Public Accounts Committee; so do we. But I think it would be of some value if his motion for the return were passed.

(Page 1540 follows)

MR. DREW: The return has been made.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, it has been made?

MR. DREW: Oh, yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is fine. Now we are "all set".

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is as follows: A resolution by Mr. Hepburn:

> "That there be laid before this House a return showing copies of all letters written by officials of the Department of Highways to any collectors of the gasoline tax in Ontario, suggesting that their bonds be handled through one particular source."

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House, the following:

(1) The report of the Provincial Auditor of Ontario for the years 1933-1944.

(2) Report of the Minister of Public Welfare of the Province of Ontario, for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1944.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) desires to rise before the Orders of the Day.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to the attention of the House, and more particularly to the attention of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) two situations which I think are deserving of his immediate attention.

The first one has to do with a strike that is going on here in the city. It is a perfectly legal strike, but even though it is a perfectly legal strike, I think, nevertheless, that every effort should be made by the Department of Labour to have this strike brought to a conclusion as early as possible, and whatever efforts are made by anybody to end the strike, would be highly commend-

able. Now, I think the House would like to know the circumstances of this particular situation. This strike that is taking place in one of the C.I.L. plants, the Paint and Varnish Division, here in Toronto, and the union is an affiliate of the Canadian Congress of Labour, local number 1 of the Canadian Industrial Union of the Canadian Congress of Labour.

Now, this union has already had a contractual relationship with the company. The company admits that during the previous relationship with the union, the union did everything that was required of them, was an entirely responsible body, and because of this admission on the part of the company, when the union came back for a renewal of the contract, they asked for the check-off. They also wanted maintenance of membership.

The company refused to concede either of the two points. The union then went through all of the conciliation procedures, even to the extent of waiting for the report of the Conciliation Board. The Conciliation Board has made its report known, and it is a unanimous decision that the check-off should be conceded. The company, in reply, refused to concede the recommendation of the Conciliation Board.

The resident management is not unduly averse to accepting the recommendations of the Conciliation Board, but it is a group of directors who reside in Montreal who are throwing a "monkey-wrench" into the works. Here, somebody who is only interested apparently from the standpoint of dividends in an undertaking has given a direction to somebody else, that they must not do something. The company claims that it is not their policy to concede a

check-off. That is very untrue, because the very same company already has the check-off in another plant here in Ontario.

I want to draw this matter to the attention of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) in the hope that he will direct every effort he can, through the medium of his conciliation officers, and even to the extent of himself becoming interested in it, to get this strike settled.

Now one in particular of the people who are at the head of this union happens to be a person of whom the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) thinks very highly, and whom the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has commended very highly as a member of his own Board on the floor of this House. I am referring to Mr. Elroy Robson, who is the Regional Director of the Canadian Congress of Labour, and you know, and I know, that it must be a very extreme situation for Mr. Robson to be connected with a situation like this, namely, a strike situation. He generally bends over backwards to prevent a situation coming along like this.

I do hope that the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) will lose no time at all in getting some procedures in operation whereby this strike can be disposed of. That is my first point.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the second one that I want to draw the attention of the House to, concerns local number 504 of the United Electric Radio and Machine Workers Association in Hamilton.

On January 23rd, the president of the local drew the attention of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) through the medium of a letter, -- copy of which I have here -- to the fact that there was a necessity for certain

sanitary and general health improvements in the plant. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) wrote a reply to the letter saying that he was drawing it to the attention of the Chief Inspector, under the Factory, Shop and Office Buildings Act, for the purpose of having one of the inspectors contact Mr. Ready for the purpose of having some further information about this thing.

On February 16th, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) sent a letter to Mr. Ready, in which he said:

"Dear Mr. Ready:

Pursuant to your letter of January 25th, respecting health and sanitation conditions at the east end plant of the Canadian Westinghouse Company Limited, Hamilton, Ontario --"

I think the hon. member for St. Andrews (Mr. Salsberg) mentioned that yesterday.

MR. JOSEPH A. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I did.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Planning and Development): That is the shortest speech you have ever made.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON (Brant): The shortest speech on record.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker, the letter goes on:

"I just received a report stating that you accompanied our inspector on an inspection of the plant, and that certain suggestions arising out of that inspection have been forwarded to the company who will, no doubt, carry them out.

I thank you for your interest in this matter, and hope that everything will be adjusted satisfactorily."

That is signed by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley).

On February 19th, Mr. Ready wrote to the hon.

Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) in which he says:

> "Referring to your letter of February 16th respecting health and sanitation conditions at the East End Plant of the Canadian Westinghouse Company Limited, Hamilton, Ontario. You state that suggestions have been forwarded to management from Inspector McAvoy, we would be pleased indeed if we could have a copy of same.
>
> Thanking you for your co-operation.
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> (Sgd) Alfred Ready,
> Pres. Local 504,
> U.E.R. & M.W.A."

Then, on February 21st, the Deputy Minister of Labour, Mr. Marsh, sent a letter back to Mr. Ready in which he said --

MR. DALEY: I talked to him. I had him write that letter.

MR. WILLIAMS: Anyhow, it is the Deputy Minister who replies to this letter.

It is in effect:

> "Dear Sir:
>
> Your letter of the 19th instant addressed to the Honourable Charles Daley, Minister of Labour, has been referred to the undersigned for acknowledgment. I note you are requesting a copy of our Inspector McAvoy's suggestions for improvement of the safety and sanitary conditions in the East End Plant of the Canadian Westinghouse Limited, Hamilton, Ontario.
>
> I regret that I am not at liberty to comply with your request in forwarding a copy of Mr. McAvoy's report. However, you may rest assured that the recommendations made by Mr. McAvoy will be forwarded to the Westinghouse Company for implementation which will remedy the conditions of which you complain.
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> (Sgd.) J. F. Marsh,
>
> Deputy Minister of Labour."

HON. MR. DALEY: If I may interrupt, I admit that that was my instructions. I had too many letters to answer that day and I asked the Deputy to answer this, just along that very line.

MR. WILLIAMS: Do I understand that the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) concurs that the report of Mr. McAvoy is to be known only to the company?

HON. MR. DALEY: Do you want me to reply to that now?

MR. WILLIAMS: Not to the whole thing. To this question, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. Minister, (Mr. Daley) is concurring, -- and he says he is -- with the statement of the Deputy Minister, that is all right, as far as I am concerned.

Then there is another letter, and this must have been the last copy of the whole series that was typed, because it is rather indistinct. I will do my best to read it. It is dated March 14, 1945, addressed to Mr. James F. Marsh, Deputy Minister of Labour, Parliament Buildings, Toronto 2, Ontario, written by Mr. Alfred Ready, President of Local 504. This reads as follows:

"Dear Sir:

Pursuant to your letter of February 21st, re improvements of the safety and sanitary conditions in the East End Plant of the Canadian Westinghouse Company Limited, Hamilton, Ontario. I note with amusement that you --"

MR. SALSBERG: Amazement.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, "amazement". Why not let me have one that is better typed. Well, it goes on to say:

"I note with amazement that you say you are not at liberty to comply with our request for a copy of Mr. McAvoy's report on the aforementioned conditions.

You state I may rest assured that the recommendations made by Mr. McAvoy will be

carried out by the Westinghouse Company. As the President of the certified Union in this Plant and as the complainant re the conditions, I fail to understand your refusal to forward copy of report. The Union which I represent has no assurance that the recommendations of the report will be fully carried out by the Company, and not knowing what the report contains this Union is unable to determine whether the report is adequate, whether all the complaints made are covered, and in fact has no way of insuring that anything at all recommended by you will be accomplished. Up to date there is no visible indication in the Plant that any action is being taken by the Company to improve the conditions as complained of.

I am taking the liberty to send a copy of this letter to the Prime Minister, to the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hepburn and Mr. A. A. Macleod.

Yours very truly,"

This is signed, as I said before, by Mr. Ready.

We have been asked to raise this matter in the House to-day for the purpose of trying to get some common-sense into this particular situation. I want to say, quite as distinctly as ever I possibly can, that I personally cannot see the slightest objection for letting the workers, who have to work under certain conditions, know quite clearly what the inspector who inspected the conditions had to say they should work under. There is no reason under the sun for not letting the workers know. And the fact is they do not know what you have said, then the company can very well represent to the workers that the things that they have done -- if they do anything -- are just all that was recommended.

I do not think it is even courteous to refuse such a report to the workers, and their president of their union, so they can know just what you have done. I do submit, Mr. Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) that you should

reconsider this situation, and without the slightest hesitation tell your Deputy to forward a copy of Mr. McAvoy's report to the president of the union, so that they can see that the Department is acting on the "up-and-up," as between the companies and the workers in this respect. If the report is kept secret, as far as the union is concerned, and given only to the company, you cannot expect anything else but the suspicion that the Department is in "cahoots" with the company.

The best thing to do is to instruct your Deputy Minister to forward without delay a copy of Inspector McAvoy's report to the union, so that the union can see that the company has had the recommendations implemented.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, if this were the only company that we had to inspect, or if we only had a dozen, this request would be a perfectly simple one. But we have many thousands of inspections every year, and I would just like to review, for the benefit of this House, what happened. I have not the benefit of letters which I received from Mr. Ready, or which I wrote to him, or which I instructed the Deputy to write, but, immediately upon receipt of his complaint, I instructed an inspector to go out there, and I personally told him "Find this man Ready, and see if he will go with you, and have him point out the very things he is objecting to, and see if they can get them fixed up." Could anything have been fairer than that?

Mr. Ready goes out with the Inspector, and the Inspector comes back and reports to me that the very things that Ready complained of seemed to him to be quite reasonable, and he would make the representations to the company, and he did not think there would be any more trouble.

I, as Minister, have certain responsibilities, and among them is the operation of the Factory, Shop and Office Buildings Act, and I cannot conceive how you can think for a minute that every time I make an inspection and suggest some little improvement -- and we are doing it every day; many we get with co-operation of the managements -- advising and suggesting that in order to benefit a good labour relationship it would be well to improve this, or to improve that -- and that is the policy we have established and it is working very well.

But if you can conceive how I could advise every union in every one of these plants as to everything we suggest be done -- well, I certainly cannot agree with you, and unless there is something takes place in this House directing that I do, I just cannot do it. I will not share the responsibility. If I fail in my efforts to do a good job, there are means of getting me out of here, but I will not advise every union all over this country of every little improvement we advise a company to make.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) I am afraid has misunderstood. I did not ask, never even suggested nor so much as hinted that you should send out reports to every union about this kind of thing --

MR. DALEY: This is a precedent --

MR. WILLIAMS: If I may, Mr. Minister: -- you have already given the information here now which I will undertake to forward, as taken from the official record, the very thing that Mr. Ready was wanting to know. You said that the Inspector had reported to you that the things that

[illegible]

and among them [illegible] of the [illegible] of the [illegible]
office building [illegible] and I do [illegible]
think [illegible] and [illegible]
and suggest some [illegible]
it every day, why we get with [illegible] of the
managements -- [illegible] and [illegible] that [illegible]
benefit a good [illegible] relations. [illegible]
improve this, or to [illegible] that [illegible]
policy we have on [illegible]

[illegible]
union in every one of these places so [illegible]
suggest to him -- well, I generally [illegible]
you, and unless [illegible]
Hours depending that [illegible]
not share the responsibility [illegible]
do a good job, [illegible] are [illegible]
but I will not [illegible] every [illegible]
of every [illegible] we [illegible]

MR. MILLHAUSER: Mr. [illegible]
Daley) I am [illegible] was misunderstood. [illegible]
never even suggested nor do such as [illegible]
should send out reports to every [illegible]
thing --

MR. DALEY: [illegible] -

MR. MILLHAUSER: [illegible]
already given the [illegible]
take to [illegible]
very thing that [illegible]
that the [illegible]

Mr. Ready complained of appeared to be very reasonable, and he was recommending their implementation. All I was asking was -- not that you should regard this as a broadcast, but that you should respond to this single request made by Mr. Ready. Apparently you did not realize that. You were prepared to make this general justification of your decision, and yet you gave in the House the information you might very well have given to Mr. Ready.

(Page 1550 follows)

MR. DALEY: I am sorry, I do not follow you.

MR. WILLIAMS: There is the other point the hon. Minister has not replied to. I brought out two points.

MR. DALEY: Regarding the strike. I will assure the House in this case, and in every other case, I do the best I can.

MR. WILLIAM MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my colleague for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts) I suggested I might say one word with reference to the shamrocks on the desk of the hon. member for St. Patrick. I would like to point out tomorrow is the 17th of March, St. Patrick's Day, and after all the charges and counter-charges here this afternoon, I would like to say that is one day on which good Irishmen do not fight. Along with my colleagues' shamrocks here, I have a shamrock, too, and it says, "To Bill from John." I do not know who "John" is, because sending me something from John would be about as bad as sending me something from George.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): John Bracken.

MR. MURDOCH: There are so many of them. I am not exactly an Irishman, so I do not know why I qualified myself, except perhaps I spent maybe fourteen years on the English side of the Irish Sea. I cannot qualify on account of my riding or on account of my constituents, only in a very small degree. I do not know whether my little shamrock, if it lives until June or July, will qualify for the baby bonus, but I think the only claim I can have to St. Patrick is the fact while I am in Toronto I spend most of my time and money in the St. Patrick Riding.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee of the whole; Mr. Reynolds in the Chair.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order No. 40, Bill No. 41.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fortieth Order, Bill No. 41, the Securities Act, 1945. Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, before the sections are called, possibly it might be helpful to the House if I made a word of explanation as to what happened to this bill when it was referred to the Legal Bills Committee. It so happened that those effected by the bill were concerned with a limited number of matters of some principle, and more substantially with matters that had to do with what might be called practical
2 application of the bill without relation to principle. For that reason, as I had introduced the measure and assumed some responsibility for it, as Attorney General, I believed it was my duty to get the bill in as good shape as possible for the consideration of the Committee. Actuated by that desire, between the time when the bill was referred at the sitting of the Committee last Wednesday morning, at 10:30, I made myself available to those different parties who wished to make representations, with the result that of those representations and amendments that commended themselves to me, when the Committee met in the presence of those who wished, initially, to make representations, those amendments were introduced and explained by myself, and proved

to be acceptable to those there to make representations, and also to the Committee, which then saw fit to report the bill with its amendments.

Examination of Bill No. 41 and the complimentary bill No. 42 will indicate all of those amendments are now reprinted in the bills in everyone's folder.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): To-day?

MR. BLACKWELL: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We have had no chance to look at them.

MR. BLACKWELL: I understand the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) feels the amendments are too difficult to proceed with.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not want to sound like a complainant, because the Attorney General, I think, has been very reasonable in the way he has handled this thing from the outset, but in looking over the Order paper to-day I noticed that this bill is designated in the Order paper, "Not reprinted". I, therefore, gave it no thought, and I am now in the position I find it is in the book, reprinted, and they are important amendments, which the hon. Attorney General explained to the Legal Bills' Committee, and which were, in some cases, so lengthy I did not attempt to write them all out during the meeting of the Committee the other day. So, so far as the amendments he is now discussing are concerned, those of us who are interested have not had an opportunity to re-examine the amendments which were orally explained to us by the hon. Attorney General on Wednesday.

I do not want to be misunderstood, because I think

the hon. Attorney General has been very patient about this, but it is an important bill, and some of the amendments, as he will agree, are quite important.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I feel the hon. Attorney General is following the course he has all the way through and will be most anxious to cooperate. I do not think the request of the Leader of the Opposition can be considered unreasonable, but there is only this, this bill has had considerable consideration, and it has been before the Committee, and if the hon. Leader of the Opposition feels it should not proceed, I do not think we should, but, on the other hand, if he feels we could proceed with the undertaking, if he raises any objection with regard to any of these sections it can be brought up on Monday, and I will, at his request, move or second his motion to return the bill again to the Committee.

MR. JOLLIFFE: To the Committee of the whole?

MR. DREW: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, I appreciate that suggestion, but at the same time I wonder if we might not get through with it more quickly if we take up any suggestions we have to make at the same time that the Attorney
3. General is explaining the changes to the House. When the bill was in legal committees, the hon. Attorney General explained, orally, a number of these amendments, and they sounded sensible to me in most cases, but I did not have the actual text, and it was suggested the bill was going to be reprinted, and we could see it in Committee, which we now have. I am inclined to think, on the whole, in view of the fact there are other hon. members interested,

it should be taken Monday.

MR. DREW: Would it be helpful if the hon. Attorney General gave the explanations to the amendments and this Committee rise without dealing with any sections?

MR. JOLLIFFE: That would be fine.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, as I understand the suggestion of the hon. Prime Minister, which appears to be acceptable to the Leader of the Opposition, the bill will not be called by sections, but to assist the hon. members of the House in consideration of the bill between now and Monday, it is suggested I go through the sections and explain the effect of the amendments.

The first amendment appears at about the middle of page 3, in the interpretation section. The words are underlined. The amendment there, you go as far as the words "or redistribution". That is merely a clarifying amendment. The sentence that is consecutively underlined, the part sentence, reads as follows:

> "either a trade through a broker who is not engaged in such distribution or redistribution to the public but is acting as the agent of the purchaser or"

That is, perhaps, the most fundamental amendment that was made to this bill. It was to deal with this situation, where stock is coming from the treasury of a company there is usually a person, an underwriter or optionee, who is selling to the public, but at a stage of that sale of treasury stock the stock becomes actively traded on what is known as "the over-the-counter market." Under those circumstances, many members of the public and brokers who have nothing to do with the primary distribution, - that is, the placing of the stock with the public, - come into being, but are in no way associated with the

primary distribution. This amendment is to eliminate members of the public who purchase through brokers who are their agents, such brokers having no participation in placing the stock initially with the public. That leaves the matter in this position, that anyone who is actually engaged in the distribution of treasury stock, and deals with the public while so engaged as a principal, - that is, as an owner of the stock selling to the public, as opposed to the member of the public buying the stock, - must deliver a prospectus.

It was the considered view that the delivery of a prospectus under those circumstances, under the over-the-counter market operation, was a physical impossibility, and that amendment is to alleviate that difficulty.

The next section where an amendment occurs is Section 15. The original conception of the bill was that persons who had not been resident in Ontario for a year, with the option of making their home in Ontario, would be ineligible for registration as a broker or salesman unless they had been registered in the jurisdiction from whence they came, and also there was the fact, as part of that conception, members of the Armed Forces were not included in the prohibition.

Now, it became quite clear on the basis of representations made that although in general that might be a sound practice, there were certain cases where that absolute rule would only operate to keep out of the business people of established representations coming to the province of Ontario to engage in business, bringing funds with them, which would be very, very beneficial to the development of the mining industry in the country, and for that reason that question is left, by the amend-

ment, in the absolute discretion of the Commission.

With reference to the Armed Forces, it is made quite clear as to them. Their absence, as members of His Majesty's Armed Forces, from Ontario, does not mean they have ceased to reside in Ontario. In other words, they remain qualified, no matter how long they might have been away.

All members of His Majesty's Armed Forces is not deemed to be ceasing to reside in Ontario - in other words they remain qualified for registration no matter how long they have been away.

Now, on page 10 there are two amendments there that are simply corrections. I do not think I will take the time of the House explaining it. They simply are amendments to accurately describe what the transaction actually is. There is no matter of principle at all.

Now, under the Bill as first printed on page 11 s.s.(t) has been deleted and a new sub-section (t) has been included in the Bill and this sub-section is of the utmost importance to the Bill, and in order to explain this sub-section it is necessary for me to refer to the other Bill - that is Bill 42. "An Act respecting Prospecting Syndicates having a Capital not exceeding $35,000, " as amended. This is the section of The Securities Act which enables an actual prospector who has staked or participated in the staking of claims to sell the units of syndicate which deals with his claims free from the prospectors' provisions of the Act, and I feel that the House will agree with me that the section is so drawn that no one but such an actual prospector who staked or participated in the staking can sell. Anyone in the financial business must comply fully with all the provisions of the Act in selling syndicate shares, and that is the effect of that amendment at the foot of page 11.

On page 12 a new sub-section - 20 (1). Section 20 (1) has been included. That is to exempt from the necessity of registration as salesman those salesmen who might come in that designation by reason of being engaged as

floor traders on the stock exchange. They do not actually contact the public at all.

The next amendment I come to is Section 49 (1). The changes, again, in this section are underlined. I need say nothing about sub-section (a) beyong the fact that the section is substantially re-drafted for the purpose of clarification and I feel that the members on examining the old with the new will agree that that is important, although it means precisely the same thing.

Now, under sub-section (2) there is a convenience there which enables the underwriter or optionee, who may be out of town when the statement is to be filed with the Commission, to appoint a duly authorized agent to sign for him.

Then there is sub-section (3), which is new and I had better read it:

> "(3) Every underwriter and optionee shall be entitled to rely upon the accuracy and adequacy of the disclosure made in any statement filed under subsection 1 except as regards any matters which are within the knowledge of the underwriter or optionee."

The reason for that is quite obvious when it comes to reports of mining engineers, auditors reports and a great deal of information about a company, the person responsible for the sale of the issue must necessarily rely on auditors' reports, engineers' reports and other statements of facts made by the officers of the company.

Now, on page 24, sub-section (4) of 49. there are some words included in the third line to this effect:

"unless the Commission otherwise directs."

that is to enable the Securities Commission to direct that subsidiaries cannot be necessarily included in a consolidated balance sheet if that inclusion would in itself be

misleading.

Then there is an amendment which is underlined at the end of the sub-section which enables the Commission to allow company's statement - that is, balance sheets and profit and loss statement, to be used if more than 120 days old when, in the opinion of the Commission, there have been no material changes that would make that statement misleading. The reason for that is in larger issues, with the accounting help available to-day, in some cases it would be utterly impossible to make an issue at all if the section had to be complied with without that amendment.

Now, there is a substantial amendment as far as phraseology goes to sub-section (6) which deals with corrections and this provides that the new statement shall be required to be signed only by the signatories to the original statement. Now, that may arouse some of the members curiosity but the fact is on many issues there are sub-underwritings after the issue is arranged that run sometimes into hundreds of underwriters, and if all those people had to be seen and brought together to make any material change it would be physically impossible to accomplish it, and this arrangement allows original signatories to the original statement to sign changes and also permits the Commission to decide under all the circumstances who ought to sign.

And then in Paragraph 7 there is an exemption from compliance with the Section, which reads:

> "(d) from one broker to another broker where the purchasing broker is acting as principal."

It was thought that there was no necessity of requiring the delivery of a prospectus from a broker acting as a principal to a broker who was acting as a principal, and not as a member of the public.

I almost passed amendments of some importance here in Section 50 or 51 where sub-sections are new in the Bill. An examination of these Sections I think will indicate that they are really self explanatory. The definition of "primary distribution" in this Bill endeavours to group two types of transactions, that is, where there are sales of treasury stock to the public, it is felt that there should be full disclosure of all the facts in that case. But then again where there are a number of underwriters acquiring or a reorganization of a company, a reconstitution of existing shares, where quite large interests are constituted, that also has been included in a distribution section, so that a prospectus has to be given.

On the other hand, such isolated things as this, where there is a sale of stock, where there is no intention of a reorganization for the public, there is a discretion left with the Commission to determine what is or is not necessary. The reason there is no appeal from that decision is because it is not the sort of a decision that a person would wish to appeal from; it is a case where a person would not be left liable later on. He wishes to be sure of his grounds so that he can make an application.

In Section 50, Sub-Section 2 is on the other end

of the picture. When does this primary distribution end? And the Commission is given a discretion here to determine either that it is concluded, if it is, or that for the time being there is no primary distribution going on.

I can illustrate that. An investment dealing firm might underwrite a distribution of stock and wholly distribute it to the public. But from that time on, unless it can be finally concluded, it might be argued that any stock which came into their hands, one, two, three or five years later might be held to be not a concluded distribution. The issue may concern only part of the treasury stock, and under that the primary distribution might be only suspended, and later on there might be an issue of further additional stock which would still be primary distribution resumed.

Now, if the Hon. leader of the Opposition has a point to raise there, I would like to hear it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There must be a misprint in the concluding words of sub-section 2. I think probably the word "whether" does not belong there, and I am wondering if there is any other wording in the draft, and perhaps the Hon. Attorney General could tell us, and we could make the change accordingly now.

MR. BLACKWELL: As we are not dealing with the Bill Section by Section in Committee, I would suggest that I just note the fact that there is apparently a typographical error in the draft. Presumably the word "whether" should be there, but I would rather check it with some caution. I am told that that is right, so that it is more than a guess that it is right.

Now, the next discretion vested in the Commission is where persons are in a position where they are or should

be entitled to distribute securities to the public, and they do not control the company, and are unable to get the material to make full disclosure , discretion is vested in the Commission to order production of that material for their use, on proper terms.

Another sub-section deals with the dispensing with signatures by the Commission where such person has not control of the company and is unable to get other persons to sign, so as to have the signatures.

Other sub-sections are only for the purpose of clarifying the previous wording.

Likewise, at the top of Page 27, Clause (c), it is quite apparent that the words "together with other resources of the company" are necessary so as to determine whether the company can carry out the option.

Also, clause (d) had to be completely re-written in order to express the meaning of what was intended. There is no change in the principle of what was intended.

And following Section 55, the remainder of it on Page 28 I do not need to labour the amendments which are merely clarifying and do not change the principle.

Now, Section 66 and 61, the limitation expressed in the Bill as first printed was one year, and that has been reduced to sixty days in both those sections; and further a new part has been added to each of those sections, which require, after the giving of notice, that a party wishes to sue that the action must be commenced within three months.

There have been two small amendments made in Sections 68 and 69; a new clause B has been inserted, consideration must be shown, -- it always is in practice.

In Section 59 the words "if any" are added, because there are many transactions which there have been no salesmen.

In Section 60, right at the end (b) has been deleted and substituted therefore has been the expression "The Sale of any securities which have been exempt from registration under this Act." That is any of the exempt securities, securities which do not require to be qualified, and that anyone could freely sell, are removed from the restriction as to telephoning.

I have dealt with Section 63.

Section 65 has been amended by the addition of the words which say any offer or solicitation in respect to a sale. That requires on letter heads, circulars and stationery the names of those who hold more than a ten per cent interest in the enterprise. It was thought quite proper to limit that to cases of offerings or solicitations.

Now, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Hourse, those are the amendments which were presented by me to the Committee and reported by the Committee to the House. I hope the explanations may be of some assistance in enabling the members to consider the Bill. We are not in the Committee to consider those amendments.

MR. OVERALL: I would like to draw the attention of the Attorney General to Page 24, Section 5:

> "(5) Where the securities to be traded consist of shares of a mining company a full and up-to-date on the property of the company and the development thereof made by a person who in the opinion of the Commission is a qualified mining engineer, geologist or prospector, certified by such person stating, --"

I would like to draw to the attention of the

Honourable Attorney General whether the Commission should say whether an engineer is qualified or not, I think is something which should not be. I would like to suggest that there should be inserted, --

MR. BLACKWELL: We are not interested in whether he belongs to the professional engineer's Association, but whether he is qualified to make the report. The Commission is and should be primarily interested not in whether he was a member of the Professional Engineer's Association, but what they would be concerned with would be, Would he, in the opinion of the Commission be qualified to make the report. There are other people who are qualified to make reports, beyond the professional engineers. It is quite often that in practice mining engineers, who have reputations without black marks against them, would be qualified in the opinion of the Commission.

MR. OVERALL: I would take it from that, that the Hon. Attorney General has some doubt in his mind as to whether or not engineers who are practicing are qualified to report.

I do not think for a moment that the government would question the right of a person who in the opinion of the Commission would be a qualified lawyer, -- I think if legal counsel were employed by the government or a commission, a lawyer registered with the Law Society would be able to make the report. The same thing should be true with the engineer. If a man is registered and comes within the code of ethics of that Association, he would be a man able to make a report. If a man is qualified as a mining engineer, then I suggest that he be registered, just as anyone who

wants to be a lawyer would be registered with the Law Society.

MR. BLACKWELL: This Bill is not in Committee and is not going into the Committee until Monday. All Ihave been trying to do has been to make plain the changes in the Act and explain them to the House. And, according to the lateness of the hour, it was not my intention to try to take the Bill through Committee.

(Page 1566 follows)

MR. THORNBERRY: By what standards will the competence of engineers be judged?

MR. BLACKWELL: We can consider that in committee.

MR. OVERALL: My purpose in mentioning the amendment I proposed was not to take the Minister by surprise on Monday.

MR. BLACKWELL: I shall be glad to have my hon. friend talk it over with me, and then he can move his amendment on Monday if he so desires.

MR. DREW: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House. We shall proceed on Monday with bills, and we shall sit every night next week except Friday.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): Before the House adjourns may I crave the indulgence of the Prime Minister for a moment. The hon. member for London (Mr. Webster) made the statement that the reeve of Port Stanley had been paid $350 by McManus Petroleums. I have just been in touch with Mr. McManus. He explains that the former reeve of Port Stanley, who is a member of one of the finest old pioneer families, is a real estate and insurance agent and that he had an option on certain property purchased by the McManus Company, and he was paid the regular real estate commission, not while he was reeve, but afterwards, after he had been defeated for the council.

MR. DREW: Since the point has been raised we shall of course have my hon. friend's remarks before us in the transcript of to-day's proceedings.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Do I understand correctly that we shall be dealing with bills both on Monday afternoon and evening?

MR. DREW: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And we shall not proceed with the Throne Speech until Tuesday. Is that the intention?

MR. DREW: That is the intention unless, of course, we finish with the bills early on Monday, which is perhaps being a little optimistic.

MR. JOLLIFEE: There are quite a few bills.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 5.05 p.m.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-THIRD DAY

AFTERNOON SESSION

Toronto, Ontario,
Monday, March 19, 1945.

SPEAKER: Honourable William J. Stewart, C.B.E.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

HON. R. P. VIVIAN (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Thompson, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to provide for an annual grant to the University of Toronto School of Nursing," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the first time.

MR. GEORGE BENNETT (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Riggs (Windsor-Walkerville), that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Sandwich-Windsor-Amherstberg Railway Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Would the hon. member give an explanation?

MR. BENNETT: The bill provides for a board composed of elected representatives of the people rather than appointed by the board, as exists at the present time.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Brown (Welland), that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Municipal Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Would the hon. member explain?

MR. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): This bill would simply make it permissible for any municipality that so desired to place the number to be elected on the ballot paper. There is a lot of confusion in Port Arthur, due to the fact we elect nine to the Board of Education and ten Aldermen. There are constantly ballots being scored by a misunderstanding on this point, and I believe it would be a good thing to simply mark on the ballot paper the number to be elected.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Insurance Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

MR. WILLIAM DUCKWORTH (Dovercourt): Would the hon. Minister explain?

MR. BLACKWELL: First, the principle object of this bill is to enable our provincial, incorporated insurance companies to participate in the National Housing Act, of 1944. The bill contains a number of other amendments of

more or less clerical nature and remedial measure.

HON. W. G. THOMPSON (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Vivian, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Land Surveyors' Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MR. CYRIL OVERALL (Niagara Falls): Would the hon. Minister give an explanation?

MR. THOMPSON: The purpose of this Act is to make provision for returned soldiers, so that they will be able to serve a shorter apprenticeship, and, secondly, to change the apprenticeship conditions to meet the shortage of Ontario Land Surveyors.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Mortgagors' and Purchasers' Relief Act, 1945," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Is this the usual?

MR. BLACKWELL: This is the usual.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Cheese and Hog Subsidy Act, 1945," and that same be read now a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act respecting Marine

Insurance", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Further bills.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I want to read a couple of telegrams to the House in reference to the statements made by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) last Thursday, in his account of a conversation he said he held with the Right hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, in Ottawa, in which the hon.member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) said we would take steps to verify.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): He is not here.

MR. NIXON: So, when I received the Hansard report I wired the Right hon. W. L. Mackenzie King yesterday, as follows:

"Rt. Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King,
Prime Minister, House of Commons, Ottawa.

"Yesterday Hon. Charles Daley said in Legislature, (Hansard report,) 'I was in Ottawa at one time on official business for this Government, and met a high-ranking official there. I do not need to mention names. He was about my size, stout, with a round face like mine, and he came up to me and said, 'I understand that you are Mr. Daley, the Minister of Labour for Ontario.' I said, 'Yes.' Then he said, 'Sit down and let us have a talk.' We sat for a few minutes and then he said, 'How do you get on with that man Hepburn?' I said, 'Well, I have always got on very well with him. I do not, of course, have a great deal of association with him, but when I see him he is friendly and nice.' 'He is a terrible man,' he replied. 'He used to get so mad when he would tear me apart that I would never answer him.' He went on to say, 'He has done more to put the Liberal Party where it is to-day than any other man in the country.'

"MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): I think you had better tell us who the man was.

"MR. DALEY: Mr. King, yes.

"MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): I just want you to repeat that, so that we can verify it. Mr. King said that?

"MR. DALEY: Yes, that is what the man said. He said that."

I might say, Mr. Speaker, I did not send that collect. The reply I received Saturday reads as follows:

> "I thank you for your night letter of March sixteenth just received. I should be obliged if you would deny unequivocally every statement made by the Honourable Charles Daley as reported in your wire to me. I am not accustomed to speaking to anyone, let alone to strangers and political opponents, in the manner described by Mr. Daley.
>
> "W. L. Mackenzie King."

2. HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), I am able to say, although the hon. Minister of Labour is not here (Mr. Daley), that occasion in question, in which the conversation took place, was at the time of the Labour Relations Conference held in Ottawa shortly after this Government took office, and, as a matter of fact, I was present when the discussion took place between the Right hon. W. L. Mackenzie King and the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), and I am able to verify that was said, and more.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a committee of the whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in committee, Mr. Reynolds in the Chair.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Thirty-seventh Order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thirty-seventh Order, the Securities Act. Mr. Blackwell.

Shall Section 1 form part of the bill?

MR. H. CONNOR (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I believe there are eighty-five paragraphs, and during the explanation the hon. Attorney General mentioned the word

"gambling". He said the bill had rules with reference to a certain form of gambling.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): I said nothing of the sort. I did not say the bill was a gambling Act. If the hon. member wants to quote me, he better look up Hansard.

MR. CONNOR: I am not quoting you on the bill. You did mention the word "gambling". I remember quite distinctly you mentioned it, of a sort of gambling, and you were trying to stop gambling in stocks. This bill was an Act trying to stop gambling in stocks, Irrespective whether it is, or not, the regrettable part of the bill is we have spent about four days on this bill, and we have not spent a day on any health measures or housing measures.

MR. BLACKWELL: The question under discussion is Section 1 of the bill, not health measures. There is plenty of time to speak on those.

MR. CONNOR: I am talking about Section 1.

MR. BLACKWELL: I would ask the hon. member to speak on Section 1. It is now in committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 1 form part of the Securities Act?

MR. CONNOR: That is exactly what I am talking about. He does not need to start "beating around the bush", because there is no one in this House "beats more around the bush" than he does. The bill is up for discussion, and I am quite in order speaking on it.

MR. BLACKWELL: Stick to the bill.

MR. CONNOR: The sad part of the bill is that it came up before health and housing.

MR.BLACKWELL: Again, the hon. member keeps repeating

he will stick to the bill, and then he talks about health. The bill has been approved in principle and reported by the Legal Bills Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is Section 1.

MR. CONNOR: Are you allowed to speak on the bill? If not, say so, and I will sit down.

MR. BLACKWELL: Section 1 of the bill.

MR. BERTRAM E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): Is the hon. Attorney General the Chairman, or is the Chairman ruling?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will rule, but I am going to listen. You can discuss the principle on second reading.

MR. CONNOR: I am discussing the principle of the bill.

MR. BLACKWELL: We are discussing Section 1. If the hon. member has a discussion in regard to the principle of Section 1 we will be glad to hear it, but we do not want a long harangue on the virtue of the bill.

MR. CONNOR: You are not getting a long harangue. We have spent four days on this bill. Is that in order? Four or five days we have spent discussing the bill, and we have not spent one day on any essential legislation in the House, and I am registering my regret we have to place the Securities Act ahead of all the other legislation, and the House is drawing quickly to a close. If that is the best this Government can offer, looking over all other essential legislation, let us hear it.

MR. WILLIAM DUCKWORTH (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Who has held up this House? What Party has held up this House?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are discussing Section 1 of the bill.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition):

Mr. Chairman, before we leave the Section, there is a point, an important point, I think, involved in the paragraph, about which I would like to say a word. It is in that part of the Section which defines primary distribution, and in which the hon. Attorney General explained, on Friday, the amendment which came before the Legal Bills Committee. When the hon. Attorney General was speaking previously about the bill, I was very interested to hear the point he made about the difference between a broker who is acting as an agent and a broker who is acting as a principal, and I can see that that definition is found in the latter part of paragraph J of the Section.

3. Now, the question I would like to direct to the hon. Attorney General in this connection is this, it is not a question as to the language of the paragraph, which I think is clear enough; the question is whether the hon. Attorney General considers that this wording, taken together with some other sections of the Act, makes it perfectly clear that a broker who has been privately associated with another broker in handling a primary distribution to the public is actually acting as a principal, rather than as an agent, and whether there is any machinery under the Act which will bring that situation to the attention of the Commission, if it exists. I may not have made myself entirely clear. The point is, Does the hon. Attorney General know that many primary distributions are handled by more than one broker, and very often the broker who is actually associated with another broker in handling a primary distribution is not publicly identified as such. I think that is what he is getting at in the definition section, but it requires, I think, to be related to some of the other sections.

Is there any safeguard other than the integrity of the broker, himself, any safeguard which will put the customer or purchaser on notice that the broker actually is not acting as his agent in purchasing a certain security?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, the definition of primary distribution, skipping the verbiage, is calculated to produce this result, and this, read with other sections of the Act, of course, that wherever a person in the primary distribution, - that is, the function of getting the shares from the trasury of a company to the public whenever there is a sale by someone in primary distribution, - and engaged in that to the public, then the full compliance with Section 49, which are filing sections, and full compliance with the prospectus section, is required.

Obviously, there is no way of detecting, until the thing has actually happened, whether someone engaged in the financial business is going to seek to irregularly avoid the section, and the way this bill deals with that subject is in the tim-ehonoured way of imposing adequate sanctions for such an evasion. These sanctions simply amount to this, that quite aside from becoming liable to prosecution under the provisions of the Act, but by other Sections of the Act, very heavy civil remedy is imposed against the broker. That is, the proof of compliance is on the broker, and, following that proof of compliance, if that onus is not discharged, there is an automatic right of recision of the contract, and these sanctions are, I submit, sufficiently heavy and exacting to bring compliance with the Act.

Going beyond that point, the Act, in that respect, will depend, obviously, on its good or bad administration, and whether or not it is enforced, and the whole disclosure

system which this Act contemplates is the very type of system which leaves behind it a record of the case, which enables the Commission to seize upon this as evidence and determine whether or not the Act has been complied with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 1 form part of the bill?

Motion agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 2 form part of the bill?

Sections 2 to 19, inclusive, agreed to.

(Page No. 1578 follows.)

MR. HEPBURN: Mr. Chairman, Section 19, Clause S, on page 41. I notice the Bill was in the Private Bills Committee, and the parties had an opportunity of appearing there, and I think it was very generous that the Attorney General and the House extended to these people this privilege. But the Prospectors and Developers' Association, and two or three other parties, met me in my office and suggested certain minor changes in this, which they think will give wider scope to the little fellows.

I know that the Hon. Attorney General has given considerable thought and study to this Bill and knows its every detail, which I do not profess to have done. But Clause S reads in this way:

> "(s) trades in good faith by an actual prospector of a security issued by him for the purpose of financing a prospecting expedition" ...

and it is suggested that the second line of this Clause be amended to read "security issued by or to him" -- adding "to him"; so that this clause would read:

> "(s) trades in good faith by an actual prospector of a security issued by or to him for the purpose of financing a prospecting expedition, or for the purpose of disposing of any of his interests in a mining claim" and so on.

I would like the Attorney General to tell the House whether there is any merit in that suggestion.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, that revives really another question that has been pretty completely and adequately discussed by all groups that have made representations on the Bill. That brings up the question of escrowing of shares in a mining company; and, so that the members might follow this discussion, I would like to make a reference to another section.

If the members will follow Section 52, on Page

27, Clause (d), and there it is provided that one of the matters over which the Commission has a discretion, -- and this relates particularly to mining properties, -- is that the Commission should have discretion to determine that such an escrow or pooling agreement as the Commission deems necessary or advisable with respect to securities issued for a consideration other than cash has not been entered into.

The members will recall that The Royal Mining Commission report recommended that a vendor's shares should not longer be subject to escrow. But if that were so the result would be that on mining promotions the large number of shares that are issued for a completely non-proven prospect would come into immediate competition with the shares that are being sold to provide money for the treasury to develop the property, -- and by that I mean right from its initial stages.

Now, I do not know who the Hon. member means by a prospector or prospectors, but I can say this, that every organization interested in this matter that has made representations to me, and I believe all the organizations have, including the Prospectors' Association, have highly recommended that the escrow provisions be not abandoned.

I will now, if I may, return to the other sections and throw a little further light on the question. Both clause (s), on page 11, and clause (t) are important, clause (s) in exempting securities really with reference only to securities, -- these are not stocks or units in a syndicate but are usually other securities issued by the prospector on his own credit before he has anything to sell.

Now, where the prospector under this Act really is in a freer position than he was under the other is under two things, Bill 42, which will come up next, the Prospecting Syndicate

not exceeding thirty-five thousand dollars; and Clause (t) which follows that, which enables a prospector to dispose of units on any property he has prospected, quite independent of other sections of the Act. But Section (t) is carefully guarded, that once a person is in the position that he has no real interest in the property, but helps prospect it, it comes back, and it was on that that it was considered safe to come back to the old Prospecting Syndicate not exceeding thirty-five thousand dollars.

Now, so far as the large amounts of stock that would interfere with the treasury of financing, it is proposed that that would be subject to the escrow provision.

What the Act provides for is that, instead of pouring everybody into the same mould, there will be a discretion as to what are proper escrow provisions and will permit the prospector to put on conditions, and the prospector has not to say it will be one for one.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I take it from what the Hon. Attorney General says that the Commission has to work out under the law or experience and the circumstances, what are reasonable provisions. It seems to me that what is necessary under this section and section 52 is that you should not go to extremes about it. It would be wrong, I think, to prevent a prospector realizing on any part of the vendor's securities issued to him. It would be most unfair to prevent the prospector from realizing anything at all. On the other hand, I think it would be equally unfair to allow him complete freedom to realize on any or all the vendor's shares at any time. It would make it very difficult to finance the property. Some middle course has to be followed. The view that is mentioned is that the Commission should have power

to decide what is the reasonable compromise, -- is not that it?

MR. BLACKWELL: That is just it. I should say it would alter the position, and I am sure every other Hon. member of the House feels in the same way about it, -- I do not myself feel qualified to write a complete provisions for the escrow; that has to be worked out by the Commission from their experience. I think what is a safe thing is to start where you leave off, and change when there is evidence that justifies a change.

Sections 19 to 48, inclusive, agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 49 form part of the Bill?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, as the Hon. Attorney General probably knows, the prospectors and developer's Association has suggested that the requirements with relation to prospectuses, under Section 49, will, at the present time, create great difficulty becuase of congested conditions in the printing trade and difficulties in connection with getting paper and so on. I would like to hear the Attorney General comment on that suggestion. I am not prepared to say myself whether it is a very weighty one or not.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, as the Hon. leader of the opposition knows, when this Bill was before the Legal Bills Committee, the Prospectors' Association was represented there by, no doubt, the same person who made representation to him, and that point was not raised.

The fact of the matter is that I am daily in receipt of complaints regarding the ease with which paper is obtained for tipsters' sheets, of all sorts, and are circulated throughout the length and breadth of this and other lands.

The fact is that the brokers, who actually put out

the prospectuses, have not made these representations, and feel that they can comply with the Act. The representation in question was made to me more in relation to this particular problem , that is, when is a person a prospector, and when is he not a prospector.

The fact of the matter now is that under this Act, when a person is a prospector in relation to a project they can sell freely under section 19, Clause (t), which we discussed a moment ago, -- he may sell free of any prospectus. But when he sells under any other capacity and is in fact a broker, he must comply with the conditions as to the prospectus.

There has been no complaint by brokers who put out industrial issues and also by brokers who deal with commercial issues; and I cannot believe that mining prospectors will be met with any greater difficulties than are suffered by any other broker.

MR. HEPBURN: If I understood the Hon. Attorney General right, a prospector can sell his shares to anybody free of anything, -- am I right in that?

MR. BLACKWELL: I had reference to the thirty-five thousand dollar syndicate. That gives the prospector what he can do in regard to using money to do development work on the property.

There is felt from the relationship of the terms of that particular Bill to which we will come presently, arrangement itself contains its own system of disclosure, while the other conditions make it impossible for them to go on. But once you get into the share market, where the transaction is being handled by some financial house, it is the invariable practice then that we have the full disclosure

system with theprospectus.

The fact is that this report is based on the difficulty of getting printing and so on, done, and it is said that it will delay the transaction. Well, as far as I am concerned, when the public are being approached, -- I am not talking about securities now that are (1) being traded on the Exchange, or (2) even being traded on the open market in Toronto; but, surely, when the public is being approached there is one thing we have to take note of, and that is what the member of the public is entitled to know before he goes in.

There has been every argument by those who do not want to issue a prospectus, and this is the last one, which I only heard of in the last two or three days.

MR. HEPBURN: Would it be asking too much to ask the Hon. Attorney General to leave this section stand along with Section 55? I think we can make up for this in other Bills.

I understand that the Prospectors' and Developers' is a rather important association. They have made representations to the Hon. Attorney General, and, I believe, to the Hon. leader of the opposition. Would the Hon. Attorney General let is stand over until we could have a short conference together.

MR. BLACKWELL: In reply to the Hon. member from Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) I have to say that I have been over this subject so often, and, as far as I am concerned, I do not think once more will do me any particular harm; but I should say to the Hon. member for Elgin that these particular people were in my office not later than this morning and left at time saying that they were satisfied. I would put it simply

and to the Hon. leader for the opposition in this way, that those representations have been very carefully considered. The fullest opportunity was created in the legal Bills Committee, and, with respect, I do not think the party in question is quite playing the game in this connection by avoiding the bringing of this matter up, in a measure behind closed doors.

If the Hon. leader of the oppsoition and my friend from Elgin have not had reasonable opportunity to consider this matter, -- I think the fullest opportunity has been had to discuss this matter before the Legal Bills Committee and also in my office. It is simply an attempt to avoid the issuance of a prospectus. In other words to exhibit to a member of the public a prospectus is the keystone of this Act. If we throw that out we may as well throw out the whole Act because that is what gives a member of the public reasonable protection; and that is the real issue.

I do not think a Member of this House is entitled to take any other position than that a member of the public is entitled to be told the material facts. If not, we might do something else. But, if they are to be told the material facts, I think we cannot do better than is done in this.

MR. HEPBURN: Did I understand that the members of the Prospectors and Developers' Association said that they were completely satisfied?

MR. BLACKWELL: They have always said that they were satisfied. I do not think I should name names here. These people have had legal advice and people to represent them. I have even had letters saying they were satisfied. They did not care to raise the point before the legal Bills Committee, but they come to me, and they go to the Hon. member for Elgin and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and now they say

and to the Hon. leader for the opposi[illegible]
that those representations have been [illegible]
stated. The fullest opportunity was [illegible]
bills committee, and, with respect, I [illegible]
in question is quite playing the game [illegible]
by avoiding the airing of this matter up, [illegible]
behind closed doors.

If the Hon. leader of the opposi[illegible]
from Elgin have not had reasonable opportunity [illegible]
this matter, -- I think the [illegible]
to discuss this matter before [illegible]
and also in my office. It is [illegible]
the issuance of a prospectus. It [illegible]
to a member of the public a prospectus [illegible]
act. If we know that not we may [illegible]
whole act because that is [illegible]
reasonable protection; and that [illegible]

I do not think a Member [illegible]
to take any other position than that [illegible]
is entitled to be told the material fact[illegible]
do something else. But, if [illegible]
facts, I think we cannot do [illegible]

MR. MEPBURN: And I [illegible]
the Prospectors and developers [illegible]
were completely satisfied?

MR. BLACKWELL: They have [illegible]
satisfied. I do not think I [illegible]
people have had legal advice and [illegible]
I have even had letters saying [illegible]
not care to raise the point [illegible]
but they come to me, and [illegible]
and the Hon. leader of the opposi[illegible]

that they are not satisfied because the public has to have the facts.

MR. HEPBURN: I am not prepared to pass judgment on this particular issue, because it was only placed before me at ten minutes to three. But the Prospectors' and Developers' Association gave me a copy of a letter to the Hon. Attorney General in which, I would say, they protested violently against this particular section.

What I am asking is that we shall have an opportunity to consider it further. The Attorney General is perfectly right in saying that there was ample opportunity before the Legal Bills Committee . I have no opinion whatsoever except that I have a great regard for this Association. I believe it is very representative of the men who go up into the hinterlands of Northern Ontario, and the fact that the President of the Association addressed a letter to the Attorney General asking for further consideration of this particular section. It would not be out of order to let it stand over for another day or so.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear that I am not in a position to take sides on this matter. As far as I am concerned the prospectus should be maintained. But, if there is any way in which the objection can be met, I think it would be fair that it should be looked into. But I would expect that a Bill that is as complicated as this, a great many people might fail to raise all the points they might raise. That would be true of myself; I am not complaining about it; and there may be no way of meeting the objection that is put forward and, at the same time, reserve the principle of maintaining the delivery of the prospectus. But, if there is any way, I would like to see it found.

MR. BLACKBURN: Mr. Chairman, this section, as I have

that they are not satisfied [illegible]

the facts.

MR. [illegible]: I am [illegible] prepared to [illegible] this particular issue, [illegible] it was [illegible] at ten minutes to three. But the [illegible] several association gave us a copy of [illegible] letter to the Hon. Attorney General in which, I could say, [illegible] violently against this particular section.

What I am asking is that we should [illegible] it - ly to consider it further. The Attorney [illegible] rectly right in saying that there was [illegible] the Legal Bills Committee. I have [illegible] except that I have a great regard [illegible] believe it is very representative [illegible] the hinterlands of Northern Ontario, and the last time the President of the Association addressed a letter [illegible] General asking for further consideration [illegible] section. It would not be out of order [illegible] for another day or so.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. Chairman, [illegible] clear that I am not in a position to [illegible] as far as I am concerned the [illegible] But, if there is any way in which [illegible] I think it would be fair that it [illegible] I would expect that's what [illegible] a great many people might [illegible] might raise. That would be [illegible] planning about it; and then [illegible] section that is put forward [illegible] the principle of maintaining [illegible] But, if there is any way [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

said, -- I hope the Hon. leader of the opposition will follow this very carefully, because the point under discussion is not an incident of this Act. I might explain for the benefit of the Hon. leader of the opposition and others, that, quite obviously, there are a substantial number of those in the investment business who have no desire to be in the position, for obvious reasons, of having to delivery a prospectus to the public. Quite obviously, as that is the keystone to this Bill, public disclosure, and that matter has been uppermost in the minds of, I won't say the persons but the person who is making these representations, and there would only be two sensible alternatives to my mind, the one would be to refer the Bill back to the Legal Bills Committee, but, if that is done, we are only wasting our time because those people will not make those representations there. Now, if I saw in this picture any alternative suggestion, any proposed amendment that could be considered without destroying the entire principle of the Bill, I would, as I have been all the way through this, be anxious to examine in detail every proposition. But this is a desire to change the Bill, and I would say that would be unacceptable, and it would be a waste of time of this House to refer the Bill back to the Legal Bills Committee, because the point in question, I am bound to say, is fundamental.

When the hearing was held before the Legal Bills Committee, that point had just as much importance then as it has now. It is not because there was any mistake made, but the fact is that it is to avoid the prospectus, which is the basic principle of this Bill, that they want to havethe Bill delayed.

MR. HEPBURN: I would like to read the second paragraph

of the letter which I received this morning, --

MR. BLACKWELL: I have it myself.

MR. HEPBURN: At first the Hon. Minister told us that the Association was perfectly satisfied, but he later rather qualified those remarks. I begin at the second paragraph of the letter:

> "While we appreciate that Bill 41 with its present admended provisions goes a long way to meet the objections which were raised to the Bill as originally presented to the House, we nevertheless are of the opinion that the provisions of Section 55 which requires the delivery of a prospectus in the manner as therein set forth will be impractical and will reflect against the financing of legitimate mining ventures."

Then they follow with other objections which I will not bother to read to the House. I do not think it would do any injury to the House to let the two sections stand over.

(Page 1594 follows)

MR. BLACKWELL: I might say that there is a further paragraph in the letter that should be read because it brings the matter into clear issue and that paragraph is:

> "We again submit that the public would be amply protected if instead of Section 55, the Act contained a provision requiring every advertisement, offering to or other invitation or solicitation of the public or any member thereof, to subscribe for or purchase a security to which Section 49 is applicable shall state where a copy of the material mentioned in Section 55 may be obtained."

that is, a member of the public all over Ontario can write into the Security Commission or Broker's office when they are approached by mail or otherwise and that simply means that a member of the public is not getting a prospectus. That issue was discussed literally months ago and every organization in this province. . .. I think I will have to be frank with this to the House: This letter is not written from the point of view of the prospector; it is written from the point of view of the person who is the President of the Prospectors and Developers Association, not as attitude qua prospector but as attitude qua pusher of securities. I make the statement, in view of the letter, that is the simple question before them which they may as well decide now without any further delay, and that simple question is: Are the public entitled to have material facts delivered to them? Every investment broker and agent in this town says it can be done. As far as I am concerned the Bill will be of little value to the investing public of this province if full disclosure is abandoned.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think the principle of full disclosure is important to the Bill. I am in favour of it. I hope the Attorney-General will be prepared to cover the case I raised the other day of the listed mining stocks which are subject to issuing at very much lower prices than those

quoted on the exchanges of which the general public knows next to nothing and the best answer that the Secretary of the Exchange could give us that always somebody had a copy which they could look at if they were wise enough to do so.

MR. ROBERTS: Might I draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Dominion Companies Act, which it was hoped originally would cover every province, provided not only for prospectus but delivery 48 hours before the sale can be completed. May I also point out that the Securities Exchange Act requires delivery of prospectus or what is practically the same thing as prospectus that all material facts and of the most careful scrutiny of all those facts be made before the issue can be qualified by the Exchange. What the Attorney General has said, as far as I am concerned, impresses me and I think this provision is very important.

Section agreed to.

MR. CYRIL OVERALL (Niagara Falls): I wonder if it is in order to move an amendment to sub-section 5 on this page 24? I would like to strike out words "mining engineer" in the fifth line and insert after, in the fourth line "a registered mining engineer" and then that sub-section will read:

> "(5) Where the securities to be traded consist of shares of a mining company a full and up-to-date report on the property of the company and the development thereof made by a person who is in the opinion of the Commission is a registered mining engineer, geologist or prospector certified by such person ....."

MR. BLACKWELL: Before indicating whether that amendment ought to go or not I would like to say this to the hon. member (Mr. Overall) that raised it. This relates to who shall certify the mining report and the people who are

competent to do that are divided into three classes - that is, mining engineers, geologists, and those who by reason of their prospecting experience are qualified to do so.

I should say to the House, since the hon. member (Mr. Overall) raised that question on Friday I have given the matter some consideration and here is what is the meaning of that amendment: that substituted for the discretion of the Commission in determining what mining engineers might sign a report would be the Professional Engineers Society. Now, that might be all right if all the people qualified academically by practice and by desire are members of that society, but at the present time I am not prepared to put the Securities Commission in that position with relation to another Bill which is still before this House - of establishing that the only person who can be accepted on a mining report is a mining engineer who is registered by the Professional Engineers Association.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He is not suggesting that.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is what it amounts to. That is what his amendment, as I see, amounts to. It is meaningless otherwise. I will say this to the hon. member (Mr.Overall) as a purely practical matter - that is, a mining engineer who is a member of the Professional Engineers Organization and who has, perhaps, some higher qualifications than some other mining engineer or who is at least qualified as some other engineers who do not care to become members, that there would be no difficulty as far as I am concerned, but I am not going to restrict the Commission to find that the only engineer who can sign a report is one who is a member of the Professional Engineers Association.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Better read it.

MR. OVERALL: I will read it:

> "(5) Where the securities to be traded consist of shares of a mining company a full and up-to-date report on the property of the company and the development thereof made by a person who in the opinion of the Commission is a registered mining engineer, geologist or prospector certified by such person"

MR. BLACKWELL: The amendment would have precisely the effect that I indicated it would. Registered engineer means identically registered under the Professional Engineers Act.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The word "or" is in there.

MR. BLACKWELL: It is a perfectly practical matter. unless there is some practical effect in the member's mind, I do not see why he particularly wants to get a reference to the Professional Engineer in there, and when he uses the expression "registered" it means professional engineer registered with the Association. I do not really think the amendment is helpful. It leaves it exactly where it is unless it is restricted and I am not prepared to accept it on a restricted basis.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I cannot see how it restricts. I do not like to make an issue of it but I would like to point out there, what I do not like to see written there actually is "in the opinion of the Commission". That should not be in there, and persons qualified to make a report should be registered engineer and registered geologist and registered prospector, but actually the geologists and prospectors are not registered.

MR. BLACKWELL: I can quite see the evolution that is going on in the Professional Engineers Association. It may come to the point where professional engineers in this province are controlled exactly the way the Law Society controlls lawyers, but that is not the existing law of this province and there are many highly qualified people who are not yet members of the

Professional Engineers Association and for that reason I cannot accept at the moment that mining engineers should be qualified by the word "registered". While that amendment may be perfectly acceptable in a year or two years hence, it is untenable now.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I understand the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Overall) does not desire to make an issue of it, but in fairness to him and so there won't be any misunderstanding I want to point out the words of his amendment are perfectly clear. There is nothing in his suggestion that will exclude anybody.

MR. BLACKWELL: That does not change it.

Section agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 50.

MR. BLACKWELL: There is a missprint in Section 50, down near the foot, the third line from the foot, the word "where" has crept into that line by mistake, should be deleted.

Section agreed to.

Section 51, 52, inclusive agreed to.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This seems to be a very vital section. A great deal depends on the administration of the Act perhaps even more than what is in the Act itself. This section puts the responsibility, as I understand it, squarely on the Commission for accepting or rejecting statements which are supposed to contain full disclosure of all material fact. There is one point I wish to make in connection with the administration. I see nothing in the Bill which expressly attempts to assure that a reasonable proportion of the monies raised will reach the property for which they are intended. That, of course, is of particular interest in connection with mining developments but since there is nothing in the Act itself about it the responsibility is going

to rest with the Commission and I want to suggest most seriously to the Attorney General and whoever may be the new Commissioners under the new Act that it will be their duty and their obligation to the people of this province and for the future of the province to satisfy themselves that most of the money subscribed by the public actually reach the property for which they are being raised. For my part, I cannot see why the traditional twenty-five per cent should not be the outside limit.for monies diverted during the promotion of a company or the sales of its stock and my hope is that the Commission will keep very much in mind not only the full disclosure of all material facts but also the public interest requires that the savings of the people should be wisely and constructively invested.

Section agreed to.

Sections 53, 54, 55, inclusive, agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 56.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, a little while ago the Attorney General referred to the sanctions which are available under this Act and which I think he said are the best assurance that the law would be complied with. Now, the difficulty I see about Section 56 is this -perhaps someone can enlighten me, perhaps I am imagining things - but is not it true that Section 56 is no use to anyone unless a customer finds out that he has been deceived in some way and unless he then takes steps towards recission. In other words, is there any protection for customer who never does learn?, that he has not been told all he should know and that his broker may have acting as principal rather than as agent.

MR. BLACKWELL: I think in that respect, Mr. Chairman, that the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has really made

his reference to Section 63. Section 56 deals with the failure to deliver the prospectus. Section 63 is not unlike that, in that it deals with the failure to make disclosure of being a principal rather than acting as an agent for the purchaser. Now, the right given under these sections 56 and 63 is a new right of recission. As the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) well knows at common law for mis-statement or misrepresentation or any of these things which can be wrong about a prospectus the purchaser already has all that civil relief without having to depend on these sections. These sections are more in the way of sanction against the broker in that the right of recission is given in relation to mere failure to deliver or disclose and in no way interfere with all the other common law remedies for misrepresentation or damages by reason of recission that flow from civil wrong. The purchaser in either case also has the protection that goes with the criminal law pertaining to fraud, those sections I mentioned on second reading, whereby certain frauds in the matter of security are criminal offences and should be prosecuted as such. This is additional sanction put in this Act for the purpose of requiring that the prospectus does get delivered and it is not in any way cut down .....

MR. JOLLIFFE: I understand but it does not help if the purchaser lives in Kansas.

MR. BLACKWELL: On the other hand there has to be some reasonable limitations. There was a great deal of discussion about that. The limitation under the Dominion Act is 30 days, and this is twice as long. Now, if that limitation is much longer than that you simply put the people in the position of handling the stock for certain period than they keep them in the property and if they act badly they then apply for recission.

Any longer period would be completely unfair.

Section 56 agreedto.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 57.

Section 57 agreed to.

MR. BLACKWELL: There are two typical errors that I would like to mention so that they can be corrected in Section 56, paragraph 2. Section 53 mentioned, should be Section 55.

Section 58, 59, 60, inclusive, agreed to.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, this section has been criticised by both sides. There are those who think there should not be any restriction at all on telephoning - perfectly legitimate form of communication, used by many other businesses, and they cannot see why a man who is a registered broker should be prevented from using that medium which is open to practically else. On the other hand, as most members of the House know, there is also a feeling that it does not go far enough. My chief purpose in rising at the moment is to point out that whether they like it or not the financial fraternity are not in the same position as other business in respect to this matter. It is not merely a matter of protecting the public here in Ontario; it is also a question of protecting the good name of this province and this country.

I do not know whether the Attorney General was listening to the radio Saturday night or not,but I was listening to a radio station on Saturday night at 7 p.m. to be exact, and just by chance I heard a broadcast by the Buffalo Better Business Bureau and it was a dramtization with the most harrowing detail of a widow who was swindled by high pressure telephone call from the City of Toronto in a Canadian Mining Stock and the House can imagine the sort of details with which the thing was

emebellished - the widow had just lost her husband, a naval commander killed in the war; she had little money, not very much. She knew nothing about investing it. Her young son drew her attention to some exciting literature coming from Toronto and persuaded her to read it. She did not pay very much attention until she received two telephone calls from Toronto, which were duly dramitized and she was persuaded to take two blocks of this valuable security, she ought to put $700 into it, which she did, and a little later, as a result of another call, put in $700 more, and of course lost it all.

The effect of the whole broadcast was, to my mind, very damaging to the name of this country and certainly very damaging to the developing of the mining industry of this province. Incidentally, before the close of the programme there was reference made by some person speaking on behalf of the Buffalo Better Business Bureau to the Attorney General by name and stating that the Attorney General is sponsoring a new Bill which he hopes will prevent a re-currence of such a tragedy as this. I hope that statement coming at the tail end of the programme will prove it does not. I am not sure. In any event the point I am making is we certainly must appreciate and the financial community must appreciate, together with this boast about having the largest mining exchange in the world, together with that this province is getting from all the publicity in the United States and elsewhere as a result of certain operations which have been carried on in recent years.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, that was a very interesting emotional experience that the Leader of the Opposition had and my gret regret at the moment is I was in a position to share it with him.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You would have enjoyed it.

MR. BLACKWELL: I know I would. I must say this: That the transaction complained of by the Better Business Bureau would not be legal under this telephone section. Plus also that the widow in question would have been entitled to prospectus, that thing I was so insistent on this afternoon.....

MR. JOLLIFFE: SHe would probably be impressed much more if she received one.

MR. BLAckwell: I want to say this; as far as the investing fraternity of this town is concerned, and I should say it on their behalf, there are persona and people that dislike intensely features about this Act, but I want to say on behalf of firms engaged in the marketing of securities, they all recognize that certain of these practices are damaging to the reputation of Ontario throughout Canada and in the United States and elsewhere and they all recognize it is damaging the reputation of people in the business right in Ontario and that is why those organizations have been so co-operative in accepting the provisions of this Act, and I hope that after it has been under administration for a time that the expectations voiced by the Leader of the Opposition from time to time about the Bill will be achieved.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Hopes, not expectations.

MR. BLACKWELL: Hopes will be achieved and that some of his dismal views will be demonstrated to be unwarranted.

WILLIAM J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane,South): I want to again register my objection to sub-section 2 of this section. I think we have covered the question fairly well in sub-section 1 and to go again and print it again under sub-section 2 we destroy the effect which was intended in the first part of the section. I submit that sub-section 2 and 2 (a) limits the persons to whom the person making the call can put through his call,but that gives

him an opportunity to say: Well, this person is a friend of mine, and this person has called me up and got in touch, but that gives --

MR. BLACKWELL: The hon. member (Mr.Grummett) appreciates that telephone call has to be put in writing.

MR. GRUMMETT: I think in including those two sub-sections we are destroying the plural effect of sub-section 1 of section 60, and I just want to raise my objection to the whole sub-section again.

MR. BLACKWELL: I appreciate very much the attitude of the hon.member (Mr.Grummett) in confining himself to registering his purely personal views and his protest, which is a very nice way of dealing with the matter, but I feel in that connection this should be said; Without that degree of relaxation every individual engaged in the investment business is absolutely debarred from in any way making any additional contact in business and it simply creates a whole series of anomolies; that is, people that have a large business to do and have settled customers have it no matter how legitimately someone else ia attempting to carry on business there is no legitimate way for them to make any fresh contacts. Unless there is a means of doing that in the Bill it simply means right at the outset we destroy that measure of co-operation from people who are in the business that is necessary to make any Act succeed. If we make it as restrictive as that we put it in a position there is no way to get any business unless you do go out and break the law. What I am hopeful of and what I wish to say, with that realization I am hopeful that we will be able to engage in more successful law enforcement in regard to the more limited restriction and we will get a higher degree of co-operation from everyone in the business.

Section 60 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 61.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Section 61, sub-section (b) contains a reference to listing, which indicates the basis for the objection I raised the other day about listedmining stock. In sub-section 1 of this section the Government have recognized the weight of a representation that a stock as listed, about to be listed, or application will be made for listing and have prohibited such representations on the part of a broker or salesman. Now, of course, the reason the Government have recognized that is that the same people get unduly influenced as to the standing of a stock by representation that it is on the point of being listed. That is the basis for the point I raised the other day about a considerable number of mining stock which are listed on the stock exchange but which, in fact, like so many unlisted mining stock, are subject to outstanding option agreement and I am raising it again because I have a further point to make about it.

I would just like to say for the information of members of the House who have not heard me talk about this before, that a great many unlisted mining stocks are subject to outstanding option agreement under which a broker can take month after month delivery of that stock from the treasury at a certain price and if he can make a market, get rid of this at a considerably higher price. Now, that is a general thing on the unlisted market and I think most people would expect it to happen,but the point of which the general public is not aware is this: that a considerable number of the mining stocks listed on the stock exchange are also subject to outstanding option agreement and I am going to give three examples of it without naming the companies concerned. Company A selling on the Exchange at the present time between 40 and 45 cents per share is actually subject to an option agreement under

which the optionee right now is entitled to take stock from the treasury of that Company at 15 cents per share. Similarly Company B selling on the Exchange at 75 to 85 cents per share is subject to an agreement under which the optionee is taking down stock at 60 cents a share. And even a more extreme case, Company C is being traded on the Stock exchange between a $1.70 and $1.85 and the stock is being taken down from the treasury by an optionee at only 30 cents at the present time.

Now, most of the general public are under the impression that these companies are established, that they have some status, have some standing because they are listed on the exchange. There is apparently an active market at a respectful heighth in their shares and I am afraid many of those who buy and sell such shares are under the impression that they are buying and selling them on a sort of free and uncontrolled market on the Exchange and that the prices they know on the Exchange represent the kind of money that is actually going into the financing of that property, and they are entirely wrong about it.

In the third case I gave, if the public were to purchase the stock at $1.80 under the impression that $1.80 per share or something in that neighbourhood had gone into the development of the property he would be entirely wrong. He would be wrong also if he thought that had any real foundation, because the fact of the matter would be that the optionee had subscribed 30 cents or less at an earlier date under optionee agreement which actually reached the treasury of the Company. I know the answer which is made on behalf of the stock exchange, that that sort of thing has gone on for a long time and that listing statements are sent out to all member houses of the Stock Exchange and if anybody wants to go into the member house and asks to see listing statement they will find out all about

it, they will find out somebody is busily taking down shares and doing very nicely on it. That, to me, does not cover the situation. If the Attorney General is interested in making sure that the public knows the fact,- this is most material fact which most members of the general public do not even suspect, which, as a matter of fact is not even known to a good many people who make a business of writing on the subject as I happen to know. Some of the people who make their living writing about mining stock are not aware that this occurs with the listed stocks. They know it happens with unlisted stock.

Another thing is, you cannot get speculative money for mining development unless you let somebody take the risk with the assurance sometimes, everyone now and then, he will be able to make a very wide margin as a result of the operation. Well, that may be true in some cases. I suppose it is true that as long as capital is raised for mining development by the speculative method that wide margins will occur every now and then, but no effort whatever has been made to give the mine or the property itself some benefit where there is a great appreciation in the value of the stock. The entire benefit, where there is great appreciation, now goes to the optionee or underwriter, whichever he may be called and I think it is rather serious that when we have people throughout the province who are in a position to invest some money in mining development, I think it is rather serious when they invest in a promising mine in the belief that all of it or most of it is actually going into the building up of a mining development in this province when, as a matter of fact, they are in one of the cases I have mentioned investing $1.80 in shares of which 3o cents will actually reach the property and the balance will remain with an optionee or underwriter who

happens to have been lucky in the case.

I do not think it is enough for the Attorney General to argue that he cannot regulate prices. What I would like to know is whether any effort has been made or inquiry has been made into the possibility of assuring that more of the public's money does go to the mine, assure that the mine gets something like an even break as well as the general public of this province. Let there be no argument about regulating prices. I know it is probably a fantastic suggestion that any bureaucratic authority can regulate the speculative movement of prices on an exchange. What I am concerned with is this: would the Attorney General be prepared to recommend that the new Commission in scanning agreements hereafter when they are filed with the Commssion some attention will be given to the possibility that if the value of a stock greatly appreciates, the property itself as well as the optionee, will get some benefit from that appreciation. That is a different matter entirely from the regulation of prices and I think it is a metter which ought to be taken into consideration if we are really interested in finding adequate capital for mining development.

MR.BLACKWELL: I do not wish to make a long explanation,Mr. Chairman, but I do wish to say in the first place that under this Act there is a prospectus to start with which will disclose all material information in regard to the option. As far as sales directed to the public is concerned, no matter what price the broker may be making the offer at, the option will appear in that prospectus. When the stock comes on the exchange the principle involved is this: what the public are interested in then is the values,actually sound or unsound, are established in the public estimation that lead them to trade in and trade out.

Page 1610 follows.

This question provides no particular difficulty on industrial issues, because there you are dealing, in the main, with tangibles, the tangibles being the plant, machinery, and equipment, and the inventories, and so on; the intangible of those issues is the ability of management.

But when you come to a mine, you have to-day a piece of moose pasture, that either by geological or for other reasons has a promise, and arrangements are made to finance, shall we say, its exploration. At that point, any value that may relate to any securities issued, whether by syndicate agreement, or by way of shares in a company, are definitely limited, and at that point there are really three elements involved, one is the prospector who staked it out; another is the man who financed it, and the other is the public who participates in that speculation.

The situation is this; exploration proceeds, and to-day something that was merely a hope at the time of drilling becomes possessed, for the sake of argument, of an entirely different standard of values. Now, it is a pretty difficult matter at that stage to go around and readjust, and say because that speculation turned out, we will take a general practice on the hope of speculation in this being successful, and we will have something back from you, and something back also from the promoters. It is very difficult, indeed; all I can say is this, that on this Mining Commission, we propose to have an Executive Commission, and we hope to have a practical mining mind, and we hope to have someone with a practical knowledge of the financial business. I am sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition

(Mr. Jolliffe) is aware that all the principles of this Act will be under constant review. I appreciate, as well as he does, that we have not reached the end in this Statute by any manner of means. What we may have done is to properly control the protection of the investing public in this province.

MR. A. A. CASSELMAN (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the remark of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and also the continuing remarks of the Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) having occasionally looked at the board and visited the brokers' offices, and I might say that I was not aware what was going on, nor in the way it was explained by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe).

I am suggesting that the stock which had an option like that should not be listed. I do not know whether that is what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) was getting at, but it certainly was rather startling news to me, in the light of the fact -- as I say, I have been watching the boards, and have watched some of the tradings, and if, when McLeod Cockshutt went up to five dollars a share from six cents, I thought it went up because that was the value of the stock, or the value that people had put on it, not thinking that some optionee had an option on one hundred thousand shares at thirty cents --

MR. JOLLIFFE: I don't know about "thirty".

MR. CASSELMAN: I just used that by way of illustration. My question is this; would it be feasible that the stock could not be listed as long as someone held an option?

MR. L. G. ROBINSON (Waterloo South): Mr. Chairman, it just occurs to me to ask whether the stock is listed or unlisted, trading continues, and if the mine is successful,

trading carries on at a higher level, but if the option is there, it is purchased at a lower level, and the same trouble would exist, whether the stock was listed or unlisted.

The thing, to my mind, is based on the manner in which capital is made available for the development of the mines. If we are going to deal with the old system in the way in which it has been done, in order to induce capital to-day at the lower optionee's level, we would probably have to continue on this basis, but it seems if the capital is going to get back to the mines, the basis will have to change.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Robinson) is certainly right, as long as the development of mining prospects is to be by personal interest and speculation. This is the way it will have to be done, but some day the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Robinson) may get the opportunity to have the state take it over, and do all the prospecting, and take all the losses and all the gains.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) will agree that this is going to provide a very interesting test of the administration of the Act, because the hon. Attorney General was not born yesterday, and he knows what actually happens, that an optionee, who is perhaps not a member of the Stock Exchange, quietly takes down the stock under his agreement, and discreetly pushes it through the exchange.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is obviously so.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, that is what actually happens

and the connection between the optionee and the member house will be very obscure at times, but the member house is acting as a channel through which that treasury stock reaches the public.

I shall be very interested to see whether such distribution turns out to be primary distribution or does not, because if it is primary distribution, under this Act, the member house will have to tell his client that is what it is. But if it is not primary distribution, the unfortunate client will continue under the illusion that he in his good judgment has decided to buy a certain stock which, as a matter of fact, is being sold to him by a broker who is acting as a principal, or an assistant of the principal, who is taking it from the treasury. Is that not so?

MR. BLACKWELL: I am gladd the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has this feature --

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, but the interesting thing will be to see whether it works.

Sections 61 to 63 inclusive agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 64 form part of the Bill.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) permit a question? In Section 64, we have the words in reference to investment counsel, "Printed in a conspicuous position". Now, I am just wondering whether similar words are not used in Section 62. I take it the purpose of the words, "In a conspicuous position" in Section 64 is to prevent investment counsel from using very small type, which might not be noticed. Is not the same thing in Section 62? I know we have passed it, but is not the principle as good in one case as in the

other?

MR. BLACKWELL: It is not quite the same principle, Mr. Chairman, in this respect, that the investment counsel, who function under this Act, is a person who should have absolutely no conflict of interests, and is in a position to advise with relation, presumably to some security or a limited number of securities at one time.

The other section simply requires that ahead of the transaction being completed, there be disclosure of the principal's interest. It may be either in that circular or in writing, before completing a transaction.

Now, as a practical matter, some of these lists are really quotation lists, and some of them are extremely lengthy, and they are put out by people who, in relation to some security, act as principal, and in others act as agents. That is the rather peculiar second part of the earlier section. I believe that in relation to a particular disclosure of a principle, we are dealing with an entirely different type of situation than we are in regard to the investment counsel. That section is really being directed to those "tipster sheets", which we know are there, and from them we know at the present time there is indicated all sorts of conflicting interests going on.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is there not a conflict of interests in both cases?

MR. BLACKWELL: Yes, but there is some similarity in principle but the investment counsel section deals with a much more emergent and exigent situation than the first one does. I doubt if there is any particular desire of using any larger print in the first one.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am afraid it will only be in Section 64.

Motion agreed to.

Sections 65 to 75 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 75.

MR. BLACKWELL: There are more than two pages. If you will turn to Page 37 you will find the next page is Number 33, and Section 73 starts there.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The Opposition has it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.

Sections 73 to 77 inclusive agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 78.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I rejoiced when I heard the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) indicate that much of the present regulations were going to be brought into the Act itself. I like the principle of the thing, although I know it cannot be carried all the way.

But when I looked at Section 78, I was awe-struck to see the territory which is there covered, and the territory which is going to be dealt with by regulations. I do not know what the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) has in mind, but he certainly has put forward a lot of legislation by regulation there.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, that makes me a trifle despondent, because I had a considerable amount to say in this Legislature about the propriety of delegated Legislation. I feel that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) will consider this thought, that we might have, strangely enough, a much larger regulation section, which would be much broader than this application. As a matter of fact, the length of this section is rather the result of the substantive law in the Act being settled very definitely, and it is describing the administrative

matters in connection with the regulations. The very fact that it is tied down in the Act, means a much longer section of regulations. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) appreciates that is so.

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 79 form part of the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 80.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Would the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) tell us whether there is anything new in Section 80.

MR. BLACKWELL: No; it is right out of the old Act.

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 81.

MR. WILLIAMS (Ontario): Just for the sake of asking one question, will the hon. Minister (Mr. Blackwell) tell us anything about Number 81? Who is this in here?

MR. BLACKWELL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I spent most of my life as a lawyer wondering what it was, too. It was only after I found myself in my present capacity, and had it explained to me by our Legislative Council, that I appreciated it.

MR. WILLIAMS: You are not going to read the book, I hope.

MR. BLACKWELL: It is one of the cases where I have a great desire to follow what I presume is not a proper course in this Chamber. It simply means a way out. I am sorry it is as simple as that.

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 82.

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 83.

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 84.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Now, may I be allowed to strike a slightly sour note? Is the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) in a position to give us a rough idea of when this Act will be proclaimed, if we ceased to pass it? We had some legislation at the last Session which we were assured was highly important and desirable, and I have heard no mention of it since the last Session. I am thinking of one of the commissions mentioned during the last Session, which was to be set up.

Does the Government propose to go ahead with this in the immediate future, or the distant future?

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I think it would probably be the intermediate future. By that I would say this; I do not think at this stage that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) is really striking a sour note. I would say this; this Act should not be proclaimed until a commission is appointed which is prepared to go into it, and you cannot appoint a commission until you are prepared to say to them what they are to administer. I think it would be a great mistake to proclaim the Act without the commission giving adequate consideration to what the administrative purposes are going to be, and I would think that the earliest that this Act could not be properly put into effect earlier than the middle of May or the beginning of June.

MR. NIXON (Brant): I don't suppose the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) has canvassed the field

yet for a commissioner.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He will have a lot of trouble finding somebody.

MR. NIXON: I was wondering if he was prepared to take the House into his confidence as to who is to head this commission?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 85.

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

MR. WILLIAMS (Ontario): Three cheers.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order Number 41, Bill Number 42.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-first Order; House in Committee on Bill Number 42, "An Act Respecting Prospecting Syndicates Having a Capital not exceeding Ten Thousand Dollars."

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill Number 42, "An Act Respecting Prospecting Syndicates Having a Capital not exceeding Ten Thousand Dollars."

Section 1 to 3 agreed to.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This means the end of the ten thousand dollar minimum?

MR. BLACKWELL: Yes.

Section 4 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order Number 38, Bill Number 44.

yet for a commissioner.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He will have a lot of trouble finding somebody.

MR. NIXON: I was wondering if he was prepared to take the House into his confidence as to who is to lead this commission?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 38.

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

MR. WILLIAMS (Oshawa): Three cheers.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Good Number 41, Bill Number 42.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-first Order: House in Committee on Bill Number 42, "An Act respecting Syndicates Having a Capital not exceeding Ten Thousand Dollars."

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill Number 42, "An Act Respecting Prospecting Syndicates Having a Capital not exceeding Ten Thousand Dollars."

Section 1 to 3 agreed to.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This means the end of the [illegible] dollar minimum?

MR. BLACKWELL: Yes.

Section 4 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill [illegible]

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): [illegible]

38, Bill Number [illegible]

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-eighth Order; House in Committee on Bill 44, "An Act to Amend the Public Health Act."

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No.44, "An Act to Amend the Public Health Act."

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 7.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the House would allow us to go back to Section 2 for a moment? I was not in the House when Section 2 was discussed.

THE CHAIRMAN: What do you want?

MR. DENNISON: I would just like to question the wisdom of passing Number 2 at this stage, when so many cities and towns in the province have no facilities for treating sewage, and are pouring raw sewage into our lakes, streams, and rivers, and some of these are large cities -- the city of Ottawa, Windsor, Niagara Falls, Sarnia, and, to a certain extent, Toronto, and there are a total of fourteen cities, and fifty towns which have no sewage disposal plants of any kind, and on the outskirts of these cities are many houses which are now pretty adequately looked after by means of septic tanks.

As far as the additional load being placed upon the system; if we give the local Board of Health the right now in cities or towns of any size to require that the septic tank and particularly the sewage disposal, be scrapped, and they be forced to use the city systems, it will mean that a larger volume of sewage will pollute the lakes, rivers, and streams of this province.

I think it is a bad situation that any city or any town or any village should be allowed to lay a sewer

at all before they have first constructed a plant to properly treat the sewage. It is a bad principle. And I am wondering if passing Section Number 2 will not aggravate that condition, and I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Vivian) would object to an emendment after the word "system" in the second line, with these words being added "a sewage disposal plant", so that the section will read:

> "Where a local board in a municipality in which a sewage system and sewage disposal plant have been established, recommends--"

and so forth. This would prevent that situation developing.

MR. VIVIAN: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with Section 2, to which we returned after we had passed it, I would like to reply to the hon. member for St. David (Mr.Dennison).

I would like to draw this to his attention. It is well recognized in the province that we are in times of stress and strain regarding additions to local water works or proper sewage treatment facilities. That was true prior to the war, and is true even moreso now.

The local interest in municipalities is at such a high point at the present time that as soon as materials are available, and labour is available, many of these municipalities will go ahead with the features involved in the erection of proper water works and sewage disposal plants. The suggestion of the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) would seem to be a retroactive step, and taking rather a gloomy view, because there are municipalities in the province who have their plans ready to go ahead, and they will be assisted by a measure of this sort.

The point he raises about dumping sewage into the lakes, rivers and streams is more imaginative than real.

May I be permitted to point out with the present facilities a reduction of typhoid in this province from 7 and a fraction to 0.2 in a sufficient number of water works departments without untreated sewage. If my memory serves me correctly, it went from 178 to 310, so apparently we are having a very practicable effect in reducing the existence of typhoid fever.

I would go further and say that the question of septic tanks may or may not create a more serious local hazard than additions to certain existing sewage disposal plants. I think it is using the lesser of two evils, and I think we can depend upon the sanitary officers which we have in this province and the supervision from a central department, to be able to advise a municipality whether or not their procedure is justified.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, the question of water supply is not one involved in this section. Neither is the question of water supply involved in regard to disease, because in municipalities which do not have a water supply, of course, they would not be under this section. This only applies if there is a water supply, so that if there is a water supply and that water supply is properly inspected, it is pure.

MR. VIVIAN: What was that, I did not hear that last remark?

MR. DENNISON: If there is a water supply, and that water supply is properly inspected, then the water supply is generally pure.

MR. VIVIAN: Is it?

MR. DENNISON: That is why the rate of disease has been reduced, but in many cases that does not show that the

stream is not being polluted, because we have modern facilities for filtering water, and you can take a heavily polluted water and put it through a modern filtration plant, and get good drinking water. We do that right in this city of Toronto every day, as the hon. Minister (Mr. Vivian) well knows.

MR. VIVIAN: Good drinking water?

MR. DENNISON: If the wind is from the east, they take the water from the western intake; if the wind is from the west, they take the water from the eastern intake, and by putting a lot of chlorine gas into that water, and taking the taste away afterwards by another process, they finally arrive at a pure --

MR. VIVIAN: Mr. Chairman, did I understand the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) to say they take the taste out of water? Was that his statement?

MR. DENNISON: Yes, they have to put water through another process to take the taste away after they put the gas in.

MR. A. BELANGER (Prescott): What is the direction of the wind when you can drink it?

MR. DENNISON: The danger is this; if one man forgot his duty one day down at our filtration plant, there would be an epidemic in this city, because we are polluting the water of the lake within a mile of the intake pipes every day and seriously polluting it, and why have we been permitted to do that?

Let me just tell you; I know the hon. Minister (Mr. Vivian) probably intends to give more technical assistance to the local munitipalities in building sewage disposal plants, in the future, and that should be done.

I agree with that one hundred percent. But the fact remains that in the past, that technical assistance, and that advice from the Government has not been applicable to local municipalities in constructing sewage disposal plants, and the result has happened in Toronto away back in 1930. They said they were going to build a plant. They were not advised by the Department, or by their own Works Department, as to what size that plant should be, and they went to Boston and engaged a firm of experts, consultants, and these experts drew up a twenty-five million dollar proposition to pump the sewage from Toronto to Hyland Creek, where there would be a glorified disposal plant, and, of course, the tax-payers turned the whole idea down. It was fantastic to expect the city to spend twenty-five million dollars.

Then the city had a Board of Review, and this was the first time they got any help from the province. The province did have a man -- Doctor Bury -- who sat in with this Board of Review, and they pared down the estimates, and finally arrived at a sewage disposal plant which would cost about twelve million dollars. That was still too much money for the city to spend. The province did not offer any kind of help at all --

MR. VIVIAN: Why should they?

MR. DENNISON: And no sewage disposal plant was built, and the lake continued to be polluted.

Finally, two years ago, we decided to build a six million or eight million dollar plant, which will give complete treatment as soon as the final stage is built, but this delay of ten years was caused because there was no leadership by the province.

I think the province, in connection with a sewage

disposal, should be prepared to have plans available. The local municipality has no experience, and their officials have no experience in sewage disposal; they should not be put at the mercy of experts from Boston or any place else. In the case of this Hyland Creek plan, these consultants drew two hundred and fifty thousand dollars in fees before a shovelfull of dirt was turned in the construction of the sewage disposal plant.

That puts the municipality at the mercy of those who charge high fees for technical advice, and I would urge, before this section is passed, the province should be prepared to tell the municipalities what they are prepared to give, and what technical advice they are prepared to give to save the municipalities money in the construction of these plants.

There is no mistake about this. It is a simple system, but the system has not added value to the farms in the neighbourhood; it should bring available to the farms a good grade of fertilizer, a better grade than barnyard manure, where these plants are constructed.

And we should bear that fact in mind, because our land should receive back every bit of fertilizer that is taken away from the land over the years.

Now, the city of Milwaukee, where they have carried this to a logical solution, has built a plant where they processed this sludge into a first-rate fertilizer, and it sells, even in this city. It is called the Melognite Fertilizer, and the city of Milwaukee makes a sale of about seven hundred thousand dollars a year of that fertilizer.

I would like to move, to bring this before the House,

seconded by Mr. Strange, that sub-section 2 of Section 2 be amended by adding after the words "sewage system" in the second line thereof, the words "and a sewage disposal plant".

THE CHAIRMAN: You said you wanted an explanation from the hon. Minister (Mr. Vivian). We did not re-open the section for an amendment.

MR. DENNISON: I think I asked if the House would permit us to return to Section 2 again.

MR. LESLIE HANCOCK (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, I think no one should detract from the very grave importance of the point raised by the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) and I would be glad to support the amendment, if the hon. Minister (Mr. Vivian) considers this is the proper place for it.

However, the hon. Minister for Planning and Development (Mr. Porter) is in the House, and I would like to know whether this Act is adequate for the implementation of the question raised by the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison)?

The cities have already developed expensive plants, in many cases, and are dumping into the rivers. Now, whether they can adopt this sytem, as the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) suggests, that easily, I don't know.

I would like to know whether the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Porter) considers that in the event of the river valley development, this would be taken care of automatically? If it would not -- even so, I presume it would be a good thing to have a section in this Act which gave further beginnings to their plan. Perhaps we might hear from the hon. Minister of Planning and

Development (Mr. Porter).

MR. VIVIAN: Mr. Chairman, I did not get all the hon. member behind me (Mr. Hancock) had to say, but I gathered he is wondering whether the Public Health Act provides adequate provision for the passing of regulations to deal with housing, with regard to sanitation and sewage -- is that your point?

MR. HANCOCK: No, I want to know whether the clause in the Public Health Act would be overlapping legislation with the proposed River Valley Legislation? I presume, when we get such legislation --

MR. VIVIAN: The answer is "No".

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison): there are one or two things I would like to point out to him with regard to the proposed amendment. -- As amended, it reads:

> "Where a local board in a municipality in which a sewage system has been established --"

"Sewage system" is an inclusive term. In view of that term, do you still want to put your amendment? I am asking you "Yes", or "No", and if you do, give me the words.

MR. DENNISON: I would like to say, if you will assure us it includes --

MR. VIVIAN: I can assure you that "sewage system" is an inclusive term. It may or may not include, the treatment of raw sewage.

MR. DENNISON: Then if that is true, the hon. Minister (Mr. Vivian) would have no objection to making it clear --

MR. VIVIAN: That is why I want the words of your proposed amendment. What are the words?

MR. DENNISON: The Clerk of the House has it.

Development [illegible]).

MR. VIVIAN: Mr. Chairman, I did not [illegible] the hon. member point me (Mr. Hansen[illegible]), but I gathered in his wondering whether [illegible] provides adequate provision for the [illegible] to deal with housing, with [illegible] -- is that your point?

MR. HANSEN: No, I was [illegible] in the Public Health Act [illegible] with the proposed River Valley [illegible] when we get such legislation --

MR. VIVIAN: The answer is "No".

MR. CHAIRMAN, in [illegible] St. David (Mr. Hansen): [illegible] would like to point out to [illegible] amendment. -- As amended, it [illegible]

"More [illegible] in which a [illegible] established --"

"Sewage system" is an inclusive [illegible] do you still want to put [illegible] "Yes", or "No", and if you [illegible]

MR. HALLDORN: I would like to say, if [illegible] assure us it includes --

MR. VIVIAN: I can [illegible] is an inclusive term. [illegible] treatment of raw sewage.

MR. [illegible] (Mr. Vivian) [illegible]

MR. VIVIAN: [illegible] proposed amendment. [illegible]

MR. DENTON: [illegible]

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: That sub-section 2 of Section 2 be amended by adding after the words "sewage system" in the second line thereof, the words "sewage disposal plant."

MR. VIVIAN: Mr. Chairman, this is nothing about which there is any contention. It is a limited provision. I do not think it makes a particle of difference one way or the other, but if it pleases the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) to accept the amendment, we will be glad to accept it, in the way it can be applied.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 2 as amended --

MR. VIVIAN: No, not "as amended" in those words. I want the words corrected.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I would suggest that the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) and the hon. Minister (Mr. Vivian) consult with the Legislative Council as to the correct wording.

MR. VIVIAN: That is right.

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL: (York North): I would point out that after all this is a permissive legislation, and the Board of Health can do it at their own discretion.

MR. VIVIAN: That is right, the amendment does not add anything to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 7 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill as amended be reported?

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Provincial Treasurer): We cannot report the Bill.

MR. BLACKWELL: Perhaps if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) will indicate whether he considers it is essential to reserve the amendment --

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, in view of the fact that I do not understand the matter, not being an authority on sewage matters, such as is the hon. Minister (Mr. Vivian) and the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) -- as they undoubtedly are -- I would like to see it reserved until I understand it more clearly.

MR. BLACKWELL: If the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) indicates he thinks, after the explanation, that it is desirable to reserve it, we have no objection. If not, it might as well go through.

(Page 1630 follows)

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Minister is very quick to say this thing does not mean anything, but my suggestion is that he and the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) could talk to the hon. members of the Legislative Council.

MR. BLACKWELL: I think the hon. member for St. David might be satisfied to let it stand.

MR. DENNISON (St. David): Personally, I do not think the words, as they appear here, mean a system with a proper sewage-disposal system at the end of the system. You can have a system that pours out into the lake or river or canal that is still a sewage system.

HON. R. P. VIVIAN (Minister of Health): And still it would be a proper and adequate sewage system. It may not even be at the end of the plant.

MR. DENNISON: There might be a meaning placed on that in the Definitions Act. I do not know. Perhaps there is. Perhaps "sewage system" means a system with a sewage-disposal plant, but I can hardly believe it.

MR. ROBINSON (Waterloo South): The hon. Minister for Health (Mr. Vivian) stated the term "sewage system" may or may not include a sewage-disposal plant, and I think it is implied, if we are going to be clear, there should be an alteration in accordance with what the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) is advocating.

MR. VIVIAN: Reserve the section. Why waste time on it now?

MR. DENNISON: I am willing to have it reserved.

HON. L. M. FROST (Provincial Treasurer): Reserve the whole bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order 39, Bill 63.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thirty-ninth Order, Bill No. 63, "An Act to amend the Public Trustee Act." Mr. Blackwell.

Shall Section 1 form part of the bill?

Motion agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 2 form part of the bill?

Motion agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order No. 40, Bill No. 65.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fortieth Order, Bill No. 65, "An Act to amend the Evidence Act."

Shall Section 1 form part of the bill?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, Section 1, sub-section 1, clause 2, should be amended to read, after the word "corporation", by adding the words "its successors and assigns". I think the suggestion is obvious.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 1, as amended, form part of the bill?

Motion agreed to.

Shall Section 2 form part of the bill?

Motion agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I move we do now rise and report certain bills.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. WALTER B. REYNOLDS (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the House begs to report one bill with amend-

ment, three bills without amendment, and progress on one bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall the report be adopted?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Now that you have returned to the Chair, I will revert to the first of the Government Orders. Take Order No. 1, third reading.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order, third reading of Bill No. 37, "An Act to repeal the Political Contributions Act". Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 37, being "An Act to repeal the Political Contributions Act," be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

3.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

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

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, third reading of Bill No. 38, "An Act to amend the Judicature Act." Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move Bill No. 38, "An Act to amend the Judicature Act," be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

MR. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order No. 45, Bill No. 56, second reading.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 45, Bill No. 56, "An Act to amend the Dog Tax and Livestock Protection Act."

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 56.

(Page No. 1634 follows.)

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): No. 43.

CLERK OF HOUSE: No. 43, second reading of Bill No. 56, intituled An Act to Amend the Dog Tax and Live Stock Protection Act. Mr. Doucett.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Public Works):

Mr. Speaker, I have handed a copy of an amendment to the Hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). I wish the Bill amended in the second reading.

MR. G. H. MITCHELL: (York North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a little objection to this. If my reading of it is right, a municipal authority may be held responsible for damage to live stock by wild animals. It seems rather straining the point to ask a municipal authority to accept such a responsibility.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. member has misinterpreted this Bill a little. It is purely permissive.

Motion agreed to. Second reading of the Bill.

MR. DREW: No. 47.

THE CLERK OF HOUSE: Item No. 47, second reading of Bill No. 64 intituled An Act to Amend the Mining Act. Mr. Frost.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move for second reading of Bill No. 64. I might just give the House an explanation.

Section 1 provides for the modernizing the discovery provisions of The Mining Act to enable the modern geophysical methods to be brought into play in connection with claims where the outcropping is not sufficient to indicate that there is an outcropping of mineral.

That is the purpose of Section 1. It provides that a mining claim maybe staked only upon discovery of valuable minerals in place. As you know, by means of electronic

devices, and so on, minerals may be discovered which are in fact many of feet underground.

The idea of this amendment is to bring the section into line with modern scientific devices.

Section 2 is only for the purpose of using the mining Act for the purpose of acquiring title to land. Many cases have arisen where valuable summer cottages may be acquired by somebody staking under the Mining Act; and this is for the purpose of preventing that particular act.

Section 3 brings up the date in connection with the matter of marking tags on stakes that are put on claims. The provision now will be that there will be a year for doing the work, and it gives six months to place the tags on the stakes.

Section 4 applies to the use of coupons which are given for assay purposes. Under the practice, as it now is, sometimes coupons are saved up for years and years and are all applied to a particular claim.

In the Province of Quebec the provision is one year; and this amendment brings us with the use of coupons down to two years.

The succeeding sections down to sub-section 4 of Section 5 are complementary; then we come to sub-section 7 of section 5, which is aimed at preventing blanketing. By an ingenious use of The Mining Act, at the present time, I am advised and it is said that work which should be done on as many as forty claims can be concentrated on one claim. Perhaps the Hon. member for St. Patricks (Mr. Roberts) who gave me the figure forty can say whether that is right or not. But it was that as many as forty claims, the work can be done all on one claim. It has been decided that this should be reduced; and this provision has the effect of limiting the work that can be done

in that manner down to nine claims instead of forty. This prevents blanketing; and this new provision will avoid that, and will limit the concentration of the work on so many claims down to what is a reasonable limit.

The rest of the Act is more or less routine down to section 7, with these amendments. In Section 7 is provided that where a soldier has a claim registered in his name and he had a year to do the work, that if he sells his claim to some other bona fide purchaser, the work immediately comes due; and the result is that in many cases the soldier is unable to sell his claim because of the onerous conditions in the event of sale.

This provides that the pruchaser shall have a continuation of the soldier's rights up to one year.

These are matters which can be more effectly discussed later. I move the second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to. Second reading of the Bill.

MR. DREW: Order No. 44.

THE CLERK OF HOUSE: No. 44, second reading of Bill No. 57, intituled An Act to Amend the Statute Labour Act; Mr. Doucett.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of Bill No. 57, An Act to Amend the Statute Labour Act.

Motion agreed to. Second reading of the Bill.

MR. DREW: Order 42.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-second Order, second reading of Bill No. 47, An Act to Amend the Workmens' Compensation Act. Mr. Daley.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill to amend the Workmens' Compensation Act, I would just like to state briefly what these

amendments are supposed to accomplish.

At the last Session an amendment was made to protect the third party in an accident, a person who has been under the protection of the Workmens Compensation Act and then finds himself in difficulty through a third party having a part in the accident. And the wording that was passed last year was found to be a little bit to severe, and went to the point of bringing, in certain cases, rather an injustice on people. And we are clearing it up in the legal phraseology, and we are also asking that this Act shall have effect on and after the 6th Day of April, 1944, to eliminate that degree of what might be called unfairness.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON (Brant): There was a case in court at the time, was there not?

MR. DALEY: Yes, and it was felt to be unfair. Another portion of the Act extends the right of the Commissioners to participate in the Workmens' Compensation superannuation. The Commissioners are, to all intents and purposes, employees of the Commission. They work for a fixed salary. And, if they choose, we felt that they should have the right to participate in the superannuation fund.

The balance of the Act simply extends to validate any regulations, as they are continuously making new regulations in regard to broadening the scope of the Act and taking in more people; and this makes it absolutely certain that there can be nothing wrong with that, and it is desired to validate those regulations. I move the second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to. Second reading of the Bill.

(Page 1638 follows)

I move second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to; Second Reading of the Bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order No. 47.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 47 Ordered; Second Reading Bill No. 58, "An Act to Confirm Tax Sales."

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 58, "An Act to amend the Tax Sales Act."

Motion agreed to; Second reading of the Bill.

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL (York North): Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) - I have not had time to go into this - Would that compel the municipalities to have tax sales in the future, or are they permitted to carry on?

MR. DUNBAR: To carry on just the same, moving the date ahead one year. And there were two words omitted from the last Act, that is, "Interest" and "penalty". There was a Court case, where they said that "All taxes accrued", and it should have read also "interest and penalties". So that a man could not carry on for ten years, if there were no purchasers, but would have to pay any interest and penalties.

MR. MITCHELL: I do not think the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) quite got the point I was trying to make. In some municipalities, as the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is aware, tax sales are not being held nor carried on under the regulations which existed through the depression, when the municipalities were under supervision.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, I understand that.

MR. MITCHELL: This is not mandatory in that regard?

MR. DUNBAR: No, there is a number of municipalities that have applied for the same privileges and powers, and that is put in the amendment to the Municipal Act.

HON. GEORGE A DREW (Prime Minister) : Order No. 48.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 48; Second reading of Bill No. 59, "An Act to amend The Bees Act".

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Acting Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 59, "An Act to amend The Bees Act".

Motion agreed to; Second reading of the Bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order No. 55, Bill No. 73.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The 55th Order; The second reading of Bill No. 73, "An Act to amend The Liquor Authority Control Act, 1944".

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of Bill No. 73, being an Act to amend the Liquor Authority Control Act, 1944, I do not think I need add anything to what I said on the first reading, except possibly to remind the House that this Bill is really a temporarily expedient. The proper method of paying the expenses of The Liquor Authority Control Board was set up by this Statute, and it was not thought desirable on further consideration to carry out that practice at the moment, by reason of the relations between the Dominion Government and the Provincial Government on revenue matters, and it was felt that while this arrangement exists, the practice in regard to both receipts and disbursements under the Liquor Control Act should continue, and this amendment is for the purpose not only of accomplishing that, but accomplishing it retroactively from the time The Liquor Authority Control Board came into existence.

I move second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time.

HON. GEORGE A DREW (Prime Minister): Order No. 43, Bill No. 46.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 43rd Order; The second reading of Bill No. 46, "An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act".

HON. R. P. VIVIAN (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, this proposed amendment to The Public Hospitals Act, is one portion of a programme which has been the concern of this administration over the past eighteen months, as to how we can improve the Hospital facilities of the Province.

The main feature of the Bill has to deal with the establishment of an increased rate to the public general hospitals in the Province, in the matter of payment of ward costs for indigent patients. I would not take the time of the House to point out in detail just now all these, but I would like them to know that we have had the committees working - some of them over a year - dealing with this particularly difficult problem. The joint studies committee of the Ontario Hospitals Association, and officials of the Department of Health, and other Governmental Department, have been attempting to ascertain the ward costs, and the costs of the operations in the general hospitals of this Province.

They have made several significant contributions to Hospital management, the primary one being in the establishment of a proper cost accounting system, which was not generally gone into in the Province heretofore, so that when this is completed, for the first time, we will know exactly what the hospitals have to deal with, and what they are faced with in the matter of provision of services, and what is the cost of them.

In addition to that, there is a sub committee of this joint studying committee which has been attempting to bring forward a recommendation for hospitals, in the matter of payment for the indigent care. It is perfectly obvious that the small twenty-five or thirty to fifty bed hospitals

are not required to provide the services which some of the larger institutions must supply, and if some of our larger institutions, particularly teaching hospitals, they are required to provide extensive and expensive services, for which they can receive no remuneration in an amount reflected in the amount they receive for the care of public ward patients.

I simply explain that, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the House that this is only one very small part of the programme which has been going forward, and which is now coming into view.

The proposal specificially is that the amount payable by the municipalities and the Province to the general hospitals shall be increased, and they shall be increased in this manner: Heretofore, the municipality has paid $1.75 per patient per day for those indigent patients accepted as a municipal responsibility, and to that was added a provincial rate of 60¢.

Last year, after the result of the original study, which was simply a study of twenty-eight hospitals, we were attempting to provide some relief, and made a grant of fifteen cents extra per day from the Province to the Hospital. Some of the municipalities, including the City of Toronto, voluntarily increased the amount they were paying above the $1.75 rate. The City of Toronto increased its rate to $2.19.

The proposed amendment will increase the amount from $1.75 to $2.25, municipal rate. The Provincial rate is left open to be fixed by Order-in-Council for this reason, that if we are to get a classification of the hospitals, which would mean that the hospital, depending on its size and the services it rendered, would be in a position to receive better and more favourable treatment in the matter of rates, as might be agreed upon, than the Act would permit

them to do so. So that for the present the Provincial contribution is fixed at 75¢. Thus, it is considered that this, based on the combined rate of the $2.25 and 75¢, would be $3.00 which is the lowest amount of money that is considered to be applicable for ward care in any general hospital in the Province.

I move second reading of the Bill.

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL (York North): Mr. Speaker, I am just referring for the moment to Section 2, subsection 8, this expropriation clause. Would the Board under this, be permitted to go into any municipality and expropriate, or only the municipality in which they operate?

MR. VIVIAN: In the municipality in which they operate.

MR. MITCHELL: I do not think it applied to that, Mr. Minister, (Mr. Vivian), does it?

MR. VIVIAN: That is not a matter of principle, Mr. Speaker; it is a matter of the wording of the Section, and could be left to the committee.

MR. MITCHELL: Would it be possible to have an amendment in order to keep them in the municipality in which they are operating?

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, speaking on the principle of this Bill, I am very sorry that the hon. Minister (Mr. Vivian) in announcing this Bill is unable to announce somewhat of the same programme as he announced in this House on the 18th of March last year, when, in a report before the House, he announced the Government was prepared to underwrite the costs of the general hospital care.

MR. SPEAKER; It is now six o'clock ; Would the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) move the adjourn-

ment of the Debate?

MR. DENNISON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the Debate.

Motion agreed to.

The House recessed until 8 o'clock p.m.

(page 1646 follows).

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-THIRD DAY

EVENING SESSION

Monday, March 19, 1945.

AAA 1 The House resumed at 8 o'clock.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourned at 6 o'clock, I was dealing with Bill No. 46, a bill to amend the Public Hospitals Act, and I drew the attention of the House, or was about to draw the attention of the House, to the fact that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Vivian), in a report tabled in the House last year, announced that the Government planned to underwrite the cost of general hopsital care. And, at that time, he announced that there would be a minimum of 4,500 beds in the hospitals of this province, and that the Government supposed that they would take steps to solve that shortage in the near future, and he gave the impression, in this report, that the whole expense of the cost for patients in municipal hospitals who were unable to pay their own way would be paid by the province. And, he suggested, in discussing the number of beds needed, - he took specific hospitals in the city of Toronto,-for instance, he suggested in this city, alone, there would be provided, when the plan which he proposed was finished, an additional 1,011 hospital beds. It would be divided by 183 beds for the

Toronto East General Hospital; for the General Hospital, 200 additional beds; for the Hospital for Sick Children, 600 beds, - they would like 600 beds, but the plan would give them 168, and so on.

When that statement was made I am very certain that the people in charge of the hospitals throughout the whole province expected that the Government was, henceforth, going to pay the whole cost of day care for the patients who were indigent and who are now being paid for partly by the province, providing seventy-five cents a day, and partly by th municipality, providing up to $2.19 at that time.

Now, that has not been realized, and I noticed last fall, on the 20th of October, 1944, the Provincial Hospital Association reminded the Government that that pledge had not been fulfilled, and the President of the Provincial Hospital Association has said, "Hospital leaders of the province had worked so hard on the statistics, and had showed the average cost per day of ward patrons to be $3.82, which had been --" And it states, as it goes on, that they had not received the $3 allowance which had been suggested by the Hon. Mr. Vivian himself, and the statement goes on further to say that the province's own survey of hospital costs referred to this afternoon by the hon. Minister (Mr. Vivian) shows that the cost was $4.25 per patient per day. Now, in view of that fact I am sure the hospital authorities, and people interested in this problem of paying hospital costs, will be disappointed in this bill.

According to the figures presented in the Government's own report, the cost per day is $4.25; according to the figures presented by the hospital associations, themselves, throughout the whole province, the cost is $3.82, but, in any case, $2.25

put up by the municipality, plus seventy-five cents put up by the Government, (and I think that is very meagre, and does not meet the need, at all,) the total will be $3 a day, leaving a total of $1 a day, to be exact, eighty-two cents a day, - if we take the whole provincial average, or $1.25 a day if we take the Government's own survey,
2. short. That means the hospitals of this province are going to lose $1.25 a day on every patient, on every patient referred to by the municipality, and unable to pay his own way. That means that the plan proposed by the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Vivian) last March, instead of being realized, instead of these hospitals having funds to go ahead and build the necessary additions, they will be forced to continue on the present shortage of hospital beds, and their expenses, as everyone knows, are going up daily.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hoped the hon. Minister would be able to announce to this House that he was prepared, in this bill, to remove some of the burden from the shoulders of the municipality, and assume at least $3 a day, as suggested by him last March, for the hospitals of this province.

HON. R. P. VIVIAN (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the statement made by the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) was never made, and his statement is so full of inaccuracies it would be difficult to correct them all. There are, however, certain statements which I think should be cleared. I tried to explain, in the original moving on the second reading, that this bill was a bit and piece of an overall hospital programme, which has evidently not penetrated the mind of my hon. friend. He quotes the average daily ward rate of the province as being $3.82, as discovered by the hospital survey, which is a joint hospital study group, and

which I spoke to, and that average is made of hospitals in the vicinity of $2.73 for the lowest, and upward between a $2.75 and $3 mark, and some hospitals in the province as high as $5 plus per-day care, which raises the point as to why the amendment to the Public Hospitals Act is produced in this way. I do not think, for a minute, that my hon. friend would suggest a hospital that has announced and proven ward costs of $2.73 should receive $3.82. Therefore, in striking a rate, you must strike a base rate, and the rate which is struck by the proposed amendments is a minimum of $3. There is a provision in the bill for a sliding scale of provincial payments that can be made effective when a classification of hospitals is produced that is satisfactory to the hospitals themselves and meets the needs that do exist and havebeen shown in the costs' study programme. Until such time as the hospital groups, themselves, are prepared to bring forward such a classification, no one could, under any circumstances, make any classification for those hospitals, so what we are asking the House to do at this time is to provide a basis, the lowest point being $3.

Then my hon. friend (Mr. Dennison) is further confused in the matter of capital costs. Indigents in the hospitals of the province, at the present time, are at their lowest point. Nobody running a hospital can make any money on indigents, and nobody can save any money toward capital costs and new construction, and one of the functions of the committee now sitting is to determine not only the exact need of the province in the matter of capital cost of construction, but the best method of doing it, and the best method of financing. Therefore, we must not confuse the issue

of payment of the base ward rate with what is necessary and has to be done to build more hospitals, to vary the types of hospitals and have them distributed more equitably. I do feel when this classification which can come forward from the Hospital Association itself is produced, the criticism which my hon. friend has spoken of tonight, in the matter of hospital ward costs of $3.82, will be answered.

There is one thing which I forgot in my previous utterances, and that is to give notice of motion to amend, which will occur at the time of third reading. It will be under Section 4, sub-section 16. paragraph b, which I will give to the various groups at that time.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David). May I ask the hon. Minister this question? Did the Hospital Association have the right picture when they understood from the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Vivian) that he was prepared to pay $3 as the province's share of hospital care?

3. MR. VIVIAN: No, there was no commitment given at that time. The hospital people, themselves, did not expect $3 from the province at any time.

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL (York North): Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that I can let this opportunity pass without registering a general protest against the system of hospitalization in this province and country, generally. We find at the present time the public, generally, depend on a system of hospitalization:

1, grants which are obtained from the specific municipality;
2, grants from the county in which the municipality is located;
3, from public-spirited citizens who are financially able to assist; and,
4, from the collections by women and children on the street, implementing the funds obtained from the other three sources.

That does seem to me to be a most reprehensible practice in a country of this kind. One could understand it in the dark

ages. Insofar as the present set-up is concerned, we find now, even in this proposed bill, that more responsibility is being placed upon the municipalities insofar as proportionate contribution is concerned. I am firmly of the opinion, insofar as the hospitalization of this country is concerned, that it rests entirely in the hands of the Federal and Provincial Governments. The municipalities should not be charged. We find when man power is needed for a matter of national importance they do not hesitate to take them from any part of the country.

Now, the whole system, whatever the hon. Minister may bring forward, I suggest should be definitely part of a future national health and pensions scheme that will quite possibly, and I think quite fittingly, emanate from the senior government of the country, but I do suggest the province should have some part, both as far as administration and probably part of the contributory costs. But, I do want to protest against the present system, and suggest to the hon. Minister if there is any way in which this Government can bring down a scheme that will provide for the construction of hospitals across the province, rather than depending on the present methods, it will be a very commendable effort on his part.

MR. JOSEPH B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, just a word in general regarding the problem of hospitalization, which is nothing new, but which this bill does not necessarily help to solve. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the public citizens of this province were led to believe, as a result of legislation proposed and legislation opposed in this House, that improved facilities would be provided and improved services would be gotten. Nothing of the sort took place. In this bill, which

seeks to amend the weaknesses in the present weak system of hospitalization, the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Vivian) does not take a single step, as far as we can estimate, from the legislation before us, to further ease the burden of the municipalities and the tax payer, nor does he do anything to make it possible for these institutions to take care of sections of people that they employ. I am particularly concerned, (and I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister is not unaware of it,) that because of the charitable character and the policy of the Government, the Provincial Government, to take full responsibility for hospitalization, we permit a shameful exploitation of some of the finest women in the country, who are serving as nurses in these institutions. They are doing their work with devotion, and even with self-sacrifice, but the institutions are unable to pay them adequately to take care of their requirements and to enable them to live decently. I do not believe that many of them give up their duty because of the payment, but it is a fact that they are underpaid, and it is a fact that most of the hospitals are unable to pay the nurses a living wage and to provide them with living quarters of a sort that they deserve, in view of the service that they render, and this is so because most, if not all, hospitals depend upon private charity contributions from individuals who make up the deficits that accumulate year after year, and I, like the hon. member for York North (Mr. Mitchell) feel that this matter should be brought to the attention of the House and the public, and that the Government should have by now assumed greater responsibility in the financing, particularly

of indigent patients, let alone assuming the responsibility for hospitalization, generally, more than they have done.

Last year we had the expression from the Government benches against a national scheme,-"We want only a provincial scheme." Now we have no provincial scheme.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it should not be necessary to correct the hon. member. No such statement was made by the Government at any time to any general plan.

MR. SALSBERG: If I recall, -- I have not the record before me, -- the hon. Minister for Health (Mr. Vivian) objected to the scheme, as it was known, and then, true, it was not completed and was not in its final stage when this matter was before the House a year ago. The question was definitely created, - what we want is a provincial scheme, and one able to give better service than any federal scheme as outlined at that time.

Further, my main purpose at this moment, Mr. Speaker, is not to engage in a discussion of merit of provincial concern, but I believe in a federal health insurance scheme that will take care of the hospitalization requirements of all citizens. Until such time as this is achieved, I do feel this Government should go further than it does in assisting hospitals so their service may be improved, and so these splendid people working in them, nurses and attendants, will be taken care of in the degree they deserve and that the people, at large, would like to see them looked after, but which is denied them because of the meagre contribution of the province toward indigent patients.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order No. 42, Bill No. 35.

MR. SPEAKER: Forty-second Order, Bill No. 35, "An Act to amend the Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act." Mr. Frost.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 35, and in so doing I should like to explain the purpose of this amendment and to give notice of a further addition, by way of amendment, to this Act which, if introduced now, can be printed and in the hon. members' books for the committee stage of the bill.

Now, the amendment, as proposed in the printed bill which is in the hon. members' books, is a comparatively simple matter. It increases the company's contribution to the sulphur arbitration costs from $5,000 to $10,000. The purpose of that is as follows: Mr. Murray is the present sulphur fumes' arbitrator, and he is employed by the Department of Mines, or has been employed by the Department of Mines, on a part-time basis. He is also employed as a Commissioner of Agricultural Loans in making farm valuations and adjustments under the Farm Loans Act. As the result of a discussion which took place in the Legislature here last year at the time the estimates were introduced, a good deal of the question was raised to the sum of $5,000, which had been set down in the estimates providing for the costs of Mr. Murray and these arbitration proceedings. As the result of those discussions last spring, the Deputy Minister, Mr. Rickerby, and myself visited the Sudbury area, and particularly the agricultural area which had been affected by sulphur fumes, and we went over, quite extensively, the situation there, and as a result of this we are now

placing Mr. Murray on a full-time basis in connection with the sulphur-fumes matters, and taking him out of the Agricultural Loans Section, and in the meantime the Department of Mines, in connection with the Department of Lands and Forests, is conducting quite extensive investigations into the subject of the injury to the plant life and so on which is happening in the Sudbury area because of the heavy fumes which come from the various plants in that
5. locality. At the moment the services of Mr. Murray are being loaned to the Department of Lands and Forests, which is conducting an investigation, and we feel that the costs of the Department will probably be doubled in the next year, and for that year we doubled the amount the mines are paying.

The mines actually pay to the province, or the Department of Mines, the costs of the investigator in the cases of investigating sulphur-fumes matters.

Now, at this time, I should like to introduce a further amendment to the Act providing for an appeal from the Sulphur Fumes Arbitrator. Particulars of this can be printed and in the hon.members' books when the matter comes up in committee. The appeal provisions are roughly these: for a good many years past, I believe about twenty years, the decision of the Sulphur Fumes Arbitrator has been final, and there has been no appeal from that. As was mentioned in the House here last spring, the number of cases which actually go to arbitration are comparatively few,-speaking off-handedly, I think in 1944 there were 506 cases, and I think about 135 of those were settled by the company without any notification. They went out and settled them, and I think the arbitrator only

handled something less than a dozen cases, so that the matter of appeal may not be of importance, but I was impressed, and the Government was impressed, by what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) said in connection with the Sulphur Fumes Arbitrator. His decision is a final decision, and it may be that many of those up there may perhaps feel they are blocked from a complaint, and therefore we are introducing a provision permitting an appeal to the municipal board in connection with the findings of the Sulphur Fumes Arbitrator.

I beg to move second reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

(Page No. 1657 follows.)

MR. DREW: Forty- eighth order.

THE CLERK OF HOUSE: The fiftieth order. Second reading of Bill No. 66 intituled An Act to amend The Nurses' Registration Act. Mr. Vivian.

HON. R. P. VIVIAN (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, this Bill is really so simple that there is not much more to add to what is already contained in the explanatory note. The proposal is a simple one, to make recognition of a new class of nurses, to register assistant nurses whose qualifications will be governed by regulations. They will have the opportunity of acquiring a title for the practical training which they will receive. The proposal will not in any way interfere with efforts in smaller communities where they do practical nursing, but it will assure them of the title.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Health what about the Academic qualifications which will be necessary for nurses in training.

MR. VIVIAN: Mr. Speaker, replying to the Hon. Member for East York (Miss Macphail) I can only say that the Association is drawing up regulations to take care of that. It is as simple as possible, as I understand, the first year in high school or graduation from an elementary school.

MISS MACPHAIL: It is difficult I judge by reading in the newspapers, for the hospitals to get enough girls to train in the hospitals to turn out R. N. because of one fact that junior matriculation is a very low educational qualification and other hospitals require senior matriculation. That takes a long time, and it takes a lot of money on the part of the parents or the students. They go into hospitals and train for three years; and in some hospitals they have to trainfor three years and get no pay or uniforms.

I do not know of any work where they work so hard

and arduously as nurses in training. I do register a protest that if the educational standard has to be as high as junior matriculation, I have learned that in some hospitals it must be senior matriculation, -- and they have more or less to buy their own things during the three years of training. Of course they live in the building and their food is supplied; but something more than that is necessary if there is to be enough or nurses in training, because what they are paid, when they graduate as R. N. Nurses is not nearly enough to compensate them for these years of training.

I expected that something like this would have to happen because I expected that in wartime, at any rate, people who have taken their junior or senior matriculation would not take to that three years more of training with no compensation, and with really hard work and long hours, and I am told sometimes seven days in the week, -- I hope that does not happen in all hospitals, -- and then when that is over they get but a very average or very small wage or salary so that this will fit a need.

But there is another paragraph I want to make. It is sometimes true that a person who is very clever academically has not the qualifications which will make a good nurse; and sometimes people who have the very qualifications which would make a good nurse will find that the training is very difficult, because they did not go to school long enough.

So that I recommend people of less academic training who can have at least professional recognition; and that can be done. But probably the thing that should be done later is to pay nurses in training something, -- I am not talking about a salary now, but I am talking about enough so that the nurse in training does not have to rely upon parents for three years

more of buying uniforms and clothes that they must have when they go out of the hospital on the street. But that they will get something, twenty-five or thirty dollars a month, in addition to their training. I recognize that their training is and should be considered of value. But I do consider that hospitals exploit, -- of course they are really driven into it, but I do consider that they exploit students in training. And all of us have known cases where the health of a student in training has suffered, -- generally temporarily, -- owing to their arduous training and long hours.

I hope that what will happen will be that they will accept junior matriculation at first, and then when they go on that they will get recognition.

Motion agreed to. Second reading of the Bill.

MR. DREW: Fifty-first Order

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifty-first Order, second reading of Bill No. 68 intituled An Act to Amend the Venereal Diseases Prevention Act. Mr. Vivian.

MR. VIVIAN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the second reading of this Bill, which is An Act to Amend the Venereal Diseases Prevention Act, there are a few things I would like to point out to the House, some of which are historical, and I hope at least that you will find them interesting.

The Venereal Diseases Prevention Act became a separate statute in this Province in 1918. Prior to that time, the first legislation enacted to deal with this problem of venereal disease was in 1879 and was contained in an Act entitled an Act respecting Andrew Mercier Reformatory for Females. It was not until 1913, in a revision of the same Act, that the words "syphilitic or other venereal disease"

appeared in the Ontario Statutes.

This present venereal disease prevention Act contains some of the provisions which have been carried over from the original Andrew Mercer Act, together with amendments from time to time.

This Act was administered by the division of Communicable Disease Control in the Department of Health until 1939. At that time a separate division of Venereal Disease control was established; and Mr. Speaker, it was probably a very wise move that such a separate division was established, because the problem, while one of communicable disease, is more than just a communicable disease problem, and the method by which one must deal with it does not follow the same general principles of dealing with an ordinary communicable disease.

Previous to 1943 this problem was dealt with in Ontario through steps which had been taken to develop venereal disease control clinics in twenty institutions subsidized by the Department of Health. These centres were organized in twelve general hospitals, and some preventative measures were carried out; but there was no co-ordinated programme either in epidemiology or in public health education. A most significant omission, Mr. Speaker, is evident in the absence of records and statistics prior to 1943, and this is the main reason that in answer to a question which was put on the Order Paper, Question 14, that the answer had to be "No record available." For those who may have forgotten the question, I will read it, "How many cases of syphilis (all forms) have been reported in each year from 1939 to 1944, inclusive"? "How many babies were born in Ontario suffering from prenatal syphilis?" This question, unfortunately, was drawn in a way to indicate that the author was not familiar with the

problem, -- and I do not say this unkindly, -- but it is a difficult problem; and I would like to point out some reasons why.

The reports of pre-natal syphilis provide only an indication of the actual number. Prior to 1943, there was no effort made to separate into classes the various types of syphilis; and I can assure you that steps were taken immediately after 1943 to rectify this omission and a good many others by reorganization of the venereal disease control Organization. And this Organization recognized the need for knowing a good deal more about syphilis in this Province.

Since April 1st, 1944, a very detailed analysis has been made on a daily and weekly basis in this division, of all cases being reported. This analysis represents a distribution of cases in type, stage of disease, by reporting the district, age, group and sex. Such information will be invaluable in improving our data on venereal disease. Reliable data on the incidence of venereal disease for the latter nine months of 1944 and up to date is now available.

Added to this the division searched the records and made as an accurate analysis as was possible for the first three months of 1944. So, Mr. Speaker, we have a reasonably complete record for 1944 and a complete record since that time. And steps, of course, are being taken to make our statistical data even more valuable for public health purposes.

Now, at the time of the reorganization of this division of the Department in 1943, a preventative programme was outlined and a set of objectives was set for the coming year. I am very happy to state that most of these objectives already have been attained. There was, first, the reorganization

of the central office with the provision of additional space, administration and equipment and complete records; second, the expansion of the office staff; third, the provision of an epidemiological venereal programme; fourth, a careful and essential programme on venereal disease; and fifth, the question of a programme for the improvement of venereal disease progress. We are not particularly proud of some of our attempts.

There was a reorganization of the physio-therapy division on an organized basis. Thirdly, the organization of a most cordial liason with the Federal Department. And, I might say, Mr. Speaker, that without this last, none of the rest would have been possible.

The expanded programme of the organization of this administration contains seven important objectives, in other words the things which we are trying to do, firstly, an assurance of adequate medical care to every person in this province suffering from venereal disease is most important. Every person in need of treatment must receive it. Many patients will seek medical care at the hands of their own physician, and the Department is making it possible in such cases for the physician to provide all the necessary care, regardless of the patient's ability to pay. In some instances it will be necessary for the Department to pay all the costs of such treatment.

Second, the establishment of a programme of health education on venereal disease. We firmly believe that venereal disease is wide spread to-day largely because people do not know what it is about; they are unaware of the facts; and this can only be overcome by a sound programme of public education which is presented in an acceptable manner.

Third, the objective to deal with the procedure in undiscovered cases. The Department is developing a field service of carefully selected trained workers, who will assist the local communities in their campaign against venereal disease, because the campaign against venereal disease must have its being largely in the local community; so that one of the important further objectives of the programme is to stimulate the local municipality to take such action as will be required to correct the facts, so that incidence of venereal disease may be lessened.

Fifth, to protect the homes and families of this Province. The young people planning marriage must be taught the facts, and should have a pre-marital blood test; and, sixth, the Department has outlined the measures to assure for the unborn the fullest protection from congenital syphilis. The treatment of a mother before the birth of a child will prevent the transmission of the disease to the child.

Seventh, we are concerned with the advancement in teaching and research and with the facilities within this province of the three splendid medical schools, large hospitals, and research and other institutions; and we look forward to the time when further advance may be taken in this regard.

So, Mr. Speaker, to assist in implementing this programme in one particular way, this amendment to the Venereal Diseases Act is presented to the House. The proposed Bill contains seven sections, apart from its entitlement. Sections 1, 3, 4 and 5 are designed to secure improvement in the adequacy of treatment and to further protect the unaffected public in such a manner as to ensure the greatest possible

cooperation of those affected and their physicians.

I would like to point out to the House that the problem of venereal control is not a simple one. Venereal disease is much more than a simple communicable disease. It involves social and moral issues which must be taken into account in designing effective control. I cannot stress that too strongly. There are so many facets to the problem and there are so many things which must be taken into consideration, that sometimes we may stumble in producing effective measures with undue haste and with an insufficient amount of consideration.

Section 2 of the Act, Mr. Speaker, is a new Section. It is designed to protect the new generation by requiring that suitable tests be made to assure the parents of the unborn child that no syphilitic condition exists.

It is important that such tests shall be taken as early in pregnancy as possible, because experience shows that treatment begun before the fifth month of pregnancy and continued in an effective manner will assure that the child will be born free of this affliction.

To assure that the treatment will be given without cost to the afflicted, if necessary, the requirement contained in the amendment and to the statutory provision elsewhere can and will fully protect the new generation.

And, Mr. Speaker, the passage of this Bill will mark another milestone in our progress in dealing with this problem; and again Ontario will be the first Province in this Dominion to enact progressive legislation. I am informed that nowhere else in this Dominion has such legislation been introduced and implemented, not even in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. STRANGE: Then, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Health has the information which I asked for as to pre-natal syphilis in 1944, so that the answer was only true in regard to the information in 1943 and previously, -- or I may be wrong.

MR. VIVIAN: The question was how many babies were born in 1939 to 1944 suffering from pre-natal syphilis. And the answer was, We do not know. Nor for any year. I can tell you how many we know about but I cannot tell you how many there were.

MR. DENNISON: I would just like to say that the House should know the extent of delinquent patients, if I might use that term, with this reply in answer to Mr. Strange's question .

In the province a total of five thousand, three hundred and sixty-five cases of syphilis were reported in 1944. Of that number nine hundred and eighty-three were treated in these twenty clinics which are partly operated by the province, to whom at least, assistance is given by the Province. Another nine hundred and eighty-three cases treated in Provincial clinics. It is most amazing to find that three hundred and ninety six, or thirty-seven per cent, were delinquent in completing their treatment. Now, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that until we can solve that problem we have a long way to go before we solve the venereal disease problem.

I was interested last fall in an article in the Star by Dr. Hutton of Brantford in which he suggested that the local officer of health should have the power to put patients on oath, and force a disclosure of the names and addresses of contacts. And, further, the suggestion was made that one

weakness in our present set-up was in this respect, that when the Provincial Department of Health notifies the local medical officer of Health of a new case in his District, he does not know the name and address, nor the name of the physician.

MR. VIVIAN: Why should he?

MR. DENNISON: It is reported by number. And in Hutton's article he made this point, that as long as that system prevails the Local Medical Officer of Health will never track down all the subjects.

MR. GEORGE R. HARVEY (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that as far as this Bill goes I can see no objection to it. I would like to heartily endorse what the Hon. Minister has said about the need of pre-marriage tests.

I know it was at first rather difficult to discuss such legislation; but I do not think the Hon. members need to be reminded that there is on the Order Paper such a Bill, and it would be in the interests of the Province that that Bill should be dealt with.

I am glad the Hon Minister mentioned why there was no answer to the question No. 3, asking for the number of venereal disease or gonorrhea treated in each year from 1939 to 1944 inclusive by private physicians or by private clinics.

I was under the impression, perhaps I was wrong, -- that all physicians and all clinics must report to the Department every case of venereal disease coming under their care. In that case it should be possible to have the records in order to answer that particular question.

Before I conclude Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay

some tribute to the remarkably good work which has been done during the last year by various organizations throughout the Province under the guidance, I believe, of Major Larue of the Department. They have done good work in bringing to the attention of the public the nature and the importance of this disease and its control. I think the opportunity should not be missed to pay tribute to the work which has been done. When the work was first undertaken it was rather a disagreeable subject. I believe it was taken up by the Junior Board of Trade; by public lectures and pictures they have given education on the subject. Now, the real problem with venereal disease is the lack of knowledge of the disease on the part of the general public.

There is one point in this Bill, -- perhaps I should put it rather in the nature of a question. I realize it is part of the existing Act, but in Section 3 , sub-section 1(a) it refers to any person, where any person has been named under oath.

I would like to ask the Hon. Minister by whom that oath is administered. It does not seem to specify in the Act who is to administer that oath. Would it be possible to include "or affirmation" -- you remember we had a discussion on a previous Bill, and the decision was that "or affirmation" should be included.

MR. VIVIAN: Yes;

MR. HARVEY: I would like to ask the Minister why it was not possible to answer question 3?

MR. VIVIAN: Would you mind reading question 3.

MR. SPEAKER: I would venture to suggest for the information of the House, the questions on the Order Paper are not debatable.

~~MR. STRANGE: I am aware of that, Mr. Speaker.~~

~~"3. How many cases of syphilis and gonorrhea have been treated in each year from 1939 to 1944 inclusive by private physicians or by private clinics?~~

MR. STRANGE: I am aware of that, Mr. Speaker.

"3. How many cases of syphillis and gonorrhea have been treated in each year from 1939 to 1944 inclusive by private physicians or by private clinics?"

(Page 1669 follows)

CCC-1

MR. VIVIAN: I think the answer was no record available for exactly the same reason that, unfortunately, previous to 1943 our record left a great deal to be desired. Since then, as I explained, since 1942 we have a good record and that has been kept up ever since.

MR. STRANGE: That same answer, would it apply to other questions, the fact that the records are not in order.

MR. VIVIAN: Yes.

Motion agreed to.

MR. DREW (Prime Minister): Second reading Bill No.69.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 52nd Order, second reading of Bill No.69, "An Act to Amend the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act",1944" Mr.Daley.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to ask a question before it did come before the House.

THE SPEAKER: It is not before the House.

HON. MR DALEY (Minister of Labour): In explanation, while the Act itself has written is pretty much self explanatory, it is simply to empower Industry and Labour Board to operate the hours of work and vacation with pay, to make regulations, to decide a period of time that could be set in order to accumulate 8 hours of work. In other words, to decide how many hours a person could be called upon to put in upon a split shift. There are certain types of industries that it is very difficult to get away from the split shift - such as restaurant business - and we are trying to get down as low as we possibly can and we want regulations and authority to do it. The other powers of the Act is to make it possible for to have regulations in regard to vacations with pay and where a person who does not work a full year for a certain employer but who for any reason, either of his own accord or because he happens to be laid off or fired will be entitled to a pro rata basis of the amount of money he would

have accumulated for holidays. It is simply broadening the regulations we now have in effect in regard to the construction industry, where we know that the work is more or less intermittentand men, with few exceptions of course, are not steadily employed for a full year and as you know we instituted the book with the stamp credit, which is working very well. So now we propose to extend that so that all people who work will accumulate credit according to the length of time they work for any employer. I move the second reading.

Motion carried.

MR. WILLIAMS: When I got up before I wanted to find out whether there was something wrong with the arrangement of these things. I see that this Bill is numbered 69 - mine is marked 50 but apparently 69 in this House comes before 50.

Hon. Members: That is right.

MR. WILLIAMS: Do not be sure it is going to be right because you are in the minority,you know. More ways of killing a pig than cutting its throat.

Now, I have no objection at all to these two small things that are contained in this Bill No. 69 but what bothers me is that there is a possibility of the effect of this Bill was sort of outlawing the other bill or making it not possible to bring it on or something. I believe there is something in the Rule, is not there - something that has already been dealt with on the same subject, not being possible to re-introduce. Is not that in the same session or is it all cock-eyed I got them. I do think that the Bill ought to be taken in their proper order instead of jumping all over as we are doing here. Had we taken the bill in their proper order the two point that are contained in Bill 69 of the Minister would have been taken care of in this

other Bill with other things which the minister has not taken care of. I am quite satisfied that the minister did not even think of doing this one until he saw Bill No.50.

In the last session of the House we pointed out just how silly the sections of the hours of Work and Vacation with Pay Act were. How inadequate they were. The possibility of misconstruction of particular clauses but apparently we were too young in experience in the House then to have any notice taken of our words. And I am glad to say that after twelve months they have learned by experience that the things we complained of are now going to be corrected. We told you then that this business of giving a week's holiday with pay- there is a very funny incident in this clause of Vaction with Pay. The Minister and the Attorney General will recollect that it reads that every employee working in an industrial establishment or undertaking shall be granted one week's holiday with pay for every working year of his employment. Well, some of our people in the Trade Union Movement for just amusement took the literal interpretation of the Clause and went up to their employer, some with 30 years service and said; the law now says we can get 30 weeks holidays with pay because we have been 30 years in your employment. I believe, too, the thing really went to the courts up in London. I am informed there was an attempt made to have some judge rule on this particular thing but he ruled the intent of the Clause rather than the words.

I am glad now that the correction is being made but I do hope that and I think I am entitled to this explanation from the Prime Minister (I hope the introduction of this particular Bill is not going to set aside Bill 50 which deals with some phases of this same matter because Bill 50 contains other things

that this Bill No.69 does not refer to.

MR. DALEY: Might I, Mr. Speaker, just say we do not do things just out of the hat. We give them very careful consideration. I would say both these amendments have received for the past six months very much consideration.

MR. SALSBERG: (St. Andrew): Does this Bill- I did not see it - does it in his opinion provide for such groups of workers who, by the nature of their work, are employed by a whole number of employers instead of one or two. I have been approached by the Union of Restaurant Employees, who have a considerable number of members, who are employed by different employers all the time. They might work two days in one establishment or for one caterer and the next three days elsewhere. They are engaged and working quite steadily and they are not receiving any vacation with pay. That is also true in many cases with musicians and others. There was some provision in the Act originally and I submit Mr. Speaker, that the amendment does not seem to provide for that group of workers. I wonder what the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley(would have to say about it.

MR. DALEY: I think there will have to be some limit. There would have to be a reasonable amount of money coming to make it worth while or else by regulations it could be worked out so that once a month the amount of money might be credited to that person. I do not think we should put people to the expense and trouble of putting one cent, two cents, in a book every time that somebody might work but this Act does definitely take care of that type of worker, but regulations will have to be worked out to handle it.

MR. SALSBERG: I wanted to ask a question first. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am a bit doubtful about the regulations that this department has prepared. Last year in the adoption of this Act

there were differences of opinion in the House - I am not prepared to agree with the hon. Minister that the regulations fully interpreted the Act and I do not know whether we can leave matters to the Department to regulate. I think every hon. member of this House was of the impression that the regulations adopted last year provided for the maximum work-day and the regulation - I am sorry to say - I have not got them with me; I have them in the building; I did not think discussion would come on in this Bill - but the regulations issued on the hours of work and holidays with pay, extended that limit far beyond. There was a violation of the spirit of the Act; there was a maximum work-day established. The regulations did not interpret the spirit or even the letter of the Act, as I recall. Second, the Department or the Minister who is responsible for these regulations in the final analysis did something more than that. They permitted themselves to include, particularly in the hours of work group of industries, that were definitely designated by the Federal authorites as not being war industries. For instance, the Hon. Member for Bellwood (Mr. MacLeod) tells me florists are included as war industry. But the industry I was referring to was textile, with which the hon. minister is acquainted with. In the Federal regulations 1003textile is listed as non-essential industry. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the great influence of the textile industry was responsible for the Federal authorities listing them as not being governed by 1003 because 1003 was to have governed only war industries, but to the extent of that industry is powerful in Quebec and perhaps being aware that Quebec provincial Legislation will be less effective than even 1003, that industry was in the column of non-essential industry federally,but when it came to list textile industry in Ontario, insofar as the hours of work was concerned, they were listed amongst those

war industries and hours of work in that industry is not to be considered at this time. I do not, Mr. Speaker, know with what authority those regulations were made and I use this opportunity of bringing these matters to the attention of the Hon. Minister. I might say that I spoke out against them at the time when they were made known. To the best of my ability I tried to point out that the regulations were violating the spirit of the Act of last year which we in this House were led to believe provided a maximum work day, regulations did not permit that. Second, that they violated the spirit of the Act when in conflict with the Ottawa regulations 1003 they included textile as an industry that is essential in character and therefore an industry to which the regulations of the Act cannot apply. You cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. If it is an essential industry it should be governed by 1003 in Quebec. In Quebec it is not governed because it is not listed as essential,but in Ontario they were listed as very essentialand therefore hours of work could not be disturbed and I am sorry this was permitted to happen and I believe the minister should point all the weaknesses out at this time in the hope of bringing about changes in these regulations and also perhaps make sure that new regulations, if they are to be made on the basis of these regulations, will be more in accord with the spirit and intent of the Act than experience has shown us during the past year.

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL (York-North): I am rising, Mr. Speaker, on a point which was referred to by the hon. Member from Ontario (Mr. Williams) It might, I think, be termed as a point of information. The hon. member from Ontario (Mr. Williams referred to a Bill sponsored by himself, Bill No.50 which is relavant and in line with this Bill No.69 now under discussion. Now, at that time the Minister was in his seat. The question I wish

to direct to the government benches is this: There are many private bills on the docket, sponsored by private members. I just wonder whether it is going to be possible for any of those bills to be given consideration by the government benches or is their purpose to recognize any bill sponsored by anyone other than the government benches?

MR. BLACKWELL: As the member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) has so kindly pointed out we are a minority here and if the rest of the House might so decide we might not reach those bills.

MR. NIXON(Brant): May be we had better start calling Orders then.

MR. MITCHELL: I still wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that is an evasion of my question. This is too important a matter to just laugh at in this manner. There are many bills, much time have been spent on, time has been spent in order that these elected members, representatives of the people, might bring some legislation down that will be of real benefit to the people and the worthy gentlemen, the Hon. Attorney Gneral (Mr. Blackwell) just laughs it off, just as much to say because we domot happen to belong to the Government benches that anything we may have is just utterly futile.

MR. BLACKWELL: No, I mean the House seems a trifle amused at the prospect but the consideration I mentioned is a very real one. I might say to the hon. member for York North (Mr. Mitchell) that if the Hansard of this House were examined I think it would be found that the Government benches have not taken up any more than a very poor share of the discussion of this House and if the Bill have not been reached as rapidly as the member for York (Mr. Mitchell) desires or others desire, they might talk it over in their several caucuses, and if they

prefer Bill to discussion of other matters no doubt that could be arranged by co-operating generally throughout the House.

MR LEAVENS(Woodbine): Section 1 to the amendment I think has been clarified by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) I would just like to know where Clause (dd) comes under this particular Act. I have tried for weeks to get clarification in regard to wages with pay - what groups come under and what do not. To which I have no satisfactory answer. The Minister himself when I discussed the question with him was not too clear on it. Industry and labour board has not been too clear on it and I think this Act as a statutory law should be clarified to a point where members would be sure what this Act means and who comes under Vacation with Pay.

MR. DALEY: I think that the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Leavs) still has in his mind one particular case where..

MR. LEAVENS: I have not one particular case in mind at all; I have simply asked in a general way for clarification of who comes under the Act.

THE SPEAKER: May I just respectfully suggest to both sides, we are going on with Committee work; we are not discussing principle of Bill, That is out of order.

MR. CASSELMAN (Nippissing): I don't know that I appreciate the remark of the Attorney General insinuating we were taking up more time than the Government Benches, and we will come to our Bill after a while I trust, and I am not so sure that the mistakes of the Bills we passed a year ago will be corrected by this Bill. I should have liked,Mr. Speaker, if this Bill instead of leaving it up to the regulations to prescrib what length of hours shall constitute a day's work, I should prefer the Bill to have in a clause specifying what those hours were

I certainly do not intend to ask any questions but I think when a minister brings down a bill it might be a very good idea for him to give some intimation what he thinks hours are. I know some people who think you can work from 9 a.m. to 11 p.m. and to 4 a.m. and still call it a day's work.

MR. DALEY: I would go so far as to say I think 10 hours to get 8 hours in but we tried to deal with the people concerned in a given industry, both employee and employer and work out something that will be satisfactory.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time.

THE SPEAKER: Next order.

MR. WILLIAMS: What about Bill No.50 now.

MR. BLACKWELL: No.53rd Order.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 53rd order, second reading Bill (No.70) "An Act to amend The Medical Act." Mr.Vivian.

MR? VIVIAN: I am in some difficulty as to know how to deal with this Act in a way which will be easier on the House. It is a Bill of some 17 or 18 sections. There are no principles involved that I think are contentious and I think inasmuch as the Bill is in the member's books it will be dealt with in Committee, I simply propose to move the second reading at this time.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The difficulty about that is when we get in Committee the Chairman will be calling the sections and no doubt they will go through very quickly. Now, it might save time and trouble- it is just a suggestion - I am not saying the Minister to do this if he does not feel like it, but it might save time and trouble if he would give a brief explanation about each section noe.

MR. VIVIAN: I would be very glad to do that. What I day

would simply be an elaboration of the explanation in the book.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is as unimportant as all that?

MR. VIVIAN: As a matter of principle. This is principle. I really think it can be dealt with in Committee much more effectively.

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the Bill.

MR. BLACKWELL: Call Bill No.72.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of Bill No.72. "An Act to Amend The Minimum Wage Act." Mr. Daley.

DDD 1

3-19-45

HON. CHAS. DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of Bill No.72, "An Act to Amend the Minimum Wage Act". This is another one of the regulations. We wish to be able to ascribe the proper number of hours for a part-time employee. We think that the custom sometimes used more or less of calling in part-time employees for one or two hours is unnecessary and is a hardship on the worker. We have in mind that they should be assured of four hours' work as a part-time employee, or receive the equivalent of four hours' pay per day. This clause will enable us to regulate under the Minimum Wage Act that particular phase.

The other is to establish the forty-eight hour week under the Minimum Wage Act. It is now, as I recall from memory 52-54 hours. This merely fulfills our obligation to the people who come under the Minimum Wage Act, and establishes a forty-eight hour week.

I move second reading of the Bill.

MR. CHAS. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Speaker, I find no fault with the principle which the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has outlined here for the purpose of this Act. My fault lies in the fact that the Act does not do some things, or there are not some amendments in the Act which should be there. It was announced in the press, and to my knowledge, the hon. Minister or members of the Government have been approached by the representatives of organized labour, both the Trades and Labour Congress, and the Canadian Congress of Labour, and a programwas placed before the Government which called for a minimum wage of fifteen hundred dollars for industrial undertakings.

MR. SALSBERG: It was announced.

MR. MILLARD: Yes, it was announced; it was in the press. I think this House would like to know -- certainly I would like to personally -- what the Government proposes to do with the request, which was made, and which in my opinion appears entirely reasonable as far as industrial undertakings are concerned.

We have talked a lot about planning and development, but every child, I think, knows that unless we have a minimum wage of at least fifteen hundred dollars a year, we will not have the purchasing power to keep the wheels of industry turning when the war is over.

I do not know how any Minister can plan the affairs of this province unless there is an income on an adequate level to keep industry moving in the post-war years.

Now, as I say, Mr. Speaker, I am not complaining about the matters in the Bill; I am complaining about the principle that the things which should be in the Bill are not there. I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) or from the Government, if there will be a further amendment, or what they are going to do about this request which has been made, and which, in my opinion, is entirely reasonable.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I would advise this House that we are canvassing the whole minimum wage question, and I have at the present time a tentative appointment with the hon. Minister of Labour at Ottawa (Mr. Mitchell) at which time I understand he is calling all the provinces in, to see what can be worked out Dominion-wide with regard to minimum wages.

But you must not forget our minimum wage is for female workers only. We have no minimum wage here for men,

with the exception of a schedule in the textile industry. I believe there is one regulation there that does create a minimum wage for men.

As far as the fifteen hundred dollars is concerned; did the hon. member (Mr. Millard) think fifteen hundred dollars for women workers --

MR. SALSBERG: Why should not women get fifteen hundred dollars?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. DALEY: I must admit that is as far as we are contemplating going, changing the schedules of the minimum wages. We have the authority to do that without an Act. The Industry and Labour Board have that authority now to change schedules and change zones and re-establish the Act to these two what might be considered minor -- although in the general set-up are quite important -- and the necessity to pass this Legislation in order to enable the Board to proceed.

I think it is a step forward; probably not as far as some would like to go, but certainly we are going forward.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, speaking to the principle of this, I want to say right away that I think the delegation or relegation of the authority to a Board to determine in days like these a minimum wage, remembering the minimum wage that already exists, is most unfortunate.

After all, when this Board -- this Minimum Wage Board -- is asked to designate a minimum wage for some group of workers, that Board is inevitably compelled to place the minimum wage something along the line of the

existing minimum wage. I cannot imagine, in view of the fact that the minimum wage for Toronto at the present time for women is $12.50 a week for 48 hours, that if the Board had to decide for a part-time worker who worked 24 hours -- I cannot imagine them giving those part-time workers who work half a week $7.00, because they would not stand up against the holler of the employers, when the minimum wage is $6.25.

Now, asking or giving authority to a Board to determine a minimum wage without also bringing in some part of the regulations somewhere or including in this Bill some sort of provision that will fix a minimum rate much higher than the sdandalously low one which prevails at the present time is not, in the first instance, doing justice by the Board who have to decide this matter, and, secondly by no means doing justice to the part-time workers.

This Bill we have here is most inadequate in that it is only dealing with a part of the job that it ought to deal with.

You must have something more in here, unless the absence of that something more is an indication on the part of the Government that $12.50 is to be the minimum wage. If you do not intend $12.50 to be a minimum wage, then put something in this Bill which will entitle your Minimum Wage Board to act according to the highest standards which the Government want to adopt.

I saw a press report by the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) --and I think he also made a statement in this House --- that it was his intention to introduce an amendment to the Minimum Wage Act to provide for fifteen dollars per week for some grades, and twelve dollars and fifty cents for

some others.

Now, I would like to know if fifteen dollars in the city of Toronto is the standard of minimum wage that the Government wants to set -- I would like to know that. Because, if fifteen dollars in the city of Toronto and twelve dollars and fifty cents outside of the city of Toronto is the standard you want to set, then I do not give much hope for your future success, Mr. Minister of Labour, in your own particular riding, an industrial riding, namely St. Catharines.

Fifteen dollars is not enough. The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) asked the question whether fifteen hundred dollars a year, twenty-eight dollars a week, fifty-nine cents an hour, should be payable to women --

MR. DALEY: I just asked the question.

MR. WILLIAMS: I am at a loss to understand why we must always regard women as something subnormal. I think it is high time that people of all political parties should recognize the equality of the sexes, certainly the trade union movement is on record as demanding equal pay for equal work, without any distinction.

The war, surely, has shown that women are doing the work of men, and doing it very grandly, and while the war is on, and while they are performing these services, to question whether they should have the same wages as we think the men ought to have, is certainly a little reward for what these people are rendering.

I am glad that we on this side of the House -- and some others in the House -- are unquestionably of the opinion that women should get the same wages as men. If

DDD6

3-19-45
Mr. Williams.

we do not accept that point of view, we are more likely to accept a point of view which prevails at the present time in certain industries in the province of Ontario.

Only this morning I was in negotiation with an employer, and I was asking for a rate of forty-five cents an hour, and the employer said, "There are some of these people living at home, you know." Well, is that not interesting? Just because they are living at home, they must not get forty-five cents an hour. And when I spoke to him about the ones who were not living at home, the answer was, "They are not very good workers." Always the same arguments to keep them down -- always. Whether it be from the standpoint as to whether the women should have as much as the men, or the argument I heard this morning, it is always the same story, to keep them down.

Perhaps you have heard the story about the little chap fighting with the big fellow and the little chap finally got him on the floor, and somebody said, "Why don't you let him get up?" and the little chap said, "No, I had a hard enough job to get him down."

I think this Bill should contain some indication from the Government of a minimum standard, in order that the Board should have some guide so that if this oversteps the $12.50 cents mark, or in some other areas, where it goes down as low as $9.00 for 52 hours -- if they should in such areas establish six dollars or seven dollars for twenty-four hours a week, they are not likely to get their fingers rapped for having stepped outside of the standards which are already in existence.

Now, we must remember that this Minimum Wage Board is not an independent board. It is a board composed of

civil servants. You cannot become a member of the Board until you are first a civil servant. Even the last appointee to the Board -- who was only appointed a very short space of time ago -- first of all had to take a job. Oh, he did not take it very long. It was a case of merely saying that he had a job as a civil servant, and then put on the Board, straightaway.

The three of them on the Board are civil servants, and I venture to say that because they are civil servants, like most employees, they try to carry out the wishes of their employer. Now, the wishes of their employer in this instance, without any other indication, is that the minimum wage in Toronto is $12.50, and in Hamilton and places like that, it is $11.00, and in other places, varying amounts, as low as $9.00 and in some places $7.00 for 52 hours, a week. If that is not your standard, tell the civil servants who are on this Minimum Wage Board what that standard is. Put it in the Bill so that the House will know just what standard you want to establish.

MRS. R. M. LUCOCK (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I cannot add to what the former speaker (Mr. Williams) has said, but I feel that in Ontario, particularly the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley)Ishould be particularly happy if he would lead in this step for justice or equal pay for equal work.

I also believe that our hon. Minister of Labour in Ontario (Mr. Daley) could lead the way for the hon. Mr. Mitchell in the Federal House. A lot of us are not very satisfied with him, but I believe that hon. Mr. Daley, our hon. Minister of Labour, could lead the way, and I think that he and all of us would be very, very happy

if this progressive step were taken.

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL (North York): Mr.Speaker, I have very little to say, but once again I want to refer to an observation of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams). He speaks about the minimum wage, and I have a copy of Minimum Wage Board Order No.11, with reference to the telephone systems in districts -- small centres under 4,000 population -- rural districts -- and I find that the commencing salaries for a 48-hour week is the magnificent sum of $5.00. $5.00, not $7.00.

MR. SALSBERG: For a 52 hour week?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. DENT (Oxford): That is what the farm boys get.

MR. MITCHELL: Well, then it is time they got more.

I was horrified, Mr. Speaker, when this chart came before me several weeks ago. One of my constituents referred me to it, and said that her daughter, a girl or 19 or 20 years of age, I understand, was working 48 hours for $5.00, and that an old, experienced worker in the same telephone exchange was working for $8.60, with a few cents deducted for -- I suppose not income tax, surely, -- but Unemployment Insurance, or something.

So I think while the hon. Minister is looking into this minimum wage matter, he should bring more of a standard, insofar as the general labour picture of Ontario is concerned, in the rural centres, rather than just the cities. I cannot understand how these women can live decently on that kind of money.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand it either, and that is why I have been devoting a great deal of time to looking into the matter, but what I seem to get

here is, "No matter what you have done, you have not done enough."

MR. SALSBERG: That is right.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that in my opinion the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) is receiving criticism that is not due in its entirety to him, but he, Mr. Speaker, should not complain about having demands made, regardless of what he does. That will continue, because the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) I think is not in a position to do it, from what we see.

The situation is very serious, if, after public statements made by spokesmen of this Government, that a higher minimum wage law was going to be enacted, and figures were cited, such as fifteen dollars a week minimum -- if, after such statements, we are now advised that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) has an appointment in Ottawa, and that no regulation is forthcoming during this Session.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the matter is very serious, when I recall that on the opening of this Session, in the Speech from the Throne, there was very definite indication that the earlier statement made by the spokesmen for the Government was definitely going to be implemented. That part of the Speech states:

> "Minimum Wage Act and the Regulations thereunder will be amended to secure a more satisfactory remuneration for female workers, and to change the hours of labour from 52 to 48. The rates of pay will be adjusted by the Industry and Labour Board."

Now, after a public pronouncement, and after references in the Speech from the Throne, the hon. Minister of Labour

(Mr. Daley) is not obliged to tell this House that no legislation is forthcoming, but he has an appointment with the Federal Minister of Labour.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is serious, because it indicates beyond a shadow of doubt that some powerful lobby was at work compelling the Government to change its attitude, since the House was opened. Otherwise, there would have been no change in Government policy.

The statement made, I submit -- and I want to assure the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) that I would have been much happier to have had the opportunity of rising and greeting him upon a real step forward -- although not sufficient -- if he had implemented what he promised, and if he can still do that, he will not have to ask the members why they keep on demanding, after what he is doing.

But we must acknowledge and recognize, after we have a citation of figures, and a reference in the Speech from the Throne, that here two weeks later we are advised that nothing will be done.

MR. DALEY: No, no.

MR. SALSBERG: That was the question the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mitchell) was asking, was there going to be legislation as promised, and the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) replied that he has an appointment in Ottawa, and I think the Government, and particularly the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) should take this House into his confidence, and tell us what lobbying and what forces were pressing upon this Government to keep them from carrying through what little they promised in the Speech from the Throne. Was it a textile group, or was it another group? I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) will find it easier

if he takes us into his confidence and tell us what opposition is arising, and I believe the House will then be happy to co-operate with him in his beating such opposition, and making it possible to bring in advanced legislation dealing with the minimum wage. Because, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) has said is basically very important true, that there is no need of post-war advances if we fail to provide purchasing power for the working men and women at home, in addition to our attempts to utilize foreign markets, and develop our export trade.

But we are, in this country, in a situation where unless we raise wages, and increase purchasing power, the great productivity of the nation will not find its outlet.

Therefore, this is not just a simple matter, and I think the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) is certainly in an unenviable position. I think it is important to know why the change of policy, why the back-tracking, and who is responsible for it, before we can proceed, unless the hon. Prime Minister will assure the House that the announced intentions -- he wishes me to raise my locks and has been signalling to me. I am sorry, but that is what happens. However, I am glad to know that the hon. Prime Minister is paying such minute attention --

MR. JOLLIFFE: Perhaps we should all take our hair down.

MR. SALSBERG: I am willing. I would like the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Labour to take theirs down and let us find out who is behind this blockade, and let us find out, Mr. Speaker, what happened to the legislation which the Government announced it was going to

introduce, but which has not been introduced. It is, in my opinion, an important problem now, and a vitally important one in regard to the post-war period.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I can answer the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) in a very few words. There was no lobbying from anybody; in fact, it was the very opposite. We had the greatest co-operation from practically every type of industrial people, including the workers, in trying to develop a new schedule of rates, which would be fair. We have that schedule prepared, and it is not necessary to have an Act in this Legislature, because the Board has the power to change the schedule of rates, without any amendment to the Act, as promised in the Speech from the Throne here we are making this change of hours of work and the number of hours, which is in itself an increase, and that can be done under the authority we have.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, no.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. DALEY: We are changing the zones and establishing new rates. We have that already. We could announce it, as far as we are concerned, to-morrow, but in view of the fact that the hon. Minister of Labour of the Dominion of Canada (Mr. Mitchell) felt it might be well to discuss this Dominion-wide with all the Ministers, and asked my opinion of it, and I thought it would be all right, and I could see no reason as we are always talking about co-operation with the Federal Government, and I think this is one place where we can co-operate, because I feel it would be a good thing to have a Dominion-wide minimum wage.

MR. JOLLIFFE: When is that meeting likely to be?

MR. DALEY: Immediately after the Sessions are over. None of the Ministers could go now, because the Legislatures are meeting in the various parts of the Dominion, but it will be in the very near future. In fact, we had a date set, but that has been changed, and this will be in the very near future, and I can assure this House that what was said in the Speech from the Throne will be carried out.

If we cannot come to some definite agreement at Ottawa, as to a national scheme, we will proceed with our own, because we have the approval, and while the amount may not meet with entire satisfaction of everybody, it is something that, after a great deal of study and consideration, we feel is fair, and it will be put into effect.

MR. L. G. ROBINSON (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I once asked the Right Hon. R. B. Bennett how long he thought it would take for the kingdom of heaven to come on earth, and he replied by telling me the story of making an English lawn, that you rolled it, and so on, and after a thousand years, it came out a lawn. Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that was a typical Tory reply.

What we are proposing to ask to-night is not the kingdom of heaven; it is just an adequate minimum wage -- that is all. At the present time, in Canada, fifty percent of our farmers are not making a decent wage -- that is, in 1941, which was a war year. They were living below a subsistence living scale, and 37 percent of our industrial workers were so living, at a time when our national income was three times that which it was in 1932.

DD 14

5-19-45
Mr. Robinson.

Now, the question of adequate wages for the ordinary man is just this important -- as has been pointed out -- that unless we are able to have such after the war, when Government spending increases, or dries up to some extent, we are not going to have anything like the good times that we have now at home.

Now, I realize that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) cannot make such things occur by just passing an Act. You have to be in collaboration with various other Departments, including the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) and no doubt in collaboration with the Dominion, so as to arrange our finances that the economy of this province can pay a high minimum wage, but I suggest that it is a barren position to just state, "We are doing a little bit more". I suggest that the planning which should have been done in this connection has not been done; that the various departments which should collaborate on this have not collaborated, and when the war is over, and the intense aim will be to unify every one in Canada, there must be substituted another goal, and surely a formulated goal on a minimum and a maximum basis with respect to what you might do or might not do with the Dominion Government, should be set out in a schedule, so that the people who labour in Ontario may be able to know that perhaps not next year, but the year after that, their real income may be at a certain level, and the Government has planned so that the year after that it will be on a higher level, so that there must be some dynamic goal to unify the energy of our people after the war.

MR. NEILSON ALLES (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to identify myself with the principle of this Bill,

DD 15

3-19-45
Mr. Alles.

but first of all I should like to qualify any remarks I might make about it. I have been placed in a very fine position; in fact, I have been placed on the mailing list of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and some of the literature I have received is very revealing. One particular point I feel would be of interest to the House, and possibly be of interest to us in endeavouring to adopt the right attitude towards this Bill is that their opinions seem to go along these lines during wartime the attitude of the employer is almost invariably towards the "pegging" of wages, and the excuse they give in this case is that if wages were not "pegged" inflation would ensue. Now, in peacetime the attitude of the employers is usually one toward wage slashing, and for two reasons (a) because of the surplus in the labour market, and (b) because of the competetive markets which force employers to reduce their selling price, and consequently they feel they must take it out on the workers. In both cases, the worker is the one who suffers, both in war and in peace.

Now, we cannot be blind to the fact that these are important problems which we have to face in the post-war world. We must be prepared to face these problems, or be prepared to accept the consequences.

It has been pointed out here to-night by the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) that a minimum wage of fifteen hundred dollars should be established, and it was also pointed out that this would provide a minimum of purchasing power. This fact has been a well-tested economy during the period of this war; it has given the Canadian people increased purchasing power, and enabled the working

people to maintain a standard of living a great deal higher than in the depressed Thirties.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I should like to go on record definitely as supporting a minimum wage fifteen hundred dollars for men and women.

MR. BERTRAM LEAVENS (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, in his remarks, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) said that at least this was a step in the right direction. I would just like to warn the hon. Minister of Labour and the Government benches that this was not the time to take steps. We are facing the end of at least the first part of this war, when we will have a problem to face, and the taking of feeble steps will not face the problem, and the matter of the purchasing power in the post-war period is the all-important thing, as far as Ontario and the rest of the Dominion of Canada is concerned.

Governments in the past have always fed us this pap, "Well, it is a step in the right direction," but they have not taken enough steps to materialize the things they tried to lean on to have us visualize bringing prosperity to this country.

The minimum wage as set down by the Statute of the Department of Labour in Ottawa was higher, even for a decent standard of living, than that quoted by the two Congresses, of fifteen hundred dollars a year. Surely, when two Labour Congresses in Canada, which represent the trade unions in this country, have gone on record as stating that fifteen hundred dollars should be the minimum for industrial workers -- surely it is time the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) in the Ontario

Legislature, and those on the Government benches, became cognizant of the fact that Labour, through its Congresses, is not asking more than those who control industry are able to pay in this province.

I am surprised that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) who was very proud to say that he carried a union card for so many years -- I have never seen it, but I will take his word for it that he has one -- would take the step he has taken as the hon. Minister of Labour and as a union man; that he is taking a step -- but it is a mighty feeble step -- in the right direction.

I want to know, and I think this House has the right to know -- what the hon. Minister of Labour regards as a decent minimum wage. Perhaps if he would set a standard we would have something into which to put our teeth, and debate the point as to whether he is right or whether he is wrong.

MR. WILLIAM C. RIGGS (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take part in this discussion on the minimum wage question, because I feel that this is a question where we must state our position, and bring it before the public, and let them know that we have to have a higher standard. When we say "Fifteen hundred dollars a year," as the minimum scale, some people connect that with the purchasing power that is needed to keep our economy standard high, and if we all go back to around twelve dollars or fourteen dollars, is this going to cause things to happen to our economic system which will not be good for this country? So I want to associate myself with those who are endeavouring to have our standard for our workers raised up, so that purchasing power will remain, and give

us an opportunity to buy the things we need to keep our economy standard high.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Should these questions not be answered, Mr. Speaker?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order Number 56, Bill Number 74.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifty-sixth Order; second reading of Bill Number 74, "An Act to Amend the Highway Improvement Act", Mr. Doucett.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill Number 74, "An Act to Amend the Highway Improvement Act."

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time.

MR. BERTRAM E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): Would the hon. Minister care to go through this, clause by clause, with some little explanation of it?

MR. SPEAKER: We are dealing with the principle of the Bill now.

MR. LEAVENS: It was on the principle of the Bill that I think my request was made.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I will be very pleased to explain this, if the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Leavens) requests it. I did the other day.

"(a)" is giving permission to a county to appoint a suburban road commission as their Highway Committee. In fact, the hon. member for York North (Mr. Mitchell) knows very well about this, as this was the request which was made from his county, and one which has been in effect for a number of years.

The next is that the amendment to Section 18 will

permit the authorization by regulation of the County Roads Committee for permission to pass a resolution for a Government grant. That is a change of policy made last year, making payments twice a year, and according to the Act it was necessary for the County Council to pass a resolution, before they could get the money from the Government. Now, this is giving authority to the County Roads Committee to pass the resolution due to the fact that County Councils to not meet -- some of them -- more than twice or three or four times a year.

The next is an amendment to Section 36 which provides for the designation of suburban roads, to make it quite clear that such designation cannot take effect until approved by the Minister. And to provide for the payment of 75 percent subsidy on suburban roads, making it the same as county roads.

The next is an amendment to Section 49, providing for the payment of a subsidy up to one hundred percent on bridges. This formerly was from 50 percent to 80 percent in counties.

I may say that this change is for the northern part of the province of Ontario. There are great areas there which are unorganized, and where the natives find it impossible to finance the 20 percent, so in cases where it is found necessary, the Minister may pay up to 100 percent.

In fact, I must be frank and say this, that this is only making it legal to do what has been done since the Highway Department took over the northern development. The Act was never changed, but still the Department made these expenditures.

The next is an amendment to sub-section 5 of Section 71, providing for the prescribed distances at which buildings or other structures be erected from trees, shrubs, and so forth.

Previously it set the distance at which buildings could be built, but by this amendment, if there is any change in a building, an addition to it, or something of that nature, bringing it closer to the road, they get a permit for doing so.

The last is changing the name of the divided highway to control access.

I think that is an explanation Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order Number 57, Bill Number 75.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifty-seventh Order, second reading of Bill No.75, the "Sugar-Beet Subsidy Act, 1945", Mr. Doucett.

MR. BERTRAM E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): Is this a continuation of what the other Bill covered?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Before we move into Committee, I will call Order Number 58, Bill Number 76.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifty-eighth Order; second reading of Bill Number 76, "An Act to Amend the Fire Department's Act," Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General); Mr. Speaker, in moving of second reading of Bill No.76, "An Act to Amend the Fire Departments Act", I should say

to the House that this amendment will enable the three-platoon system to be established in municipalities permissibly. That was a request from the Firemen's Union who found that some of these arrangements could be made for a permissive three-platoon system, excepting for a legal question, which to-day exists, as to whether under the Act a municipality has the power to do it, and this Act is to clear that up, and make it possible, where both sides are desirous to do so, that a three-platoon system can be established.

I, therefore, move that Bill No. 76, "An Act to Amend the Fire Departments' Act," be now read a second time.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say that this Bill, I think, is very much to be welcomed, having regard to the fact that when the war is over, it will probably be done as an entirely peaceful thing in many municipalities.

I cannot help but recall that some 20 or 25 years ago, the late Mayor of Toronto, Mr. James Simpson, was very active in promoting a somewhat similar Bill, and was largely responsible for introducing the two-platoon system in this province.

(Page 1702 follows)

I am sure if he were alive to-day he would be extremely interested to see the bill before the House to-night.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order No. 60.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixtieth Order; second reading of Bill No.78, "An Act to amend the Factory, Shop and Office Building Act."

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

HON. GEROGE A DREW (Prime Minister): Order No. 61.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 61, Bill No. 79, "An Act to amend the Public Vehicles Act." Second reading of the bill.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 79, "An Act to amend the Public Vehicles Act."

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Sixty-second Order, Bill No. 80.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixty-second Order, Bill No. 80, "An Act to amend the Commercia Vehicles Act," second reading of the bill.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 80, "An Act to amend the Commercial Vehicles Act."

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order 64, Bill 82.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order 64, Bill 82, "An Act to amend the Trustee Act." Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can add anything to what I said about Bill No. 82 on first reading. It simply increases the percentage that a trustee is permitted to loan on the valuation of real property from 50% to 60%. If this is not done at the present time, the trustees will be unable to participate in housing projects, and it is one of a number of amendments made through the Trustee Act, the Insurance Act and the Loan and Trustee Corporations Act. I therefore move that Bill 82, being "An Act to amend the Trustee Act," be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I will revert to the second reading of private bills which have been before committee. Order No. 3, Bill No. 2.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, second reading of Bill No. 2, "An Act respecting the Town of Barrie." Mr. Johnston.

MR. GEORGE G. JOHNSTON (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 2, "An Act respecting the Town of Barrie."

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

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

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order, Bill No. 3, "An Act respecting the City of Welland." Mr. Brown.

MR. HOWARD E. BROWN (Welland): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 3, "An Act respecting the City of Welland."

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

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

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order, Bill No. 6, "An Act respecting the City of Woodstock." Mr. Dent.

MR. THOMAS R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the bill, "An Act respecting the City of Woodstock."

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

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

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order, Bill No. 8, "An Act respecting the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Niagara." Mr. Roberts.

GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts) I move second reading of Bill No. 8.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

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

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order, Bill No. 10, "An Act respecting the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada." Mr. Cook.

MR. JOHN H. COOK (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 10, "An Act respecting the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada."

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

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

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth Order, Bill No. 11, "An Act respecting the City of St. Thomas." Mr. Hepburn (Elgin).

MR. MITCHELL F. HEPBURN (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, I move Bill No. 11, "An Act respecting the City of St.

Thomas," be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

2. HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Ninth Order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Ninth Order, second reading of Bill No. 5, "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough." Mr. Scott.

MR. HAROLD R. SCOTT (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 5, "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough."

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

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

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Tenth Order, Bill No. 9, "An Act respecting the City of Kingston." Mr. Stewart.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Harry A. Stewart) I move second reading of Bill No. 9.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

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

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eleventh Order, Bill No. 12, "An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur." Mr. Robinson.

MR. HOWARD E. BROWN (Welland): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Robinson (Port Arthur), I move second reading of Bill No. 12, "An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur."

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

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

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twelfth Order, Bill No. 4, "An Act respecting the Royal Ottawa Sanatorium." Mr. Laurier.

MR. MITCHELL F. HEPBURN (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Laurier) I move Bill No. 4, "An Act respecting the Royal Ottawa Sanatorium," be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

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

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirteenth Order, Bill No. 7, "An Act respecting Peterborough Civic Hospital." Mr. Scott.

MR. HAROLD R. SCOTT (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 7, "An Act respecting the Peterborough Civic Hospital."

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

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

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourteenth Order, second reading of Bill No. 13, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa Separate School Board," Mr. Laurier.

MR. MITCHELL F. HEPBURN (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, in the absenceof the hon.member for Ottawa East (Mr. Laurier), I move Bill No. 13, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa Separate School Board," be now read the second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of entertaining certain bills.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr. Reynods in the Chair.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Thirty-fifth Order, Bill No. 34.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-fifth Order, Bill No. 34, "An Act respecting Forest Engineers." Mr. Thompson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 2.

MR. CYRIL OVERALL (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman,

under Section 2 of this Bill, I should like to make some observations. I should like to point out to the House, Mr. Chairman, that while I am heartily in favour of Forest Engineers being recognized, I believe they should have some representation on the examining board, which is mentioned under this Section.

The Section reads: Five members will be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. In order to illustrate the weakness in the faction, I would like to read to the House part of an excerpt from what is known as "The Timber Probe Report", which was signed by the Hon. George A. Drew, Frank Spence and Harold Welsh, and I understand the only living member of this report is the hon. Prime Minister. And this Timber Probe Report is dated, - that is, the minority report is dated April 13, 1939, and it says:

> "Not one witness went so far as to say that the present method of administration, licensing, sale, supervision and conservation of our forest resources by the Department of Lands and Forests is all that could be desired."

And then later on it says:

> "That general feeling of insecurity was all too obvious, and one of the reasons that it was impossible to get specific recommendations from many extremely capable witnesses was the obvious fact that they were fearful of prejudicing the companies with which they were connected if they gave evidence which appeared to reflect upon the administration of the Department. While this was very apparent in the evidence of the witnesses themselves, it was even more apparent in discussion with some of those who would have made good witnesses, but frankly stated that it would be putting them in a serious position if they were called, because if they told the facts the companies with which they were connected would be penalized."

And further on:

> "The most serious contributing factor to this feeling of insecurity and freely-expressed fear of reprisal, is the Forest Resources' Regulations Act, passed in 1936, which confers upon the Minister absolute power over all the pulp and paper companies in the province. The sweeping powers under this Act are exercised with-

> out regulation and without right of appeal. It is doubtful if any less democratic piece of legislation has ever been put upon the Statute Books anywhere within the British
3 Empire."

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the Examining Board that passes upon the qualifications for a forest engineer should contain two forest engineers that would be in a position to criticize those who were admitted to be called forest engineers, and they would not be in any difficulties with the Department of Lands and Forests. I can imagine that the Government feels that this Bill should be patterned upon the Optometrists' Bill, upon which five members are appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, but I submit, generally speaking, the optometrists do not work for the Government, whereas the forest engineers will probably be working for the Government, and be under some obligation to the Government, so I would like to see, of the five persons forming the Examining Board, two forest engineers registered under this Act, so that they could, - that is, the Examining Board, - have some autonomy, and two independent forest engineers could examine those who came up for registration without being in any difficulty and without its reflecting upon their position.

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, as regards reading from the Timber Probe, may I point out it could very easily work both ways. I cannot see where the suggestion by the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Overall) would help out, at all. In bringing in this Act, we kept, quite a lot, to the procedure followed by the Ontario Land Surveyors, who are, to a large extent, employed on Crown property. I feel this bill is very much along the same lines. These engineers, while

they will be in the employ of the Government, as well as industry, will, to a large extent, be employed in Crown forests. We are here recognizing a new body, and I certainly feel the Government should have control, and retain control, until that new body at least comes to maturity.

MR. GEORGE H.MITCHELL (York North): I wonder if the hon. Minister would be prepared to indicate his information as to who should form the Board, what kind of personnel.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to in any way divert the hon. member for York North (Mr. Mitchell) from his question, but it might be helpful to give a little more of the background of this bill before the House, which might help to give an understanding. It really involves the age-old problem, Mr. Chairman, of what really came first, the hen or the egg.

At the moment we find this simple proposition that this, after all, is a registration act in which it is proposed to register these people who are described under the Act as Forest Engineers. Now, if it were not for the fact that the Government hopes that there will evolve, in reasonable time, a strong organization, and with that a proper representative board, I suppose it might as well start out and stop as being a registration act. The fact of the matter is, now there is in existence no organization of forestry engineers that is so constituted that at the moment it could be, by the slightest stretch of the imagination, said to be in a position to make recommendations.

The picture is that at the moment there is a national organization, the loosest possible sort, I would say, and there are in Ontario, I understand, four sections of that branch, but some of those branches have no executive officers for the time being who could speak responsibly for them.

One point is that the members of the House should have very clearly in mind is that the field of activity covered by this Act is a rather different thing from the field that is occupied by an established profession.

If I may make the analogy clear by using my own profession as an example, the situation is this, a lawyer, as such is given a sort of a franchise under Provincial legislation. It is deemed to be in the public interests on the assumption that he will sufficiently qualify himself that certain matters should be restricted to practicing lawyers.

This profession of Forestry, if there is such a thing to-day, is by no manner of means in that situation. Forestry is practiced by two types of people, one are academic and are graduates from a school of Forestry at the University. But also we have, and with equal entitlement to practice by many people under this Bill, who have practiced and have to be recognized. So, consequently, it would appear that until an organization has been developed where it is capable, in fairness to all interests entitled, that the Government must take the responsibility during those initial stages.

Now, under those circumstances to argue that the organization that is at present in Ontario should have two or three representatives, is rather meaningless. I understand

that in the course of time the Department hopes that they will have all the responsibility on the Board, when they reach that stage, but at the moment it is the responsibility of the government, to select from all throughout the Province, what the government should take the responsibility for the Board at the moment, under what is a registration Act.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared and willing to let the government take the responsibility. If there is anything wrong no doubt it will be up to the government and will be brought to the government's notice. But I feel that the forestry engineers working for private industry, and not working for the Lands and Forests, will desire some representation on this Board of Examiners. I think it would be a fine gesture on the part of the Government to inquire if they need representation on this Board of Examiners. I quite understand that they will resent the fact that they might be ignored on these matters.

It seems to me that at the present time, while it is the responsibility of the government, it is quite all right for the government to accept such a responsibility; but I still feel that they are well enough organized to have representation on such a Board which will examine all within the profession.

Sections 2 and 3 were agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 4 form part of the Bill?

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): Mr. Chairman, in regard to Section 4, the first sub-section, may I ask whoever is piloting this Bill, What is a Forestry Engineer? Is he a graduate of one of our universities, and, if so, how can this Board determine whether such an engineer, if he has a certificate from the University, is not entitled to be a member?

HON. W. G. THOMPSON (Kent East): Some of them may be graduates of Universities but if they have the qualifications which entitle them to practice, that is all that is wanted.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, would the policy be, if there are good men who have not academic qualifications, that they should be recognized? There is a startling need of forestry in this Province, and if this Bill is going to assure representation to foresters who have not had academic training, I am for it. I was afraid you were going to ignore those who had not academic standing. I am glad that the Minister has clarified that.

Clause (f) of Section 4 brings me back to Section 1, with which I wanted to deal, because it says:

> "(a) 'Board' shall mean Board of Examiners in Forestry;
> (b) 'forestry' shall mean the management and administration of forests and forest lands and shall include forestry education and forestry research, the supervision of the inventory and valuation of forests, the preparation of maps and topographical plans of forests and the maintenance, conservation, protection, regeneration and reforestation of forests and forest lands." --

AN HON. MEMBER: Upon a point of order, there are amendments which much abreviate that.

MR. MILLARD: I was doing this in order to bring out that it is dealing with a very important industry, an asset of this Province.

Here is a Board being established, being composed of five persons who are going to have the power to register men with certain qualifications, practical or academic, to do a very important piece of work. And what I want to know is how this Board is going to make regulations under this Section, -- a great number of regulations, according to this Section.

How does this tie in with the whole question of a forestry commission raised last year by the government. We were promised a forestry commission. Is this Board to be connected with the Forestry Commission, or are we going to

have a whole lot more of legislation?

I have been one who have had the opportunity of poring over the legislation relating particularly to the Northwest Part of the Province. How is this going to tie in with the Forestry Commission? Has this the approval of the Forestry Commission, or is there such a thing as a Foresty Commission yet? Or how is this thing going to tie in?

We were told last year that the whole thing was to be studied. This is another step I presume, and I would like to know how it ties in with the Forestry Commission.

MR. BLACKWELL: This does not in any way tie in with any Acts which have been brought im. There would be nothing in existance such as any part of the Act, excepting such improvements which may be made from time to time with the registration. This deals with men of a certain type of skill, and thir method of registration. In view of that, this Act does not fit into that picture.

At the present time certain of the Acts, it is highly desirable, should be brought together in some form of a forestry Code; but they must be held back until the termination of the war, because, as the Honourable member knows, there are certain overriding powers beyond the powers of the Province.

I might say that it has already been arranged with the parties interested in the different provinces for the general purpose of considering what will arise at the termination of the War Measures Act, at the termination of the war.

Section 4 approved of.

MR. THOMPSON: The Hon. member read Section 1

Clause (b) as in the original; but that was amended.

I gave a copy of the amendments to all the leaders of the various groups.

Section 5 and 6 approved of.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 7.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): Mr. Chairman, let us go back to Section 6:

> "6. -- (1) No person other than a registered forest engineer shall describe or hold himself out as a forest engineer or registered forest engineer or use any designation or title or abbreviation or do any other act likely to lead to the belief that he is a registered engineer."

Does this mean that notwithstanding that a man might be a graduate of the Forestry School of the University, he would not be entitled to become a member of this organization, unless with the approval of this Board?

(Page 1718 follows)

MR. HEPBURN: Come back to section 6, "No person other than a registered forest engineer shall describe or hold himself out as a forest engineer . ."Does that mean that notwithstanding the fact that a man might be a graduate of Toronto University in forestry he would not be allowed to practice his profession unless he subjected himself to joining this organization presided over by a group of men appointed by this government? Is that the story?

MR. BLACKWELL: If I may answer for the Minister the question of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn), this, of course, as the hon. member from Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) appreciates is a general registration of those who are engaged in the practice of forest engineering. They will include, as has already been mentioned, those professionally educated at our institutions of higher learning. Some who have qualified on the basis of academic standing may later fall on the basis of conduct but subject to that I think the hon. member from Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) need have no fear of the academically qualified person. As a matter of fact, the whole concept of the Act is not to interfere with the legitimate rights of the practically qualified fellow who----

MR. HEPBURN: Apropos of what the Hon. the Attorney-General just said, I note that in section 4, sub-section (b) provides for fees payable. Now, supposing the graduate of Forestry of Toronto University takes the position and does not want to be subject to pay fees, then can he be barred from practising his profession? I presume he can be barred.

MR. BLACKWELL: I am just trying to meet the question, if this legislature bars him in the Province of Ontario he is barred.

MR. HEPBURN: I think it is rather drastic. I do not see why you have authority to set up Board which would bar

graduate in forestry engineering to practice his profession if he wishes to do so without joining this kind of an organization. It can provide what it calls 'disgraceful conduct' and suspend his license. For instance, in the Optometry Bill, which will be before this house shortly, disgraceful conduct is described as advertising spectacles for the people and under that Act for advertising spectacles the Board of Optometry can suspend the license of a qualified optician. I think it is rather drastic.

MR. MILLARD: On section 6 it seems to me that the Attorney-General is advocating a clause which is just in reverse of the position that the Attorney-General took earlier today on another matter regarding Engineer Act registration. I cannot understand the difference between the two situations. I would like the Attorney-General to explain it. This case he says "No person other than a registered forest engineer"must register but in the other case the Attorney-General is not prepared to go that far.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member from York, West, (Mr. Millard) is not trying to confuse me. The situation this afternoon was much different from the situation here. I concurred in the suggestion this afternoon, and what I would be concurring in would be the government delegating to a professional organization the power to exclude academically qualified people from practising. Now, it is an altogether different matter for the government to delegate that to an organization completely outside the control of the government than it is for the government to set up Act whereby anyone engaged in the practice of forestry engineering, whether academically qualified or eligible for registration by reason of other qualification, nevertheless must be registered and comply with the Act. That is the distinction, whether right or wrong.

MR. DREW: I think there is real merit in the point that is raised by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn).

MR. HEPBURN: Look out, I have a weak heart.

DR. DREW: Don't get startled--accidents happen. The purpose of this Act is to get a system of registration which will in itself create a group from which these men will be drawn that can guide their own profession. Then you will have registered engineers.

Now, I am going to move that the words "forest engineer or", in the second line of section 6 be struck out and the section will read then:

> "(6) No person other than a registered forest "engineer shall describe or hold himself out "as a registered forest engineer or use any "designation or title or abbreviation or do any "other act likely to lead to the belief that he "is a registered forest engineer."

MR. A. BELANGER (Prescott): I can see some value in the objection raised by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn). There is a situation somewhat like this even in the law profession. A man may be a bachelor of law graduated from the University and still he is not allowed to practice unless he is passed by the Bar. I mean by the Bar of Ontario, by the directors, and must be registered in order to practice, but there is a difference, however, in this that bachelor of law, a graduate from the University, must be registered by members of his profession and not by the body appointed by the government, but in this case the graduate from the Forestry School of the University will have to be examined for registration by a Board of Directors or examiners who are not graduates-none of the five perhaps will be graduates, will be just practical engineers. I see there rather an anomalous situation which has been provided for I believe in the bill. The bill has a great deal of merit but I am afraid it does not go far enough to protect the graduates of our University. I believe it is too late to attend to that now but I hope in the Regulations

that will be made there will be specific designations and exemption for these graduates of the School of Forestry of the University.

Section 6, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 7, 8, 9, 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Section 11--

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear more explanation of this section. I would not be prepared to criticize it at the moment but I do think that we ought to hear more about the intent, whatever the words may say.

MR. THOMPSON (Minister of Lands and Forests): He would not be entitled to collect as a registered forestry engineer. It would bar him from that. In other words, he cannot sue as a registered forest engineer.

MR. MILLER (Algoma-Manitoulin): It would seem to be the case of setting up a closed corporation. While I am naturally-and definitely being from the northern part of the province and recognize the need for any action that can improve forestry practice and forestry conditions in this province, yet I think this Act is very unfortunately drawn. I would like to refer back but we are not getting very much information, for instance, the penalty:

> "Every person who violates the provisions of sub-
> "section 1 shall, for a first offence, incur a
> "penalty not exceeding $100 and for a second
> "offence, a penalty not exceeding $500. or
> "imprisonment for a period not exceeding three
> "months, or both."

That is severe. It seems to me we are setting up something that is pretty severe in the protection of some group. I was just wondering why there is not some group of forest engineers who have complied with the Regulations and have academic standing from the University why there is not a group lobbying against this bill. In other similar situations there would always be a group who would want this legislature to protect their particular rights. Now, the

only reason why that is not the case possibly is because a great many of the graduates of forestry are or may be employed by the government and they do not want to prejudice their case by coming here at this time. Now, that may not be the case at all, but I am just trying to draw your attention to the fact that usally a group is very zealous of their rights in connection with this matter, especially those who have passed certain standing in the University in days gone by--they are very zealous of that position. They would be very apprehensive of a bill such as this. We see no lobbying. For that very reason I am worrying about this bill. I dont know that we have a great deal to worry about. As the government says Regulations will be provided but there seems to be something behind this bill that cannot be seen at the moment. As I said, I am absolutely in favor of any movement by this government which will improve forestry conditions in the province, but to institute a Board, a new set up, which provides that even those who have definite standing in the province, years' standing to practice forestry with the government and private firms, must come to this newly formed Board--there may be laymen on this Board--and submit to the Regulations and be affiliated with them under conditions set down by the government. I am quite willing to be shown. I would like to have those in the front benches clarify some of this just a little as to what the final result will be as far as the qualified men are concerned.

MR. THOMPSON: There seems to be considerable misunderstanding as to what University graduate in forestry is. I might mention our own Toronto University has a four year course. Some of the U. S. is one year. Some other countries only require high school education. So that I think there is entire misconception as to what graduate of University is.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not think that is the point which arises under section 11. For the enlightenment of the Committee would the Attorney-General tell us whether section (1) (b) was amended. A reference has been made to amendment in section 1.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If it was amended does the amendment relate to (b)? Can we have that read.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: "Forestry shall mean advising "and reporting upon management "or administration of forestry "and forest lands."

Takes the place of old clause (b).

MR. HEPBURN: May I ask the Minister if this Board is going to be self-sustaining, going to collect fees under provisions of this Act--will the Board be self-sustaining? Is there any restriction on the amount of money spent by the Board? It says:

"The Board may appoint a secretary and such "other employees . ."

Is this Board going to be self-sustaining or can it spend any money it wants or set fees?

MR. THOMPSON: It has authority to set fees according to Regulations here.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The question which does arise under section 11 is this: That there may be the case of a forest engineer who may not be registered solely by reason of the fact that he is an employee of a firm. There may be a firm of registered engineers. Now, that may not arise at the moment under existing conditions but it might conceivably arise and I want to be satisfied that the rights of such employee will be protected in the event it becomes necessary for him to recover his remuneration in the courts.

MR. BLACKWELL: Most of the people who will be

registered under this Act are employed by private companies or by the government and the intention of the Act is all those employed for this purpose shall be registered. The reason section 11--it is a peculiar looking section--the reason is it is about the lowest possible sanction that could be placed in the Act. As a matter of fact there is no penalty under this Act for practising as such. There is a penalty they hold out by representing oneself to be registered while not registered. There is absolutely no penalty for doing this work-simply the fact that you cannot charge for it. The reason for that is that it is the lowest sanction that could be placed in the Act.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Will the Attorney-General answer this question? Take the case of under graduate of school of forestry who, during his so-called vacation is employed at forestry work. Now, he would presumably not become registered until after he graduated or satisfies the Board that he is qualified. I do not think section 11-for the simple reason that I think it deprives him of his right to recover his salary in the summer months. I can easily see that defence put up in the courts against a claim as a result of sectionll.

MR. BLACKWELL: The Minister nods. I have never been very much fussed about this section and I suggest you leave it.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, after listening to the different questions and answers relative to this bill it just impresses me that this Board is just going to have a blank check. They have the power to collect fees; they have the power to enlarge the staff if they see fit. Does not appear to be any definite control as to their activity.

They are just going to sit in a position where they are going to tell anybody else what to do and assess fines against everybody and they could become a very arbitrary body under these regulations.

MR. OVERALL: I would like to say this bill is a good bill and could have been drawn a little bit better. However I would like to point out that Forest Engineer should be registered. It has been already said that our forests have been mismanaged and if we were going to improve on the management of our forests we have to have forest engineers and they should be registered. The Attorney-General has practically given an undertaking that the members of the Board, five persons, will be appointed by the Lieut-Governor in Council for year, but at some future time he will consider that the representatives on that Board will not be appointed by the Lieut.-Governor in Council and I think that is something that should be kept in mind.

MR. BLACKWELL: I would not want to sit here and have words put in my mouth. I want to make it quite clear I gave neither on my own behalf nor on behalf of the government, present or future, any such undertaking. All I indicated was that it was the common practice in the selection of these boards that any government--I think this one or any other government under the circumstances will select a Board that is representative of the different interests involved.

HH 1

3-19-45
Mr.Blackwell.

I did express the hope that as this establishment grew up, it might become capable in the course of time to be self-governed completely. That, however, is a matter for the future, and I certainly cannot give any undertakings for myself, or on behalf of my successors.

MR. L. G. ROBINSON (Waterloo South): You mean similar to the Law Society being self-governed?

MR. BLACKWELL: That is a matter for some future decision, having regard to the facts that are reached. I would express that hope, that this organization might some day become self-governing. Some of them already are.

MR. A. BELANGER (Prescott): Mr. Chairman, one last remark about Section 11.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: That is out.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was moved that it be deleted.

MR. LESLIE HANCOCK (Wellington South): Mr.Chairman, are we speaking on Number 12? What is the next Section?

THE CHAIRMAN: The next Section is Number 12; it will be Number 11 now, the original Number 11 is out.

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON:(Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, we had a new section put out.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Yes, I have it here. A new Section 12, which now becomes Section 11, reads as follows:

> "Nothing in this Act contained shall apply to, or affect the practice of any profession or calling by any person practicing such profession or calling, and under authority of any general or special Act of this Legislature, or to the recovery of any fees or charge for the performance of any service in the practice of such profession or calling."

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the new Section 11 carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 12?

Motion agreed to.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I thought the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Hancock) wanted to speak to that.

MR. DREW: He thought Section 11 was still in.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 13.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Can we count on the hon. member for London (Mr. Webster) to oppose this Section 13 and profane the use of the word "engineers"?

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported as amended.

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report certain Bills.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. WALTER B. REYNOLDS (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I wish to report that the Committee of the Whole House reports one Bill wish one amendment.

I move the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

MR. M. F. HEPBURN: (Elgin); Before the hon. Prime Minister moves the adjournment of the House, which I presume he intends to do at this time, may I ask him when we may expect replies to the forty-five questions that are now on the Order Paper.

MR. DREW: I will have a number to-morrow, and the Departments are working on the remainder at the moment.

Mr. Speaker, we will proceed to-morrow afternoon

with the Speech from the Throne.

I move the House do now adjourn.

MR. L. F. HEPBURN (Elgin): Will we sit to-morrow night?

MR. DREW: Yes.

Motion agreed to; the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

- - - - - - -

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FOURTH DAY

AFTERNOON SESSION

Toronto, Ontario,
Tuesday, March 20, 1945.

SPEAKER: Honourable William J. Stewart, C.B.E.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

MR. JAMES de C. HEPBURN (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the third report of the Standing Committee on miscellaneous private bills, and move its adoption.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hepburn (Prince Edward-Lennox) begs leave to present the following as the third report of the Standing Committee on miscellaneous private bills; the following bills without amendment:

"Bill (No.1), An Act respecting the Ontario Music Teachers' Association.

"Bill (No.17), An Act to Incorporate the Kingboro Club.

"Bill (No.19), An Act to authorize the Corporation of the City of Toronto to Plan and Zone the municipality."

The Committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

"Bill (No.14), An Act respecting the City of London.

"Bill (No.15), An Act respecting the Sacred Heart College of Sudbury.

"Bill (No.20), An Act respecting the City of Toronto."

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Further reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

MR. ROBERT D. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Robertson (Wentworth), that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Municipal Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, seconded by Mr. Connor (Hamilton East), intituled "An Act to amend the Minimum Wage Act," and that same be read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Health): Would the hon. member explain?

MR. WILLIAMS: The intent of the bill is to establish a minimum wage for certain workers of $1500 a year.

MR. WILLIAM J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Robinson (Waterloo South), that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Public Schools Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Would the hon. member explain?

MR. GRUMMETT: In rural public school sections any vote for trustees, or upon a question, is an open vote. The amendments provide for a secret ballot.

The proposed sub-section 9 (a), enacted by sub-section 1, provides notice of the results of the election be sent to the candidate. Accordingly, the notice provision in the present sub-section 10 of Section 69 is no longer required, and the sub-section is therefore re-enacted to bring it into conformity with the proposed sub-section 9 (a).

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Dunbar), I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill, "An Act to amend the Companies Act", and that same be now read a first time.

2. Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Would the hon. Attorney General explain?

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is two-fold. The first amendment is to prohibit trafficking in sharebolders lists, the amendment I indicated I would bring in. The second amendment is to enable the provincially incorporated insurance company to undertake loans under the National Housing Act, 1945.

MR. WILLIAM J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Robinson, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Separate Schools Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Would the hon. member explain?

MR. GRUMMETT: In rural separate school sections any vote for trustees, or upon a question, is an open vote. The amendment provides for a secret ballot, similar to the provision of the former Act I just introduced.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill, "An Act to amend the Loan and Trust Corporations Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Would the hon. Minister explain?

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Blackwell, that leave be given to introduce a bill, "An Act to amend the Mining Tax Act," and that same be now read a first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Before proceeding further, I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) asked a question on the previous bill.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Yes, I wanted to ask the Attorney General to explain the Loan and Trust Corporations Bill.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, this bill has seven sections. Each section contains an unrelated amendment. The first amendment deals with reducing the par value of shares on capital stock of the loan and trust companies. The second amendment is to bring the lending powers into line with the

trust company and insurance company lending powers. The third amendment is to extend the lending powers to enable this type of corporation to avail itself to the National Housing Act. The fourth amendment is a tidying-up one that involves no matter of principle. It is bringing it up in line with the modern corporate practices. Section 5 removes the present ten-year limitation on debentures, which is an unworkable provision, in view of the National Housing Act of 1945. Section 6 enables this type of corporation to distribute to the next of kin of deceased depositors all sorts of deposits up to $600. Section 7, which is the final one, deals with a statement. This has been a very heavy matter for this type of corporation to deal with by the statute, and now they have to give a statement to every depositor, while the amendment proposes they give it to the depositor who desires and asks for it.

MR. SPEAKER: We will now revert to the bill introduced by the Hon. Mr. Frost (Minister of Mines).

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MR. WILLIAM J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Would the hon. Minister explain?

MR. FROST: The purpose of the Act is to make the form of payment of mining taxes conform with other taxing statutes, particularly with a view to adjusting matters for a general revision of the Act at the time of the termination of the Federal Provincial Agreement
3. as the principal point. The second point is the provisions were made for the acceleration of the forfeiture proceeding, so that lands may be reopened for staking at an earlier date, and there is an amendment in connection, fees for trappers.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) has the privilege to speak.

MR. CHARLES H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Speaker, there is a matter, I think, of public interest and concern at the moment. There is a stoppage of work in one of the two largest steel plants in Canada, at Sault Ste. Marie, and due to the stoppage by some thirty men engaged in the dispute with their employer, 2,500 are now affected, and possibly before this week is concluded the entire plant of 5,000 people will be out, and production will be almost completely stopped in that plant, and it is a matter which involves the National War Labour Board, and, to some extent, stems out of a decision by a conciliation officer of the Department of Labour and Regional War Labour Board in Ontario.

About February the 15th these men, after repeated attempts to negotiate a wage increase with their employer, were directed to go to the Board at Toronto, the Regional War Labour Board, and the conciliation officer was sent in because the stoppage of work occurred at that time, and these men were promised if they would return to work that the matter would be taken up before the Regional War Labour Board, and a decision would be made within thirty days, and, as far as the Regional War Labour Board is concerned, my information is they acted totally in compliance with the promise that had been made by the conciliation officer of the Department, and dealt with the case, and made their decision within about fifteen days from the time that the promise was made. However, in the meantime it was learned that their request was on the narrow-gauge railways, and the steel plants would have their wages put on a par with the

standard-gauge railway workers in that particular area, so the matter was placed under review by the National Board, and thirty days passed, according to the promise, and when the thirty days were fully concluded the men again stopped work, and they had no decision either from the Regional Board or the National Board.

(Page No. 1735 follows.)

I believe in this case, Mr. Speaker, that the House ought to know that all decisions of the Regional Board are subject to review and final disposition by the National Board. This case is somewhat complicated by reason of the fact that the steel industry made application to the National Board to be counted as a national industry. The National Board, on the other hand, told these few workers that they were not a National industry but a regional industry, and their cases would be dealt with by the Regional Board.

Now, we find that the National Board has taken the matter under review, and it is still under review and the final decision or report has not been made; with the result indicated to this House.

I think we should ask that the decision made by the regional Board should be released to these men who are involved in this matter; and also that we should press the National Board, who have had the matter under review, I understand, since March the 1st, to make their decision and make it known to these people within the next ten days. I believe both these requests are reasonable; and if the Hon. Minister of Labour through the regional Board would release the decision of March the 1st, and if this House would ask the National Board to make their decision known within ten days for the sake of harmony, that the whole matter could be settled.

I want to tell the house that the union is doing everything it can, through its representatives and officers. I am very much concerned about the situation. I do not want to say that the situation is out of control, but I do say that these men have a legitimate grievance, they were made

a promise, and that promise was not kept; and the result is that this has tied up the work and more and more people are out of work; and production is reduced in these works. Therefore, I ask the House and the Hon. Minister of Labour to see that the decision of the Regional Board is now made known to the men, and that the National Board be requested to make their decision within the next ten days.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I think probably the request of the Hon. member (Mr. Millard) might be asking for something which could not be given. I do not know whether you could set a time of ten days; maybe they could do it in five days, or it might be that they would not be able to do it in ten days. Sometimes there are complications which do not appear on the surface. I do not think you can tell any Board that they can do a certain thing in a certain number of days.

I am not opposing some pressure, but I think that might well be done by me as Minister of Labour for the Province, rather than to try to bring pressure on this House to back it. I do not think we would be doing the right thing in demanding that the National Board will make their decision within ten days because it might not be possible to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): On Orders of the Day, I am tabling answers to questions 16, 18, 20, 22, 29, 32 and 35.

MR. NELSON ALLES (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I want to make a statement on a matter which is of some importance in this House. A few days ago the Hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) was speaking

about witholding a decision. Since that time the Commission has stated that they were not making any pressure.

I do not like to mention the matter that suggests a remedy. I only mentioned the foregoing because it is similar to a situation and it might cause the same disappoint as the Hydro Commission is in not dispensing with the union of employees.

I would quote a letter from Mr. Paul Scarr, Secretary of the Windsor and district Trades and Labour Council:

> "Mr. N. Alles, M.P.P., Parliament Buildings, Toronto.
> Dear Sir: As you undoubtedly know, a hydro sub-station is under construction in the Walker Road district, in Windsor. Up to the present time, non- union labour has been employed in all the work on this station. This Trades Council therefore sent a letter of protest, to the Prime Minister; the Minister of Labour; and the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission, requesting that some action be taken in the matter.
> The result was that Mr. Thos. Hogg sent Mr. R. L. Hearn to Windsor to meet a committee from this Trades Council. The outcome was that our committee reported progress, and that Mr. Hearn would return in the near future with a definite answer. On Tues. 13th. inst. Mr. Hearn returned, and was accompanied by a Mr. Forgan. The outcome of this meeting was that Mr. Hearn and Forgan have agreed to union labour to all with the exception of nine men, who were brought here from some other point. Our stand is that all shall be union workmen on this, and all such future projects. Therefore, if we can win our point at this time, we fully believe that we can whip the yellow-dog tactics of the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission.
> We are therefore asking, that if there is anything which you can possibly do to assist us in this move, you can rest assured that it will be sincerely appreciated."

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is a very strong letter, and I believe that the Hon. member from Windsor will agree with me that the Hydro Electric should not place itself in the position of not hiring union men, especially where the city is unionized, as is my own city of Windsor.

There is a second matter which I would like to bring

before the House, because, perhaps in a few days it will be too late to bring it before the Legislature, and perhaps then I would not have the opportunity. This is a matter which affects a great many of our War No. 1 veterans. At the outbreak of this war many of the more war-worn veterans came forward and offered their services as the government might deem that they could best serve their country. Possibly because of age, many of these men were turned down for the active services; however a place was found for many of them and they were given the job of guarding Ontario's vital services.

It is my opinion that these men are being paid by the government of Ontario. Their job was to guard such places as the Hydro-Electric power plant at Niagara Falls, and at other places. Many of the Hon. members may have seen these men around their constituencies guarding plants against sabotage and other injuries. Had they failed and neglected their duty, it might possibly have meant months of delay before work could have been resumed. --

MR. DREW: I do not wish to interrupt, Mr. Speaker, but the great job which has been done here by these people has been discussed many times since last September. I think the time has come to put a stop to this matter of delaying the business of the people of Ontario.

MR. ALLES: I am not in habit of delaying tactics. That is not my way.

MR. SPEAKER: Now that you have the floor, will you bring your remarks to the point?

MR. ALLES: Mr. Speaker, I feel that these men's services should be recognized in some way similar to that given to the A. R. P. I think it would be a gracious

action on the part of the government to send a letter, or a medal of some sort, to these men. There are some three or four hundred men involved. As far as I can see they have only received one weeks' pay with their dismissal.

MR. L. HANCOCK (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to mention one matter.

MR. SPEAKER: I have declined to grant the privilege of the House to the Hon. member because in my humble opinion the matter he wishes to discuss is not of sufficient importance to take priority over other matters on the floor. But, now that you have the floor, please bring it to the point as soon as you can.

MR. HANCOCK: I wish to bring to the attention of the House an article which appeared in this morning's Globe:

> "Ontario has power to say who comes into Ontario, under the British North America Act, and unless it is the intention of the Federal government to move all enemy alien Japanese back to British Columbia, they must consult Ontario and the other Provinces, Premier George Drew said yesterday.
>
> He was commenting on a Federal Government report indicating it may be recommended that those Japanese" --

and I stress this sentence:

> "that those Japanese now in other Provinces be settled east of the Rockies.
>
> It was not our choice these people should come to this Province,' Mr. Drew said. 'As we understood it, it was entirely a safety measure to remove these people from British Columbia when it was believed there was possibility of invasion by Japanese forces.
>
> There is no reason an emergency measure of this kind should be employed to settle in this Province Japanese whom we would not welcome at this time.'"

Now, Mr. Speaker, many of these boys had been here nearly three years, therefore they are Ontario citizens by this time, and therefore, within the jurisidction of this House.

I have a letter from Mr. G. E. Trueman, of the British Columbia Securities Commission, which states:

> "Every person (of Japanese origin) who has come east from British Columbia, before leaving British Columbia has been passed by the R.C.M.P. as being wholly in sympathy with the Canadian war effort.
>
> We have very few enemy aliens of Japanese origin in Ontario at this time. The vast majority are either Canadian born or naturalized citizens, and the Japanese nationals who are here are, for the most part, the fathers and mothers of the Canadian born boys who preceded them to Ontario."

According to the figures which I got, they show that 85% of the Japanese in this country at this time were born in Canada, or are naturalized; and many of those who are not naturalized are the parents of these boys who were born in British Columbia. They are working on farms and the farmers are glad to have them.

Although the article does not state any differeniation, it does state that those Japanese born elsewhere have settled east of the Rockies.

I submit that the Hon. Premier of this Province should qualify his statement and make it clear to this House that those native born citizens of Japanese origin are not included in his statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. DREW: The Sixth Order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The sixth order of the Day. Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for the consideration of the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I hope it may be said that I am rising on a matter of some public importance, and as I proceed to speak I hope that I will be able

to bring out some points, and perhaps direct a shaft or two of criticism here and there, but, in the main, to make a constructive speech.

First of all, I want, of course, to congratulate those members of the House who have participated in the debate thus far. It may be that in the course of my remarks I will deal with some of the matters that they spoke about in their speeches. I will try and do that in a way that will leave no trace of offence or undue criticism, because, after all, we farmers are very humble and mild mannered persons until we are aroused; and it is not with any desire in our hearts that we depart from the road of mild criticism with constructive measures for bettering the lives of the people of this Province.

I want to say just a word or two in passing, about some of the remarks in the Speech by the Hon. member from Bruce (Mr. Duff). In my judgment the speech of the Hon. member for Bruce was one that was well thought out. It was one that contained many constructive suggestions that might be very usefully employed in bettering the life in the Province of Ontario.

I want to deal particularly, if I may, with the suggestion that came about the middle of his remarks concerning what I shall call the rehabilitation of rural Ontario. The Hon. members of the House will recall that I have spoken on this matter a great many times in this Chamber, and I am very keenly interested to ascertain if anything can be done to revitalize the rural parts of the Province of Ontario. And, now that we have a new Minister of Planning and Development, I am more hopeful than ever that in his post-war plans there will be included some idea of how we can regenerate those

sections of Ontario that have fallen off in population and have gone down in value, not only to the community, but to the Province as a whole.

I am thinking, as I speak, and my Hon. friend from Bruce and Hon. members from other ridings will agree with this remark, thinking of small villages and towns, dotted here and there throughout the ridings and counties of Old Ontario, that thirty and forty years ago were thriving little villages or towns, and to-day they have gone down hill, so to speak, until they are, as I say, of very little importance to stabilizing the community life.

(Page 1743 follows)

It is true, I think, that many of these villages and towns have gone down the grade because of the fact that the industries that once supported them has moved on or been merged with a larger industry, and the branch is no longer being carried on in the community. The point I want to make, in co-operation with my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. Duff) is to say to the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Porter) that I hope he will seize the opportunity to speak in this debate; I hope he will unfold to us what plans he has - and I am sure he has plans - to rebuild rural Ontario to make it what it once was, a community centre worthy of the name, and able to maintain around the community centre a happy, contented population.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded too, of the debate of last year in which the hon. Prime Minister participated, in which he was very optimistic about the possibility of getting industries to come to Canada at the conclusion of this war, and he went on to say, as I recall it, that he was hopeful - as we all are - if and when these industries came to Canada, that they have a plan - a master plan, if you will - so that these industries will not be congregated still more thickly in the larger centres of population, but they will be distributed as widely as possible throughout the whole acreage throughout the Province of Ontario, placed there according to plan, where they will do the most of good, and where they will revive once again the community spirit, that is not only essential, but vitally so, to the whole Province of Ontario.

In my way of thinking, it is not good to make our big cities larger, and our small centres smaller, and I do not think the attention of one man or one group of men can rectify that situation, and I do not think it can be done over night,

or in the course of a few weeks, but I think it can be done, and what is more, I think it must be done, if we are going to discharge in full our obligations to this Province and to the people who will come after us, after we have left the stage and gone on to whatever our reward may be.

So I want to leave that thought with the House, that I sincerely commend the remark of the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Duff) , and I hope that the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Porter) will tell us what plans he has in this connection, and tell us before the debate closes. I think not only myself, but all hon. members, are anxious to see what the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) has in mind for a post war reconstruction, because we should be able to say that things will not go on as they are with the assured prosperity that we enjoy at the moment in the post war, unless we do something of a stabilizing character to correct the abuses, and to build, artificially if you will, to counteract the trend that always comes at the conclusion of a war, and that leads into depression.

I do not think depressions are meant to come after war; I think men, if they use the ingenuity and brains which God gave them, can avert in a great measure the depression which usually follow wars. And here is one place we can start to do it, in the Department which has been formed, and I am sure that all measures tending toward the re-allocation and the rehabilitation of life in this Province after the war is something with which we will agree with the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) one hundred per cent.

Now, I want to touch a moment on some of the remarks of my hon. friend from Wellington - North Wellington, I believe it is, -(Mr. McEwing) and my sentiments towards those remarks of my hon. friend - before I say them, I want to say

I am pleased that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is in the House. I like to see him here, and I believe that he tries to do the best he can. Sometimes I think that he is influenced all too much by the impractical politicians within his own party who would try to shove on to him some things that even he does not believe are possible, or for the good of the Province of Ontario.

And it is in that frame of mind that I would like to say a few words about the County Agricultural Committees.

As you will recall -- and as I think the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McEwing) read, -- this is the famous point number four in the twenty-two points. This point I can readily imagine was constructed for the vital purpose of luring the farmers of Ontario into the Tory cavalcade at the last general election, and I am ready to admit that it had some effect at that time, but the only danger to the party that is now in power is that you might be able to fool the farmers once, but I will darned if you can fool them a second time.

You see, in respect to these County committees, the idea was nurtured in the brain of the hon. Prime Minister himself, and it became a delight after he returned from one of his visits to England. And I think the hon. Prime Minister was impressed - in fact, I know he was impressed -- with the work that the County committees or the unit committees were doing in England in emphasizing the production for wartime use, And when he came back to Canada, the older members of the House will recall that he was very enthusiastic about the possibilities of transplanting these County units into the Province of Ontario, with good effect,

and that is contained in the twenty-two points.

I want to read the phrase that covers that.

Number Four says

> "to set up committees of outstanding farmers in each county, with authority to plan jointly production and promote a processing and distribution of farm products."

Before I pass from that, I want you to note the two words "with authority" now, anyone who saw the Bill which was introduced, incorporating these committees, last year in the House will recognize at once that the "authority" was dropped out, and I think it is just as well, for I cannot imagine any good, old solid farmer being told by his neighbors that he had to cut the weeds off a certain patch of land, with his sons overseas and no help available. "With authority"; to my mind that was a terrible phraseology, and it was just as well it was left out.

But when they leave that out, they have not got very much left, and I want to enumerate what, in my judgment, were the shortcomings of the county committees of Agriculture.

I want to say, before I start, that I do not think they will ever take the place in Canada which they occupy in England. I do not think they are necessary; I do not think they are desirable, and I do not think they fit into the agricultural picture, and I do think they conflict most definitely with existing agricultural committees and organizations, which can do the job much more effectively than they can.

Now then, the hon. Prime Minister no doubt in his study of these organizations overseas will grant me this; that those county committees operated in England, in a

country that was never able to produce sufficient food to feed her own people. England always was - and I imagine always will be, in your lifetime and mine anyway, dependant upon outside sources for a greater bulk of her foodstuffs. England's ships are carrying her manufacturing products to all parts of the world, and distributing those products, and carrying back in their holds, from all parts of the world, the foodstuffs that are necessary to feed the English population. So that these county committees in England serve this very primary and fundamental purpose, that they helped to instill in the English farmers' minds and hearts, the idea of producing more and more, so that England would become less and less dependant on outside sources for her food supply. And in that role, Mr. Speaker, I say they have a place.

But when you bring them to Ontario, and you transplant them into this country, you are trying to do the impossible, because this Dominion of Canada has always demonstrated that she is not only able to supply food for her own people, but has always been an exporter, and I presume will continue to be an exporter of the basic products produced by the agricultural industry. So when we start to set up this system in Ontario, whose main purpose in England was the production of agricultural products, we find that the need which this committee or commission supplied in England was not necessary at all in Ontario nor in Canada, because we have no trouble in this Province- or very little trouble - in the production end of our agricultural industry.

If the farmers of this Province are given a price that is reasonable, and given wages for the work involved

in producing agricultural products, then I say to this House, there is very little in the way of production that we cannot overcome.

We have demonstrated that through this war by producing twice as much products with one-half as many men. So the need of these committees to instill the idea of greater production in the minds of Ontario farmers was not necessary.

Now, I wanted to touch for a moment on this other angle - and I am dealing with this extensively because I want to say to the House - and I think they will agree - that they got a good few of farmer votes for my friends across the way the last time, because they dressed them up in such a beautiful clothing, and paraded them so well, that the farmers thought, "well, here at last is something worth while from the Government . So I suggest to the House that these county committees are in direct conflict with existing organizations in the counties who can do the work just as efficiently and just as well. The Agricultural Committee of the County Councils, which are set up in almost every county, and whose purposes are the same as this committee, and the federation of agriculture which was organized in every county, have and will do the work that is prescribed for this committee. And then, furthermore, this committee is not a committee that arose in the ranks of farmers to help the farmers. This is a committee sponsered by Government, that is paid for by a Government, and is controlled in the main by Government, and such a constituted committee can never fill a place that is worth while in Ontario agriculture.

The Secretary of the local committee is to be the agricultural representative. All the costs incurred by the committee are to come out of the Consolidated Revenue Funds of the Province of Ontario. And so I say to the House, and to the Province, that there is no use in trying to extend these committees into the counties which are not yet organized, because they will be very short lived affairs having no worthwhile function to perform in the agricultural fabric of this Province.

Now I leave these points, and I want to touch for a moment on the famous stockyard question. I want to say that I was very conservative - shall I say - in the remarks I made upon this issue last session. I said that it was not worth a five cent piece to the farmers of Ontario, but I did not even then think it would be the detriment to the farmers that it has since become.

I do not want to deal with all angles of this question, but I do want to say again that this was one of the things with which this Government was able to induce so many farmers in this Province to vote for them in the last Provincial election. This is one of the things. They dressed it up, and tied a red ribbon on it, and the farmers thought they had something. Do you want me to tell you why? Because the farmers have always thought that the charges they paid at the stockyards were too high, and they always thought - and had reason to think - that there was speculation and manipulation practiced without end at the Toronto Stockyards, and in the processing plants. And so when you said "we are going to take over the yards", and your candidates all over the Province widened on that, and said you were going to lessen the costs, and cut the commission costs, and cut the food cost, and stop this

speculating and manipulation at the Toronto stockyards, they thought again they had something from Government.

Well, you did not stop it, for you have not cut the costs to the farmer, and you knew when you made the promise that you could not cut the costs to the farmer -

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Provincial Treasurer): Just wait and see, and you will be satisfied. We will please even you, if you will wait for a little.

MR. OLIVER: Oh, will you?

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. OLIVER: Well, I will be awfully glad to see it. Mr. Speaker, I say the Government knew when they made this promise to the farmers that they could not cut the costs involved in charges at the Toronto stockyards. They knew that the Federal Government, under the Livestock Control Act had complete authority to set the price of hay, the price of bedding, of feed, of straw, and everything else, and they knew they could not move one inch in this matter unless they received the authority and approval of the Dominion board, yet they went around the Province and intimated quite clearly to the farmers that all they had to do was to vote for them, and all things would be straightened out.

Well, the farmer sells his hay for twelve dollars, and then when he sends his cattle down to the stockhards, he pays thirty-six dollars for the same hay, to feed back to his cattle. The commission charges are the same; the charges for straw are just the same; in fact, all charges connected with the yards are just the same as they were. So there is no redress on that point.

Then I come to the question of the stockyards themselves, and may I say to my hon. friend from Haliburton, Victoria, Lindsay, and points east (Mr. Frost) that when he interjected the other day when this was being discussed, and said the President of the Co-operative Company was one of the men on the provisional board of directors - he is wrong on that point.

MR. FROST: He was, was he not?

MR. OLIVER: He may have been at one time, but he was not when you spoke. He also said, perhaps by intimation, that I was a member of the board of directors of the Co-operative Company, and I was in a way responsible, and hooked in and could not talk out loud. Well, as a matter of fact, I am not a member of the Co-operative Company; I never was, and I do not suppose I ever will be. So you are not invulnerable, and not in the clear, when speaking of these things.

But I want to say most definitely to the House that I think it is pretty generally conclusive that the stockyards at West Toronto are in a worse condition than they have ever been in since they were erected and used as the means of housing cattle while being held for sale. And that is almost a year after the Government took these yards over, and promised redress. The indescribable filth that has been present out there all winter - and I suppose still is - is conducive only to one thing, and that is to spread disease amongst the cattle, and hundreds of cattle - I do not know whether that question was answered today or not - but I venture to say that hundreds of cattle died in the yards last fall and winter by reason of the fact that they contracted disease because of the filth and dirt and muck that was allowed to accumulate in those yards.

And I would say further to my hon. friends across the way that they ~~not~~ not only did not do away with speculation and manipulation, and give the farmers a better deal, but these cattle did stand in these yards for four or five days, to a week or more, and came up to the sellers' bench in a very dilapidated looking condition. They were all covered with one thing and another, and they had not gained any during their sojourn in the yards, so that rather than help the farmers in the prices they received, most definitely the farmers lost thousands of dollars due to the condition of this cattle after being housed in the yards, before they were brought up for sale.

Now, my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Frost) said that a board was appointed, and there were some farmers on the board. I say to him that I do not give two hoots about that point. I do not think it adds to your credit, nor to your standing as a Government for you to try to hide and try to pass the responsibility on to somebody else, and to get away from a responsibility that rightfully belongs to you, and the people of Ontario will see that it stays with you. That is all I want to say on that particular point.

MR. R. H. TAYLOR (Huron): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) to clarify something?

MR. SPEAKER: May I request that both sides of the House allow the speaker to conclude his address, and then ask a question.

MR. OLIVER: I am not going to stand for that - at least, I don't think I will. I never saw that procedure followed in the House before.

MR. SPEAKER: I simply asked the hon. members if they would let the speaker (Mr. Oliver) conclude.

MR. OLIVER: I do not see why a speaker should be subjected to remarks throughout his address.

MR. SPEAKER: I just requested to allow the speaker to conclude his address, and then questions may be put.

MR. OLIVER: That is just what I object to. If I want to andwer a question raised by an hon, member, I have the right to say whether I want to answer it at that time or not, but do not transfer them all back to the end of the speech, and then have me subjected to a barrage -

MR . SPEAKER: Will you carry on, please.

MR. TAYLOR: May I ask the question?

MR. OLIVER: Yes, what is your question?

MR. TAYLOR: May I ask the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Oliver) if it is not true that the stockyards have no roofs on them; is it not true this year we had an unprecedented amount of snow, and is it not true at the time he refers to, due to nature, which no government can control, the conditions he mentions in regard to the stockyards may be attributed to that.

MR. OLIVER: In answer to my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Taylor) I say there were no roofs on them when the government took them over. They knew what conditions might become, and they became just that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may, I want to discuss for a few minutes the report of the agricultural inquiry commission, and I do not want to talk very extensively on that report, because it is, as hon. members will be aware, who have received a copy, a very voluminous document.

(Page 1755 follows)

It is a very worthy document. I think they should have said what they did say in less words than it took them but, at any rate, that was their prerogative if they used words if they desired to do so but I hope when the Budget debate is up in the House that I will have an opportunity, and other hon. members of the House will also avail themselvew of the opportunity, to discuss the various sections of this report because I think it is a report that has merit. I think it is a report that shows that the members who sat on that Committee devoted a good deal of attention and time to the problems that were brought before them. I just want to say, however, before I start into a discussion of this report - a very sketchy one, that I have come to the place where I have lost a good deal of faith in commissions and boards that are appointed by a government outside the membership of the House itself and without representation of the members of the House on that board. I think we have got to get away from that idea. I think the Government have got to take the responsibility on their own shoulder for the introduction of legislation and I think we have got to get back to the place in this province where they have ministerial responsibility and where those ministers are willing and able and anxious to introduce remedial legislation without passing the buck to a committee or board, whatever you like to call it. I say that quite definitely because this government has sinned somewhat in the appointment of commissions and boards. I do not know whether the question was answered to-day or still counting the number they have appointed but they have appointed a good many of them. But it is not the individual committees that were appointed I am criticising right now but I say quite definitely it is a wrong principle and we should get back to responsible government

and all that entails and we are getting a long way from it in all these committees and boards &c. These commissions are costly, they run into a lot of money for the period they sit and they are time consuming. Some of the pressing problems that these committees are discussing, there should be action on them within six months at the most, and yet this committee has sat over a year all told, its lifetime, and it is important I think that that element should be considered.

Another thing about these commissions, of course, is that they are an excellent thing, just an admirable vehicle for government to shift responsibility and shift, through lack of desire to deal with a pertinent question, they will shift it on to a commission with the idea and with knowledge that with a little coaching and a little help these members will sit for months and months while the issue involved becomes worse and worse. That, to my mind, is an important point in this respect and so it is with these misgivings of all commissions I want to discuss this committee's report for a very few minutes. Then, of course, there is the other angle about commissions and committees is when the Government gets its report they usually honour the labour of those on the commission by failing to implement their recommendations contained therein.

Now, bringing this right home to the Agricultural Committee's report my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Kennedy) knows full well that back in the early Twenties there was an agricultural committee in this province headed by Dr. Jamieson, later the Hon. Dr. Jamieson, a man who sat for many years in this House. It toured all over the province of Ontario holding meetings for months and brought in what to look

at was an admirable report,but I do not think the Minister of Agriculture will say to me this afternoon there was any, and certainly not very many of the recommendations contained in this report, were ever crystalized into legislation, and I say to you - no matter how good those recommendations are they are not worth the paper they are written on unless they are followed by statutory action on the part of the government and that very seldom happens, and I hope it is not right in this case.

Now then, the report itself. I am going to just sketch it; I am not going into it very deeply. I am bound to admit, and I am anxious to admit, it sets out the agricultural situation in the province rather clearly and rather well. It is a document that will be of value to the Minister of Agriculture if he cares to be persuaded by the contents of the committee's report. I think one could say, however, that it has too much verbal dressing and there are too many words around it - I mean you would almost need to be more than an ordinary farmer to grasp the full significance of the various points made. I think, also, if one wanted to make another objection to the report it would be that they are more or less timid in making recommendations. I know I can think of a lot more recommendations they could have made and I am going to speak on some of them a little later on, but they did enquire into some very interesting fields affecting farmers in the Province of Ontario. They enquired into farm credits, into rural education, soil conservation, live stock and soil research or what do you call that - soil analysis - we will let it go at that anyway.

I want to talk for a moment about the first one, farm credit. The committee's report on farm credit I agree with entirely. The committee recommend that the province don't

go back into the business of loaning money to the farmers in the province, the same as the old Agricultural Board, and I think in making that decision they were prompted by very wise counsel because our experience as governments in this province with the agricultural development Board have not been too good, to say the least, but at any rate the commission recommends that we do not go back into the loaning business as a province but that we fall under and seek to work under the recommendation of the Dominion Farm Loan Board so far as extending credit for farm purposes is concerned. With that I agree. I make one recommendation that young farmers should be given provincial loans or guaranteed bank loans on the part of the province. Now, that is something that can be gone into. There is much to be said in its favour but I do not know why it cannot be worked under Dominion Farm Loan Board. I cannot see why an ideal like that could not be embraced in the Farm Board if it was very definitely brought to their attention.

They say also in the report that Credit Unions have been doing very good work in the province, and I agree with them. I agree absolutely that credit Unions are founded on a very sound basis in this province and I do hope that they will progress until the day comes in this province when the farmers through their Credit Union can finance their own operations in respect to processing, &c. We all agree with that. Then they make one important recommendation in that they say the $5,000 now made available under the Marketing Act for Co-operative Marketing, store houses &c. should be raised to $25,000. Well, in these times when co-operative marketing is on the march it seems to me that is a very reasonable suggestion and should be

carried out.

Then there is the question of education for rural people. That is an intensely interesting document and should be studied by those in charge of making the laws respecting rural education. The education that we have had in Ontario in some respects failed to meet the need that exists and we have need in parts of this country or province for an education that is particularly adapted to rural people and this report sets that out in very definite language, and I hope something will come out of it.

Then there is live stock report and I touch on it just briefly. The main recommendation in the live stock report is that we put on a campaign and tighten up existing legislation to the end that we will have eliminated the scrub sires in all fields of live stock in the province and replace them with high grade pedigreed animals. That, to my mind, goes without saying. We should do that. We should intensify our efforts towards that end. Because after this war is over, when we go on to the markets of the world, it will be essential that our products will stand the test of quality before they can be sold to the advantage of Ontario farmers overseas, and one of the ways to get that quality is to see our breeding stock is of the best.

Then there is a chapter that deals with better feeding practice that I agree with. There is a chapter that deals with veterinary problems in the province. Inasmuch as last year I spoke on this particular matter, let me read the recommendation of the commission in respect of veterinary services. It says:

> "That all courses in animal husbandry at agricultural colleges, schools and short courses, should include more extensive instruction in veterinary science. The commission also feels that a much more co-operative spirit might be developed if graduates of the Ontario

"Vetinary College were encouraged to sicuss with clients the conditions involved in the treatment of animals for an ailment under consideration. Possibly in this way greater confidence might be established as between the veterinary and the farmer. And this should help to break down the feeling that science is over the head of the average man. The secrets of a professional man are entitled to some protection, and without disclosing these, the farmer might be encouraged to develop more interest in scientific assistance, if he were not entirely in the dark as to the why and wherefore of treatment of his animals."

Now, I just want to say in respect to that, similar to what I spoke of last year, that there is a great need in rural Ontario now for farmers being supplied with some of the basic drugs that are used to combat diseases that are well known to the farmer and the farmer knows the drug to be used as well because nine times out of ten at the present time for erysipelas and shipping fever and all that kind of stuff the farmer goes to the drug stores and purchases the drug that is required, comes home and injects it into his animal and it is not necessary to call a veterinary now. The suggestion I made last year and I repeat now, that some of those common diseases that are so prevalent to live stock of this province and for which treatment is well known and can be purchased in any drug store, that the Government will be going a long way to help farmers if they furnished these basic drugs, and I would not make the list too long at the start of these basic drugs because there is a vast difference between the cost of the drug itself and the price sold for in the retail trade. I just point that out to the Minister because I think it is worth while discussing.

I am taking longer than I intended. I think, perhaps it will be said in later years that this committee's report will be more famous for its omissions than for what is included in the report inasmuch as they fail to recommend as to what

better conditions should be employed in the Marketing of Ontario Farm Produce and to me that is the most important problem that faces our people at the present time. Why could not they have surveyed the field of marketing and made some recommendations that would have been helpful and beneficial to rural people.

MR. DOUCETT: Might I ask the hon. member if he has read this report. It states in there that is one of the points they could not get around to and intended to report in supplement regarding marketing.

MR. OLLIVER: I know all that.

MR. DOUCETT: You are going to say that.

MR. OLIVER: I have an idea what I am going to say. I am discussing the report as it was tabled in the House and I am saying it was unfortunate that marketing has not been dealt with in over a year that this commission sat and that they did not bring recommendations into the House at this time. Because I am going to say to my friend that the successful marketing of Ontario products is not a thing we can put off for any length of time. As soon as this war is over we are going to find conditions in this province where we are going to have other products and where successful marketing is of the utmost importance and I say it is essential there should be in this report something about this very matter.

I want to touch for a moment on some of the things mentioned in the report and I hope the Government will implement some of these recommendations. I will tell them a good one they can start on. There is a recommendation in the report that the Government should pass a Bill making it obligatory for the packers to pay back to the Government the money that they deduct for horned cattle in the yard. Now, this practice

has gone on for quite sometime.

MR. DOUCETT: I might say, Mr. Speaker, in reply to my hon. friend I have that Act all prepared and will be introduced.

MR. OLIVER: My goodness, is not that great; we are making progress. I will touch on one or two more and perhaps will get results. I congratulate the Government if they did that because already in Western Canada two I think of the provinces have similar Acts on their books.

MR. DOUCETT: Three.

MR. OLIVER: Well, I was being conservative. and the money is paid into the Department of Agriculture, into the Consolidated Revenue Fund - does not matter which - and is used to the advantage of the Live Stock industry of the province. So that I won't need to discuss that any more. That is very fortunate.

I want to touch for a moment on the need for marketing legislation and marketing machinery in this Province. I think the time has come when we must stream-line our marketing machinery to meet marketing after post-war conditions. I think it is essential that we should begin now to prepare for the day that we know or hope at least is not far off. I would go so far as to say this: That if the Committee on Agricultural Inquiry had recommended the setting up of a department of government, having as its heading - Co-operative and Marketing- that I would have supported that recommendation. I think the time has come when we should give more attention to the marketing end of our problem. Over in the Agricultural Department we have many trained men and good men appointed by this Government and past Government, but men who are trained but trained particularly along one line and that line is production, and I say to you, Mr. Minister-and I think you will agree with

me that it is time that we had a department and the personell of that department were trained not in the art of production but in the art of distribution, in the art of co-operative marketing, in the art of selling our products to foreign markets and all these things and I do not think they can come successfully from department, the main men of which are inculcated with the idea that they should produce more. I am quite serious in that matter and I think it is a problem that will come up very forcibly in the near future. I want to tell you why the marketing of products is very important. I said a while ago in my address that we had doubled production - I think that is a safe figure to us - doubled our production of agricultural products in war years with about half the men employed that were before the war, showing that we have a terrific capacity for production and now we are able because of war time conditions to sell these products to Great Britain, just as much of those products as we can and will produce but that condition is definitely a wartime one and as soon as the war is over, within a reasonable time thereafter, you will find that countries like Denmark and Argentine and all these others who used to ship to the British market, you will find them tearing away the debris and you will find them trying to get on to their feet after years of war and destruction, and you are going to see then in this province and in the whole world a vicious searching for market in the post war period - a vicious search - and we would be over confident, Mr. Speaker, if we thought for a moment as soon as condition settled after this war we would still be able to sell the present proportion on the market of Britain. That argument won't hold water because England is a trading nation, England has got to sell her manufactured products and she is

prepared in return to take agricultural products that she needs, and you will find just as surely as we are sitting here to-day, as soon as the war is over and things clear away that England will start to buy again - not from choice but from necessity - from these other countries that she bought before from this country and the percentage of those products that she bought from Canada will be less and less as the months go on. We might as well face that condition. The same is true as to the competition on the world market. I just heard this morning - I cannot give this as a definite fact. I think Britain is buying beef from the Argentine at less than 7 cents per lb. The Minister shakes his head.

MR. DOUCETT: You are not far off.

MR. OLIVER: And when that beef goes to the British market I do not know how we are going to compete with beef at 7 cents when ours is twelve cents. These are tremendous problems that will face us just as soon as reconstruction commences after the war, and we should be prepared in this province to do what we can not only to find markets but to recover markets. We should seek too improve the quality of our products because the Englishman that eats our No.2. bacon to-day his appetite will be a little more particular after the war is over and he will want the No.1, and we must carry on continuous education to improve products, agricultural products, so that they can stand up against the products of any other part of the world. Another thing I think this marketing department, if you set it up should concern itself. I think they seek ways and means not only of finding markets but of increasing the consumption of the markets in our own country.

because I think there is a field there. I think there is a field there that we have not fully developed and I think with a proper department of government set up that they could do much within our own confines to increase the percentage of those products that are consumed at home.

Then there is the other angle that we should find other uses for the products of the farm and I am very hopeful along that line sometimes - and sometimes I am not so hopeful - but I think science and research have done a remarkably fine job in finding things that will take - I don't know hardly what I want to say. Let me start this again. What I want to say is this: that science and research in the past and I think will in the future, do a fine job in finding uses for farm products in every line of production. I am reminded as I speak that it is possible now to make a sweetner in the form of sugar from wheat. It is being done at the present time not very far south of the Forty-ninth Parallel in the United States. Making a sugar - I don't know what to call it - fluid or something. Anyway it is making sugar from wheat, and they have demonstrated in the past in the production of gasoline, &c. Germany has produced gasoline from wheat and other cereals. There is a great field for endeavour. If we lose our overseas market to any extent we will have to turn to these things to solve the problem of finding a market for the agricultural people of this province.

Now then, I want to say another word here and it may not just agree with the Minister of Agriculture, but there is one thing....

MR. KENNEDY: You have been pretty good so far.

MR. OLIVER: Thank you. I thought you would agree pretty well being the kind of man you are.

There is something in the committee's report that I think one should comment on. There is a section in there which says that the hog producers presented a plan to the Committee whereby they might come under the Farm Products Control Act. I think it is very essential that they do come under that Farm Control Marketing Act, and I was rather disappointed when the Committee said that the plan, that the hog producers presented to them was not acceptable or would not work. Now, I think the Committee's duty when they reached that impasse was to find out what plan would work and what plan would allow producers of hogs in this province to come under the Market Control,Act.

MR. KENNEDY: We have got it pretty well under way now.

MR. OLLIVER: That is good, indeed, because this point follows immediately on that. We have the speculation and manipulation. It is still down in the packing houses and stock yards. It could not be removed at all but the one way it can be removed, and effectively, is socializing the plant. I have great doubts as to the possibility of that myself.

HON. MEMBERS: You are getting cloe to it.

MR. OLIVER: I have the greatest doubt of the possibility of socialization of packing houses. There is this point where that point can be solved for the farmer of Ontario in respect to beef and hogs. They should be in a position to control that product so effectively that

they could say to Mr. McLean: here is your product at such a price and you either take it or leave it. To me there is a good way out there and I hope the farmer of this province will some day be able to say they are organized so effectively that they still can do that.

Then there is the other point I want to make, and I am not going to speak very much longer. I think we should do something either provincially or federally and I am not going to ague as to which place it rightfully belongs at the moment. We have in Ontario and have had for many years what is known as the "Dominion Insurance of Hogs. You know we produced in 1944 2,000,000 Hogs in Ontario, according to the report from the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa, and they take one half of one per cent off the value of these hogs as Dominion Insurance. That Insurance is used to compensate the packer for condemned carcases that are unfit for human consumption. Nobody seems to know where this law started. I do not think there is any legislation to back it up. It is just something that was agreed to between friends, I presume and it has been going on for many years, and in 1944 in the province of Ontario the packers got $250,000 by way of Dominion Insurance on hogs that were sold by Ontario farmers. They give no accounting of that. Accrding to the live stock report of the Dominion Government some 4,000 hogs were condemned last year in Ontario. Now, those 4,000 hogs in round figures would be, $100,000. So that if you take that $100,000 off the $250,000 that the packers received for Dominion Insurance you have $150,000 left that looks very much like a profit to the packere of the Province of Ontario.

MR. CASSELMAN: Then they use all by-products?

MR. OLIVER: Yes, and I do know this that the Eastern Canada Packers, which I think are a co-operative outfit, run their Dominion Insurance for .023, which is less than one quarter percent and they have a balance in doing it on that basis. In Ontario this Dominion Insurance does not pay the farmer if he does his hog in transit. I mean, if the animal gets sick on the way down or kicks out on the way down the Dominion Insurance has nothing that compensates the farmer for the loss of that animal. That comes under the Insurance that is carried by the Truckers themselves,but in this Eastern Packing Concern, this .023 of one per cent not only carries the loss of the condemned animal but carries the loss of animal damaged in transit and they are able to carry that other loss at less than half what we are paying in the province of Ontario. I should say that we could do the same with this as we are doing with horned cattle. We should say to the Packers - "turn over the money to us, you are collecting by way of Dominion Insurance and we will pay back to you what we consider a just and fair amount." There is no reason that I can see that farmers should be penalized in this way.

MR. NIXON: I ask the hon. gentlemen a question - may be they could use this money for animals that die in the stock yard too?

MR. OLIVER: Then, immediately...

MR. FROST: The hon. member from Brant (Mr.Nixon) asked you a question,- what did you do about this Dominion Insurance during the nine years you were in power?

MR. NIXON: We did not have stock yards.

MR. FROST: What did you do about it? Not a thing.

MR. OLIVER: We were busy doing other things. We were so busy doing other things in enacting legislation for the benefit of rural people that we had not just got around to this. There is no question that if time had allowed we would certainly have been there and I think my hon. friend will agree there is a point in that. It looks to me as if the farmer has been penalized beyond the point where it is just and right.

Now, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say these few kind words. I have my hands in the right position. In the House last year we were not very critical of the Government's leglislation and I think we were justified in the position we took at that time. The Government had just been elected. They had received the public's endorsation on the matters that were being brought up in the shape of legislation and I think we were justified in waiting to see just how this legislation would work out but now we have waited and we have seen and there is any doubt in our minds now as to how we should proceed. We should not draw back our criticism or withold it where that criticism is justified and I think serves the best interests of the province of Ontario. It was amusing to me - and I am sure it was to the other members to find the change in tactics on the part of the Government this session as compared to last session. I was reminded - I had better not say this because the Prime Minister is a great military man and he perhaps will dispute it - but I always understood that one way of achieving a military victory was to attack through strength and that is what the Government is trying to do this year. I was amused the other night when

the hon, member for St.Patrick (Mr.Roberts) rose and he said to the hon.members across: you have been real good all this session, you have acted as an opposition should act.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is wishful thinking.

MR. OLIVER: At any rate he said those things and he was serious in saying them. Then he turned to the group in this corner and he let loose. Of course, that signified some very important developments. Very important and one need not enlarge on them. The Government's idea presently held is that their main opposition will come from the Liberal party in the next election and I want to say to them that in that they are using very good judgment, which is uncommon to them at sometimes.

Now, muc of the criticism that has been directed over here has been directed at my hon. friend whose seat I have taken. I never noticed it. There has been a very pointed attack on the hon.member for Elgin (Mr.Hepburn). The hon.member for Elgin has faults, many of them I think. He has made a few mistakes and I too have faults, many of them, but one thing that can be said about the hon.member for Elgin (Mr.Hepburn) is that he always comes up fighting and that he has as his goal the betterment of the people of this province. Let me say to my friends across the way that in the last election - you look at the figures for the popular vote and there is very little separates us. You know people got the idea prior to the last election we were getting just a little bit too conservative. Just a little bit.

MISS MACPHAIL. They put the wrong party in.

MR. OLIVER: And they sought to administer I believe honestly what they thought was a mild rebuke in order that

we might turn in our way and get back again on the real reform pathway, but in the procedure they made the fatal mistake of hitting us just a little too hard and slapping a wee bit too hard to the left with the unforseen result that the party with the policy they did not like at all received the call or the nod and came to sit in Government places in thie House. So I say to the House this afternoon, so far as we are concerned in the test that seems not to lie so very far ahead, we are going to get back again on a platform of real reform, we are going to get back again on a basis of the common man, understanding his problems, seeking to interpret his desires and believing in so doing we represent not only him but the best interest of all Ontario. Thank you.

MR. GEORGE LOCKHART (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I could have very little criticism of the previous speaker in his remarks. I suggest now that after he gets the Packing plants straightened out in his mind he will probably be over on this side of the House.

(Page 1780 follows.)

He need not worry about the next election, which probably might be imminent, because I think he will find out that the two old reactionary parties will be together in the final analysis.

Now, the small portion of the Speech from the Throne devoted to agriculture stated agriculture continues to be the most important basic industry in Ontario and the most important, and that was about as far as it went. Reference was also made to the Ontario Agricultural College, Macdonald Institute and the Ontario Veterinary College. The exact findings of this organization and administration, and the eventual disposition, have not been placed before this Legislature as yet. All the hon.members of this Legislature sincerely regret, as I do, the illness from which the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is recovering. We hope the spring weather will restore his good health and strength.

This Government, however, has a definite responsibility to the farmers of Ontario, and the farmers certainly have a right to expect that constructive legislation will be coming forward from the Acting Minister of Agriculture, and should have been brought forward before this time.

This is the twenty-fourth day of the Session, and I believe three small bills that have something to do with agriculture in this province have come forward up to the present moment. Now, we do not think that is good enough. The hon. members on this side of the House have certainly had a good deal of patience in waiting for this legislation, and are waiting for the tabling of the interim report of the Commission of Enquiry. It seems to me that we should have had some parts of this report, at least, to study. It

is most important in this province, and certainly most important at this time, with the approaching close of hostilities. All who have made even a superficial study of the findings, as the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) has quite aptly mentioned, find that it goes into a lot of detail and is rather difficult to take in
2. in a short space of time. This is generalized, largely, when you read it through three or four times. You find there is a very comprehensive picture of what the agricultural conditions are in this province at this time. And, generally, I think we will agree that agriculture is not in a very healthy state in this province, even in war economies. There are certain matters which might be adjusted now. There are some which will take some time, it is true, to bring about. There is a definite lack of planning and research so necessary at this sitting of the Legislature, in view of the post-war rehabilitation, a responsibility that we, as the Legislature, cannot possibly escape. We just have not time to do the job as it should be done. The Government also, as has been pointed out by the previous speaker (Mr. Oliver), should act, and act immediately on the findings of this Commission before it is too late. I think we have gone a long way now, without having these constructive measures, that are so necessary in this province in agriculture, to be enforced.

This brings me to a suggestion to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Drew). I think we all agree that six weeks is not time enough to discuss the important things that we have to discuss in a province as vast as Ontario. I think we come down here, and we rush these things through, and we are criticized for talking about our constituencies and doing those things that are very necessary as members

of our constituencies in this Legislature. I think the only answer is we should have a longer time to decide the important issues that come before this House. My suggestion to the hon. Prime Minister, and I think the alternative in this, is, first, that we should reconvene after Easter recess or that the government recommend to the Lieutenant Governor that a special session be called to discuss these most important agricultural considerations within four months of the close of this particular session. I am serious in this matter. It is most necessary, as we all know, to have a proper consultation with the Dominion authorities on matters that concern the products of the farm, which, in the final analysis, depend a good deal on our export trade.

Now, as I said before, this Legislature is called to do a necessary business in the province of Ontario, and indulging in political manoeuvering during the normal life of the Legislature will be strongly condemned by far the greater part of the electorate of this province when the truth is told.

Our relatives and friends are not fighting for this kind of farce. Every hon. member of this group, the CCF, as our leader has stated, is willing to cooperate in constructive legislation for the people of Ontario, and actually judge everything exactly on its merits and act accordingly.

Some members of the Commission made a special trip through Northern Ontario, - I believe there were five members, - and they held several sittings, and heard briefs presented by farmers and farm organizations in that part of the country. The report has brought out a small supplement

of this northern situation, and, first, I intend to deal with agriculture as a whole in the province, and then I am going to touch, briefly, on the northern Ontario situation.

Much has been said in the past year about farm prosperity gained through better prices for farm products and a market for what is produced. The farmers have been praised for this production, and have been credited with doing it through patriotic motives. I believe it is commonly stated we have 40% more production in the last year, with 30% less farm help. But, let us look at this more closely. The average age of the farmer in Ontario to-day, the operator of the farm, is between fifty and fifty-five years. This certainly shows, with this splendid production that a good many people are overworked, at this advanced age, on the farms of Ontario.

How did they do it? Well, to some degree, relatively small, by modern machines and modern conveniences, which have helped.

The main reason for this production is the fact that men and women on the farms of Ontario have worked fourteen to eighteen hours a day, far beyond their strength. This does help eliminate some of the old-age pensions. I think you will remember, back in the heavy snow storm in Toronto, in December, the newspapers were warning the people over fifty years of age to stay away from the business end of a snow shovel, but I will tell you the farmers do work hard, and there is a limit to what they can do.

Now, why do these farmers work such long hours? There may be several reasons. Most of them have boys and girls in the armed forces, and they are trying to keep the old home together. They are patriotic Canadians, and they

want to produce this very necessary ammunition of war, and they are also striving to clear off mortgages and provide some security for the future.

The main incentive has been better prices than from 1930 to 1939. It has been said, and any farmer, almost, that you approach on his farm will say, if we give him the price he can produce the stuff. This is very true, but there is a good deal behind the structure of farm prices in Canada, as well as in other parts of the world. I think there is a false conception brought about in Ontario of the actual conditions of agriculture at the present time. The farmers of Ontario are not coming out of this war in nearly the same relatively good condition that they did from the war of 1914 to 1918. You will remember at that time we did not have any price restrictions, and you will also remember at that time there was no great shortage of implements. You will remember that the prices of implements, in a good many cases, were about two thirds of what they are to-day. In other words, we had, at that time, a relatively well-balanced economy in this country, and the farmer, himself, had a chance to come out of that in as good a financial condition as the people in other industries.

Now, it is a little different in this war. After that high period of prosperity in the last war, it is true we, as farmers, were probably over-enthusiastic, and we did certain things that we had to pay for later. However, we did run into the depression in the '30's, but I am not going over that now. In 1939, after going through this period of depression on the farms of Canada, we were relatively in rather a poor shape, from every angle, to accept this increased production that was necessary for war. That is, our

buildings were run down, our stock, in some cases, was not as good as it might have been, our equipment was rather poor, and then we find, in November, 1941, the price-ceiling regulations came on in our Dominion Government, which we think, on the whole, were very good, but the prices of farm products were not placed in their proper relative position at that time. The farmers have been carrying on nobly, with this decreased background of essential machinery, buildings and help for productivity.

Now, it is true we have bolstered farm prices up since 1941 by subsidies. We farmers appreciate this assistance from the Government in subsidizing our products. We may have to use this method of assisting farm prices for some time to come in the transition period.

However, while we are certainly in favour of subsidies, we recognize subsidies are not a permanent answer for the price of products on the farm. Subsidies are a temporary form of relief, and farmers, as such, cannot put much confidence in them. Subsidies are not sound financing, and in a period of shrinking revenues would get us into considerable difficulty. The tendency is to subsidize more and more agricultural production, rather than getting at andremoving the causes of poor farm returns.

In the year ending March 31, 1944, the consolidated revenue fund paid out, through the Department of Agriculture in this province, in subsidies to the farmers of this province, $3,235,767.44, or 61% of the total expenditure of the Department.

In the year ending March 31, 1945, the percentage will be greater, and next year will be well over 70% of the expenditure of the Department of Agriculture. I know that

is necessary, and I know the farmers of Ontario have to have this protection, to enable them to bring the production they are asked for, but at the same time we must consider what we can do to get at the position where farmers can get the price that they should have for the products they produce. While this relief helps the farmers who are producing these particular farm products, it has to be paid for by all the people of the province, and also by some farmers who are not pro-
4. ducing articles that would be covered by subsidies.

I repeat again that we believe in the strong protecting the weak, and the full backing of the war effort, but this is not the solution, and we must find something more permanent.

The Interim Report of the Commission of Enquiry shows this to be quite an involved problem. To establish a price floor under farm products, with every farmer asking for a guaranteed price, is something that is certainly going to test the ingenuity of this country and this province. The Government of Ontario, under the wide powers of the Farm Products Control Act, can do a great deal, and when marketing schemes are endorsed by the hon. Minister, orderly marketing and regulating of farm products come into force.

Now, we must recognize that complete control or regulation of farm products must, in the final analysis, rest with the Dominion authorities. You simply cannot take care of agricultural products of Ontario by setting up an Ontario House in London. We have to have a consultation with the Dominion authorities. No province, itself, can do this, and, as was pointed out before, we must do what we can to supply the people within the province and

cooperate with the Dominion authorities to bring about the necessary regulations to take care of what is used within the country and exported.

This does not excuse this Government, or any previous administration in Ontario, from not seeking the full cooperation of the Dominion authorities. I have been in the Cooperative Movement a long time, myself, as I suppose many other hon. members of the House have, and I have found, in the Cooperative Movement, when we come up to get something done we do not fight with them; we insist upon having a hearing, and we insist upon sitting around the table and discussing these things, and I suggest every farmer in this Legislature will agree with me on most of the ills of agriculture, and I think probably we could get together and discuss some ways of removing some of the causes of the condition that we find ourselves in to-day.

It burns me up to see the people of Ontario, and the rest of Canada, kept from getting rightful consideration, while leaders of this country parry back and forth with senseless nonsense for a political advantage, aided and abetted by the newspapers of this country. I think we have seen plenty of that in this House.

The "Toronto Star" backs Hepburn; the "Globe and Mail" backs Drew. Big business on Bay Street gambles on the possible winner, and the people of Ontario pay through the nose. The only good thing that comes out of it all is that they may slap each other out of the picture.

The boys who are fighting for us overseas are not fighting for this type of consideration. They are fighting in order that we may preserve something that is fit for them to come back to.

Now, in the floor prices of farm products in the report of the Commission, we have some comments that I would like to quote here:

> "The following views are commonly held by most groups in our National Society.
>
> "1. That agriculture is entitled to the Active support of all interests within the nation to protect it from being the chief absorber of the impact of economic crises and crush 'the unenviable position of the agents of primary production.'
>
> 2. (And this is a most important comment.) That farmers having been denied, through price ceiling necessity, many of the economic gains that normally would have compensated them for their depression losses, and having borne a magnificent share of war production in the face of reduced labour and machinery, to the probable detriment of their market positions, after the war are entitled to special, national consideration in the post-war period, particularly as their excess production, unlike that of other war production, was called out at relatively no great cost to the public.

In No. 3, I would like to quote, in part:

> "That the maintenance of farm purchasing power, by stable prices, is at all times the most potent factor in contributing to the prosperity of all elements in the national community."

To establish adequate guaranteed floor prices, it would be logical to conclude that in the event of over-production of a given product it would be necessary to establish some measure of planning and control and delivery on a quota system to be equitable and maintain the desired constant orderly flow of goods to the market.

(Page No. 1791 follows.)

FF1

3-20-45
Mr. Lockhart.

to be equitable and maintain the desired continent flow of goods to the market.

Now, the Commission asks a question, and I quote:

It seems logical that if the Provincial and National economy is to attain and maintain the highest possible standard, all classes of society will have to subsist on the same basis as much as possible; and I suggest that we should take one clause of the report of the Commission of Inquiry which does seem the most logical solution of the difficulty, and that is Clause (b) on Page 5 of this Report:

> "To assure the farmer a financial return comparable with that of producers and workmen on the same general net income level" --

I have put in that word "net".

Now, our hope has extended over a period of years is to get an adequate standard of living for all the people of this country, it is necessary that we should have this income on a level, that is so that we would have a purchasing power, in the farm groups of the country, that would enable them to purchase their needs from those people who produce in industries, and vice versa. In any case, it will be necessary to sustain our agricultural economy by artificial means until such times as we can, by education, soil survey, hydro development, and lower costs of machinery and some

cooperation and use of same to cut our costs of production and get them on a far more uniform basis than we have today.

In other words, in addition to getting a farm structure in the country which is equitable to keep the purchasing power of the farmers up to where it should be, we also much do those things that will put our farmers on a more efficient basis of production in this country, to produce a standard of living in Canada that a man who is producing all the goods that the people can use and distribute them.

We believe that the farm family on the family farm, in the Province of Ontario is a sound basis of our social rural structure; and we believe that one of the sound basis for success in the future is to keep the producing power of these farm families at the highest possible level.

We have made many mistakes in agriculture in the past but let us profit in the future by our experience. While we are working on post-war rehabilitation it is quite sound to suggest that we also take care of the civilian production and conditions as we have them at present.

One of the basic troubles underlying the cost of production in this country is the fact that unsuitable, oftentimes submarginal lands, in the past, have been opened for production. Let us avoid that mistake in the future. Let the agricultural land settlement of the future also be determined, first, on the inherent characteristics of the soil itself on that farm to produce. The value of this is born out by the soil surveys that have been taken in this Province, and also by looking at the conditions of some of

our farm homes and the production of our farm lands in Ontario.

Conservation has been given a very close study by foresters at least; and I join with the Hon. Member from Grey South (Mr. Oliver), Mr. Speaker, in suggesting to the Hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Porter) that this is one of the very important things of the future, to plan, in colonization or in resettlement in this country, of the basic inherent characteristics of the land to produce.

Now, in consideration of rural education, in the primary and secondary schools and extension of large school areas in the country, under central local administration, I am quite in accord with the recommendations of the Commission.

We certainly consider education one of the most important aspects of rural life. I do not agree with my friend, the Hon. Provincial treasurer, that the government is getting off on the right foot in the present system of increasing grants, that is, if the government considers equality of educational opportunity to every child to the extent of his or her mental capacity or ability to learn. The farmers are just as far behind the urban worker in secondary educational facilities as they are in their share of the national income, and that is a long way.

To bring the present urban standards to the rural children, the far greater portion of the additional grants, if not all, should be spent in placing secondary and vocational facilities in the rural areas until fully and uniformly balanced in the Province.

The Provincial Treasurer has used his own County, I believe Victoria County, as an illustration showing how

these grants work to some advantage. I am going to use an illustration of my own, and I think he will quite likely be able to follow it. I live in a rural area, and, back in 1921, in that area we set up a rural consolidated school, teaching up to the second year, which eliminated three one room schools. I will agree that it has been of great advantage to that community.

This additional grant to this particular school, which is Morley Consolidated School at Stratton, Ontario, does not lower the taxes on my farm one cent, and I am an average tax payer in that community. But our son, who has been going to school this past two years getting his higher education, has to board forty miles away. Our daughter, also has to go, in September to this same school.

I think the Provincial treasurer can easily see from this practical illustration that it would take quite a lot of money to compensate for the costs we have in getting our children as far as even junior matriculation.

Of course, the answer is that we should have perhaps one more room in that school, and one more teacher and the various facilities that go with it; but I think probably the Provincial Treasurer will say to me, in answer, Just wait and see and probably this will work out. But I have been waiting to see this thing for the past twenty years; and a great many of the people of this country have been forced to make great sacrifices in order to get their boys and girls in school.

MR. FROST: Did I understand the Hon. member to say that this grant does not make any difference to the taxes in his municipality?

MR. LOCKHART: In actual practice, Mr. Provincial

Treasurer, our school this year gets $800.00 extra grants.

MR. FROST: What did it get last year?

MR. LOCKHART: I cannot tell you that, but it gets $800.00 extra grant, for this school has to replace five one room schools.

MR. FROST: Perhaps the Hon. member should wait until the grants are arranged there. You see, if there is an amalgamation of five schools, to start with, they would get a subsidy of one hundred dollars a school, to start with, and then they would get whatever the rate of grant is. What is the rate in your community?

MR. LOCKHART: Seventy-five per cent.

MR. FROST: Then, you see, that would be five hundred dollars for the combined school section, plus seventy-five per cent of yours costs. That is only on the public school costs. Are they teaching any secondary education there?

MR. LOCKHART: Up to the second year.

MR. FROST: Then you will receive, in the second year end of it, up to eighty-five per cent.

I think when you see the grants you will see the difference. If you will give me the particulars of your section, I will have the grants worked out which they will receive.

In a comparable school, for instance, in that mariposa school there is a public school with secondary educational facilities, and I think the grants to that school are increased from about seven hundred dollars up to roughly forty-five hundred dollars.

In your school perhaps the rural grants were higher, because perhaps it was an assisted school in any event. But

I will be very glad to have it worked out for my hon. friend and give him the particulars.

MR. LOCKHART: Perhaps the Hon. Provincial Treasurer just did not listen carefully to what I said. I said it covered the area which to-day would need five one roomed schools. Actually, it replaced three schools back in 1921, but additional Indian territory has been taken into that territory and our school system has had to take that in, at present.

Unfortunately, quite a lot of our people are not in as good a position to get educational facilities, because our people in the rural areas have to make great sacrifices to get their children this secondary education. And I said before, I think, that when this system was being set up, if they were carrying out the point that additional educational facilities were to be put to the place where rural children might get it, according to his or her mental capacity, the whole system should have been set up on that basis, first.

Now, the Farm National Radio Forum during January had quite a discussion of this school problem in Canada; and in the Province of Ontario seventy-five per cent of the people reporting said that they would be quite willing to pay the additional taxes if they were able to get the additional educatinnal facilities.

The think I am pointing out is this, that relatively the whole difference in taxation, or the relief from taxation, is nothing compared with the cost which we residents in rural districts have to pay to get our boys and girls properly educated in the Province of Ontario.

Now, in the recommendations of the Commission with regard to the Ontario Agricultural College: as I said in the beginning, we cannot go into that very extensively, because we do not know what is in the mind of the Government yet as to the disposition of this college.

MR. A. BELANGER (Prescott): Will you ever know?

MR. LOCKHART: However, I understand the hon. Minister is quite definitely of the opinion that it should be taken out from under the direction of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy), and I think with that I heartily agree.

However, the O.A.C., due to probably some extent the large size of the province, has not been able to do the job for agriculture that it should have done in the years gone past. Relatively very few of our boys from the farm areas have been able to take advantage of the facilities of this college. Too many of those who have gone to the college, other than those who have come back probably as agricultural representatives, have been absorbed into industry and have gotten away from the rural areas altogether.

The Commission has recommended that a special course of three months duration should be set up in districts and counties of the province to give some additional agricultural education to the people of these areas. That is all right for a step, but it does not go far enough. I think that there should be practical demonstration farms in every county and district in the province of Ontario. On our trip to the north last September, I was quite impressed by the little demonstration farm up at Herst, which has had very capable direction, and has contributed

quite largely to the advantage of those farmers in that area, and you can also see the results in the breeding stock which has been turned out from that little farm.

I do not agree with the Commission that this special farm, which is picked out, where there is a good type of farm, where demonstrations can be set up, fills the bill in any way. I know, from practical experience, that these people are far too busy, and certainly it upsets their farming operations a great deal to have people coming around and asking questions, and visiting these farms. It just does not cover it.

Now, the second point I would like to make is in regard to hydro in this province, because hydro is one of the very important considerations in cutting the cost of farm operations, and bringing a high standard of living to the rural people.

Personally, I deplore the fact that it is developed on a municipal, rather than a provincial basis in this province. It can be, and is used by this Government -- and previous administrations -- as a political advantage in advertising the lowering of rates at election time. I think that is one thing that should be kept entirely out of politics. Certainly we should get hydro power at the lowest possible cost, but I think that profits of a hydro should be used to spread the hydro further and further through the province again, taking care of the people who may be in areas where it is not possible to get the number of contracts required to the mile.

It would also relieve some of the congestion, which we have in these big areas with industry being drawn into

these cities through cheaper power. Industry thrives on electrical energy, and the only way to decentralize it is to decentralize hydro itself.

I am sure the people of the farm areas would be glad to exchange sunshine and green grass and fresh air to the little children south of the General Hospital, within sight of the financial parasites of Canada, down here on Bay Street, and also in sight of the monumant to Sir Adam Beck, the father of hydro in this province.

Hydro is a natural resource, and it should be used for the benefit of all the people of the province, because it belongs to the people of Ontario. We can go one step further, and it would be one step further in benefiting rural areas, and also urban, and that is we should socialize the manufacturing distribution of all the equipment and hydro supplies, which are used in this province.

Farm machinery, too, makes up one of the highest costs of operating our farms, and it was brought out in the Sirois Commission Report several years ago that definitely there was a monopoly of farm machinery in Canada, and certain recommendations were brought forth, and we farmers well remember that rather than lowering the cost of farm machinery, it actually increased it. The cost of farm machinery is a big problem on the 80 or 100 or 160 acre farms in Ontario, and certainly this is one thing that the province can do, within its own right, and that is to give some relief to farmers in cutting down the prices of farm implements.

Actually there is no competition in the implement

industry at all; it is a monopoly. The only competition is in the distribution, and that adds to the cost.

I agree entirely with the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) that the report of the Livestock Committee and the Commission of Enquiry is first-class, and I think this Government, if they are going all the way in eliminating those scrub sires, in all lines of livestock in the province of Ontario, will certainly have the backing of all the farmers who are good farmers, and I think if consideration was given to the relief of those people who cannot afford to get these good sires, everybody will be happy, and we will have a better type of livestock in this country in a very short period of time.

I was quite interested this winter in the Commission that was set up across Canada to study the income tax on co-operative organizations, and I spent a half a day down here at Osgoode Hall taking in some of those proceedings. I was certainly amazed at the lack of understanding on the part of some of those private enterprises in presenting their briefs; they certainly did not know very much about the construction of a brief, or what was behind it.

On the other hand, I was quite proud of the way our farm people were able to get up there before the lawyers and answer the questions, and present their briefs in a manner which the on-looker could quite easily understand.

It was brought out quite conclusively in the brief of the investment dealers in Canada -- and I think every hon. member in this House has a copy of that brief -- that the purpose really behind this whole investigation was not to get more money for Mr. Ilsley in income tax

returns, but to try and eliminate the co-operative organizations in Canada.

And the official opposition in this Assembly, will fight to the last ditch any infringement of the rights of co-operative organizations operating under Rochdale principles in this province.

Another important feature I would like to deal with is the problem of rural credit, and it has been dealt with quite effectively in the report of the Commission.

Purchasing power has been siphoned off from the rural areas, to a large extent in the past, with high interest rates on the various operations that a farmer has to carry out in the ordinary consideration of his business. I notice to-day that the banks of this country are very friendly to the farmers, but I can well remember back in 1930 when they were not quite so friendly, and I would certainly say to the farmers of this province that they go ahead in their co-operative credit unions to the extent, as the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) has pointed out, to where they will be able to control their own credit facilities, at least on a short-time basis. I also believe that the state has to take definite part in long-term credit arrangements. I think it should be done on a Federal basis, but I do believe that the state must take an active part in producing credit at a low rate of interest.

Now, as I said before, five members of the Commission of Enquiry, including the Chairman, and the Secretary, made a trip to the north and west, as far as Rainy River and Kenora, and received briefs from organizations in that area. All the recommendations of the Commission are applicable in the north, but there are certain features of the

north that are slightly different from the rest of the province. I think that is due in part to the fact that timbering has been carried on largely in the past, and probably the farmers did not get themselves as well-established on the land as they might.

However, the north is producing a great deal of wealth which has been used in this southern part of the province, and certainly in the near future special consideration should be given to the north, and I think we are just asking for what is coming to us.

Here are some of the general conditions which apply in the north more than they do in the southern part of the province.

First, we have a lot of marketing facilities. That is due, to a great extent, to the scattered population in the northern areas.

We need drainage there; we are in the same position probably as this province was thirty or forty years ago, and we have to get this drainage done by power implements and at a cost, if possible, to the people.

There is also in the area large areas of land where the timber has been cleared off; the soil is good, but the stumps are not off the land, and heavier units of machinery will have to be provided for clearing this land.

Another thing we need in the north is more co-operation between the Governmental departments operating in the area. I think this is one place where perhaps the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Porter) might do something to get a little more co-ordination between the various departments in the north.

I think sometimes they get too far from the centre of Government, and take advantage of the situation. I do appeal at the present time for more representations to some of the Ministers in regard to this matter.

Then we have a lack of veterinary services in the north. I think perhaps that is true more or less all over the province, but more especially in the northern areas.

We have good agricultural representatives in the north, but for the most part they have too much territory, and in some cases have to do a great deal of the veterinary work in that area.

We need probably some new settlement and some re-settlement in the areas of good soil where educational, roads, hydro, and other services can be supplied. That is one thing which is known to all hon. members of this House as something which has to be done very carefully, and if we are going to get these various services distributed throughout the north, certainly we must get more farm population, on our better quality of land.

I notice that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) has announced that a special Deputy Minister is going to be placed in the north country, and I think that is one thing which is long-overdue, because certainly we need somebody up there who can co-ordinate the various activities in the north, and get proper representation, something similar to what they have in the southern part of the province.

It has been borne upon me, quite extensively during this past year in visiting many of the farmers' meetings down here in the King Edward Hotel. That is one thing we farmers in the north can never enjoy, due to the vast size

of this province, and certainly the only answer to that is to set up some similar set-up in the central part of the northern area itself.

The official Opposition of this House recognizes the position of agriculture in this province and the importance of same, and, as I said before, we will do everything in our power to co-operate in anything constructive that can be put forth by this Government at this time, and again I say that we should consider sitting here a longer period of time to consider the most important things which are placed before the House.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me state most emphatically that our party, the C.C.F., does not believe that there is any necessity for an election in the province at this time. We do not believe that the citizens of Ontario want an election on issues of political manoeuvering for position. We do not believe that the people of Ontario will appreciate the holding of an election while their boys and girls are on the fighting fronts, with only two Sessions held of this 21st Legislature.

We, in the C.C.F., have no illusions as to what is required in the transition from a war economy to a peace economy; neither have we any illusions in regard to the necessity for complete co-operation with the Federal authorities, no matter what their political stripe may be in the immediate and post-war world.

The position of this Government is quite clear. If they cannot carry out their mandate from the people, without constant consideration of political party advantage, then the Conservative Government in Ontario should resign, and make way for this co-operative common-

wealth federation opposition.

We have a program which considers the needs of the people, and that is our first consideration.

MR. ROBERT D. THORNBERRY (Hamilton, Centre): Mr. Speaker, and hon. members of the House:

A good many words have been used in this debate and a vast amount of territory covered. One would almost be inclined to think that nothing new could be added. I find, however, that each speaker outside of this group leaves so many inaccuracies to be corrected that I could take until Easter to straighten them out.

To the many nice things said for the mover and seconder of the address in reply I will simply say "me too". I might say, however, that on listening to the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk I was reminded of a well-known "ad" that was prevalent some years ago. It depicted a small terrier listening to a large horn and entitled "His Master's Voice".

As one of the 61 new members in this House, Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I do not take kindly to so much ritual and ceremony. I have never been accustomed to it and I don't believe any new member is unless perhaps the lawyer members who are used to similar stuffiness in court. I believe that we could dispense with a lot of it without interfering or losing anything democratic. I did have some years experience on the Hamilton City Council and I much prefer the lack of formality of that body as compared to this. I like better still, however, the invigorating and refreshing simple procedure of the Trade Union meetings.

I am appreciative of the opportunity that democracy

has afforded me of taking part in the deliberations of this Assembly. This democracy I speak of is something to cherish, it has been handed down to us common people by our forebears. The extent of this democracy was dearly won and wrested from the ruling class only after many a bitter struggle. The price of retaining this democratic freedom is eternal vigilance and because it is so, is the reason I recognize my obligation as a democrat and have allowed my fellow citizens to make the decision that I was a fit and proper person to represent them here in this House. Towards that end I dedicate my humble efforts.

This seat that I occupy or, rather, the riding I represent, has historic significance, because it was in 1906 that the late Alan Studholme was first elected to this Assembly. He was the first labour member elected to any parliament in Canada. Although the seat that he represented was Hamilton-East, although at that time Hamilton-East covered a large part of the territory that is now Hamilton-Centre, so that to some extent I feel I am following in the shoes of the great Alan Studholme. Hamilton seems to have pioneered in producing some of the first and most progressive members of parliament, for in 1934 Hamilton-East elected the only C.C.F. member of this House in the person of Sam Lawrence, now Mayor of Hamilton, who alone battled the reactionary Government of that day as well as the equally reactionary Official Opposition.

Since last Session, Mr. Speaker, there have been a few changes in the seating arrangements. The "wandering boys" of the Liberal corporal's guard have closed their ranks and seem intent on dying with their boots on. My

esteemed colleagues from Wellington-South and Essex have also crossed to the right wing of the House which has been a cause of some measure of disappointment to myself and others. Whether changing sides is the result of weakness or strength, it always succeeds in making enemies as well as friends. I'm sure time alone will determine whether my former colleages have served their own or their constituents interests best.

Changing sides has been perhaps more often a tragedy in history. In my own city of Hamilton some fourteen years ago a certain individual rode into the Federal parliament on the backs of the common people. But the wining and dining and glitter and dazzle of position weaned him away from the common cause that he had pledged himself to support and to-day he enjoys the distinction of being the most hated member of the King cabinet. I wouldn't for a minute be so unkind as to compare my late colleagues to the individual just mentioned. I rather compare their case to that of the late Ramsay McDonald who in his old age and suffering from senile decay took a certain course that he believed in. Events several weeks later proved that his fears had no foundation. But although some historians will record him as a traitor, my own opinion is that he was sincere, but like my two former colleagues in this House, he was the victim of bad advice.

When I think of this thing called the Tragedy of Changing Sides, I am reminded of a verse by Whittier which he wrote over the tragedy of Daniel Webster -

> "Revile them not -- the Tempter hath a
> snare for all,
> And pitying tears, not scorn and wrath,
> befit their Befall;"

I am a member of this group because my fellow-members are men and women who are striving for the same goal in the same manner. We are a team who are working together because in working together there is added strength and momentum. If the time ever comes when I decide to tack into winds of reaction instead of bucking them head on, the decision to leave the group will be mine to make, but the decision to remain in this House I do not consider as being mine to make, but belongs solely to the electorate of my constituency. To deprive them of the opportunity of endorsing my reactions would be to play politics.

MR. LESLIE HANCOCK (Wellington South): You will have a chance, too.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. THORNBERRY: I noticed in this last Session that playing politics took up a big portion of our time. The jockeying around, in order to strengthen position of one party of another, either Mackenzie King or John Bracken, is something that took up a great deal of our time. Personally, I would like to lay the blame right at the feet of the hon. Prime Minister of this province, because last Session it became very boring to have the hon. Prime Minister get up before the Orders of the Day and give us a little sermon on the beer situation. In fact, I came to the conclusion that he was not so much interested in his "22 points" as he was in his "22 pints".

HON. LESLIE FROST (Provincial Treasurer): 24 pints.

MR. THORNBERRY: I listened with a great deal of interest and amusement to various other speakers in this

debate. The one that impressed me most was that of the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Duff). After listening to his constructive suggestions I am of the opinion that there is not much difference in his outlook and that of this group.

The Minister of Labour made a very verbose speech which was very disappointing because while there were many words in it, there was no substance. I rather expect it was a substantiation of the Minister's claim last year that he was one of the little people. A little man trying to do a big man's job. He mentioned the fact that it was so-called reactionary Toryism that brought in Workmen's Compensation, but I'm sure he wouldn't have believed that when he was a member of the Carpenters' Union. He has been living on "lark's wings" too long.

It was with mixed feelings that I listened to the "effervescent and disordered droolings" of the member for Huron (Mr. William Taylor). It is a strange thing that inaccuracies up to a certain point are boring, past that point they become irritating, but past a further point it becomes amusing. I am glad to say that the speech of the hon. member for Huron ran the gamut of all three emotions. In listening to his speech I was reminded of a story concerning Hannibal, Caesar and Napoleon.

I am not a student of ancient history, but I take it that Hannibal was a great warrior in his day, similar to Caesar and Napoleon, and they were looking at this war from where they happened to be -- I do not know whether they were looking down or up -- but Hannibal said, "Boy, oh boy, give me those tiger tanks, what I could have done with those things," and Caesar said, "Not me, give me those Lancaster bombers, and I would still have the Roman Empire,"

and they turned to Napoleon, and he said, "Not me, give me Doctor Goebels, and the world would never have known I had lost this war."

What I mean by that, Mr. Speaker, is that if the hon. member for Huron (Mr. William Taylor) gets around Ontario enough, he will "kid" the people into believing that the 22 points have been implemented. In fact, I have come to the conclusion that he was the hon. Prime Minister's "secret weapon".

He had a very difficult time explaining the reference to two books. And he was hazy concerning the titles, the publishers, and everything else about them.

I think just for his enlightenment -- because he might want the information for another time -- I would like to quote to him just what the press of this country had to say about "Social Planning for Canada". Now, "Social Planning for Canada" was compiled by the League for Social Reconstruction, a non-political body, and whose views, the C.C.F. party more or less endorse.

MR. TAYLOR: You do know the books I referred to?

MR. THORNBERRY: I take it you were referring to "Social Planning for Canada", because these were your own words, taken from Hansard:

The Toronto Daily Star said:

> "It is a great service that these writers have rendered to Canada. The book impresses me as epoch-making. I should not be surprised if it comes to hold such a place in Canadian economic literature as Adam Smith's 'Wealth of Nations' did in England nearly two centuries ago."

That is a fairly substantial recommendation. Now,

I will read what the "World Wide" said:

> "We write, perhaps with prejudice, certainly with fervour, when we say that this volume will constitute the most significant, serious, and practical political manifesto so far produced in Canada."

Then, the "Witness and Canadian Homestead" said this:

> "The value of such an earnest and informed attempt to cope with our national problems from the standpoint of social betterment cannot be over-estimated."

Now, I would like to quote what the "Mail and Empire" said -- and the "Mail and Empire", everybody will acknowledge, is the Gospel, according to the Tory party. It says:

> "Social Planning in Canada is a milepost in the economic life of the nation, which sets a new standard of accuracy and disinterestedness. The Doomsday Book of Canada."

That is the "Mail and Empire".

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I take it from that that the hon. member for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Thornberry) approves of a social plan for Canada?

MR. THORNBERRY: Yes, I certainly do.

MR. TAYLOR: Would the hon. member for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Thornberry) care to have it reprinted and put back into publication?

MR. THORNBERRY: Now, the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor) spoke at great length concerning rationalized socialism, and different types of socialism. For his information, there is only one type of socialism. Socialism is social ownership, and I would like to quote what Sir Norman Angell said to a group of American news-

papermen, when he visited that country:

> "The second fact to note is this: about the biggest business in the country is not a capitalist business at all, but a socialist business. It is the great co-operatives, wholesale and retail, the result of working-class organization."

I hope we get the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor) straightened out as to what socialism is, because the C.C.F. believes in social ownership, when the needs of the people demand it, and not before. There is no necessity for it before, if private enterprise does the job up to a certain degree. We would never think of harvesting a sapling tree; we will wait until it grows to its full growth, and then harvest it, and the same way with ownership of the means of production and distribution of this country. They do not need to be brought under social ownership until it is necessary.

It is a strange thing that every bit of social ownership we have to-day -- every bit of social security -- has only been wrung from the old parties against their will, namely hydro, the T.T.C., old age pensions, unemployment insurance, and family allowances.

We have the hydro, the result of pressure from underneath -- and agitation. So, in order to keep the votes of these people, oh, sure, I do not know what party passed it, the Tories or the other half of the Tory party, the Liberals, -- but we have the T.T.C.; all those things, but the people really responsible are the working people. It was the late J. S. Woodsworth who was responsible for the meagre form of old age pensions we have in the books. You might also say he was equally responsible for unemployment insurance. Only as a last gesture to hold their positions do the old parties ever give us anything.

The C.C.F. is just as responsible for these measures as they have been for family allowances, because if it were not for the C.C.F., we would not have had family allowances.

Now, during the last campaign it was very amusing to hear some of the names the C.C.F. were called, but we have become callous to hearing ourselves called names, especially being labelled "Communists", and I think it ill-becomes the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. McLeod) to indulge in that old popular pastime, for no other reason than to confuse people. The C.C.F. arose out of the needs of the people; it will support every measure that is a forward step, and oppose every measure that is a backward step. Government interference has gone as far as it is possible to help the people. The next step must be social ownership of that production or service unit that has outlived its usefulness under private ownership. We can safely say then that the real "liberalism" of to-day is the C.C.F. program of social ownership where necessary. The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) apparently takes exception to the fact that the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) defended himself against a charge of being communist in court. He got a clean bill of health and $1.01, which proves that being charged with being a communist is a pretty cheap charge. Surely the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr.MacLeod) must realize that it was the spade work done by the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) that helped Stewart Smith get that 42,000 votes. The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) picks up the torch of reaction to criticize and ridicule the record of the New Zealand Government.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): I did not criticize

them.

MR. THORNBERRY: About the enterprise of New Zealand being prosperous? I do not see anything the matter with New Zealand. To me the enterprising New Zealand is prosperoud; why should it not be?

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I did not criticize it.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): You sneered at it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. THORNBERRY: That was the impression that every hon. member on this side of the House received; if you did not criticize, you talked in a derogatory and sneering manner against New Zealand.

No one suggested that New Zealand is completely socialized. The hon. member makes much of the fact that private enterprise has prospered in the advent of the labour government which is the equivalent of the C.C.F. There is nothing to complain about in that, because where any share of the national economy is socialized, the remaining private enterprise becomes more prosperous. That is exactly how it should be and will be in Canada.

The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) has a long-range purpose, however, which is to sabotage the C.C.F. The "phony" alliance with big business and the Hepburn gang is all part of that scheme.

Now, nobody claims that you can set the alarm clock to-night, and wind it up, and when it goes off in the morning you will have socialism. It is not as simple as that, although the people in New Zealand have made as much progress as anybody else in the world.

They have the greatest social security program in the world; they provide super-annuation benefits for all persons over sixty-five; aged benefits for all over sixty; cash benefits for invalids, widows, and orphans and children under sixteen; temporary relief for those sick or disabled or impaired; it has a public health program which provides hospitalization and medical services to its entire population, and that includes the major part of the cost of general practitioners, and specialists, nurses, medical and surgical expenses, and hospital care, full maternity care, and various supplementary benefits such as part of X-ray and diagnostic services.

It has a housing program under which seventeen thousand attractive low-rent homes were built in 150 towns, between 1937 and 1939 -- seventeen thousand in those two years. How does that compare with our situation in Canada? Surely it is nothing to sneer at -- the progress in New Zealand? If private enterprise is more prosperous, it is because they have taken over more means of production and put more money into the hands of the people, so that they can make private enterprise more prosperous.

Mr. Speaker, as the house is now six o'clock, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

The House recessed until eight o'clock p.m.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Toronto, Ontario,
Tuesday, March 20, 1945.

EVENING SESSION

The House resumed at 8 o'clock.

MR. ROBERT D. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, before we adjourned at 6 o'clock, I had made mention of the different phases of social legislation that had been passed in this province and all Canada. While I agree that other governments have had the credit, we will say, of passing it, as the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) has repeatedly stated, we do not care who gets the credit, as long as the people get the benefit.

I have some words to say to the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), and I say them with all fairness and kindness, but rather reluctantly. I feel, in view of his own remarks a little counter-remark is not out of place. In making his remarks, I feel the hon. member for Bellwoods has a long-range purpose in these snipes at the CCF. The constituents that elected him are the same type of people that elected me, and other hon. members in this group. I do not think they appreciate this sniping at the CCF or sabotaging of the CCF, because they are not very much impressed with any suggestion of a phony alliance between the progressive-thinking people and the people with the background and history of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn), and anybody that would suggest for one minute that

their interests lay behind the hon. member for Elgin, I believe are betraying their constituents, or else they are just plain muts.

I feel I am just as sure, if not surer, than anyone else here, with a majority of some four thousand, although no one knows the fickleness of the people, but I am fully satisfied that they are fully satisfied with our party, and myself as the instrument for that party. I, personally, welcome an election, because there is nothing calculated better to keep the interest alive in people and keep our organization well oiled than an election, but I feel the people of this province feel an election is neither desirable nor necessary. The support of any Government should be based on the merits of its legislation, on that and that alone, not any jockeying around.

The present Government has had an opportunity to legislate for the people, and I think it can be admitted by the majority of this House that they have failed to do this, and it now must either move on or move over and let somebody else do the job who knows how. As the next largest group in this House, the people of Ontario will expect this group, the CCF, to form a Government and take over the reins from the feeble clutches of the Tories. And when we do that, it is up to every individual who has any progressiveness in his soul to support this Government based on the legislation that it brings down. That is the only manner in which it can support it. You cannot elect any group, and say, "We will support it on this basis and that basis." There are a number of people with a progressive outlook in this House, the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Duff), (there surely cannot be any difference to any extent between us,) the hon. member for

Grey South (Mr. Oliver). After listening to the address of the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. McDonald) last year, I am sure he is in the right church, but the wrong pew, and if he feels he can visualize some of the things he visualizes, he is due for a rude awakening.

The same can be said for a number of other people in this House. I do not know, I have no guarantee, but I feel an individual who has the tolerance and patience that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) exhibits must have a liberal share of democracy in his soul, only I suppose, by tradition. His father and grandfather, and so on, were Tories, and he feels he can work out his own problems in that party. He, too, will get a rude awakening.

I can mention the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Duckworth). He is a smart man, but also due for a rude awakening. These people will have to throw off the shackles of party discipline if they wish progressive legislation to pass through this Legislature.

People with the background of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) could never be trusted with responsibility, because his unsavory record speaks for itself. As far as the people are concerned, his record is one long line of disaster, - Oshawa, Kirkland Lake and Sarnia, - not one cent relief for any man or woman that went on strike. That is the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn).

And, I believe the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McEwing) said just the other day if you tried to get on with your neighbour, but he stabs you in the back, you can't trust him. There is no difference between Drew and Hepburn. Let us not fool ourselves. Let us look back to 1937, when they closed their ranks to the CIO to form a coalition, and

the hon. Prime Minister left his party, led by Earl Rowe.

The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) may take satisfaction out of the fact they paid the highest relief outside of the city of New York. We can attribute some of the relief to the fact that 55% of our boys examined for military service were found unfit, - that is, as a result of the old party leadership during the depression years, 55%, according to the figures tabled by the Hon. Humphrey Mitchell in the House of Commons, due to malnutrition and lack of food and clothing. We can also attribute to that the increase of 69% of juvenile delinquency in 1943 over 1942.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) said juvenile delinquency had gone down, but not according to the "Globe and Mail" of March 29, 1944. It had increased 69%.

Yes, I think the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) would do well to review the whole question, and come to some honest conclusion, because he will find leaning backwards results in permanent deformity.

There is a great deal of truth in the saying, "If you lie down with dogs you will get up with fleas." Of course, I am not suggesting the Liberals are a lot of lousy dogs.

Mr. Speaker, I know the leader of the Opposition group has dealt thoroughly with the twenty-two points, and has torn them into so many little pieces it is hardly possible to get another piece to tear in half again, but in starting my address I made some mention of democracy, and I would like to link that with the hon. Prime Minister's No. 1 point, that reads: "To do all in its power to maintain

institutions and strengthen the British partnership as the best guarantee of Canada's spiritual and material welfare."

Perhaps the hon. Prime Minister's conception of British institutions and my conception vary. My conception of British institutions is of those handed down to us by our forefathers, who won them with blood and sweat and tears. The right to organize into trade unions and cooperatives without being called communists, the right to form credit unions, free speech and free assembly, those are the institutions I am proud of. But, what is the hon. Prime Minister's conception? How does it synchronize with mine? I think, on June 16th, last year, when asked to comment on the CCF victory in Saskatchewan, the hon. Prime Minister said, in words to the effect that it should awaken the people of Canada from their complacency regarding the danger of national socialism. He even had one better on November 17th, 1943, before the Ontario Property Owners' Association, when he said, and I quote, "The CCF are not only national socialists, but are anti-British by their own declaration."

That is a fine statement for a man who lives in British institutions. Such careless and irresponsible statements of that nature, Mr. Speaker, are not calculated to preserve democracy or British institutions. That shows the fascist mentality the hon. Prime Minister has, and he has sufficient knowledge of political science and economic science to know he is bearing false witness against his neighbour, and if he has not got that knowledge, then he should not be Prime Minister, because such intolerance can only breed intolerance, and betrays a fascist mentality.

I believe Kipling had such a person in mind, perhaps, when he wrote an epitaph to a dead statesman, and

I quote:

"He could not dig - he dare not rob,
And so he died - to please the mob.
But now his lies are proved untrue
And he must face the men he slew."

The hon. Prime Minister knows that Hitler shot and interned the counterpart of the CCF movement in Germany, because he was in Germany around that time. He paid a fine visit to Germany and Italy, and came back singing "Hallelujah, praise them both."

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not made any attempt to stop this nonsense, because it has been unadulterated nonsense, wasting the time of the Legislature for the last two hours, but I want to say this, I came back from Germany at a time a lot of your people were voting for a contribution of one dollar for the defence of this country. I found Germany preparing for a contest, and I tried to warn this country of what was coming.

MR. THORNBERRY: Does the hon. Prime Minister deny he made those remarks?

MR. DREW: About what?

MR. THORNBERRY: The CCF being national socialists.

MR. DREW: I stand behind every statement I ever made, every one.

MR. THORNBERRY: Then, what I said goes, you have
4. a fascist mentality.

We heard the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) quote the hon. Prime Minister in some articles where he said everything to suggest that Canada should go fascist.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): That is a deliberate and cold-blooded falsehood, and it might as

well be called what it is.

MR. THORNBERRY: We have seen the hon. Prime Minister do considerable wriggling since the Session started, wriggling from one position to another, and I heard the hon. Prime Minister in the Centenary Church in Hamilton deface the pulpit, telling the people a lot of bologna about the state of Russia, how civilization had sunk to a new low ebb, - nothing was any good, the people were just waiting for an opportunity to destroy their communist government. I hope the hon. Prime Minister is God-fearing, and that since that time he has seen fit to get down on his bended knees and thank God for the courage of the great Red army.

As I mentioned before, we on this side of the House yield to no one in our admiration for the economic experiment being put into operation in Russia, and we yield to no one our sincere and democratic right to criticize the political administration of those economic people of Ontario.

The people of Ontario, and, indeed, all of Canada, have learned a great deal since this war began. One thing that they did learn was that if such contemptible statements and lies can be told about Russia by certain people, those same people, when speaking about the CCF, could not be relied on.

There is one other point of the twenty-two points I just want to draw to your attention, in conclusion, No. 19, which has already been mentioned:

> "To assure the public of adequate supplies of fuel, milk and other necessities."

The Government has made no attempt to deal with

5. that promise, which becomes particularly damning when we consider that in 1943 they moved the resolution when they were in the Opposition:

> "In the opinion of this House a fuel committee should be appointed to enquire into the fuel situation and to recommend to the Government measures to assure the greatest possible supply of fuel for the coming winter."

After eighteen months in office it becomes very evident the Tories still represent the abnormal privilege, and they cannot serve two masters. These hon. members in the old parties who are sincere about real progress will have to make up their minds whether the province of Ontario is going to go backward with the reactionary Toryism, or forward with the CCF.

MR. JOSEPH B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, at this time I rise to participate in this major debate in the House, and wish, first of all, to acknowledge the difficult task which you, Mr. Speaker, have during the Session. I know how difficult it is to deal with so many self-opinionated and experienced debaters, who are confident that their every word is of decisive importance, and it is because of that appreciation, Sir, that I never object to the occasional objection which you may find it necessary
6. to make when I am on my feet. I know it is part of a difficult task, and I, by no means am making an expression of disagreement in what I might have to say at any time.

MR. SPEAKER: You would not be offering felicitations to gain my sympathy?

MR. SALSBERG: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, now that you have warmed up to those few remarks, I might say I am occasionally suspicious you are deliberately

acting harshly toward me to lean toward those who may suspect me or my thoughts. But, I assure you, it is always understood I wish to join in with the hon. members of the House in the expression that went to the two hon. members who moved and seconded the motion on the Speech from the Throne. They are both very likeable men. They are highly esteemed by all hon. members of the House, and they are very modest, as you can see, as the seconder of the motion is engaged in his own applause. It is a great tribute, particularly in the Tory camp it is a great tribute when a section of the House can say these nice things to both the mover and seconder, and in both instances really mean them.

Now, as was my experience last year, Mr. Speaker, the most impressive speeches are those made by the farm members. That is not for one moment distracting from the contents and political significance of the speeches coming from the city representatives, but I feel every time I listen to a farm representative that I am listening to something sound and solid and sincere, and there is a
7. breath of earthliness and fresh air. That goes for practically all the farm representatives this year and last year.

The hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard), and other hon.members, have addressed this point, Mr. Speaker, about having the Sessions a little longer, enabling the hon. members to deal with problems more fully. Particularly was I impressed by the impressions brought back by the hon. member for York West of the British House of Commons and the question periods and free exchange of opinions in that House. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because we are

reaching a stage in this House where the hon. members almost have to apologize for saying anything. I think some hon. members on the treasury benches are trying to create the impression that there is a deliberate obstruction in the House, and so they label every question and every remark which is to their disliking as part of an obstructionist scheme.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is the case. It is an unpleasant position for a Government to be in, when it does not command a majority. That is undoubtedly true. But, because the Government does not command a majority does not mean that the other hon. members should not exercise their rights and their obligations in questioning and in speaking their minds freely without being charged that they are obstructing or wasting time. Ihave not noticed any waste of time in the House coming from the hon. members outside of the Government. I want to give a few examples of what I mean. For instance, I raised the question in this House about a small matter, if you wish to call it so, about a number of employees of the Government engaged inthevery useful work of cleaning this building. I raised it last year, and the hon. Minister of Works at the time replied in a manner which, in my opinion, did not correspond with the fact, but I let the matter go, hoping that the complaint would be looked into and remedied.

I came back this year and found that the complaint of these workers has not been rectified, that they were still made to work, the women one hour extra every day, without pay, and the men half an hour, so I raised it again. The hon. Minister of Works replied, and again, in my opinion, gave a very evasive answer, but I did not dare

get up and question it, because I would be howled down as one who obstructs the conduct of business. And yet, here we were given an evasive reply, and a member could not come back and ask further questions. But what has happened since, despite this evasive answer? I am able to say to this House everything I stated is true, and I have in my possession a copy of the letter which was sent to the hon. Minister. He said it was a false statement; he said he never received it. I was not on the receiving end, nor on the sending end, but I have a copy of the letter sent by these workers, and I have, further, a petition signed by the employees.

But, a very funny thing is happening. This lady who gave me the information, (I did not go looking for it, nor was I seeking causes for complaint, - she cleaned the office which we occupied,) was in the Services inthe last war herself, and so was her husband, who died since of wounds received in the last war, and one of her boys came back wounded from this war, - this woman gave the information which I honestly presented to this House in the hope that it will remedy that situation. To-day, when she was in the building leaving a signed statement, she also left a note. She said, "Sorry, they sent me to Osgoode Hall." She was removed from the building to-day. The note does not say she wanted to go; it says, "I am sorry. I have been sent to Osgoode Hall to work," and it was signed by the woman who worked in this building.

Now, this matter should have been threshed out on the floor when the evasive answer was given to the hon. members, but they are made to feel they are committing a crime if they raise a question or discuss something of

public importance, and I am not through with this case, because if this method is resorted to I call this contemptible hounding of a worker who dares to give information, desiring to improve her position, who is
8 removed for exercising her rights.

You take the matter of the Hydro. I raised the question here on the Hydro situation, and its attitude toward its workers. Again, I did not go around seeking issues with the Government or with the Hydro. It was a public matter. The union concerned addressed letters to them, and I naturally raised it, as I thought that was the proper thing to do, and I hoped that the hon. Minister in charge would give a satisfactory answer. Hansard will show what he said. They never financed the Employees' Association; the Association had its own money. They were paying dues. That was that. I could not follow it up, and I am obliged to say now that that information was not accurate. The information given to the House does not correspond with the facts.

(Page No. 1828 follows.)

I have in my hand a circular letter sent out by what is known as the general committee of the Hydro Association. It is dated February 20th, 1945 and it starts out as follows:

> "Dear fellow employees: Recent labour legislation passed by the Ontario government makes it necessary for all labour organizations to 'pay their own way.' As you know the Hydro has in the past financed the operation of the plan, and each of us has to some extent benefitted by its existance. It is no longer legal for the commission to contribute to the expenses of the organization and we are accordingly asking all employees to help pay those expenses."

This, in the face of an assurance to this House that there was no contribution. And, enclosed with this, Mr. Speaker, is a printed card asking the employees to sign for a check-off, if you please, with Hydro. For a check-off, -- and it is difficult to imagine that the hydro officials were not consulted beforehand, or that they had not agreed to the check-off system, if the Association will get a sufficient endorsation.

For the information of the House, Mr. Speaker, I submit it is contrary to the information given in this House by the Hon. Minister without portfolio (Mr. ~~Webster~~ Challies), but which I could not follow up because of the fear that I would be charged with wasting time.

If that is not enough, I have here another letter, dated February the 24th, sent out by Mr. G. Kennedy, the representative of the linemens' Association, to the line Section, and he says:

> "I was rather surprised to see the better response to my appeal for support of the Employees' Association, at least as far as the line Section is concerned. What is the trouble? Is it a personal issue? Do you not care for me personally, or do you not trust me? Have you no faith in the Association? Is it the matter of the trifling sum you are asked to contribute monthly" and so on.

This is signed by the gentleman, and the signature of the stenographer is "G.M.", and I am advised that they are the initials of one of the employees of an official in the Hydro.

HON. ~~WM. G. WEBSTER~~ Mr. Challies (Minister without Portfolio): May I ask is the Hon. member speaking from the letter? May I say, Mr. Speaker, what I stated to the House was the absolute fact, that there was no pressure put on the employees by the Commission, and the correspondence here read only indicates that. And if anyone will read the article which appeared in the Toronto Globe of March 8th signed by Mr. E. L. Thompson, -- I did not know who Mr. E. L. Thompson was at the time I read it, -- it supports everything I said in the House. I do not think it is fair, Mr. Speaker, to get up and say that what I said on the floor of this House was false. I stand by it.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, that does not prove anything. I read from documents, letters issued by people of the Hydro. I did not say a thing that I cannot substantiate right here.

MR. ~~WEBSTER~~ Challies: Mr. Speaker, may I add this, the organization which the Hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) refers to is not within the control of the Commission in any way. It is an organization by employees themselves, and they have organized themselves irrespective of any help from the Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. member must admit that he must accept the Hon. Minister's statement.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I leave the matter as I presented it, as an illustration of the way we should not do business in the House, and why we should really be a bit

more free in asking questions, and why the Hon. Minister should be more prepared to answer questions. The difficulty of their position does not justify their act. The difficulty which they, as a minority government find themselves in may from their point of view, be regrettable, but that is the way things are; and they can blame the people of Ontario, if they please, but they cannot blame the members in this House who desire to discuss and deal with matters more fully than we have up to now. I think we need more time on public business to enable us to discuss things more fully and to become acquainted with public problems before they vote on them. I hope that this government and the governments that follow it, will deal with this and see that changes are brought about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that this small group is opposed to the present government. We would like to see it replaced. We would like to see it replaced by a government of all the opposition groups in the House. In other words, what we would like to see, Mr. Speaker, is a government of the majority of the members, representing the majority of voters in Ontario. There is nothing undemocratic about such a desire or proposal. Two thirds of the votes were granted to the parties in opposition. They also have the majority of members.

We in this group believe an election is not necessary, but just a shifting around, so that the majority government feels that it has the majority of the electors, of all the opposition groups.

The Hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), the leader of this group of the opposition has dealt with the question quite fully. Let me just add a point or two to clarify them.

We are as yet a growing but a relatively small political group in this House. We have no expectation or outlook of gaining government power. We cannot be accused of being thirsty for the spoils of office. We are not strong enough to challenge and become the government. We therefore are approaching this problem from only one point of view and that is what we honestly believe to be the interests of the majority of the people in this Province and of the people of this country. We speak our minds freely.

When we say that an election is not desired and is not necessary, it is not because of fear that we will lose a few dozen seats. There is no such danger, as far as we are concerned. I might even say, Mr. Speaker, that we could confidently look forward to an increase in our representation when an election takes place.

When we say an election is not desired, we believe we correctly interpret the feeling of the people of this Province. When we say that we think the government should change, and that the majority of the votes should be given the power to govern, we say that not because it would give the government to us, but because we believe that would be in the best interests of the Province and the Dominion.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, are we personally influenced by personal likes or dislikes, or vendettas against anyone. We have no animosity, and no personal battles to carry on. The Hon. Prime Minister has never defeated me, and I do not think I have contributed to his defeat. We have not run against each other, and we have no objection to his appearance. On the contrary, I think he should have been elected everytime he ran. I do not know why he was defeated on a few occasions. We have no personal battles with the Hon. Prime Minister, nor

with the Honourable the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Webster). We have no personal battles and no axes to grind with any individual.

We believe that the main danger to this Province and to this country to-day is toryism. We very honestly believe that and say that; and we will continue to say that until the danger is past. Yet some Hon. members resent being called tories, but I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the Toronto Evening Telegram, which cannot be accused of being anything but good old conservative, insists, quite rightly, in calling a spade a spade, and calls the party in power always as "the tory party" proudly and defiantly; and so I like it. So the Honourable gentleman should not object to being called members of the Tory party; they are being called that everyday.

HON. MEMBERS: We do not object to it.

MR. SALSBERG: Then there is nothing more to be said about that.

Now, having settled that point, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that regardless of the opinions of an odd member of that party, an Honourable member in the House or supporters outside, we acknowledge that there are people in the Tory ranks who are there mistakenly, but who mean well, just as we acknowledge that there are in the Liberal party ranks people, followers and some in leading positions whose mentality and outlook is identical fully with that of very reactionany tories. There is no doubt about that. But it is not the individual members, Mr. Speaker, nor the odd follower that counts. What counts in politics, and what counts in social movements is the aggregate representation of a group. What does it represent? As a whole, what does it represent? And

I believe, Mr. Speaker, and I think and I believe the majority of the public think so too that the Tory party, as such represents the most reactionary, colonial minded reactionary groups in our economic social life.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask --

MR. SPEAKER: We must have but one speaker at one time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does the Hon. member object to being called "communist"?

MR. SALSBERG: I will come to that in a moment. I ask the Hon. member to have patience.

MR. BELANGER: May I rise to a point of Order. Was the Hon. member who asked the question in his own seat?

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I cannot thank the Hon. member from Prescott (Mr. Belanger) because his action does not represent collaboration.

This does not conflict in anyway with the remarks I made about the fact about the party the Hon. member represents, and we believe that a government composed of such forces is dangerous to the Province and to the country, even if it were not a minority government. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that, so far as the party that I represent here, we are at this moment conducting our national campaign for legislative reform, directed against the King Government in Ottawa. We are not hestitating for one moment to do that. But I do say this that because no party in the country to-day enjoys the full support of the people, because there is a likelihood, after the next Federal election, as is the case in this House, that no single party will have a majority, and, because of that, we believe that the danger will exist for the government of reactionary coalition of the tories

and the reactionary forces of other parties who will gladly join with them to give us the worst type of government that we have had.

Now, the Hon. Minister for the Liquor Control Commission does not have to display a sense of cold because in his position he is always wrong. Because of that we believe that a coalition of the Liberal and Labour forces is necessary, not because we abdicate to any other party, -- we have candidates in the field from all parties. We have our differences, and we will emphasize them, but we do say that with an opposition in this House such as may prevail Federally after this next election, that there may be a coalition of the Liberal Party and Labour which will represent all phases of Labour, the C.C.F. and the farmers, of course. The farmers have been in their wrong places for a long time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether this is a matter of the business of the House, or is it wasting time? I say that this is most vital business, affecting the Ontario people, because people of all sorts, professional and farmers, their welfare depends not solely upon what the government may do, although they are affected by it, but not solely by what is done in this House, but what is done in Canada and outside, and the kind of Government we have will have a serious effect upon the sale of farm products, about which the Hon. Member for Grey (Mr. Oliver) spoke so eloquently. And the questions will not be solved unless the government of this Province and the government of the Dominion follow a constructive course, which I am afraid we cannot expect from a Tory government in Ontario, or in the Dominion. And the Tory party has a tradition.

You know, very often we are asked, Are you a Communist? And Hon. Members engage in bating, very occasionally, thinking they are gaining very much. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, when the question of communism is raised I feel like saying, Communism, so what? I will tell you what. Communism means the attainment of democracy for the masses of the people. Toryism means standing upon the family compact and hounding William Lyon MacKenzie, and taking the part of the reactionary movement against people everywhere. Speaking of communism, and you bate the red.

The Hon. Prime Minister seems to desire to raise a red bating. Communism means in this House one thing. Communism in France meant the massacre of millions of people instead of peace and order. Who is to be ashamed and back down. Communism means sending voluntarily of the best Canadian boys to fight the battle against fascism.

MR. SPEAKER: Applause is not permitted in the gallery. For the second time I warn against it. If it is repeated the galleries will be closed.

MR. SALSBERG: A democratic action, --

MR. R. D. ARNOTT (Hastings West): A dictatorship.

MR. SALSBERG: I agree with the Hon. Member.

AN HON. MEMBER: Franco.

MR. SALSBERG: If the Hon. members speak of communism, it means Tito, the heroic men in Yugoslavia and in Greece. While the Tories supported the enemies in Yugoslavia, and the same kind in every other country. And there is also something to this mentality. We had a shameful display in this House when the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) displayed the susceptibility of a Tory mind to reactionary

propaganda, yes, to fascist propaganda. I do not accuse the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) of being a fascist, but it was so easy for him to fall into the line of reasoning, when you dislike anybody, to blame somebody or blame a particular people. That is the way of fascism at all times. The Hon. the Minister of Labour does not like the Hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), and he raised the question, How could the citizens of that riding of Bellwoods happen to elect the Hon. member to this House. He did not stop to inquire who are the majority of the residents in that riding. The Jewish population of Bellwoods is a small fraction of that constituency. There was a Jewish candidate running there too, and he was defeated. I am quite sure that the Conservative candidate in that constituency will not deny that he got Jewish votes. Jews vote as everybody else in Bellwoods, as citizens, dividing along the lines as other citizens do. But the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) found it very easy to repeat, he is so susceptible, because he does not like a party, and therefore there must be something behind.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the question of government is a very serious one; and I further want to say that the Progressive-Conservative Party has, in my opinion, fully forfeited its right to any claim of having the courage of its convictions, when it stayed out of the Provincial elections in the Province of Quebec last summer. Here was a major election on important issues, and every political party was there. The Liberals were in Government; the C.C.F. went in. I disagree with their election tactics, but they were there and we were there; but the Conservative party did not nominate a single candidate in that most decisive Provincial election,

and did not raise its standard in Quebec and stand up and say, This we believe in, and we will stand or fall by that standard of ours. Why did they not go in there and speak up on the question of conscription and on other questions? How could a party claim the respect and confidence and desire the support of a majority of the people, when they neglect an election involving a third of the Nation, without forfeiting every claim to the support of the people?

When the Conservative leader went into Quebec, and the prominent people of the Duplessis party, he delivered what only could be termed a sort of doubletalk about conscription, which could have meant anything to anybody and nothing in particular to all people.

I know there are members in this House who were dissatisfied with the way that was handled. But they did not speak up. And that is the way your party acted.

I say if we should have a government composed of Tory minds and the forces that they represent and the group around them, the kind of political support such as the Duplessis group, Canada would be in for a very hard time, both internally and internationally. And, from that point of view and because of such considerations we say that this government should move over, and the majority of members, representing the majority of votes should get together and form a government.

We can say this without for one moment being accused of any partisan desire to capture government. We are not just at that point. We say this because we believe that it is in the interests of the majority of the people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on a few questions

that I believe we can approach with open minds, in spite of everything I have said about the government, -- I believe in saying what I think and that I spoke the truth as I see it, and express our opinions freely; and I hope that the Hon. members of the government will realize that their lives will go on individually, if they move over to the other side, and the other side moves over here.

As to Labour and labour legislation, Mr. Speaker, I spoke at considerable length before on that, and I do not want to take the time of the House to speak about Labour problems,

(page 1839 follows)

except to point out this; that a labour code, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, for this province is necessary, and we should strive to get it during this Session, and this, while we attempt to get Federal improvement in the Federal Legislation, such as P.C.1003 and 9384.

I believe also, Mr. Speaker, we need an entirely different approach to the minimum wage question. I have not yet had a chance to see the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams). I believe, however, that he is on the right track, even without seeing the Bill, for this reason, that the important thing is to provide, through legislation, that purchasing power for our people that will make possible for them to buy back the things they produce, and raise the general standard of living in the country. That will not be done by a little patching here and there, and the whole question of minimum wages should, therefore, be reconsidered.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we need a revision -- a basic revision -- of the Compensation Act, not only is it a question of increasing payments, but there are groups of employees who are not covered now, who should be covered. There is need, Mr. Speaker -- and it is a simple thing but very important, and I do not know why the Government until now has not enacted it -- but in dealing with the Compensation Board recently I found cases -- and I am not a lawyer; I merely deal with them in the Workmen's Compensation, applying for some assistance, but I find there are cases of workmen who have been injured, and who in the opinion of a physician is cured, but in his own mind is not cured. They are suffering -- they have suffered. The

physicians say they have imaginary illnesses. Well, perhaps that is so, but an imaginary illness is just as serious as physical one. The person affected is unable to work, and I suggest there should be established a social service department to employ specialists to deal with injured workers who have not recuperated. I was told they have no authority to do that. They said, "Well, you are a member of the House; go ahead and enact it." It is a simple thing in comparison with the job which is being done -- this and other questions.

There is a serious situation, Mr. Speaker, affecting many hundreds of families of working-men who have been injured at a time of low wages, who are kept on a starvation level, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Government should set aside a few million dollars -- yes, I am advised that is what is necessary -- to take care of men and their families who have been injured at a time when they were getting thirty cents an hour and they are now paid two-thirds of thirty cents an hour, and they cannot feed their families. They need extra money, and I think the Government should provide it.

I think, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the Select Committee on Labour should try and bring in a provincial labour code during this Session, and if they will not have their report prepared before the normal prorogation, whether this Government remains in office or we have another Government -- in either case -- I submit that the Select Committee should be prepared to bring in a report as soon as possible to the House, and that the House only adjourn and then re-convene as soon as the Committee is ready with its report.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Committee having been

given wide power, should study the other phases of labour legislation in addition to collective bargaining.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to deal with a question that is very controversial, namely, that of immigration?

Mr. Speaker, we all agree -- I think we do -- that Canada has room for additional immigrants -- for settlers. The differences that exist, as I can gauge it, revolve around the degree of the absorptive capacity of the country, but I think we can all agree there is room for additional population. In fact, Canada's future depends upon a larger population and an increased population.

Now, some people are dissatisfied with the increase of the French population. Mr. Speaker, I consider this a very normal development, and I see no cause for any dissatisfaction or alarm. I think the growth of the population of French Canada is something to be welcomed. They are a hard-working people. The growth of population not only does not harm, but, on the contrary, it improves conditions; it strengthens the country, and we should welcome it.

On the other hand, what we should realize when we speak of French Canada, is that French Canada if given an opportunity to reach an equality and wages and income because of its population, would provide this country with a new market, approximately seven hundred million dollars a year, which we now have not got, if we should equalize wages and help the French Canadian working people in the cities and on the farms to reach a level with the rest of the country, so that they could buy back and have telephones,

and buy cars and clothing that is required, as the rest of Canada do, we would find a market in our backyard, so to speak, of seven hundred million dollars a year extra. That is our big job. Not to worry about the increased population, but to helped that increased population to enjoy to the full the wealth and possibilities this country has.

Then there is the question of British stock, and the encouragement of immigration from Great Britain.

Now, I frankly state, Mr. Speaker, I consider this being a most normal of things, to find many Canadians of British stock desiring more Canadians of the same origin. Why should anybody be alarmed at the desire of a Canadian of British stock wanting to have more Canadians from the same source? It would be most unnatural, if it were otherwise. In fact, one would like to see tens of thousands of additional workers from the British Isles, those who built our unions here and laid the basis for all labour political movements in Canada. I would like to see them coming to this country. I see nothing wrong with such a desire.

But I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that while the British immigrant is one thing, to advance a policy as this Government has advanced is, I think, another thing. Where the hon. Prime Minister is wrong, is that he has failed to understand the changes which have taken place within the British Empire, and in the world, and that the state of mentality is changed. It is not doing a service to Britain to carry on a campaign, as the hon. Prime Minister is doing, to bring over branch plants, and bring over hundreds of thousands of people from the British Isles.

What Britain requires is not to bring plants, but to have a market at home and abroad for all these plants. What Britain requires is an opportunity to keep its population, and those that think they are more British than the British by advocating bringing plants here and people here, are actually advocating a policy not in the interests of Britain herself, and it took Churchill himself only a few weeks ago to make that clear.

What Canada should do is to help solve the question of the British markets as far as it can, particularly as between the problem of Britain and the United States in the post-war markets. We should help the British people retain their markets and plan for work in their plants, and all those who want to come here should be welcome in this country, just as we should welcome the increased population in French Canada.

I also say, Mr. Speaker, that we should be prepared to welcome others as well; those who have suffered in Europe, and are in need of a home; those who cannot return to their former countries, or who may want to come here -- they should be allowed into the country. Also I think those who may want to join their families and their relatives in this country, and who live at the present time elsewhere than in the British Isles, should also be allowed to come in and join their families.

I do not think that that is the kind of policy, though, that the Government is pursuing and is advocating, and it is in that sense that I understand the sub-amendment as moved the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn), that does not in any way aim against British people coming into Canada.

In my opinion, and as I interpret it, it is for the taking care of the returning Canadian fighting forces, and men and women employed in our war industries, and then welcome British immigrants and those from other shores who wish to come here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I exclude certain groups. I would excludes Fascists; I would exclude Nazis; I would exclude those groups who would want to settle here to plot against their new democratic government. I do not know that I would advocate having in this country men such as General Sosnkowsky, now in our midst, and whom I suspect is plotting against the new democratic government of Poland which Churchill, Roosevelt and Premier Stalin agreed should become the provisional government of the reborn Poland. Aside from such groups, our policy should be as I have outlined.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another point, and this is education, and I want to appeal to all sides of the House to bear with me and please try to understand the problem as I believe it, without a partisan bias.

The Speech from the Throne gave a lot of space to the question of Education, and that would be a welcome sign of interest on the part of the hon. Prime Minister and the Government on matters educational, but I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have on matters of education a great deal yet to do.

I want to say quite frankly -- and I appreciate that this is a very delicate and sensitive problem, and that I am in a position entirely different from practically all other hon. members of the House -- this is a predominantly Christian country, the majority, of course, will want to

carry on its education, and should have that right and opportunity, of course, to carry on its education. I was elected, not as a Jew, but as the standard-bearer of a party, and received votes from all people. Nevertheless, I am a Jew, and I want to make it clear to the hon. members of this House that I speak on this question, not because I consider it the only matter affecting Jews or other non-Christian people, but because I believe that it is a problem of the majority of the people, and is creating unpleasant relationships among the majority group in the

I have received -- as have all other hon. members of this House -- a telegram from the Chairman of the Association for Religious Liberty, and I felt, when I read this wire, we could all agree on the position they had taken. Their telegram reads as follows:

> "We recognize the importance of religious training. However, this should not form part of the regular curriculum in non-sectarian public schools. We approve of the former practice of clergymen using the schools before and after the school day. We would approve alternate plans which would not offend, disunite, or segregate. Such a plan should be considered by clergy, teachers, parents and community workers together."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I might say that the worst thing we can do now is to arouse religious strife among an important section of the people, and I am afraid that the regulations which are now in force have achieved just that -- not just for the minority.

I have in my hand a journal which all hon. members of the House have received. I have rarely a case where I agree with the publisher of the "Gospel Witness", but the gentleman who issues this distributes it far and wide, and

says,

> "Drew plan gives millions of public money to Roman Catholic churches."

We all know this publication and the man who publishes it, are carrying on their own war against Roman Catholicism. I am not interested in that war. I merely point out, Mr. Speaker, the situation which is being developed.

May I read to the hon. members of this House, Mr. Speaker, an extract from a memorandum presented to this Government by the Inter-Church Committee of the Week Days Religious Education, presented a year ago, April 3rd. In this memorandum, this group states.

> "We fear that such a plan as the Minister of Education proposes, if carried out at once, would probably cause division and discord in some of our communities, and even among Christian people themselves, since it might raise the old question of the relation of church and state in this field."

And they go on and make proposals to the Government, and they ask the Government to go slowly about it, and so on. This was a statement submitted a year ago.

And I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, aside from the effect it may have on the minority groups-- and of course the minority groups would hope that different arrangements could be made -- but in the interests of the majority I submit that perhaps the Government should find another way. This is not a question of continuing religious exercises which were invoked in the days when I was in school, but it is a matter of religious training, and I am wondering whether an arrangement could not be made as is done in some American cities to set aside an hour or a half hour period, when the leaders of the various denomina-

tions could come into the schools and the children can go to their respective religious leaders for religious education, without causing the difficulties we encounter now. Perhaps some other way could be found. But, Mr. Speaker, when we deal with education -- and as I say, the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Drew) is giving a lot of space to it in his Speech from the Throne -- I would respectfully submit that he consider the need of introducing in all our Ontario schools courses of the democratic way of life, courses of how children will live together, regardless of their origin.

I have gathered material, Mr. Speaker, from what is known as the Springfield System. I am sure the hon. Prime Minister is aware of that system, but it has not been introduced in Ontario up to date.

The essence of the Springfield System, which New York is now copying, and to which other cities are resorting, is to bring out the good and the best in all people to teach the children to respect one another, and the backgrounds from which they came.

In Springfield I found in the curriculum -- and I have the material here -- in a school room the text is provided. There are French Canadian children, for instance, and the course teaches them the great historic role of the Frenchmen on this continent. It deals with the achievements of French Canadians. It informs them of their cultural achievements. It deals with the Italians and with the Jews, and with Negroes and with Poles and with Hungarians, who make up the population of that city. It teaches democratic living to the young, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, -- and I speak now to the hon. Prime Minister and to all

hon. members of the House; and this is not a partisan question -- that this is a provision that is made for all sorts of people.

You go through our main industrial cities, Toronto, Hamilton, the Niagara industrial towns, Timmins and Kirkland Lake, and Sault Ste. Marie, and you will find mixtures of people coming from all over the world working in the mines and in the fields and in the factories. They all have a background which has the British view, and I submit that if the hon. Prime Minister would introduce such courses of education in our schools in Ontario, he would really be making a contribution to the unity of our people and to tolerance and better understanding. I hope that this will be looked into, and that a study will be made, and perhaps at the beginning of the next school year, regardless of how the religious training will be finally resolved, that we in this province, in our schools, introduce something like the Springfield System of Education, for the democratic life.

Let us approach this in a non-partisan way. Despite all our differences, there are questions upon which we can all agree, and certainly this should be one. In the border towns in Eastern Ontario, let us teach the English and the French children to appreciate each other, and to work together in harmony, and grow up as Canadians, regardless of background. Let us do that in Northern Ontario, and let us do it in the other cities and towns where our people live.

One more point, Mr. Speaker, and I will conclude --

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear; hear.

MR. SALSBERG: Perhaps the hon. member who applauded

is able to supply himself with what other people find difficulty in securing.

Mr. Speaker, this last point I submit is also one that should be approached from a non-partisan point of view. I speak now of the question of discrimination. There are things that some people believe should be hushed up and which others believe should be examined in the full light of day. And, Mr. Speaker, it is not with any pleasure that I draw the attention of this House to the fact that there is unfortunately throughout the province, an effect left by the Fascist and Naxi propaganda which people take into their systems unconsciously at times. And it is not limited to any one group or any one town, but we must recognize that that is so, -- that there is discrimination; discrimination against the people and those engaged in it would find it hard to explain.

Last year this House passed a Bill which in my opinion will stand out when a lot of other Acts of the Session will have been forgotten, and that was the Bill against discrimination. Time will prove, I am sure, that when many of these Bills will have been forgotten, that Section will go down in history as the one which introduced the first Act against discrimination. And the Government sponsored it, and that is to the credit of this Government. It was supported by all parties, and that is to the credit of all parties.

That, Act, however, is very limited. It only deals with the outward manifestation of what is bad, by presenting the public pronouncement of an intention to discriminate, but it does not do away with discrimination.

But it was a step forward; it was a great step forward.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) whose opinions on this question I respect, and whose personal views on matters of intolerance I do not doubt. I know that he is opposed to every form of intolerance, and I remember calling to his attention last year that discrimination on jobs is perhaps the worse form of discrimination; that discrimination in ownership of property is a bad form of discrimination, and we have seen a tablet out in this hallway, outside the entrance to this Chamber with the words: "Fallen heroic Negro soldiers of the last war." -- well, that is pretty good, but it is a mockery when we realize that a Negro nurse cannot get a job, and a Negro chap cannot get a position.

The hon. Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) told me at the time that there were other laws under which such acts as that could be avoided, but they have not been avoided.

You have seen the statement made by Mr. Justice Chevrier recently in London, and I will just quote a short paragraph. He says:

> "Referring to the anti-discrimination Act, in my opinion as there is an enactment of the Legislature, it must be taken as one which reflects public opinion, and I believe it is a step in the right direction. Obviously, the most laudable object of the Act is to repress, as far as this provision applies, all un-Christian actions of racial discrimination; racial and creed discriminations have been long an outstanding evil."

And he said:

> "These people who received out sympathy and help, should not be forced within this land of freedom and liberty to live in the worst sections of the community, and be deprived from living

with other members."

But, Mr. Speaker, I am primarily concerned with the discrimination on the job.

Mr. Speaker and hon. members of this House, I know I have overstepped my time by a few minutes, but I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and all the hon. members of this House, to grant your indulgence for a few more minutes, in order that I may draw your attention to the seriousness of the problem. When you are concerned, as I am, with such cases, and when a young chap -- and I will give a copy of this to the hon. Prime Minister and the leaders of every party to show what we have to contend with -- here is a young man seventeen and a half years of age. His brother is in England, in the R.C.A.F.; his father is in the Army since June 6, 1942. He was laid off in a plant here. He was sent to the Selective Service, and by them to a certain firm. This was on October 6th, 1944.

He spoke to the Foreman, who asked, "What nationality are you?" and when told he was Jewish, the Foreman said, "We do not employ Jews, and I told the Selective Service not to send me Jews."

This young man came to see me and asked me if this was fair play. He had just left school; his father is in the Army; his brother is overseas, and he is seventeen and a half years of age. He would otherwise have qualified, but he was born a Canadian Jew. He asked me if that was fair play. I ask you, Mr. Prime Minister -- and I know what your answer will be -- is that fair play?

And when you have a case such as the second one here of a returned man from England. He came and asked me if it was fair play. He returned from England. He is thirty years

of age; discharged medically unfit. The Selective Service sent him to a bakery to become a bread salesman, and he was refused, and in his letter to me he writes:

> "The Sales Manager told me the Company needed fifteen salesmen, and that they would be glad to give me one of the jobs. However, while answering the application, I answered to the question of my nationality that I was a Canadian citizen of Jewish descent. Whereupon the Sales Manager informed me that I could not possibly get the job since it would not, in his opinion, promote the best interests of his company if they were to employ Jewish salesmen.
>
> The gentleman in question admitted that it was not a fair thing to do. He agreed with me that when I joined the Canadian army and went overseas it did not matter what national origin a soldier came from, that we all fought for a democratic Canada. But the situation is evidently different when it comes to getting a job after a member of the armed forces returns home."

And I could cite the case of a woman who applied for a very menial job in a public utility and was refused. She finally got it, after I intervened, but she was refused solely because she was Jewish. Yet her husband joined the army since this war broke out, and her grown-up daughter, 19 years of age, gave up her job in the Post Office and joined the armed forces. Yet this woman was not good enough to do a cleaning job at night, because they found her name was Jewish.

I could cite illustration after illustration, and I therefore, Mr. Speaker, say this is one thing that this House can do, without any difference of opinion. I want to appeal to the Government and to all other parties to agree to enact a Bill during this Session, something similar to that enacted in New York and other states, not as a partisan thing, but an Act which will be an example to the

rest of the country, in which we all can participate. It will be so simple to move a Bill myself, or any other member of my group, and I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the Government, and to all other parties, that this be done as a non-partisan act.

By the way, this slipped my mind, and I want to mention it now; I want to pay tribute to the Canadian Daily Press. I have found that the Canadian Daily Press shows an outstanding sympathy and tolerance with all other people, on the basis of merit and service, rather than on origin or religious belief. I find that in the press in Toronto, and other newspapers throughout the country, the people are employed on a basis of ability, and that is the way it should be.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the Bill as adopted in the New York Assembly. I do not believe that it suits our requirements fully. I have even gone to the extent of having prepared a rough outline of an Act we could adopt in this House, which I believe would go a long way toward achieving the democracy in the relationship of people, and go a step farther in the achievement of equality and tolerance to all people.

There are things upon which we are divided; there are issues around which we can find no common ground; and we oppose each other. That is natural. It may be unpleasant, but it is the democratic way of solving problems. There are some issues, Mr. Speaker, upon which we can all agree, and I earnestly hope, in presenting the material of the New York Bill and the Toronto drawn-up draft of a Bill which I submit to the hon. Prime Minister, that he and the leaders of all other parties in this House and the

people outside of this House will agree -- as I believe confidently they will -- in the enactment of such an Act during this Session of the Legislature. Let this be another outstanding non-partisan Act performed by this Session of the Legislature. It will be a step in the right direction, and a step towards greater unity in the country, and a better relationship between all people which make up this growing country of ours.

MR. W. L. MILLER (Algoma Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, in this debate I seem to be wedged in between two speakers, one a radical socialist, and the other a Labour-Progressive, sometimes called a Communist. So it may be refreshing for the House and those who have the privilege of being in this Assembly, to hear from someone who has not particularly extreme views.

One of the actions which I have received since I listened with a good deal of interest to many of the discussions on the floor of the House, and particularly some of the speakers, has been that from a great majority of speakers in this Session, they have the tendency to place class against class, especially in matters pertaining to the labouring class of this province.

Being a Northerner, I have a great deal of respect for those who are willing to risk their livings and their capital, be it large or small, in business enterprises throughout this province, and facing our post-war problems, I am somewhat alarmed, Mr. Speaker, at the persistently critical attitude and extreme views of a great number in this House. One has to be very brave and rather intrepid to say anything in favour of the industrialists in this House at the present, and, Mr. Speaker, that should not be.

It seems to me it is about time some hon. member has the intestinal fortitude -- I think that is the word they throw around -- to rise in his place and say something on behalf of the small and large businessmen who are prepared to risk their capital, and in some cases their savings, to establish industry in our land.

MR. BERTRAM E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): Why not separate them?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MILLER: A great deal of co-operation and tolerance must be developed between these two factors in economic life.

Our social and economic systems cannot exist without the full co-operation between the capital and labour working together in the fuller development of our economic and national life of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is just a preamble, so to speak; it is just a reaction I received, and I do not mind telling you I received it sitting in this House listening to some of my hon. friends to the right, who are on the left, so to speak, and also to some extreme views elsewhere. I do not believe a single individual has expressed a word in favour of the man or group of men who are willing -- and I am not talking about the Bay Street Group, who are being much maligned, and maybe deserve it -- but I am speaking about people who are willing to throw their savings into the small businesses of this country.

We are going to take a one-sided view throughout this Session which will be projected into other discussions all over this province, we will have a one-sided mind on the

economic life of the province. Personally, I think we have overdone it, and I am not favourably impressed, and certainly not very much enamoured with the discussions of this Legislature since this distinctly one-sided attitude toward our Government problems has been apparent.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are not talking about Shipshaw?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MILLER: I had so many notes, but this is not a part of my regular speech, Mr. Speaker, and I hope you do not dock me in time for it; it was just a statement of my reaction.

I want to serve notice at the outset that I am going to be brief. I thought that would get some applause, but apparently not.

But I do want to associate myself with the sentiments and statements expressed by the previous speakers in congratulations which they have extended to the mover of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member for Haldimand Norfolk (Mr. Martin) and to the seconder, the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Scott).

It has always been customary since I have had the privilege of being in this historic Legislature to have these two hon. members, supporters of the Government in every case, speak in glowing terms of the accomplishment of the Government in the past, and, so to speak, give us a bird's-eye view of the great needs for the future.

(Page 1857 follows)

and considering the opportunity which they had and considering what they had to work on I think you did very well and your performance under the circumstances has been most creditable. The fact is that for the last ten years - and I am beginning to feel like a veteran in here, besides some of these younger group; then I can talk about ten or eleven sessions ago very clearly but it has been the practice of the government of the day to select one member from Northern Ontario and the other from the Southern part. They divided the honours. But unfortunately this time the Government could not do that, for the simple reason that this greater part of the province has not a single government representative in it unless they are paid organizers. Since I have the honour to be the member of that grand old Liberal party elected in Northern Ontario - and I say that with all deference to my colleague- the hon.member from Muskoka, (Mr.Kelly) because there have been times when he took a great deal of pride in calling himself a representative from Northern Ontario. Now, I do not blame him for wanting to line himself up with that gallant body of men but on the other hand I regard that section of the country as just being in the foothills, just at the point I might say, where the Great North begins.

Now, one can say very little about Northern Ontario without bringing in the matter of the C.C.F.Party because they had a phenomenal success in Northern Ontario in the last election. That success was achieved, Mr. Speaker, by a series of promises - promises that even exceeded those made by the Conservative party; promises which, if fulfilled would mean the setting up of a virtual Utopia in Ontario. Some C.C.F.speakers were good enough to say that complete

fulfilment of their programme could not be possible until a C.C.F. Government was installed at Ottawa. They have to confess they cannot do anything in Ontario until they are in power there and they must be in Federal power before they can implement that. So having in mind it will be a long time before Ontario will be saddled with the C.C.F. I am confident that this party, which embraces socialism as its chief plank, its formula or idealogy attained the pinnacle of its influence during the period of the 1943 election. Since that time it has definitely declined in public favour. This is my observation since then that there has been a good deal of serious thinking and discussion of the possible result of Socialism being applied to the industrial life of the North, and it is quite obvious to the most casual observer that the sane and rational thinking men and women are most apprehensive of a party which proposes a policy of regimentation, centralization of authority and eventual dictatorship.

The people of the north know that it was pre-enterprise, individual initiative - coupled with the spirit of adventure and the willingness to take risks that developed this part of the province.

Let us for a moment consider one of our major industries in the north. Consider the mining industry. In 1941, which is the latest definite information which I could get in a hurry, the value of production of our mines in Northern Ontario was: $269,815,000. The number of employees was 36,738 people. The wages paid was $ 64,579,000. The supplies purchased - to give you an all round figure - the supplies purchased by these

mines was $45,542,000.

Now, if you want to try and visualize the contribution which this great industry made to the economy of this province you must consider the purchasing power from wages. You must consider there are no factories in Northern Ontario - no furniture factories, nobody making clothing up there; everything is purchased from Southern Ontario. So you can consider what it is doing in an economic sense. This was accomplished under a policy of free enterprise. The C.C.F. policy is to socialize the mining industry. They are opposed to the profit motive. I do not want to make statements without some reference to their sacred volume, so to speak. "The major proposal of Socialism is the public ownership of the mines, forest, power resources of Canada." That is in "Democracy needs Socialism," page 51.

Henry C. Young, Toronto Star, July 30th:says :

> "The federal government should shut down all gold mines and use the 30,000 miners to relieve the shortage of labour in Canadian war industries.
>
> "He charged that Canada's gold mining industry--

this huge industry I have been telling you about, what great contribution it has made.

> "He charged that Canada's gold mining industry "' is being carried on primarily to make money for those who own the mines.'"

Now, the people of the North are beginning to wonder what the C.C.F. propose to substitute for the deal and incentive which prompts men to force their way into remote areas of the North, enduring hardships, and often privation, in the search for gold and other valuable minerals.

If the profit motive is to be destroyed what incentive is there for groups of men to risk their capital in supplying

the necessary funds needed in the prospecting for and the development of mines. Will the C.C.F. Government - if ever there be one. perish the thought - grubstake the prospector. Will they provide the funds necessary to develop prospects to the place where they are producing mines? Or are they only interested in taking over such successfully managed concerns as International Nickel, Lake Shore, Hollinger &c. That is the poser which the people of Ontario are beginning.....

THE SPEAKER: There is a member prepared to ask a question.

MR. MILLER: I am making my speech first and the only one I have made in this House and I will be glad to hear from other speakers later. I think all can hear me.

THE SPEAKER: The member prefers to make his address first and will answer after.

MR. MILLER: You can make a speech next Sunday Bert.

This brief examination of the subject must convince everyone who knows anything about the mining industry, of the utter fallacy of the C.C.F. proposals and policy as it would apply to this major industry.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that free enterprize with proper Government co-operation and Government restrictions where found necessary in the interests of the people of the province, will, in the future be the only satisfactory policy in the vast known and unknown resources of the North are to be discovered and utilized in the development of a higher social and economic life in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a matter to deal with and

I would much prefer if the Prime Minister was here. It concerns him to a very large extent, and I am sorry if he is not here at the moment but I must, of course, go ahead with the dicourse which I have prepared. I cannot very well get it twisted up.

Hon. Member: It is twisted.

MR. MILLER: I propose to discuss another matter of importance to the people of this province- the proposed Dominion-Provincial Conference.

During the last Session of the Lesgislature as well as this one we have been treated on a number of occasions to long discourses by Premier Drew on the need of such a Conference. If has now assumed the proportions of being the most vitally important need of this province. Cabinet Ministers in this House and outside of it are using this subject as their chief alibi for not having been able to carry out this committment or that in connection with their different Departments. Premier Drew, in his many statements on the subject has waxed warm in his condemnation of Prime Minister Mackenzie King for not having summoned this Conference. He claims that the onus and responsibility must rest with Prime Minister King for his failure to call this important meeting.

So just to keep the records straight- as they say in this House- I would like to read a brief history of what actually did happen, and the members of this House and the people of the Province generally will, I hope be in a better position to judge as to whom is responsible for the fact that the conference has not yet been held. I am reading an article from the Daily Star of January 20th.1945 which was a reprint of an editorial in the Winnipeg Free Press.

"Drews Record on Holding of
Dom-Prov. Meet.

"The Free Press agrees with Premier Drew of Ontario on the importance to be attached to the holding of a Dominion-Provincial Conference but, the public memory being short, it may be a suitable moment to recapitulate the facts behind the failure to have one. The responsibility lies upon the shoulders of none other than Mr.Drew himself.

It is over 12 months since Mr.Drew first wrote to Mr. King suggesting that such a conference should be held. Mr.King replied on Jan. 13.welcoming the suggestion and stating that he would at once circularize all the other provinces. These all replied favorably, though some of them suggested it would be necessary to wait until their legislative sessions were over. A secretariat was promptly formed in Ottawa to prepare for the conference. On Feb.28. the nine provinces were asked to send a senior treasury official to Ottawa to help in preparing uniform factual data, on the form of which all provinces were agreed. in order to give the conference a solid basis on which its operations could take place. Eight provinces complied. Mr.Drew refused: No official would be sent unless the general scope of the conference was known in advance. He urged that a preliminary conference should be held "for the purpose of reaching some agreement regarding the steps which should be taken to establish an effective basis for co-operation." Mr.King replied urging that these preliminaries would be better done informally.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I

THE SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. FROST: I would just like to correct ...

THE SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

MR. FROST: I just wanted to correct my good friend Mr.Miller from Algoma. I know...

MR.MILLER: Have I the floor?

MR. FORST: I mean he is so wrong. He is ridiculous. My good friend should not read from Toronto Star.....

MR. JOLLIFFE: We would like to hear you in Debate on this point.

MR. MILLER: Really to get this in continuity I should go over it again.

".....but finally consulted the other eight provinces on the desirability of holding a preliminary meeting. Seven of them turned it down.

That was in April. Meanwhile, Mr.Drew had written denying that he had refused to lend a senior official

"(who however never turned up,in Ottawa) and urged that immediate invitations to the conference be issued. Mr.King asked Mr.Drew to let the secretary of the secretariat know when the senior official was coming. Mr.Drew never replied.

In May Mr.Ralston, acting for Mr.King, who was in London, circulated a draft agenda for the proposed conference asking for suggestions, amendations and changes. Mr.Drew never replied.

As late as June 20. Mr,Drew was still protesting that he never held back on sending an official to Ottawa, but complained nobody had ever told him what the man was supposed to do when he got there-- an obscurity which apparently had never entered the minds of his eight fellow-premiers, all of whom had sent officials down.

On July 27 Mr.King wrote all the provincial premiers setting forth the progress alreafy acbieved. His letter to Mr.Drew mentioned the failure to send an official and also made polite inquiry as to what Mr.Drew thought of the agenda. Two weeks later Mr.Drew repliedsmartly saying he proposed to prepare his material as he saw fit and asking when the conference was going to be held,and protesting that he nowl earned the officials wanted in Ottawa were apparently wanted to draw up an agenda. Mr.King wired back that this was not the case and repeated that what was wanted was only the preparation of basic facts and statistics which could be interpreted on equal terms by all the provinces.

But by this time Mr.Drew had been on the hustings and before the microphone, bitterly attacking the Dominion for its family allowance legislation, proclaiming principles of extreme provincial autonomy and the safeguarding of "Ontario's money", and delivering an ultimatum regarding co-operation with Quebec. Mr.King, recognizing the futility of attempting to hold a conference which would be doomed to failure before it met, called the thing off. He said there was no use attempting to have one until after a general election had been held. This judgment, we fear is correct and unkess Mr.Drew is now in a much more co-operative mood than he was last year, the public will agree with Mr.King.

HON. GEORGE A.DREW (Prime Minister): Now, Mr.Speaker since this fairy tale has been completed.....

MR. MILLER: I still have the floor.

MR. DREW: No, I have the right to correct a wholly false statement.

THE SPEAKER: The Hon.member declares he wishes to correct an inaccuracy.

MR.MILLER: I am reading an editorial from a newspaper: I am not responsible for it at all.

THE SPEAKER: Will you just respect the Chair for a moment.

MR.MILLER: The fact remains that you are sitting down.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't but the Rules do. The Hon. member (Mr.Miller) knows very well when the Speaker rises to take his seat. The Hon.Prime Minister asks to correct a statement.

MR. DREW: Mr.Speaker, I presume this fairy tale that the Hon.member (Mr.Miller) has read is another editorial in the Winnipeg Free Press.

MR.MILLER: I remember definitely stating it was written from the Winnipeg Free Press.

MR. DREW: May I say unequivocally that there is not a single word of truth in this wholly false editorial from a publication which one would expect.

MR. MILLER: Now, I intend to proceed but since the Prime Minister has put certain doubt on this whole matter as to the correctness pf it, or being a fairy tale, I am serving notice that I am placing a resolution on the Order paper requesting production of copies of correspondence between this Province and the Dominion in connection with proposed Conference.

MR. DREW: They are on the table now.

MR. MILLER: They must be pretty well covered up. In view of the article which I have read and I do not think any honourable member doubts its accuracy, it is quite apparent that Premier Drew, by his obstructionist attitude and his insistence on having his own way and imposing his own ideas defeated any

possibility of a successful conference.

The chip-on-the-shoulder attitude of Premier Drew at the very outset of the preliminary negotiations was by no means conducive to the spirit of conciliation and understanding so necessary in deliberations, if the difficult problems effecting the rights of the Dominion and the Province are to be solved on an amicable basis. And in view of the fact that many of our pressing post war problems, including the welfare of our service man and women returning from Overseas and the thousands who will likely be released from War Plants, will have to be left in abeyance. I feel, Mr.Speaker, that Premier Drew has done this Province a great dis-service.

Now, I would like to say a few words in connection with another matter and I am trying to deal to a large extent with matters particularly obtaining to Northern Ontario. I would like to offer some remarks regarding some one of the great industries of the North,the forest industry.

This province has about 100,000,000 acres of forest area under the supervision of the Lands and Forests Department, and in addition there are vast, unsurveyed areas which constitute a tremendous back log of reserve for future generations.

A large portion of this reserve, however, is so inaccessible as to make present-day operation uneconomic, and therefore cannot be seriously taken into consideration at this time.

The fullest use of our forest resources is the basis for employment and security for thousands of our citizens, and it is expedient that long-term policies which will ensure a perpetual source of supply must be evolved.

There is and has been considerable concern over the rapid depletion of the accessible timber in the province. All too often there has been an apparent disregard of the wasteful and destructive methods of exploitation of these resources.

This is not a criticism of the present Minister of the Department, particularly as he inherited this condition from a succession of governments. It will require the application of a broad, courageous policy on the part of the Government, in conjunction with other provinces. It will require the support of public opinion and an aroused national consciousness of the importance of saving and perpetuating this important asset.

The history of the lumbering industry in the province is a sordid affair. It indicates only too clearly the utter lack of planning and vision in the earlier days. The indiscriminate cutting of all accessible timber in the Georgian Bay area and on the north shore of Lake Huron is an outstanding example of reckless disregard of the future of the industry, and even less consideration for the people of towns and villages, who eventually found themselves living in ghost towns.

I do not intend at this time, Mr. Speaker, to submit a forest resources' policy to this Government. That would be most presumptious on my part, but I do suggest that the matter be given the importance which it deserves, and I urge, Mr. Speaker, that no time be lost in investigating the best and most modern methods employed successfully for generations by such countries as Norway and Sweden.

Our forest resources must be managed in such a manner as to preserve a perpetual source of raw material for use in our own industries and for export. The indiscriminate slaughter of our forests must be discontinued if this objective is to be attained.

The maintenance of our forest areas has wide ramifications and is closely related to many other important activities, namely, the tourist industry, fish and game, the fur trade, maintenance of our lakes and streams, prevention of soil erosion, etc. The importance of this matter, therefore, must be obvious to every member in this House.

The question of export of raw materials, particularly pulpwood in unmanufactured form, is highly controversial. Some well-informed people claim that there is a substantial surplus of pulpwood cut, over and above what can possibly be used in Canadian mills, and they contend that it might well be exported to the mills in the United States.

According to figures which I have secured, approximately 400,000 cords of pulpwood are exported each year from Crown lands, and 230,000 cords from other lands, making a total of 630,000 cords sent across the border in raw unmanufactured state. This presents a very substantial economic loss to this province, since the processing, labour and sale of the finished product takes place in another country.

During the past four years the people of Canada have proven their ability to turn from peace-time pursuits to manufacture the highly technical instruments and implements of war.

Canadian brains and ingenuity, coupled with scientific research, have made a very great contribution to the task of providing the tools by which the war is being won. This was a new field of activity for many Canadians, and they proved they were equal to the task.

Is not this the time, Mr. Speaker, to capitalize on that development in our country, and to extend it to a fuller utilization of our natural resources?

If Ontario, the industrial province, is to assume its full responsibility in the development of a nation where employment will be maintained at a high level, the policy of export of our raw materials on the present scale cannot be countenanced. As I stated before, Mr. Speaker, I am not blaming this administration particularly for the lack of a comprehensive forestry policy, but the longer they stay in power the more responsibility they will have for existing conditions.

Premier Drew, when he was leader of the Opposition, was very critical of the timber administration policy at that time, and, in fact, in his minority report of the Select Committee investigating the activities of the Lands and Forests Department, the first recommendation is as follows:

> "The administration, conservation and utilization of the forest resources of the Province of Ontario should be placed under the control of a Commission, to be known as the Ontario Forest Resources Commission, which Commission should have powers similar to those conferred upon the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission."

Then in the election campaign of 1943, one of the famous points was No. 7, - "To appoint a Forest Resources

Commission." I do not know whether that got the Conservative Party any more votes, nevertheless.

This is one of the planks in the Tory platform that has not been implemented. I believe it should be, and I say this with all due consideration for the present Minister and his efficient staff. The Department of Lands and Forests is a busy place, and the Minister and his deputy are too much involved with the immediate business at hand to be expected to give time and study in an attempt to solve such a major problem in this province as a new policy for the handling of that great industry, the forest industry of Ontario.

It is a case of being too close to the forest to see the trees. I do therefore, Mr. Speaker, urge upon the Premier of the province that he keep his promise to the people by appointing a Commission of well-qualified and experienced men, whose duty it would be to make a full study of all matters pertaining to the forest resources of the province.

I am not so much concerned that this Commission take over the entire prerogatives of the Department. I think, for the moment, that would be going too far. I think we should have a committee of responsible and well-equipped men to advise the Department to set up a new policy, men who would not be associated with the Department in any way, other than in a purely advisory capacity, and I do trust, Mr. Prime Minister, that you will give that serious consideration. In fact, if you pass No. 7 of your plank, I will say a good word for you.

HIGHWAYS. I would like to refer briefly to the activities of the Highway Department as they apply to Northern Ontario. I do not want to leave anyone out if I can help it. Highway activities are very important in Northern Ontario. There is general agreement that it would be unwise and imprudent

for the Department to embark on any major construction projects during the war. Lack of man power and materials preclude any such programme at this time. However, adequate maintenance of existing highways is absolutely essential if we are to preserve what we have and protect a very substantial investment by the taxpayers of this province.

During the regime of the Liberal Government improvements that can only be described as revolutionary, as far as highway construction is concerned, were carried out progressively each year. Cement pavement was introduced to the North in many sections, and hundreds of miles of winding, difficult roads were graded and brought to a high standard. These roads will deteriorate rapidly unless proper maintenance is carried out effectively, and it is in connection with this matter of maintenance that I take issue with the Honourable Minister of the Department. We were given assurances at the last Session that sufficient maintenance work would be authorized to fully protect existing highways. In my opinion this has not been done. Apparently the Department is taking a holiday, with the result that many sections of the Northern Highways are deteriorating badly, and extensive repairs, which might easily have been avoided, will eventually have to be carried out.

I have been unable to secure definite cost figures of last year's (1944) maintenance as against that of previous years, under the Liberal Government, but I can state without fear of contradiction that there was a very drastic reduction in expenditures for maintenance last year. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is a short-sighted policy, which will undoubtedly cost the taxpayers of this province considerable money in the future, when these highways will have to be

brought up to a proper standard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just have a word, in conclusion, to say. We who live in that part of the country are confident that Northern Ontario holds the key to post-war development in this province. This greater part of the province is about seven times as large as what is known as Southern Ontario. To a great extent it is a vast undeveloped area, and no man can measure its potentialities.

This young country, with its vast, arable lands, its forests, mines, fisheries, water powers, its industries and industrial possibilities, is a definite challenge to the fortitude and ingenuity of the Canadian people, The trend in Canada is towards the North, and that is particularly true of Ontario. The North, with all its natural resources properly managed, will support a large population, and will make an ever-increasing contribution to the betterment of the citizens of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Three hon. members have desired to ask questions. Do you care to answer them now?

MR. MILLER: Sure, if you want to take the time of the House.

MR. BERTRAM E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): I do not care to ask it now, thank you.

MR. ROBERT D. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member made mention of the fact if this motive existed there would be no incentive in investigating the mining. I would like to ask what incentive there is for the boys who died on the banks of the Rhine.

MR. MILLER: I see no relation, whatever, between the statement of the hon.member (Mr. Thornberry) and what I was referring to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Minister of Mines): I just wanted, using my friend's (for Algoma) expression, "Keep the records straight" -- When we assumed office in August, 1943, in the Treasury Department, at the time of the Dominion Provincial Conference, we set up a Bureau of Research and Statistics, which is, I think, a very complete department, and one which is capable of getting together a most complete information in relation to the province of Ontario.

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL (York North): This is going to be a lengthy explanation.

MR. SPEAKER: I will decide that.

MR. FROST: I would just like to point out it does seem so useless, in view of the fact we have the most complete information here, and we have a department working on this. It would be poor management to send down a highly-paid official from our Department, to Ottawa, merely to act as a channel of communication. It would be so silly and ridiculous and needless. We tried to point out to Ottawa such a course was not necessary. I would say this --

MR. BERTRAM E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): On a point of order, I understood the Speaker to say "those who wished to ask questions" could do so. We are getting a speech.

MR. FROST: I have not spoken on the Throne Debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Read the book of rules. There is always a certain amount of latitude granted to a Minister in reply to remarks made by an hon. member. The hon. Minister is quite in order in informing the hon.member for Algoma of certain facts, briefly as possible.

MR. FROST: On the 14th of August, (I think I am right in the date,) the day the Provincial-Dominion

Conference was called off, when Mr. King made his speech in the House of Commons, I was in Ottawa with the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), and with several of our Treasury Officials, to confer with the Cabinet Council Committee in connection with the Provincial-Dominion Conference, and we had been there the day before, prior to meeting his officials. We had our officials there, and the first intimation we had the conference was called off was when we read it in the newspapers. Following that we went up and went over the matter with Mr. Skelton, Secretary of the Cabinet Council Committee. We went over the whole matter, and Mr. Skelton stated the Province of Ontario had supplied 98% of the information that was required, and he gave his own estimate at that time that only anbout 2% of the information was outstanding.

I would say one of the points they were asking was the debt of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st of March, 1944. The fact is this: the information was supplied to Mr. Skelton that day and in his hands before it had been given to me, by my own official, as Provincial Secretary of Ontario. I think that is pretty full and complete cooperation, and I say Mr. King's excuse for calling off the conference was an excuse of a most flimsy nature, and my friend would see that from reading the correspondence.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the customary courtesies of the House at times like this in making mention of the pleasure one has in listening to the motion moved and seconded, by the hon. members on the opposite side, to the Debate on the Speech from the Throne. I cannot say that I am at all in agreement with the motion,

(Page 1878 follows)

I cannot say that I am at all in agreement with the motion. Simply because the motion itself is one that is to be expected from the Government, and as far as the opposition is concerned, it could not possibly be accepted, because in my judgment the Throne Speech contained so very little.

I am not going to travel all over the thing, Mr. Speaker, but I am going to speak to the thing of which I am pretty certain I know something. And those who travel here and there on the Speech from the Throne may do so as far as I am concerned. I am going to refer to matters of labour, and I find it very necessary to refer to these matters of Labour at this particular time because the speech from the Throne itself said so little about it.

I cannot understand, for the life of me, how a Department calling itself a Department of Labour and dealing with the affairs of about a million and a half workers in this Province, could find so little to put in a Speech from the Throne as we find in the Speech from the Throne read by his Honour the Lieutenant Governor here on February 15th.

I would have thought that because the problems of Labour are so tremendous and are so vital and important, that those problems would have received considerable priority in the Speech from the Throne. It did not receive priority not by any means. The thing that receive priority was Education. And because there is so much in the Speech from the Throne about education, and so little about Labour, I can only conclude that we are going to fill the people's minds and keep their stomachs empty. It may be a very good policy to bow to the domination of the Prime Minister, because he is the Minister of Education, and let him have free run in the Speech from the Throne. The other day when the Minister of

Labour was speaking I remember quite well he said that the Prime Minister does not snap the whip. No, because you do not stand up to him. Stand up to him and see what happens. You give into him all the time.

Now, for the references to the affairs of Labour are just really two items. There is a very little bit about what the Regional War Labour Board has done, and what the National Labour Relations Board has done. But the only thing that you contemplate doing for Labour, according to the Speech from the Throne, is to amend the Compensation Act, or as the wording in the Speech itself says, that the Workmens' Compensation Act will be broadened again this year to bring additional classes of workers under its protection and legislation will be introduced for this purpose. And the other little thing that they were going to do is to amend the Minimum Wage Act.

Well, there has a change come over the scene since the Speech from the Throne was read, because the Hon. Minister of Labour has invited you to Ottawa to attend a conference, -- is this the conference of which we have heard so much? We have heard so much about a Dominion-Provincial Conference and now we hear the Minister of Labour is going to attend a Labour Conference between the Provinces and the Dominion. Good luck to you. That is better than anything else around here.

We have seen what the Hon. Minister has introduced, both about Compensation and about the Minimum Wage Act, and it has not enough strength to brush a fly off a window pane, -- neither of them.

Now, because, as I said before, there is so little dealing with Labour, I propose to deal with it, and, I might

as well say now that I am not going to be brief. You might as well know the sad news right at the start, and so far as I am concerned, it would not bother me in the least how much people get up and say that the time of the House is being wasted. If the Government had done the job that it ought to have done, if it knew how to do it, we would not be on the Speech from the Throne at the present time.

I came into this House on February 15th, and sat days around here, twiddling my thumbs. Well, I am copying you people, you see, that is about all you were doing; and we were only doing that because the Government had not prepared or organized the affairs or business in the Legislature. Even the two little items that the Minister of Labour himself introduced only came into the House this wekk, two trivial little pieces of Legislation which could have been brought in almost the next day following the Speech from the Throne.

I want to say to the Hon. Minister of Labour, as I said last night, when we discussed in a piecemeal sort of fashion some of the affairs of labour, that he has gone a step further than the Speech from the Throne indicated he was going to go by introducing an amendment to the Bill which was introduced or became law after the last Session, about which I am going to say something in a couple of hours' time.

As a matter of fact, I find the Speech from the Throne very unsatisfactory because of the little attention that the Speech from the Throne, which means the government, -- it does not mean the Lieutenant-Governor, but it means the Government, -- how much the government is proposing to pay attention to two of the principle groups in this Province,

namely Labour and Agriculture.

You can have all the education and all the Health measures and all the other forms of social legislation you like, but if you have not looked after those two basic groups, you have not started dealing with the realities of the problems which we are confronted with.

Agriculture is sick. I told you before that I was only going to talk about the things I know something about, Labour. I do not pretend to know anything about agriculture, but I heard a very grand speech delivered to-day by our good friend the Hon. member from Grey (Mr. Oliver), -- a very splendid speech, which was made up of nothing else but telling us of the sickness of agriculture, and how the doctors who profess to cure agriculture from its ailments, were doing nothing about it. That is about all we heard, agriculture is sick.

I do not want to say a word of adverse criticism about the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. I do not know that there is any man in this House who is more beloved by all members than the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy); and I am as sorry as any other member of the House, that the Minister of Agriculture has been so sick and not able to attend to his duties. But I do want to say that the sickness of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture cannot continue indefinitely because of the sickness of agriculture. You have got to attend to that particular problem, because it is one of the main groups upon which our livelihood and our standards of continuity are dependent.

The other great group is Labour. If you do not look after those two groups, if you continue to show the indifference that you are showing to them, then you might as well get rid

of the chap that is acting as Minister of Planning and Development. You have spent already, I think, something like a hundred thousand dollars on his Department, -- what for, I do not know. He has delivered some radio speeches which, I think a child from school would be ashamed to claim credit for. Somebody here to-night said something about Words, Words, Words. The agricultural interim report is said to be a lot of words. Well, that is all the radio speeches of the Hon. Minister of Planning and Development contains, Words, Words, Words. There is no indication at all of anything of a real nature in the speeches. A pleasant little thing for a kindergarten class. Very nice. It should be given to them, I suggest, for the kindergarten class, and I suggest the Hon. Minister might include it for them in their curriculum.

The problem for these particular groups means this, that if you allow them to deteriorate, you will find your need for Social Services becomes all the greater. If you raise their standards, you will find that their need for social services becomes less. That is demonstrated in this war, as compared with the black thirties during the days of depression, 1929 to 1939. It was a well known fact, wherever we went, that there was a crying demand on the part of the people for social services, because they had not the means to procure it for themselves. Now, because, of this period of prosperity through which we are passing, you do not have those demands, because the people are financially able to secure it for themselves.

So, let this question of Labour take care of itself, and you will run up against a snag in a very short time. I wonder whether the Department of Labour knows what the

problems of Labour are? The other day the Minister of Labour said, -- I felt sort of sorry for him, because he tried to take himself in a pitying sort of way, I have tried to do all these things and you are still not satisfied. I want to say that I directed a question to both the Minister of Planning and Development and the Minister of Labour, about two thousand people being laid off in my constituency, the City of Ottawa. If you have done anything about it, I do not know about it. I doubt if you have done anything at all about it, either of the Ministers.

I heard the Honourable Minister say the other day that he was in charge of the Board of Labour Relations, the War Labour Board and the Industrial and Labour Board, and was trying to show a lot of the things that he is responsible for. I do not want to belittle it, because you have got an awful lot of responsibilities. I wonder whether you are also in charge of the Board which handles civil service affairs in this building, of those in the employ of the government. I am not going to run after the red herring at the moment, because I will say something about that later on.

The people of this Province, the million and a half, approximately of the people of this Province are expecting this government to really do something for them. I am not going to attempt to belittle what the government has done. I am disappointed, I thought that that would have brought a bit of applause.

Am I mistaken that you have not done anything?

The most of the things, however, that you said you would do, you have not done. As a matter of fact, the present

position, as far as Labour and agriculture are concerned, proves that when you came along to the election of 1943 you had a few eggs that you put in the one basket, and you have not got an egg left in the nest. That is all it amounted to, -- not an egg.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are all chickens now.

MR. WILLIAMS: As a matter of fact, in the language of the English cricket field, you have had one innings and you have been bowled for a duck.

I got a smile out of you, anyhow.

The Throne Speech is a most unreal thing, in my judgment, because it deals with the past. It does not seem to recognize nothing of the future. I speaks of what you have done; but very little about what you are going to do.

Now, there is no denying that phase of what I am saying, because the record in this connection will speak for itself. Because of that particular situation, because of the absence of any recognition of the needs of the future, you are going to be defeated, and there is nothing to save you, -- I hope not anyhow.

(Page 1885 follows)

Of course, we cannot defeat you on our own. We tried that last year, and we found we were the only ones who voted against.

MR. BLACKWELL: An alternative vote.

MR. WILLIAMS: There seems to be every indication now that when the vote comes, we shall not be voting alone. Oh, yes, I know you are pretty near to the cemetery.

MR. DREW: Just across from it, too.

MR. WILLIAMS: You will not be so glad when the burial comes. With all these expressions of national socialism, and regimentation, and all the rest of it, when you hear us pronouncing the funeral oration over you, you will not be happy.

Now, it is quite apparent, because you are going to be defeated, that that does not necessarily mean an election. That point has been stressed by others before. I want to make this point very clear, that when the Government is defeated, the responsibility for calling an election will not be on those who voted to defeat the Government. All we can do is to rise in our places when the vote is taken, and say, "Nay".

MR. DUCKWORTH: "Change seats".

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. WILLIAMS: But after the vote, there will be a conference held, and none of us who voted against the Government will be in that conference. It will be held in a little place a few steps beyond our Opposition Room down here -- at least I presume it will be -- and there probably will not be any more than two people present, and the one who will be present here when the vote is taken is the one who will do the most talking in that little conference, and he will say to the other one, who will be listening, "I want

you to do so-and so, and so-and-so, and so-and-so."and the other man will say, "Yes," and that is where the decision for an election will take place -- nowhere else. It will not be decided in this House; it will be decided down there in the Lieutenant-Governor's Chambers, so that the decision about an election will rest entirely on the shoulders of two people, thehon. Prime Minister of the Province of Ontario, and his Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

We have said that there is no need for an election. While the Government cannot avert a defeat in this House, they can avert an election.

I have heard from all kinds of people in this country that we should not have an election during wartime; that it tends to take the people's minds away from the seriousness of the war; that we should be spending all our energies toward winning the war, and it must not be such distraction as an election. Well, we will find out in a few hours from now how much sincerity is in that kind of talk. These people who have been talking in this particular way will find themselves in the responsible position of deciding whether there shall be an election or not, and I think we will find out -- and this is my own personal view -- that the kind of thing they have been saying about no election in wartime will prove just so much "eye-wash".

During this debate, I think I am understating the situation when I say that we, in this group, have had a sort of "going-over" with a sort of small-toothed comb by various people in the House. Even my good friand from Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Miller) -- I think I am getting too friendly with some of these people, because I find that they treat me just the same as if I was not friendly with them

at all. The hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr.Miller) goes on and reads something in this House here about what somebody has said in a little booklet about socialism, and leaves the impression that it is our booklet, and it has nothing to do with us at all. It just what what some other "guys" think we mean by "socialism".

Now, if I am going to listen to all that kind of thing that people believe about socialism, then I will be a queer sort of, as the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Miller) called me, "radical socialist", because I cannot fit my socialism into the ideas of the hon. Prime Minister, nor into the ideas of the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Miller) and this Bowmanville statesman -- "some statesman" -- and still remain in my proper centre.

But we have been getting a fair trimming in this House. I am very sorry to hear the remarks coming from some people, such as I have heard. I am very sorry to have heard the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) and the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Hancock) taking us "over the coals". Well now, they did it, and I am going to take advantage of the opportunity to have my little say in reply, but before I come to that, I just want to say one thing about a statement of the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Miller) when he was quoting about the wealth of the mines, and about these hard-working investors -- yes that is why the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) brought in that big security thing, so as to take care of the investors, was it not? Sure. That is a happy hunting-ground. The investors in the mining field have been a happy hunting-ground for far too long, for all kinds of rogues, and thieves.

Those who own the mines, did not prospect for them; they just took advantage of the opportunity of somebody else. Up to the end of 1943, the total wages paid in six major mines of Kirkland Lake, namely Gold, Teck Hudes, Lake Shore, Wright Hargreaves, Sylvinite, and Toburn, amounted to ninety-seven million dollars. And now -- and this is interesting -- the late Harry Oakes left two hundred million dollars --

MR. GARFIELD ANDERSON (Port Arthur): Not bad.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Provincial Treasurer): We cannot find it.

MR. WILLIAMS: Not now, I can tell you where it probably is.

MR. BLACKWELL: Go on, you are doing well.

MR. WILLIAMS: I am afraid to say I do not mind, for fear Mr. Speaker will get up and rap the gavel and say, "Well I do."

MR. SPEAKER: Never mind that, proceed.

MR. WILLIAMS: Now, the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Miller) is not in his seat, but I hope his colleages will let him know that there is another side to the story about these hard-working, industrious, honest-minded, benevolent prospectors.

Later on -- much later on -- I will tell you something about how some of these people who have got the gold out of the mines have been treated.

Now, in this attack which has been levelled against us, it has not come from one particular quarter; it has not come from any particular quarter; it has been a sort of a united front kind of a thing. We are being bombarded with these attacks, even outside the House. It is not confined only to a political party. We get it from the press; we

get it from the auxiliaries of the Conservative Party, like the Chambers of Commerce, and the Boards of Trade; we get it from all kinds of places and sources, and from one that it is a disappointment to me to get it from, is from the L.P.P's.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh now, not that.

MR. WILLIAMS: It started over there, so he invited me --

MR. SALSBERG: I did not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. WILLIAMS: I sat here to-night through the great part of the speech of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) and listened to his invitation to partake of the cup of hemlock, and in asking us to do that, he leads on so queerly with "nothing to do with you" --

MR. SPEAKER: Do not throw it.

MR. WILLIAMS: Even Mr. Speaker is starting to heckle me now.

MR. SPEAKER: I am protecting you, proceed.

MR. WILLIAMS: But we can do it over here and over there, because we are the chosen few in this House. There are fifty-two of us -- we are not such a lot altogether -- but we are the fifty-two in majority, so you are not of this preferred class.

Then he breaks us down, after telling us that we are fifty-two, that there are some over here who are as bad as you are over there, that is what he said to-night. Even amongst the Liberals there are some as reactionary as those in the Tories, I agree with that. But why declare us to be fifty-two, and then under our very noses pinch some of them away, and throw them? Well, Mr. Speaker, if that

kind of trickery is being pulled, even with our eyes open, before we know where we are, most of the fifty-two who came initially from this side of the House and went over to that side, will eventually be landing back on this side.

MR. DUCKWORTH: We have two of your fellows over here now.

MR. WILLIAMS: Are they with you?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. WILLIAMS: Then, after we have established this little love-nest, all for ourselves, fifty-two of us, he then declares that we are going out onto the hustings and slaughter each other, "We are going to oppose you" -- that is what he said; "We are going to run in these elections." and so on, so apparently we are going to have a coalition of fifty-two, here in this sort of a Sunday-School class, but when we go out on the streets, we will start kicking each other around, as we usually do.

Well, I think that kind of reasoning is very queer. I was puzzled about the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) while he was speaking to-night. He seemed to be labouring under some terrific strain. I do not know whether it was that he did not have enough time to prepare, although I know he does not need a lot of time --

MR. SALSBERG: Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Oh, yes, I am not unmindful of your ability. You have great ability. If you would only take a few lessons to have it properly directed, you would have a great advantage.

Now, it is not only the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that we have had these kind of things, but we have also had them from the hon. member for Bellwoods

(Mr. MacLeod). The first day that he spoke on this Speech from the Throne, he adjourned the debate on the Thursday, and it was resumed, I believe, on the following Tuesday, and I have looked up the record and I find that the record shows that no less than approximately sixteen pages of his portion of the speech is devoted to this sort of iron-fist in a glove sort of thing, making an attack against us. I regret that very much.

The hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Hancock) does much the same kind of thing.

Both of them referred to the "brain trust" of the C.C.F. Well, frankly, if there is such a thing, I do not know it, and I am quite positive that I am not a member of it -- quite positive. Even the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) would know that if there is a "brain trust" in the C.C.F., I would not be a part of it.

If anybody wants to say anything, please speak up so that I can hear you. Do not speak under your breath, we have no brainchild.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not your turn to speak, either.

MR. WILLIAMS: It is obvious to most of the hon. members of the House that I carry my brains in the right place.

Now, referring to the "brain trust" which they claim is in the C.C.F. and the authoritarian leadership of the C.C.F.; I do not think that from people claiming to be representative of the same class of people, that things of that kind can, by the greatest stretch of the imagination, be even thought kindly.

But, after saying all these things about us, they then invite us again to co-operate. Well now, in the speech

of the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) in his reference to us, I distinctly remember him referring to my organization of which I used to be President, in East York, the East York Workers' Association, and, because he brought me personally into the picture, I will tell you why, irrespective of the "brain trust" -- if it is here -- and the authoritatian leadership -- if it is here -- why I would not co-operate with him -- personally you see. If the whole thirty-one do, I will not, so there is no leadership about it, declaring we shall not do this, or shall not do the other.

I am telling you here and now to-night -- and I cannot tell you very much longer anything about this situation -- but this statement which I am going to repeat is that I will not co-operate with you, and when the Speech from the Throne is resumed on Thursday, and I anticipate it will, I will give you chapter and verse to prove why I cannot co-operate with you.

So the hour now being eleven o'clock, Mr.Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I might say that we shall proceed with Bills to-morrow afternoon, and then if we proceed with sufficient speed, we will resume the debate on the Speech from the Throne.

I now move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to; the House adjourned at eleven o'clock p.m.

- - - - - - - - -

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIFTH DAY

Toronto, Ontario,
Wednesday, March 21, 1945.

SPEAKER: Honourable William J. Stewart, C.B.E.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The House met at three o'clock.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. WILLIAM MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Dent (Oxford) I beg leave to present the report of the Standing Committee on Printing.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: In the absence of Mr. Dent (Oxford), Mr. Murdoch (Essex South) presents the report of the Standing Committee on Printing, as follows:

"The Committee recommends that the supplies allowance per member for the current Session be fixed at the sum of $25.00 and that, to meet the convenience of the members each member of the Assembly be given a cheque for that amount in order that he may make the desired purchases in his own constituency;

"Also that an allowance be authorized and cheques issued to the full time daily newspaper representatives covering the present Session of the Legislative Assembly, as nominated by the Press Gallery and approved by Mr. Speaker.

"The Committee recommends that copies of the Canadian Parliamentary Guide, The Canadian Almanac, and the Canada Year Book be purchased for distribution to the members of the Assembly.

"The Committee recommends that the Sessional papers for the current year be printed in the following numbers: -

"Public Accounts - - - - - - - - - -		2200
"Estimates - - - - - - - - - - - -		1250
"Lands and Forests - - - - - - - - -		1150
"Mines - - - - - - - - - - - - - -		2350
"Legal Offices - - - - - - - - - - -		500
"Superintendent of Insurance:	Abstract	850
	Detailed	950
"Registrar of Loan Corporation:		
	Abstract	300
	Detailed	550
"Public Works - - - - - - - - - - -		200
"Highways - - - - - - - - - - - - -		475
"Games and Fisheries - - - - - - - -		350
"Labour - - - - - - - - - - - - -		750
"Education:	Paper - - - - - - - -	900
	Cloth Bound - - - - -	50
"University of Toronto - - - - -		200
"Births, Marriages and Deaths - -		1150
"Department of Health - - - - - -		650
"Ontario Hospitals for Mentally Sub-normal and Epileptics - - -		400
"General Hospitals, Hospitals for Incurables, Sanatoria and Red Cross Hospitals - - - - - -		900
"Prisons and Reformatories:	Paper	825
	Cloth	50
"Industrial Training Schools:	Paper	800
	Cloth	33
"Public Welfare - - - - - - - - - - -		900
"Liquor Control Board - - - - - - - -		650
"Department of Agriculture (Minister)		1800
"Department of Agriculture (Statistics)		3150
"Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Rail-way - - - - - - - - - - -		250
"Ontario Municipal Board - - - - -		450

"Hydro-Electric Power Commission	3400
"Provincial Auditor - - - - - - - - -	200
"Workmen's Compensation Board - - -	1150
"Ontario Veterinary College - - - -	1150
"Provincial Police - - - - - - - - -	300
"Ontario Research Foundation - - -	750
"Niagara Parks Commission - - - - - -	300
"Fire Marshal - - - - - - - - - - - -	1050

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave, seconded by Mr. Connor (Hamilton East), to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Labour Relations Board Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Would the hon. member explain?

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a bill designed to amend the Labour Relations Board Act to provide for eliminating many of the difficulties and obstructions which are now experienced by organized labour under the present regulations, 1003.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Challies (Minister without Portfolio), that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act respecting the purchase of cattle with horns," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

MR. FARQUHAR R. OLIVER (Grey South): Does this bill follow, pretty well, the provisions of the Western Bill?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, practically the same bill. It provides for the deduction of one dollar per head.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Strange (Brantford) that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and motion read a first time.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Would the hon. member explain that?

MR. WILLIAMS: This bill contains several amendments to the present Compensation Act, such as changing the present 66 2/3%payment of compensation to injured workmen to 100% , and, following along this particular line, the other amendments are part of the bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I have a short announcement to make to the House, which I feel should be made here, in view of the fact the announcement might otherwise come from elsewhere, effecting the work of the Department of Education. It is the result of rather extended discussions and arrangements, and deals with the subject of adult education.

Adult education is, as everyone will realize, of greater importance now than ever before, because of the extremely unsettling conditions of the war. But, quite apart from any special circumstances, however, is the fact that there is an increasing recognition that education is a continuing process which should keep right on after the school years.

In our schools we have recognized the close relationship between mental and physical education. We believe that this relationship is also desirable in adult education.

I am able to announce to-day, for the first time, - I mean by that, it was not possible to announce it before, - that we have completed arrangements for the organization and administration of both aspects of adult education in this province. The adult education board has been set up with full cooperation of all the universities in the province which will make their services available for this purpose, and, of course, the expert members of their staffs. Dr. W. J. Dunlop, of the University of Toronto, is Chairman. The other members of the Board are: Principal R. C. Wallace of Queen's, President W. S. Fox of Western, Professor C. H. Stearn of McMaster, Dr. P. Cornellier of Ottawa, Dr. G. I. Christie of the O.A.C., Dr. H. M. Tory of Carleton College, and Dr. E. A. Corbett of the Canadian Association for Adult Education. Mr. C. P. Cannon, of the Department of Education, and Mr. C. Graham, of the Department of Agriculture, will act as liaison officers between those departments and the Board.

It will be the duty of this Board to work with all voluntary agencies which have done such good and unselfish work in the past, and to spread adult education throughout the whole province. The Board will plan for adult education in rural and urban communities, particularly in North-western Ontario and Northern Ontario, which require the immediate provision of all facilities that can possibly be arranged.

The Board will seek local cooperation in the vigorous expansion and organization of adult education in every community. These efforts will not attempt to supplant existing

activities, nor to impose any fixed pattern of adult education. The main function of the Board will be to encourage communities and voluntary agencies to develop the best type of adult education for their local needs, and to act as a co-ordinating body between the various local and voluntary organizations.

Adult education for New Canadians will be a particularly important part of the adult education programme. Already many voluntary agencies and Boards of Education have done much valuable work in this field. What they have done will be of great assistance, and further expansion of this work will be carried out with the assistance of a special advisory committee of New Canadians.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, adult education is a continuing process, mentally and physically. The physical side of adult education is equally important. Here, again, many voluntary agencies have been active, and urban and rural municipalities have been taking great interest in this work. In this field, the task of the Department of Education will be to encourage and co-ordinate existing activities where they already exist, and to give leadership in the extension of physical fitness programmes suitable to the various localities throughout Ontario.

The reason I can announce this to-day is that Squadron Leader J. K. Tett, D.F.C., has been appointed Director of Physical Fitness in the Physical and Health Education Branch of the Department of Education. Squadron Leader Tett has the highest possible qualifications for this work. He is still attached to the Royal Canadian Air Force, where he has been doing similar organization work throughout the whole of

Canada since his return from operational duties. He will be released from his duties with the Royal Canadian Air Force within the next two weeks.

As so many physical instructors throughout the province have been, or are now, on active service, we regarded it as an essential requirement that the Director of Physical Fitness should have had active service overseas, and we are particularly fortunate in having obtained the services of an officer with the highest possible qualifications from the point of view of physical instruction, and at the same time a most enviable and distinguished record in combat duty with the Bomber Command. He will assume his new duties immediately after release from the Royal Canadian Air Force within the next two weeks, - no longer.

I do think, in mentioning this Officer and the duties he is to assume, and having emphasized to the people of the Department, in making this choice, that it is essential the Director of Physical Fitness should have active service experience, I should give you a brief citation. I might say, in addition, this citation I mentioned, which accompanied his decoration of the Distinguished Flying Cross, in addition to his many qualifications as Physical Instructor and otherwise, should recommend him to this Legislature and to the people with whom he will be working.

> "This Officer is an exceptional Captain. His skilful piloting and cool judgment have won the confidence of his crew. He has participated in numerous sorties over enemy and enemy-occupied territory. Forced down at sea on one occasion, with his crew, he spent thirteen hours drifting before being picked up. During a later attack on Essen, when one engine failed, he flew and bombed the target, and successfully brought his aircraft back to base. He has at all times displayed great devotion to duty."

That, Mr. Speaker, is the type of man we are putting in charge of this task.

MR. FRED W. WARREN (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister a question? I would like to know, in this work are we going to throw up the Home Economics and Manual Training and the Physical Training now being carried on? Are you going to throw this department open? I think that is the kind of work people are interested in, and, personally, I would like to see something done along that line.

MR. DREW: Very definitely. When I said "mental", I did not mean to limit that to the head, but anything constructed upon the actual direction of mental instruction. The purpose is to make available the facilities of the schools in connection with this work, and make the schools more and more a centre of local activity beyond the actual teaching of the pupils.

As the hon. member knows, we have already given several grants to schools in the rural areas, which had to make their facilities available as centres of local activity, and it will certainly be the purpose to carry on this work in that field.

(Page No. 1901 follows.)

BB1

3-21-45
Miss Macphail

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Mr. Speaker, the question I wish to ask is, Are the grants which are not given by the Department of Agriculture, -- I think in part by the Department of Agriculture and in part by the Department of Education, -- which was given in Simcoe County, and which are very useful, extended, or could they be extended now to other Counties?

MR. DREW: I think I should answer that in this way. Through very extensive discussion with the Heads of the Universities, we have set up this Board, and the purpose is to secure what is best in every County, and they certainly will have before them what you propose, and the very best of systems which can be given in any county.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question?

MR. SPEAKER: Go ahead.

MR. WILLIAMS: In reading out the names of the people who are going to comprise the council or board for this work, I did not catch any representative from the W.E.A., which is exclusively an organization for the education of adult people. If it is possible, perhaps the Hon. Minister would say whether it was possible, to have anyone of them included in this council, I submit it would be a good thing.

MR. DREW: I know that the Board itself will be anxious to welcome any suggestions, and we will be glad to implement any suggestions which will appear to extend effectively the work of this Board.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The first order, third reading of Bill No. 41, intituled The Securities Act, 1945. Mr. Blackwell.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 41

BB2

3-21-45
Mr. Blackwell.

The Securities Act, 1945, be now read the third time.

Motion agreed to. The third reading of the Bill.

THE CLERK OF HOUSE: The second order, third reading of Bill No. 42, An Act respecting Prospecting Syndicates having a capital not exceeding thirty-five thousand dollars. Mr. Blackwell.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 42, An Act respecting Prospecting Syndicates having a capital not exceeding thirty-five thousand dollars be now read the third time.

Motion agreed to. Third reading of the Bill.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The third order, the third reading of Bill No. 63, intituled An Act to amend the Public Trustee Act. Mr. Blackwell.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I now move that Bill No. 63, An Act to amend the Public Trustee Act, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to. Third reading of the Bill.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth order, the third reading of Bill No. 65, entitled An Act to amend the Evidence Act. Mr. Blackwell.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I now move that Bill number 65 intituled An Act to amend the Evidence Act, be now read the third time.

Motion agreed to. Third reading of the Bill.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order. Third reading of Bill No. 34, intituled an Act respecting Forest Engineers. Mr. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I now move the third reading of Bill No. 34 intituled An Act respecting Forest Engineers.

BB3

3-21-45
Mr. Thompson.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Thompson moves the third reading of Bill No. 34 intituled An Act respecting Forest Engineers. What is the pleasure of the House? Shall the Bill carry?

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): Before the motion is carried I wonder if the Hon. Minister would consider withdrawing this Bill? I think the House agreed that the Bill was badly drawn and ill-timed. If the Minister will not agree to withdraw the Bill, I will have to consider moving an amendment.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, it is almost three weeks since this Bill was introduced into the House. I think there has been ample time given for any objection there might be to it. I may say that I had opposition to it from some eighteen people; I asked those people to come to my office and present their evidence. Some four for five came, representing a total of somewhere around fifteen or eighteen; we had a meeting which lasted for some considerable time. The Attorney General was in on that meeting; and no evidence was advanced there that would lead me to believe that the Bill should be changed. There were arguments presented for changes in the Bill. If we had acceded to those changes in the Bill, it would have made it possible for industry to control this organization. I could not see my way clear to my way to that; and I believe, since this Bill has been before the House for some three weeks, it should now be given its third reading.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): When this Bill was before the Committee of the whole House a day or two ago, it was quite obvious then that there was not unanimity of opinion so far as the government benches were concerned. In fact, it was something strange in my experience, for, in fact, there were two amendments, one moved by the Hon. Prime Minister, and one by the Hon. Attorney General.

BB4

3-21-45
Mr. Thompson.

First, we must determine who are to be affected by the provisions of this Bill, and who are going to be brought under the control of these five men, no one of whom of necessity would be Forestry Engineers.

First, what is the purpose of this Bill?

> "(b) 'forestry' shall mean the management and administration of forests and forest lands and shall include forestry education and forestry research, the supervision of the inventory and valuation of forests," ...

MR. BLACKWELL: I would suggest that the Hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) read the designation of "Forestry" as amended and actually passed by the House in Committee.

MR. HEPBURN: I am reading the clause (b) which, I think, is very clear; and under the next section you find what he is, after he has been registered by this Board.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) read the definition of "Forestry" in Section 1, (b) of the Bill, prior to it being amended.

MR. HEPBURN (Elgin): Have the amended copies been circulated among the members?

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, they were, and the Hon. member from Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) was given a copy in his office some two weeks ago.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, the interpretation of "Forestry" reads as follows, as amended:

> "(b) Forestry shall mean the advising or reporting upon, or the management or administration of forests or forest lands."

MR. HEPBURN: (Elgin): It is still in general terms. That is the point I want to make, and nothing like that is on my desk.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (York South): Mr. Speaker, some

BB5

3-21-45
Mr. Jolliffe.

amendments were made in committee and they may have been circulated among party leaders; but should not this Bill as amended have been reprinted before being given a third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Have all the members copies of this Bill?

HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I assume that when the Hon. Minister of Lands and Forests called the Bill for third reading, it was amended. I was reading from the copy in my book. I am sure that until the Bill is properly before the House, --

MR. HEPBURN: Mr. Speaker, what I want to say, --

MR. DREW: The Bill is either to be withdrawn or not. If the Hon. Minister of Lands and Forests does withdraw the motion at the request of the Hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) there is nothing before the House.

MR. HEPBURN: I am properly within my rights in discussing the Bill, when it is up for third reading.

I do not think I have taken up the time of the House as much as three hours during this Session, which is not long in view of my position. I want to explain to the Hon. members what the full meaning of this Bill is. I still say that the definition of who are Foresters is very general, and practically anybody who draws his livelihood from the forests in any way may be brought within the provisions of this Bill, and his livelihood and that of his family are at stake.

What are we going to do? We are going to set up a Board of Examiners. As I have said before, no one of them need be a forester. They may be merely political hangers

BB6

3-21-45
Mr. Hepburn.

on. They are to be appointed by the government.

> "3.- (1) The Board may appoint a secretary and such other employees as it deems necessary for the due carrying out of the provisions of this Act and may fix their remuneration."

In other words, this aggregation, appointed it may be, as a result of political activities, are to have power to appoint their staff and pay their salaries.

Then the next power is that "The expenses of the Board, including allowances to the members of the Board, shall be paid out of the revenues of the Board."

There are no strings attached, and this political organization can fix its own remuneration and approve of any expenses which might be incurred.

How are they going to get money? They are going to prescribe the fees to be paid to the Board upon registration and renewal of registration and the penalties payable for the failure to renew registration within the time prescribed.

So that this Board can prescribe fees. I want to point out that thousands of men in the hinterland have never been consulted about this Act. There are many thousands of men who will be brought under the provisions of this Act, and may be fined by the Board for disgraceful conduct, and they can say what is disgraceful conduct.

As I pointed out, disgraceful conduct, in the Optometry Act, might be for putting an add in a newspaper or an add of more than a certain size.

I submit that is entirely out of order. Now then, what else can they do? They compelled them to join this organization or otherwise they cannot practice their profession; and if they do engage in any of these activities, then

BB7

3-21-45
Mr. Hepburn.

according to sub-section 2 of section 6;

> "(2) Every person who violates the provisions of sub-section 1 shall, for a first offence, incur a penalty not exceeding $100.00 and for a second offence, a penalty not exceeding $500.00 or imprisonment not exceeding three months, or both."

How are men scattered all over the country, which includes Northern Algoma, which comprises six sevenths of the whole of Ontario, to do?

If they cannot terrorize them sufficiently from the application of a fine, this Act says:

> "Every person who violates any of the provisions of this Act or the regulations for which no other penalty is provided shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding $25.00."

I submit, Mr. Speaker, to this House that this is really Tory legislation which sets up a political organization for the purpose of dominating and controlling a lot of people who make their living in Northern Ontario.

I am not going to labour the point further.

I move, seconded by Mr. Nixon, that Act No. 34 be not now read the third time, but be read a third time six months hence.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Mr. Hepburn (Elgin) moves that Bill Number 34, "An Act Respecting Forest Engineers" be not now read a third time, but be read a third time this day six months hence. What is the pleasure of the House?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the House just what errant nonsense is the treatise which the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) has given about the "Tory Political Board". I will now go back to the year 1936, when the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) was the Prime Minister of this province, and had a solid phalanx of -- what was it? --Some sixty-five members behind his back -- and at that time that Government had some dim views about the Optometry Act, which he has used as an illustration, and as indicated by the amendment to the Bill, which has been moved by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn). So I am prepared to take the Optometry Bill as an example.

There was an Optometry Act in force in 1936 and in 1936 a new Optometry Act was passed, which was the Optometry Act of this province until amended last year. It had a Board, and in view of what the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) has said about " Political Tory Boards", I would like to give you the provisions of this Act which indicates what the attitude of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr.Hepburn) was towards such boards at that time.

This Act, which is the Act of the Government of which he was Prime Minister, provided for a Board as follows:

"There shall be a Board --"

And I hope the hon. members will follow the equivalent language in the Forest Engineers Bill that is before the

House --

> "There shall be a Board known as the Board of Examiners in Optometry, which shall be composed of three persons, who shall be appointed by and hold office during the pleasure of the Lieutenant Governor in Council."

I hope the hon. members will note that the parallel, that the entire Board is appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Now, in view of the highly prejudicial remarks of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn), let us come to the question of how the Chairman of the Board was selected. This goes on to say:

> "Sub-section 2:
>
> The Lieutenant in Council may appoint one of the members of the Board to be the Chairman of the Board, and may also appoint a Secretary of the Board."

I never heard that at that time when that Act was introduced, and in that Board of Examiners appointed by Order-in-Council, with the Chairman of the Board to be appointed by Order-in-Council, and the Secretary to be appointed by Order-in-Council, -- that at that time the opposition used the highly prejudicial language used by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) in referring to that Board, as being a Liberal Board, being appointed for "Liberal Political Practices". In other words, in that type of organization as represented by the optometrists, and also by the forest engineers, this is the typical type of Board and procedure that has been adopted by Governments in this province since time immemorial.

Now, to deal with the further and last piece of prejudicial nonsense, I would like now to come to the penalties which may be imposed by this Board -- this is the

Optometry Board:

> "Every person who is guilty of an offence under the provisions of this Act, shall, for the first offence, be liable to a penalty of not less than ten dollars, and not exceeding one hundred dollars, and for a second or subsequent offence, to a penalty of not less than twenty-five dollars, and not exceeding five hundred dollars."

Now, may I say that when that Act was enacted, no member of the Opposition arose then and used that highly prejudicial language that these were to be penalties imposed by a Liberal Political Board, controlled for low and devious political purposes by the Liberal party.

And, Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time we regard Legislation in this House on the basis of the merit of the Legislation, and not on the basis of political innuendo and insinuation.

I will add one further thing, Mr. Speaker, that the basic principle of this Bill has been considered deliberately by the hon. members of this House on second reading, and as well in Committee, and there was one guiding principle that resulted in this type of Board, and that principle has its genesis in this, that we are not dealing with a fully developed and organized organization of forest engineers. There is the simple choice for the hon. members of the Legislation, and that is this; either to turn everybody who is entitled to practice forest engineering over to the domination of an unconstituted and improperly organized association, or whether it has to be brought up and developed under Government supervision and guidance until it reaches its maturity. That is the whole point and the whole issue before this House.

I will close by saying one more thing, and that is that, as the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) well knows, the Bill that the people who approached him want and the Bill they recommend to the Government is a Bill under which everyone entitled to practice forestry in this whole province would be placed under the complete domination and control of an existing undeveloped organization, composed of some foresters.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the issue.

MR. JOHN J. KEHOE (Cochrane North): Mr. Speaker, may I say a word here?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. KEHOE: I think the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) is perhaps a little anxious to be a little bit fast on the trigger, in introducing this resolution at this time. We on this side of the House do not agree with the hon. Prime Minister, that he should jump up and withdraw the Bill completely.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I will not interrupt you, but let me explain distinctly what I meant. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) very properly pointed out what I must admit I did not know, and which apparently the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Thompson) and the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) did not know, that the Bill had not been reprinted. Apparently under heavy pressure of printing, this Bill has been overlooked; had we been aware that it had not been reprinted, it would not have been called up for third reading. We are not withdrawing the Bill, but we are acceding to the suggestion made, -- and which is being followed in every case -- that where a Bill is not printed, we do not

wish to go ahead with further readings. We offered to let this Bill stand until it is printed, and that is the position we ask the hon. members of this House to take about it.

MR. KEHOE: I understood the hon. Prime Minister to say he was withdrawing the Bill completely.

MR. DREW: No.

MR. KEHOE: However, he has made it clear, and I am quite satisfied.

MR. DREW: I may have inadvertently conveyed that impression, in the rather hurried cross-fire.

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL: (York North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word on this: As I stated when this matter was under discussion the other day, Mr. Speaker, I do feel there are some clauses in this Bill which appear quite arbitrary, and they give unto this Board such authority, that it could well become -- well, very undemocratic, and dictatorial in its administration of this Board's affairs.

I do not want to bring up the question of patronage, -- of course, it may possibly be that it may come into the picture -- but we are trusting to the good representations of the Government in this regard.

However, there is too much indefiniteness about the Bill; it is all too arbitrary in nature, and I am perfectly convinced that there are too many boards and commissions being appointed by this Government. The remarks of the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) in that regard, were very much appreciated by myself yesterday --

MR. SPEAKER: May I submit to the hon. member for York North (Mr. Mitchell) that this discussion is becoming

out of order. The principle of the Bill was discussed on second reading and in Committee. May I endeavour to clarify the situation, as I see it?

There is a motion, moved by hon. Mr. Thompson that the Bill be now read a third time. Then we had an expression of willingness advanced by the Government, not to withdraw the Bill, but to withdraw the motion dealing with the Bill to-day.

Now, we have an amendment to Mr. Thompson's motion, from the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn), that the Bill be not now read a third time, but read a third time this day six months hence.

I do not think this is the time to discuss principles of the Bill. We should discuss whether it will be withdrawn or not.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Thompson) rose in his place and stated he was withdrawing this Bill from third reading now, and I think that puts the amendment moved by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) not now in order.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON (Brant): May I rise to a point of Order?

MR. SPEAKER: Certainly.

MR. NIXON: My recollection is -- and I would ask you to rule on it, Mr. Speaker -- that once a resolution is before the House, it may not be withdrawn except by the unanimous consent of the House.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I may say that as far as I am concerned, I did not know the Bill had not been reprinted until I heard the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) speaking, and quoting

from the original version -- I think it is -- of Section Number 1.

I then made some enquiries and satisfied myself that it had not been reprinted, and that is why I rose on a point of order.

I think the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) has a perfect right to move the amendment after the Order had been called, and the motion has been moved by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Thompson).

However, I would like to put it this way now, -- and perhaps it would be as well to hear from the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) whether he really wants it disposed of to-day or not -- but the way I want to put it now is this; I arose on a point of order about this Act being dealt with on third reading to-day, it not having been reprinted, and if necessary I will ask the Speaker to rule on that point of order. I know there is considerable dissatisfaction with the Bill amongst the people in the Opposition; there was a good deal of dissatisfaction on my own part, and there are those, on the other hand, who feel that one step is better than no step in the matter of recognizing an organization, and securing a better standing for forest engineers.

But the point I would like to dispose of now is quite apart from the willingness of the Government to withdraw the Bill to-day. Is it in order for the House to vote on third reading and on the amendment of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) to-day? Either it is in order, or it is not. Mr. Speaker, you should rule on it, and the House can decide whether they think the Speaker is right or wrong, but I would like that

cleared up.

MR. SPEAKER: May I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that I think his point is well taken. He is right in objecting to third reading, when the Bill has not been reprinted.

Mr. Thompson (Minister of Lands and Forests) moved third reading of the Bill. I placed the motion before the House. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) moved an amendment. I have accepted that amendment. During the interval there was an expression of willingness on the part of the Government to withdraw the motion from the Orders of the Day, to enable the Clerk of the House to have the Bill reprinted. We can vote on the amendment, or accept the expression of willingness by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Thompson) to withdraw the Bill from the third reading to-day.

MR. BERTRAM E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order --

MR. SPEAKER: Let us get away from points of order.

MR. LEAVENS: I think I have a right to rise on a point of order on any motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, proceed.

MR. LEAVENS: Is this Bill before the House for third reading, if it is not printed?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, the Government can move third reading of a Bill, and if someone objects, then have it stand.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I may be wrong, but I had the distinct impression that the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Thompson) indicated his willingness to let third reading stand over, before the amendment was moved. That was my impression.

It seems to me, not having received a copy of the amendment -- and I did not receive a copy of it -- I could not possibly vote on this amendment without having the amended Bill before me, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members of this House, that the wisest course to pursue is to have the House accept the request of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Thompson) and let third reading stand over until we have the corrected copy.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that third reading stand until the Bill is reprinted and placed before the members?

Motion agreed to; Bill Number 34 stands.

MR. SPEAKER: Next Order.

(Page 1916 follows)

HON. GEROGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move 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. Reynolds in the Chair.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order No. 29.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 29th Order; House in committee on Bill No. 2, "An Act respecting the Town of Barrie", Mr. Johnston.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 2, "An Act respecting the Town of Barrie". Section 1 carried?

Motion agreed to.

Sections 2, 3, 4 and 5 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order No. 30.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 30th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 3, "An Act respecting the City of Welland", Mr. Brown.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 3, "An Act respecting the City of Welland".

Shall Section 1 carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 2 carry?

MR. GARFIELD ANDERSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, with regard to Section No. 2: Was the correction made in connection with the by-law giving exemption from taxation to towns?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Yes, the amendment is entered.

Is Section 2, 3, 4 and 5 agreed to?

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEROGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order No. 31.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 31st Order: House in Committee on Bill No. 6, "An Act respecting the City of Woodstock", Mr. Dent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 6, "An Act respecting the City of Woodstock".

Are sections 1, 2 and 3 agreed to?

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order No. 32.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 32nd Order. The House in Committee on Bill No. 8, "An Act respecting the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Niagara", Mr. Roberts.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 8, "An Act respecting the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Niagara".

Are Sections 1 and 2 agreed to?

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order No. 33.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 33rd Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 10, "An Act respecting the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada", Mr. Cook.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 10, "An Act respect-

ing the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada".

Section 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to?

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order Number Thirty-Four.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The Thirty-fourth Order; The House in Committee on Bill No. 11, "An Act respecting the City of St. Thomas", Mr. Hepburn (Elgin)

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister) Order No,34.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: House in Committee on Bill No.11 "An Act respecting the City of St.Thomas."Mr. Hepburn (Elgin).

CHAIRMAN: Bill No.11 "An Act respecting the City of St.Thomas".

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A.DREW (Prime Minister): 35th order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 35th Order- House in Committee on Bill No.5. "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough"- Mr. Scott

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No.5. "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough".

Section 1.

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL (York, North): I would like to ask a question with regard to the Section 2 whether the City of Peterborough may acquire lands by expropriation if necessary. Could I be permitted or informed whether they are permitted to expriopriate outside the municipality or is it within the corporation.

MR. H.R.SCOTT (Peterborough): Mr. Chairman, the intehtion would be within the corporation but there is no intention of expropriating anyway.

MR. MITCHELL: I would like to suggest that these words be added to this Section, Mr. Chairman,in order that the situation may be clarified, Commencing I think it is "subject to the approval of the Ontario Municipal Board". I want to see some words in there.

THE CHAIRMAN: You cannot move an amendment to a private bill, I understand unless you give two days notice.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed.to.

Hon.GEORGE A.DREW (Prime Minister) 36 Order.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 36th Order "House in Committee on Bill (No.9) "An Act respecting the City of Kingston" Mr.Stewart.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No.9. "An Act respecting the City of Kingston".

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A.DREW (Prime Minister) 37th Order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 37th Order - "House in Committe on Bill (No.12) "An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur." Mr.Robinson.

CHAIRMAN: Bill No.12, "An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur".

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A DREW (Prime Minister) 38th Order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 38th Order, -"House in Committee on Bill (No.4) "An Act respecting the Royal Ottawa Sanitorium", Mr. Laurier.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No.4. "An Act respecting the Royal Ottawa Sanitorium".

Sections 1 to 8,inclusive agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A.DREW (Prime Minister): 39th Order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 39th Order - House in Committee on

Bill No.7. "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough Civic Hospital" Mr. Scott.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No.7. "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough Civic Hospital".

MR. ROLAND PATTERSON (Grey, North): I have absolutely no opposition to this Bill, of course, but in Private Bills Committee I tried to obtain some information in regard to an item and I apparently could only obtain it from the Minister of Health (Mr.Vivian) and I would like to ask him a question about this. In this Bill regarding Peterborough's Civic Hospital the grant are itemized here and one of them is a grant of $50,000 from the Department of Health for the establishment of ward,- -this is the only place I could ask it- for chronically ill patients. What I asked in the Private Bill is whether that is the policy of the Department to make grants of that nature, and I knew you could tell me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I understand the hon. member (Mr. Patterson) to say there is in this Bill an amount..

MR. PATTERSON: In the Bill it is stated there is $1,400,000 is being raised to finance this Hospital.

HON.R.P. VIVIAN (Durham): It is not in the Bill - that is the first thing I want to be certain of. You want to know the answer; I will be very glad to give it to you.

MR. PATTERSON: I knew you would be.

MR. VIVIAN: Last year, as one step in the hospitalization programme grants were made to a number of institutions in the province for assistance in providing beds for chronically ill patients. At that time the grants were made largely on the basis of $1,000 per bed. The beds, so called, cost about $3,000 or better, the balance of the money to be raised by local

efforts. There has been no grant made to the City of Peterborough in the amount that you suggest or in any amount, nor has any policy been determined by the Government regarding chronic grants other than those which have been given. Is that the answer you want?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes. The reason I asked is whether other hospitals in the province establishing wards of this kind could get a similar type of grant. That is all you have made, grants to Belleville and Kingston?

MR. VIVIAN: We have made grant to Windsor Hospital, which is a chronic hospital, not a general hospital.

MR. JOLLIFFE: (Leader of the Opposition): What is a chronic institution?

MR. VIVIAN: The Queen Elizabeth Hospital in the City of Toronto was another one. No money was given to any general hospital for the provision of chronic beds within that hospital itself with the exception of Parry Sound, which received a grant because of the difficulties of the area for the provision of chronic beds at that institution. Other than that no money has been given to general hospitals for the provision of chronic beds within the hospital itself. I would be glad to get a list of the hospitals.

MR. PATTERSON: I would like to have that list because at the present time in my own City there is a movement to provide additional accomodation and private subscriptions which are being arranged for at the present time. If it were possible to look after these chronically ill, which is quite a nuisance in this hospital, with the assistance of the Province I would appreciate it.

MR. VIVIAN: Just to conclude what is the final bit of the answer. One of these hospital Committees, of which I have made previous mention in the House, are sitting now. It is

expected their reports will come forward in the next six weeks and on receipt of their reports it will then be possible for the Government to make a policy regarding the provision of more chronically ill beds throughout the province. At that time I would be glad to receive your application.

MR. PATTERSON: Then we will be friends again.

MR. VIVIAN: Right.

Sections 1 to Section 25, inclusive, agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A.DREW (Prime Minister):40th Order.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 40th Order - House in Committee on Bill No.13 "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa Separate School Board." Mr. Laurier.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No.13 "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa Separate School Board."

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A.DREW (Prime Minister): 51st Order.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 51st Order - House again in Committee on Bill (No.44) "An Act to amend The Public Health Act", Mr.Vivian.

HON. R.P. VIVIAN: (Durham): May I ask exactly where we are at? It is my understanding we have dealt with all sections except 1 and 2, which is the entitlement. Is that correct or not?

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No.44."An Act to amend the Public Health Act".

Section 1 is adopted.

MR. VIVIAN: Mr. Chairman, the House will recall that

the Hon.member for St.David (Mr.Dennison) proposed an amendment to this section. I have had certain discussion with the hon. member. I think we have been able to satisfy his point by one proposal. I cannot take the time of the House to go into all the difficulties of sewage system and waterworks, but my understanding of the agreement was that in sub-section 2 on the second page at the top, "the municipality may install " and at that point to insert the words "with the approval of the minister". I believe that is the substance of the agreement with the hon.member for St.David (Mr.Dennison) and I would like to hear him express his agreement in that or if he wishes to move that amendment, because he did have a point and I would be very happy to have him do that.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St.David): I will be pleased to move that amendment. I think that does clear up the objection I had raised. My objection was briefly, that I thought we should put a check on any further pollution of our streams and rivers where there is no proper sewage disposal plant available.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 2 as amended, agreed to.

Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A.DREW (Prime Minister): 53rd Order.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 53rd Order - House in Committee on Bill (No.64) "An Act to amend the Mining Act" -Mr. Frost.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 64, "An Act to amend the Mining Act".

Sections 1 to 8 inclusive, agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST:(Victoria): 52nd Order.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 52nd Order -House in Committee on Bill No.56 -"An Act to amend The Dog Tax and Live Stock Protection Act" Mr. Doucett.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No.56,"An Act to amend the Dog Tax and Live Stock Protection Act".

Section 1 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 2.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, if it is the pleasure of the House I would like to move an amendment here. Insert after word "Dog" at the fifth line the words " within the municipality or within any defined area thereof," so that the sub-section will read now:

> "By-laws may be passed by the councils of towns, townships, villages and cities having a population of less than 100,000 and by board of commissioners of police in cities having a population of not less than 100,000 for prohibiting or regulating the running at large of dogs within the municipality or within any defined area thereof; for seizing and impounding and for killing, whether before or after impounding dogs running at large contrary to the by-law and for selling dogs so impounded at such time and in such manner as may be provided by the by-law."

MR. A.A.CASSELMAN (Nipissing): Where does that fit in this Act?

MR. DOUCETT: That will be a new section of the Bill. It will be re-printed over next week.

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL (York,North): Mr.Chairman, is the second reading of this Bill being deferred until the amendment has been brought up?

MR. DOUCETT: This Bill is now in committee and will be re-printed so that every member will have a copy.

MR. CASSELMAN: We will come back in Committee?

MR. DOUCETT: No.

MR. CASSELMAN: You tell us by the Rules we cannot discuss the Sections.

MR. DOUCETT: Well, if it is the wish of the House that it comes back to committee, I will not object.

MR.F.W. WARREN (Hamilton-Wentworth): Will you please read it again.

MR. ROY SMITH (Parry Sound): I would prefer that it come back to committee again. I think I am in accord with what the Minister read but I have nothing before me.

MR. FROST: The amendment is really a very simple one. You have in Ontario, for instance, townships that have a hamlet within the border of the township that is not incorporated and the situation has arisen, which makes it questionable as to whether the township can pass a by-law saying that dogs shall not run at large in the place known as the village of so and so which has not a corporate existence and the purpose of this amendment is that it gives to the township council permission to pass a by-law which says that dogs shall not run at large, &c. It is merely to meet a condition which has arisen in many of the unincorporated centres in Ontario relative to this particular Act. Now, many of the people have flower beds and gardens, &c. and they may want to control that situation and they cannot control it the way it is. I would suggest to the hon. members - I think this would be agreeable - some of the hon. members in his group have seen the amendment,- if it should turn out when the Bill is re-printed it is not satisfactory, I will assure that motion to return it to committee will be acceptable.

MR. A.A.CASSELMAN: That is it, I have a dog and it cannot read.

Section 2 agreed to.

Section 3, 4, inclusive, agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the bill as amended be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR.FROST: 54th Order.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 54th Order - House in Committee on Bill (No.57) "An Act to Amend the Statute Labour Act." Mr. Doucett.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Bill No. 57 "An Act to Amend the Statute Labour Act",

Sections 1 to 11, inclusive, agreed to.

Section 12.

MR. CASSELMAN: Section 12. I just noticed something here, "All arrears shall bear interest at the rate of ten per centum per annum."

MR. DOUCETT: That is just the same as it always was.

MR. CASSELMAN: It has always been too high.

MR. FROST: It is a municipal penalty.

MR. CASSELMAN: It is too steep a penalty.

Section 12 agreed to

HON. MR. DUNBAR. I might mention to the Hon.member (Mr. Casselman) that the municipal Act has been changed, it must be not more than five per cent per annum.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 13.

MR. DOUCETT: Section 13, on that Form 3 I would like to move an amendment adding one clause there, heading of column nine, extending it and making another column in there so that the "Date of notice to perform service" be shown when filed. That is in 3 and also in 5.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Form 3, as amended be carried?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Form 5, as amended by carried?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Schedule A. form part of the Act?

Motion agreed to.

Section 14 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported as amended?

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR.FROST: 55th Order.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE. 55th Order - House in Committee on Bill (No.47) "An Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act." Mr.Daley.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 47. "An Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act".

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 7 as amended.

Section 7 as amended agreed to.

MR. CHARLES A.STRANGE (Brantford): How was that amended? What is the amendment?

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): The amendment was just that Section 1 shall have effect on and after the sixth day of April 1944. It has corrected what rather appeared to be an injustice to certain people.

CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 7 as amended form part of the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 8.

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported as amended.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: 56th Order.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE. 56 th Order - House in Committee on Bill (No.58) "An Act to Comfirm Tax Sales". Mr.Dunbar.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No.58 "An Act to Confirm Tax Sales".

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 6.

MR. A. BELANGER (Prescott): Regarding Sections 5 and 6 may I ask the Hon. Minister (Mr.Dunbar) whether there is an action or litigation at the present time pending or is a general clause?

HON. G.H.DUNBAR: (Minister of Municipal Affairs): No, a general clause, the same it has been prior.

Section 6 agreed to.

Section 7 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Provincial Treasurer): Fifty-seventh Order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fifty-seventh Order, Bill No. 59, "An Act to amend the Bees' Act." Shall Section 1 form part of the bill?

Motion agreed to.

Shall Section 2 form part of the bill?

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): I just have a word to say about this Act, which really is a honey of an Act. I must say the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) did do a sweet job on this, and it is what bee keepers have been asking for in the province for some time.

The difficulty in the average county in regard to bees is that, for some time, if one person sells bees he must report the sale of the bees to the Department, but if a package of bees is brought in from the other side of the line, there has been no way by which the local bee inspector has any means of discovering who purchased these bees, with the result that disease breaks out in many apiaries in the counties right under the nose of the inspector, and he is unaware the bees are there, but this Act is to be recommended very highly. The only thing I have my doubts about is it just uses the term "bees", and I do not know whether that term includes all sexes. Some apiarists may dispute that. Lawyers tell us "bees" means drones, queens and workers, and therefore you do not have to differentiate. I am taking their word, although I still have my doubts.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Public Works): I have had several suggestions regarding this Act, and I am delighted it satisfies the hon. member. He suggested I should put something in here to control "bees in the bonnets".

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): I

think the hon. member wants to know whether the term "bees" was sufficiently wide in the Bees Act. Bees are not defined, and it seems to me the hon. Attorney General should have considered a definition of what are bees.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): I apologize to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I am not taking any interest in the bees.

MR. ARTHUR A. CASSELMAN (Nipissing): The hon. member was quite right. I have been in the bee business, and bees and queen bees are generally spoken of separately. Queen bees are generally shipped separately, and shipped in packages of one in a package. I think there should be a distinction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 2 of the bill carry?

Motion agreed to.

Shall the bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Provincial Treasurer): Fifty-eighth Order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fifty-eighth Order, Bill No. 73, "An Act to amend the Liquor Authority Control Act." Mr. Blackwell.

Shall Section 1 form part of the bill?

Motion agreed to.

Section 2?

Motion agreed to.

MR. AURELIEN BELANGER (Prescott): Mr. Chairman, may we ask why the Treasurer of Ontario should be talking about net profits. I am just reading this, "striking out the words 'The Treasurer of Ontario shall pay out of the net profits of'". Why should we not come out of the net profits?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 3 form part of the bill?

MR. FRED W. WARREN (Hamilton-Wentworth): There is a mispriht; there are two No. 3's on my copy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was in error. I called Section 2, and then Section 3.

Shall Section 3 form part of the bill?

Motion agreed to.

Shall Section 4 form part of the bill?

Motion agreed to.

Shall the bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Provincial Treasurer): Fifty-ninth Order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fifty-ninth Order, Bill No. 46, "An Act to amend the Public Hospitals' Act," Mr. Vivian.

Shall Section 1 form part of the bill?

Motion agreed to.

Shall Section 2 form part of the bill?

Motion agreed to.

Shall Section 3 form part of the bill?

Motion agreed to.

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL (York North): Mr. Chairman, this is on paragraph 2. Has there been an amendment with regard to that paragraph?

MR. R. P. VIVIAN (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I have not seen any amendment. The hon. member for North York raised the point the other day, but perhaps, in spite of the fact it has been carried, he would like me to speak on it.

MR. MITCHELL: Yes.

MR. VIVIAN: I can clarify it. I draw your attention to Section 2 of the Act, in which power is to be given to the Board of a hospital or corporation incorporated for the purpose of establishing a hospital, the same as the powers

of expropriation conferred on a municipality under the Municipal Act. I believe the point was raised by my hon. friend, whether or not such a power to expropriate property extended outside a municipality. May I refer you, then, to section 3 of page 2, in which it states:

> "No by-law, rule or regulation of any hospital or of any corporation referred to in Section 8 shall have force or effect until the same is approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council."

The point is simply this, that the hospitals may require to have land adjacent, or nearly adjacent, to them in municipalities for purposes of extension. That is the way in which this Section will be used, perhaps almost exclusively.

I would draw the hon. member's attention to the fact it is desirable for hospitals, particularly of the large, general hospital type, or hospitals devoted to a special type of patient, such as the Sick Children's Hospital, to have land situated where there could be a recuperative or convalescent centre, perhaps in Northern Ontario, even outside the municipality, and for that purpose this is drawn in that way.

Inasmuch as No. 3 was passed, we now come to No. 4, and I have an amendment.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Do I understand from what the hon. Minister just said, in the opinion of the hon. Attorney General and the law officers, this amendment does give a hospital board the power to expropriate land outside a municipality?

MR. VIVIAN: That is my understanding.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): What is the question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition?

MR. EDWARD BE. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): It is really the question raised by the hon. member for York North (Mr. Mitchell). Is it the opinion of the hon. Attorney General and the law officers that the effect of the amendment in Section 2 of this bill is to give a hospital board the power to expropriate lands, where necessary, outside the municipality in which the hospital is functioning, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, under the next Section?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Yes. I think the construction of Section 8 is reasonably plain. Let me take a situation to which it is properly applicable, and that is where a hospital has been incorporated for the purpose of establishing a hospital where that hospital may not be in a municipality, at all, and may not be established, but the board is established. Once a hospital is incorporated in any municipality in which it proposes to establish it, it may then pass its by-law upon the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, and the board of the hospital has precisely the same power as the municipality to expropriate in that municipality, and the effect is the hospital can go anywhere for the purpose of establishing a hospital. Now, the reason for this amendment is there was the precise situation where, in the city of Toronto-- I think I should tell the Legislature the question on which this arose. It is a very practical point. Mount Sinai Hospital, as everyone knows, has hospital property in the city of Toronto, and so has the Sick Children's Hospital. Now, the Sick Children's Hospital wanted property which the Mount Sinai Hospital had, and Mount Sinai was willing to make an exchange with them, and take some other property if their power to take

it was clear, and so it was questionable whether the word in the existing Section, "adjacent", was sufficiently close to make the power clear, so it seemed quite reasonable if the powers of expropriation are legitimate powers, then an establishment of a hospital being incorporated should have the power of expropriation, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Then, the situation, in a practical way, is this, and the procedure is also followed in a practical way; first of all, having to pass a by-law, and then get the approval, and then take another step, and then come back again. The practise would be, if a hospital wishes to build where the hospital ought to go, to then get a form of by-law approved, pass that, and then the by-law is automatically approved. That is the practise contemplated under this Section.

MR. MITCHELL: In that case, would the municipality involved, presuming it was a suburban municipality in these proceedings, -- is it possible for them to take place without notification of these actions? In other words, would they have a chance to protest against expropriation of lands which they did not consider suitable, or probably produce some other municipal interests?

MR. BLACKWELL: Exactly the same procedure as under the Municipal Act.

Motion agreed to.

HON. R. P. VIVIAN (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, Section 4, which I believe you are now dealing with, I desire to make an amendment in this, which was given on second reading. I have circulated the amendment to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), the hon. member

for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) and the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), and those hon. members who have the Acts before them, it is very simple to see my amendment, which I propose under Section 4-16-b, where it states:

> "In the case of all other hospitals at the rate of $2.25 per day for a period not exceeding thirty days, and thereafter at the rate of $1.50 per day."

The proposed amendment is to delete the words after "$2.25 per day", to strike those words out.

Now, the reason for it, — the clause would then read:

> "In the case of all other hospitals at the rate of $2.25 per day."

The reason for it: in the present Act there is no time limit. The words were originally included in this Act for the purpose of helping to limit the stay in an active general hospital of these chronic cases, who may very easily be cared for in another institution or in outside places in residences. It is desirable that all chronic cases that can be cared for elsewhere should be, because we are short of beds for patients. Desirable as it is to limit the responsibility in regard to the hospitals, this amendment is expected to work a good deal of hardship at the present time. It was put in on the basis which was received, and the basis of further information, but it is just not possible to relieve the hospitals of a sufficient number of these so-called chronic cases. There is no place we can make provision for them at the present time. These cases are in the nature of incurable cancer, heart conditions, fractures of the hip, and others of a similar nature, that may no longer stay in an active hospital. The Provincial Government, as I indicated to the hon.member for Grey (Mr. Oliver), has taken steps regarding the provision of extra

beds for this type of patient. In the survey, which shows there are more chronic patients than were at first thought, we find we must deal with it in this way just now, because with the increased costs of ward care, it is perfectly obvious general hospitals could not be expected to continue to give service to these patients at $1.50 under the original proposal. Therefore, the time limit is being deleted at the present time.

I trust this amendment will pass the House.

(Page No. 1937 follows.)

Mr. Speaker, with regard to this particular subsection, the County Council of York had an investigation, and we estimate that it would cost the County of York approximately eight to ten thousand dollars annually more than it has been paying up to the present time. If this thirty days is eliminated, I am sure it will run considerably more.

I would like to see this matter left until further investigation can be made, because it is going to cost the municipalities considerably more to assume the costs of these people.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, what section are we on now?

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 4.

MR. ROY DOWNIE (Lambton East): Mr. Chairman, years ago the municipalities were asked to agree to a raise from sixty to seventy-five cents a day.

An arrangement was made with the municipalities of Galt and Brantford to increase the rate from sixty to seventy-five cents a day. That seems to be satisfactory with the City of Hamilton. Why cannot they continue it at that rate. The County of Wentworth is objecting to the rate of $2.25, when the City of Hamilton has already to take them in at $2.00 per day.

I would like to see something in Section 4 that where the City is willing to take them in at $2.00 per day they should do so.

MR. CYRIL OVERALL (Niagara Falls): Will the Hon. Minister answer that now?

MR. VIVIAN: As to the query raised by the Hon. member for North York (Mr. Mitchell) as to the amount it

would now cost more than they are paying now, it costs an average of $3.62 a day to furnish ward care in the hospitals. The hospitals are in a position where they cannot go on with the deficits that have occurred. That is the hospital's side of the picture, -- they need assistance; and it is a question of how hospitals can be assisted at the present time under the difficulties that do exist, and, to put it mildly, owing to the relationships between the Dominion and the Provincial government, and the government and the municipality.

The municipalities of this Province are paying somewhere in the neighbourhood of ten per cent of the entire Health and Welfare work in the Province; so that they are not hard pressed for their share, given their taxing position at the present time.

The Province is in a difficult taxing position. This has always been considered to be a basic difficulty, and, irrespective of the system under which you run your hospitals, the local municipal interests must be in the picture so as to provide adequate control of the institution.

In working it as well as we could the over-all costs to the municipalities by this step, on the one hundred and twenty to one hundred and eighty day basis, it was felt that it might cost the municipalities of the Province some more money than they had been previously paying. On the other hand, they have the opportunity of getting out of that, for this simple reason, that the average stay in the hospital is in the vicinity of eleven days. There are relatively few cases that remain longer than that, unless they are of the chronic or incurable classes. Those cases which require to remain longer than that are relatively few in number.

What can the municipality do? It can do one of two things. It can pay the costs and care of indigents, as at the present time, at an all-time low; or it can make provision for the treatment and care of the patient elsewhere. And I wish to commend the area of West Hastings for the excellent provision they have made for the care of their chronic cases in homes existing outside of that area.

I see no particular difficulty in the matter of protection of the municipality. I certainly assure the House that hospitals are not anxious to hang on to these patients; they are anxious to get them out as quickly as possible. And, while I am not proposing that this should be the final disposition of the subject, it is for the moment a forward step, to assist the hospital. The municipalities will have to pay a little more money. They can be protected by the establishment of a relations officer, as between the hospital and themselves; and I feel that the hospitals will feel it is a great help to them; and I believe it is the only thing we can do to relieve the hospitals just now.

MR. MITCHELL: (York North): I had two things in mind when I raised the question. In the County of York we did decide that we would give grants to the hospitals of fifty thousand dollars annually for the next ten years, for construction only. That was passed that we are to give the fifty thousand dollars annually out of our funds. And there is also the fact that the care of indigents, -- at the present time we have an all time low, and from my municipal point of view I am anxious that nothing shall penalize the municipality when conditions may not be so favourable.

MR. VIVIAN: May I answer these as they come up? The Hon. member (Mr. Mitchell) raises the point of the City

of Hamilton hospital, -- am I correct? Now, Mr. Chairman may I point out, -- I am sorry I have not the figures accurately with me, but in those cities, where there are civic hospitals, such as in Windsor, Hamilton, London, and so on, the fact is that the amount they are paying for ward care is in the vicinity of eight to eleven dollars, which is a substantial amount of money.

The Hon. member has raised the question in relation to the hospital of the City of Hamilton, which I would like to explain. The deficits of that hospital are paid out of the taxes and funds of the City of Hamilton. The hospital makes a charge per day to the patient; that is admitted, whether or not that patient is able to pay, or whether that patient is indigent. The loss on that patient is paid for by the citizens of the City of Hamilton. If a patient comes to that hospital or to the Ottawa civic hospital from another township or town, is there any good reason why that other municipality should not pay the hospital? There is no justification for the tax payers of one municipality bearing an unfair burden for another municipality.

This amount of $2.25 is considered to be just and reasonable, a fair contribution to the hospitals of this Province.

I have explained that we are now waiting for a report from a committee on the rating or category of hospitals. We are now paying $2.25, and seventy-five per cent from the municipality goes to those hospitals which are in the lowest category; and I have here a substantial amount of literature which shows that hospital care varies in costs, for example from $2.67 to as high as $5.00 and a fraction. But a part of these costs are the result of good management, so that

they are low, or they are high where management is low maybe another thing.

Leaving the larger sums of money beyond the seventy-five cents which will probably need to be spent on a sliding scale, to be determined when the hospital association committee bring in their report on a suitable classification.

Let me make that a little clearer. A small fifty bed hospital can get along very well on a three dollar rate. A larger hospital cannot expect to exist on a three dollar rate. On the other hand, we have a municipal hospital in the city of Hamilton, which is not a recognized university teaching institution, -- it has an arrangement with one of the medical schools; or the hospital in the City of Stratford. These are important hospitals providing great facilities, and they need more than a three dollar rate; and yet their facilities are not such as would justify a rate such as that of the sick children's hospital, or the General. But when they need to have a higher grant, they may apply.

The Province pays the full cost of patients in mental institutions, with the exception of a small amount of money which accrues from the railway tax fund. It also pays the full cost of patients in the sanitoria.

The Province is paying a good deal more for hospitals than the combined municipalities; therefore we feel, under these conditions that the striking of this rate throughout the Province is a reasonable and fair rate; while there are other things which can be improved later on, it seems to satisfy the conditions.

MR. CYRIL OVERALL (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I am wondering why the government does not raise its rates a little more. In the City of Welland we have a hospital which we think, at the present time is fairly good for the section. But in going over the past years, the hospital board has been running a deficit every year, and they find that on the indigent patients and the compensation patients they have been running at a loss every year. And that is not fair that they should be running at a loss.

I would also like to suggest that the Provincial government should increase its contribution.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (Temiskaming): Mr. Chairman, I have no complaint to raise at all about the hospital getting $2.25 a day. As the Hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) referred to, if it were not for the conditions there of having nurses working for nothing, they would not be able to get the rate down as low as this.

But that is not my grievance against this Act. Section 16 in Section 4 provides:

> "When any patient in a hospital is an indigent person or a dependent, of an indigent person, the municipality in which such person was a resident at the time of admission shall be liable to the hospital for payment of the charges for treatment of such patient" ....

I would like to know what constitutes residence in a municipality. For instance, one of these chronic cases may come to your municipality and only live there, possibly for but two weeks, and be taken to the hospital and then be a charge on the municipality, while those charges should be born by the municipality from which that person came.

Do you mean to say that if a man came to a municipality to-morrow and went to the hospital, that the municipality

would be responsible for his charges.

MR. VIVIAN: May I refer you to Section 5:

> "If such patient has been discharged from a hospital and has been provided with accommodation in a municipality by and at the expense of some other municipality but in such case the patient shall, for the purpose of this Act, be deemed to be a resident in the municipality in which he was resident at the time he was provided with such accommodation in the first named municipality."

Now, the definition of "resident" at the moment is that the individual shall be resident in the municipality for a period of three months out of the previous six months. In other words, it is not a matter of two weeks, but it is a matter of three months out of a six month period. That is defined in the Act.

Now, to come down to this and clear up the problem which you offer, in which the municipality may be undertaking certain responsibilities that are not quite fair. Under Section 5, Clause (g), I told you that a resident in a municipality is defined as resident three out of the last six months prior to admission to the hospital. The meaning of this other amendment under Section 5 may be cleared up by giving you a concrete illustration. Let us assume that a Patient from Township A is admitted into hospital in Township B. That patient is discharged from that hospital in Township B, and takes up residence in B. Township, we will say for three months out of the six months. Then that patient has become the charge of Township B, which would be unfair, and that Township would charge it back to A Township. This three out of six does clear up most of the troubles.

MR. MITCHELL: When some person comes to North York from another municipality, they must sustain themselves for a period of twelve months before they become a charge to the

municipality of North York. In other words, if they need welfare assistance before the end of the twelve months' period, under our regulations they are charged back against the municipality from which they came. Apparently under this present amendment, Mr. Minister, it would be three months out of the six months.

MR. VIVIAN: That has been the clause in force.

MR. H. CONNOR (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, if there has been a dispute between two municipalities, who is to clear up that dispute?

It seems that they cannot decide it as between themselves, and how can they go about to decide that?

MR. VIVIAN: Can you give me a case?

MR. CONNOR: This young chap lives in the Town of Burlington and works in the City of Hamilton, and lost his leg, he claims through an accident at the cotton mill. The claim on this particular accident was disallowed by the Compensation Board. In that particular case when the municipalities cannot get together on it, what is to happen?

MR. VIVIAN: In those cases there is always an appeal to the courts. Frequently municipalities can come to an understanding or agreement; but when they cannot come to an agreement there is always an appeal to the court.

MR. G. ANDERSON (Fort William): May I ask the Hon. Minister as to the hospitalization costs. He said the municipality pays about ten per cent?

MR. VIVIAN: Of all welfare services.

MR. ANDERSON: I was wondering how you arrive at that. It seems difficult from any figures we have to know what is going on in a municipality. I know we have in our city at the present time such a congested condition that it would

not be possible to get into the hospital, no matter what your condition was.. That may be the fault of the municipality. Then we have a lot of old men, not able to work, under seveenteen years of age, who are put up at the salvation army. I do not know that you have any check on that, yet the municipality has to pay for their keep.

MR. VIVIAN: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but this is not on the particular matter which is before the committee. The Hon. member has raised the point which reminds me of the situation that I was faced with when I was told that there were some ten thousand odd in a certain position, and I ask how he knew that, and the fellow answered, "I counted them." We are in that same position. We have counted them in several municipalities and on that counting we feel that should be increased seventy-five cents.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Chairman, I am rising to a point of order. We have had this over and over again.

MR. ~~MITCHELL~~ Dennison: Speaking to Section 4, I think we can show that the Province should increase this amount. There is no financial obstacle in the way of the Province paying more than the seventy-five cents, because by this Bill the Province is in effect raising the municipalities forty-four cents, but they have only raised their own payment by fifteen cents. That does not jive with the picture financially, as far as the Province is concerned, because the amount the Province has been asked to pay as their share has been going down year by year, because for years more people are able to pay their own way. I have before me the report of the hospitals of the Province for 1943 ending December 31st, and the amount of money received

in the general hospitals of the Province from the patients in that year was raised nearly two million dollars. The amount of money that was paid by the Province to the hospital was reduced by one hundred and eleven thousand dollars. The amount of money paid by the municipalities to the hospitals in that year was reduced by one hundred and sixty-two thousand dollars and donations were reduced by one hundred and five thousand dollars. The net result was that the hospitals had less help from the municipalities, less help from the government and less help from donations; and with rising costs in the hospitals, their condition to finance a hospital is becoming worse. And, despite what the Hon. Minister may say, that he did not promise some relief at this time, I would like to direct the House's attention to an item that appeared in the Globe and Mail on December 22nd, 1943:-

(Page 1948 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: Has anything to do with this Section?

MR. DENNISON: Yes, because it promises something, and it was a promise that the Government was going to give an amount of money.

This is what the Globe & Mail said on December 22, 1943:

> "The Bill which Doctor Vivian will introduce at the next Session of the Legislature will make specific provision for a hospital plan. It will establish a basis for the erection of a broad sickness insurance plan. The next step will be to apply the Legislation to areas with adequate hospital facilities. Municipalities will be encouraged to embark on hospital extensions by reason of the fact that the municipal contribution of $1.75 per day for indigents will be abolished by adoption of hospital insurance."

Now, many hospitals of this province took that statement of the hon. Minister (Mr. Vivian) seriously, and they took the further statement of the hon. Minister (Mr. Vivian) made at the same time, seriously, that they would not be penalized. The hon. Minister said in a recent address at Chatham, states the Globe & Mail:

> "Doctor Vivian said that the $1.75 per diem for the non-pay patients imposed a great hardship on many municipalities, and also had the effect of restricting certain programs of buildings and additions of much-needed beds."

Now, in view of that promise, and in view of the fact that last year in the Budget we had presented to the House, we increased the estimates of the Health Department from $12,600,000.00 to $13,613,000.00, and in view of the fact that we are now informed there were only $11,600,000. of the $13,613,000.00 spent, there was certainly two million dollars available for extra assistance to the hospitals of this province, and I think what must have happened was that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Vivian)

must have been out of his office one day and the hon. Prime Minister walked in and grabbed that money for school grants. That is what happened to the extra money, which was in the Health Department last year, and which we believed and hoped would result in better and larger and more generous contributions to the municipalities.

I again appeal to the province and to this Government; if they are going to ask the local municipalities to pay $2.25, surely the province of Ontario can "kick in" with more than seventy-five cents.

MR. VIVIAN: Mr. Chairman, I am going to clear up a few things right now. It is time we did. The municipal rate of pay was increased by 28 percent, and the provincial rate is being increased, at the moment, by 25 percent. I do not know how I can make any clearer, if I drew a chart --

MR. DENNISON: They were simply to start with.

MR. VIVIAN: Wait until I am through. I do not know how I could make it any clearer if I drew a chart, that the provincial contribution is on a basis rate, as I have told this House three or four times --

MR. DENNISON: You have never been able to make anything clear -- never.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: It is all muddy when you get through with it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. HOWARD E. BROWN (Welland): How high will it go?

MR. VIVIAN: That will be determined by the Hospital Association Committee, as to the classification of the hospitals, and the rates which should be paid to them. And

that justifies the statement which was made that we would under-write the cost of ward care in this province, either out of the consolidated revenue fund, or by a hospital insurance plan, and that statement still stands.

MR. BROWN: Is it not right that this hospital association is made up mostly of representatives from the larger hospitals? I think, if you will look at the rates payable to the various hospitals, you will find that the larger hospitals receive much better rates than the smaller hospitals throughout the province.

Now, the smaller hospitals are operating at a loss, while you often find in the larger hospitals, like Toronto and Hamilton, are enabled to carry on. It seems to me this is the same old situation, that this hospital association committee is dominated by the larger hospitals, and they get better rates than the smaller hospitals throughout the province.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Provincial Treasurer): I hardly think that the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Brown) is correct in his statements.

I might say this to the House, that I think the hospitals, under present circumstances, are reasonably satisfied with the arrangement. Now it does provide an increase for them; it provides an increased contribution by both the municipalities and the province, and I should say to the hon. members of the House that this is a very difficult problem -- this problem of hospitals. Let me give you, for instance, one example. Consider, for example, in Victoria County, there is one hospital, the Ross Memorial Hospital, at Lindsay, and it really provides for the whole County of Victoria, and, indeed, provides care for some of the

County of Haliburton. That is maintained largely by contributions from the town of Lindsay, from contributions by private individuals, and from endowment funds. Actually speaking, other than the grants which have been received from time to time from the County of Victoria, there is no direct charge on the area the hospital serves. I think when we are talking about--well, let us start with the question of hospitalization and health insurance; you have got to look at our hospital situation across the board. Now, at the present time, there is a pretty thorough investigation taking place into the question, and I can say that in the course of a comparatively short time there has to be a complete re-vamping of our contributions to our hospitals, and the methods by which these grants will be made.

I would say this; that having looked into this matter from the standpoint of the Treasurer, I do not think there is anything to be gained by rushing into a situation at the moment, and perhaps doing something which has to be undone afterwards.

At the moment, the contributions for indigents are being increased in this way, and I think it provides a pretty fair solution for the difficulties concerning the hospitals at the moment, and in the meantime, with the committee representative of the hospitals investigating it, and others investigating the matter, there should be a pretty fair plan involved in the course of the near future.

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL (York, North): Mr. Chairman, without wishing to unduly prolong this discussion, I want to make one kindly suggestion to the hon. Minister (Mr.

Vivian), and that is with regard to the indigents we are discussing. Undoubtedly, at some time or other, we will have a Dominion-Provincial conference --

MR. VIVIAN: We hope.

MR. MITCHELL: --And when that time arrives, Mr. Chairman, I do hope just again with our municipal set-ups you might at least be able to go with Federal-Provincial on a fifty-fifty basis, or at the worst, 40-40-20.

MR. BERTRAM E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): Socialize the whole works.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 4 carry?

Motion agreed to.

Sections 5 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill as amended be reported?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I have here certain resolutions from the Lieutenant Governor regarding certain Bills which require the expenditure of money.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Provincial Treasurer): The Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the contents of these resolutions, recommends them to the consideration of the House.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The first resolution:

"Resolved by Mr. Doucett:

That during the period between the first day of April, 1945, and the 31st day of March, 1946, a subsidy shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund to every person who produces sugar beets in Ontario under contract with a person engaged in the business of processing sugar beets into sugar and sugar by-products, the amount of such subsidy to be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council at an amount not exceeding $1.55 for each ton of sugar beets."

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The next resolution is by Mr. Doucett:

"Resolved:

That the Minister of Highways may direct payment out of the Highway Improvement Fund of,--

(a) an amount not exceeding seventy-five per centum of the cost of construction, maintenance or repair of a bridge or culvert which forms part of a suburban road within the meaning of Part III of The Highway Improvement Act; and

(b) an amount not exceeding one hundred per centum of the amount of a township's funds expended in the improvement of a bridge forming part of a township road within the meaning of Part IV of The Highway Improvement Act."

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The third resolution is by Mr. Doucett:

"Resolved:

That during such periods between the 1st day of April, 1945, and the 31st day of March, 1946, as the Lieutenant-Governor may prescribe, a subsidy shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund,--

(a) to every person who produces milk in Ontario which is subsequently processed into cheese, of an amount to be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council not exceeding two cents, for each pound of cheese produced from such milk; and

(b) to every person who produces hogs in Ontario and sells them through regular trade channels to be processed, of an amount to be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council not exceeding $1.00 for each hog so produced, sold and processed."

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL (North York): May I ask if the subsidies are in line with what have been paid?

MR. FROST: Yes.

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The fourth resolution is by Mr. Vivian:

"Resolved:

That there be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Ontario a grant to the Governors of the University of Toronto, to be applied only for the use of its School of Nursing, in the amount of $10,000 each year for a term of five years and $20,000 each year for a further term of ten years."

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): This is just following the Bill we passed the other day?

MR. FROST: Yes.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Provincial Treasurer): Order Number 66.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixty-sixth Order; House in Committee on Bill Number 74, "An Act to Amend the Highway Improvement Act," Mr. Doucett.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill Number 74, "An Act to Amend the Highway Improvement Act".

Sections 1, 2, 3 and 4 agreed to.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, there is just one thing in connection with Number 3. I wonder if this should not also apply to a wealthy village, such as Forest Hill Village? It would seem to me that where you have a wealthy district such as that, it should be, for the purposes of this Act, listed as town or city,

so they also would pay their share of these roads. I only at this moment glanced at this Act, and I can recall some criticism that mayors of Toronto have made over the years, that while the city and various other municipalities paid their share of the suburban roads -- if they are towns or cities -- the Village of Forest Hill, because it is listed as a village, gets out of paying their share. I may be wrong in the assumption that that condition still exists, but if that condition still exists, I think perhaps some amendment should be put in here which would list a place like Forest Hill Village as a town or city.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, the Village of Forest Hill is a member of the county, and contributes to all roads.

MR. MITCHELL: Yes, I was just going to say the same thing, Mr. Chairman.

Sections 5 to 7 agreed to.

MR. MITCHELL: I presume, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) that is with regard mainly to the Kings highways and proposed new ones, as referred to in Section 8?

MR. DOUCETT: What was your question, please?

MR. MITCHELL: It was just more of an observation, Mr. Minister.

MR. DOUCETT: I might say that what we are doing in Section Number 8 is changing the name of a private highway to control access. That is the change.

Sections 8 and 9 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Provincial Treasurer): Order Number 67.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixty-seventh Order; House in Committee on Bill Number 76, "An Act to Amend the Fire Department's Act," Mr. Blackwell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill Number 76, "An Act to Amend the Fire Department's Act." Shall Section 1 carry?

MR. JOSEPH B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, on this Act I would like to ask the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) for an explanation. I have been made to understand that the old Fire Department Hours of Labour Act, which provided for rather longer hours of work, is now superseded by the Hours of Labour and Vacations With Pay Act, which provides for a minimum of forty-eight hours a week. It also provides for the fact that it supersedes, or shall supersede another Act, which fixes hours of labour if such hours are longer than the forty-eight hours provided by this Act.

In view of that interpretation, and if it is correct, that the civic employees, fire-fighters and others, will now be governed by the House of Labour Act, which supersedes all others, and if so, is it necessary to have this Act at all, or should we not then allow the municipalities to simply abide by the Hours of Labour Act, which is quite specific, and is for forty-eight hours a week?

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, the Firemen's Union warned me that someone might bring this up in a prejudicial way --

MR. SALSBERG: I beg your pardon, not "prejudicial".

MR. BLACKWELL: But they assured me that under no circumstances was it to be understood that it was raised by their Union, and I think I should say that to the House.

The Union, of course, is perfectly aware that the other Act -- the eight-hour day and forty-eight-hour week

Act -- does not apply to fire departments, while The Fire Department Act does apply, and, of course, the Union quite appreciates the extreme difficulty they have had, notwithstanding the amendment to The Fire Department Act, and last year we cleaned up the two-platoon system -- and they appreciate the great difficulty that they experienced in getting the Act into application and in force all over the province of Ontario.

In view of the fact that the question is raised, I think I should at this time pay tribute to this Union, for the common-sense way that they, so far as they are concerned, brought this about, by a combination of persuasion and assistance from the Fire Marshal, and have now got it into effect. I believe the last municipality to which it is applicable has now taken the steps which will bring the two-platoon system fully into effect.

This amendment, which is before the House, as I have already explained on second reading, and now before the hon. members, is permissive for the three-platoon system, which the firemen themselves asked for.

Now, just to finish the explanation, in view of the fact that it has been asked for.

The eight-hour day and forty-eight-hour week Act is made applicable to industries other than the obviously industrial undertakings by regulation, and as I understand it, the present situation is that municipal employees, other than firemen, are under the Act, but the firemen, for purposes which we quite appreciate throughout the province, are not under the eight-hour day and forth-eight-hour week Act.

That is a full and complete explanation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 1 carry?

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow up this question and inquire of the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) when and where any ruling was made to exclude fire-fighters from the eight-hour day Act, and to restrict it to all other civic employees? I understand there is some difference of opinion as to whether that is so.

Also, I understand that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) has ruled that it covered all employees, including fire-fighters. Was there any regulation made at any time excluding fire-fighters from the provisions of the Bill which, as the hon. Attorney General (Mr.Blackwell) has stated, covers all civic employees except that category. Certainly the Act itself does not, and I wonder when such regulation was adopted.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I, of course, cannot undertake on this short notice to deal with an Act which is in another Department, and quite obviously unless I had a consultation with that Department, I cannot possibly take the responsibility of indicating to this House all the rulings that may be made under it.

I would like to say frankly to the House that I am aware that the original drafting of the Act intended it to apply, under (a) in the Section -- I have not the Act before me, but I know it fairly well, and then the (b) clause provided that the Act should apply to such industry as the regulations might determine. I am in a position to inform the House that I am aware that the Order-in-Council

was enacted which made that Act applicable to all employees of municipalities, other than firemen. I know that Order-in-Council is in existence, and that the Act is not applicable to firemen. I am aware of that, and I so say to the House.

MR. GARFIELD ANDERSON (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, I think that it is only proper, under the circumstances, regardless of how anxious the firemen might be for shorter hours, but I think they realize, as we all do, that it is difficult to-day to keep the Fire Departments up to strength on the two-platoon shifts, never minding three.

I know I have attended many cities throughout the province in the past couple of years, and they have had quite a struggle.

MR. BLACKWELL: Of course they have.

MR. ANDERSON: To get competent men to fill up the vacancies resulting from the members enlisting.

So this Bill, as I see it, will open the way in the province of Ontario, for the firemen to adopt a three-platoon system when the men are available, and the opportunity presents itself.

I welcome this, because I think when the time arrives it will be another step in the right direction.

MR. BLACKWELL: I want to say that I appreciate contributions to this discussion made by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Anderson). As he has said, there have been countless difficulties, and that is why I saw fit, in view of the fact that the question was raised, to pay my tribute to the Firemen's Union who, as the hon. member for

Fort William (Mr. Anderson) knows, have been extremely reasonable about this whole question.

We have got the three -platoon system on a firm foundation, and this is a permissive step, which makes the three-platoon system able to be brought into existence in some areas, and I do appreciate very much the contributions from the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Anderson).

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order Number 68.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixty-eighth Order; House in Committee on Bill Number 79, "An Act to Amend the Public Vehicles Act," Mr. Doucett.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill Number 79, "An Act to Amend the Public Vehicles Act".

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, were there not some amendments to this particular Bill? I have a copy of them.

MR. DOUCETT: No, it is the Commercial Vehicles Act -- the next one.

MR. MacLEOD: Oh, I am sorry; excuse me.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are all right as yet.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order Number 69.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixty-ninth Order; the House in Committee on Bill Number 80,"An Act to Amend the Commercial Vehicles Act", Mr. Doucett.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill Number 80, "An Act to Amend the Commercial Vehicles Act".

Shall Section 1 be carried?

MR. DENNISON: With regard to Section 1, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) if any means have been found to provide a Board or somebody, of appeal, for people who lose their license, might appeal and get it back, or get the right to get insurance again?

I know he must have a lot of complaints and lots of people asking him to help solve the provlem. It is a problem. I know the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) has the responsibility of keeping unsafe drivers off the road, but there may be cases where unfortunate accidents may not indicate an unsafe driver.

MR. DOUCETT: I may say in reply to the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) that in cases where they cannot procure insurance, it is mandatory that they stay off the road, but proving financial responsibility will permit them to drive.

MR. DENNISON: That penalizes a person who has not financial responsibility, because he is unable to get insurance, and the insurance company then becomes the judge of who shall stay off the highways, instead of the Minister. It seems to me that perhaps is not just the way it should be.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, possibly in view of the fact that I had occasion to consider this matter not so long ago, I should clear up the misapprehension, if

such exists, by reason of the course this discussion is taking.

As the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) knows, there is no initial financial responsibility; it is after a person who may have been irresponsible to the extent of not taking out insurance, -- but who could have secured insurance if he had been responsible enough to do it -- is involved in an accident, and injures other people, and is unable to satisfy the plaintiff's claim, that he loses his license. If he satisfies the claim, he can become eligible to get his license back.

Another mis-statement made about this is that it is in the discretion of the Minister. It is not at all, because the Act is mandatory, and is applied without exception.

(Page 1963 follows)

MR. BERTRAM E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I happen to know of a case along this line which I took up with the Department and I was told definitely that under the regulations they could not do otherwise. It was in connection with a man in Wallaceburg. He was not on the road when he was arrested. He had been drinking - he admitted that - and went down for , I think, ten days. He was a painter and had to have his car to carry his trailer, and I appealed to the insurance company, and I appealed to the department in his behalf, but he simply could not get his license back because he could not get insurance, and he could not afford to take the bond required under the Act.

I think it is cases like this that my hon. firend from St. David (Mr. Dennison) had in mind, where a man in such circumstances could go before a board, and have them review the whole thing, and perhaps get a "break".

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, I have had it rather indicated to me that what we are talking about is not the statute under discussion, but the provisions of the Highway Traffic Act.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 1 carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 2 carry?

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment, just before Section 3, as follows:

> "to require any vehicles licensed under this Act, or any clauses thereof, to be equipped with fire extinguishers, of a type proved by the Department, and describing the conditions and location in which such distinguishers shall be kept."

That was in our old regulations, and I want it introduced in this Act.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 2 as amended carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 3 carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported as amended?

Motion agreed to.

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

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventieth Order; The House in Committee on Bill No. 82, "An Act to amend The Trustee Act", Mr. Blackwell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 82, "An Act to amend The Trustee Act".

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move that you do now rise and report the first Bill.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. WALTER B. REYNOLDS (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report several Bills, some with amendments and some without amendments, and I move the report be adopted.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, it now being six o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until eight o'clock.

The House recessed at six p.m. until eight o'clock.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIFTH DAY

Toronto, Ontario,
Wednesday, March 21, 1945.

SPEAKER: Honourable William J. Stewart, C.B.E.

EVENING SESSION

AAA The House resumed at 8 o'clock.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Forty-seventh Order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-seventh Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for the consideration of the speech of The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the Session.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, when the House rose last night I was having a very enjoyable time dealing with some phases of a situation which have been thrust upon the House by certain hon. members of the House, and I had not completed, at that time, that particular portion of my address on that particular matter. I want, therefore, to try and carry on from where I left off last night, and complete my criticism of that phase in my address. I think it has been very widely demonstrated in statements made in the House and by repeated announcements in the Press that there is no need for an election in Ontario while the war is on.

Now, the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Hancock),

in his speech, he gave to the House (or in a part of it,) some bits of information which he got when he was a member of this Party, and attending our caucus. I did not object to his saying that, because I am going to help the hon. member in making it quite clear about this particular point.

MR. LESLIE HANCOCK (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask what information I got in the caucus?

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) cares to answer.

MR. WILLIAMS: That is precisely what I was going to do. Quoting from the record, page 1415, the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Hancock) says this:

> "The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) last fall pointed out in a radio broadcast that this fall of the Government need not result in an election; and I am glad, now, at this time, to remind him of this fact. I shall expect the CCF leader to accept the challenge, and form a new Government when this Government falls; but I would suggest that he must genuinely attempt to govern with the cooperation of other elements now in opposition, or be responsible for contributing to the holding of an election in war time, which he now does not want."

MR. LESLIE HANCOCK (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, pardon me, I must rise to a point of order. I said, "which the country at this time does not want".

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker, I will accept the correction; I was only reading the words in the official record.

MR. SPEAKER: Did you point that out, to have it corrected?

MR. HANCOCK: I have not.

MR. SPEAKER: All right, we will accept your statement.

MR. WILLIAMS: Because of the criticism that was so often levelled by all kinds of people about the leadership of the CCF, I want to make it perfectly clear here and now

that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is nothing more or less than just an ordinary member of this CCF Party. We do not subscribe --

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): What do you mean by that?

MR. WILLIAMS: Just like one of us. He, -- Perhaps I had not better say what I was going to say.

On September the 13th, 1944, the hon. Leader of the Opposition made a radio broadcast on a subject that has now been successfully embalmed by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Drew). That was the subject of family allowances. At the end of this broadcast the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) made a statement. He did not make this statement on his own; it was a statement that was decided upon at the caucus of the CCF, and endorsed later on by the Provincial Council of the CCF. It was not purely a statement of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. This is what it said:

2. "An early election in Ontario is not necessary. There is no reason why Mr. Drew should not bow to the will of the majority, and change his policy. If he cannot change it, and if he is defeated in the House, then his proper course would be to resign. His resignation would not mean an election. It would mean a new Government.

"On many occasions, in Great Britain and other parts of the Commonwealth, minority governments have been defeated, and very often it did not result in an election. It resulted in a new government.

"It so happens that the second largest group in the Legislature is the CCF group. It is the official opposition, with thirty-four members. --"

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Thirty-two.

MR. WILLIAMS: That is why I coughed.

"There are those who have said that there is no alternative to the Drew Government. There is an alternative, if Mr. Drew persists with his policy of provincial isolationism, a minority policy. The

alternative is a CCF Government.

> "Let there be no misunderstanding about this. It was never our wish to take office without a clear mandate from the people of Ontario. By their decision, however, we are the second group in the House, and our support was very little less than the support given to Mr. Drew's Party. We shall accept our responsibilities, in opposition or in any other capacity.
>
> "I therefore wish to make it perfectly clear that the CCF, as the second largest group, is prepared to form a new government in Ontario if called upon to do so."

Now, I read that here tonight, Mr. Speaker, in order that I might be very emphatic in declaring that this group's viewpoint, as expressed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), in this broadcast of September 13th, has not changed one iota. We are still prepared to do that.

Now, the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Hancock), however, wants something else. We are prepared to form a government if we are asked to do so, but he wants something else, as does the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), and the "something else" is that it must be a coalition, and in order that the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) could be very positive what kind of thing the coalition would be, he also makes the terms, fourteen. He read out the terms. I do not know whether it is a platform for a coalition government, or a future election programme of his particular Party, but these were the terms, fourteen of them, which he read out. When he went on, one, two, three and four, I began to feel very worried for fear he might finally land on twenty-two and find himself in the same box as the hon. Prime Minister is in, but he stopped at fourteen, what I regard as the conditions. A coalition on those particular terms.

I declared last night, in that part of my speech on this subject, what my attitude was to that kind of thing.

Now, I did deal last night with this question of the "brain trust", but I want to quote again something from the speech of the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Hancock). He should feel quite flattered, receiving all this attention. He said:

> "The brain trusters of the CCF are like the cowbird in the nest, throwing out those who are not quite of their own policy. Twice has opportunity knocked at the door of my friend's Party in opposition, and twice it has been turned down, which is very bitter proof of the truth of what I have said."

MR. LESLIE HANCOCK (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, and say that is also a misquotation. I am sorry I have not had the error yet corrected. What I said was, "which is the bitter fruit that we are reaping as a result".

Hansard is quite incorrect.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only read these few words. Perhaps I had better leave it alone, and trust to my memory. I would be probably pulled up on a point of order when I trust to my memory.

The hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Hancock), in referring to the possibilities of a coalition, made quite a point of emphasizing that both parties over there and over here were not the same, that there was a difference.

Now, when I spoke in the House in the last Session, on the Speech from the Throne, I got into quite some difficulty with my hon. friends opposite, because I was linking both of them up together, and saying there was no difference. Well, I am going to have another "go" at that tonight. I still say there is no difference between my hon. friends over here (indicating) and my hon. friends here (indicating), except my hon. friends over there, I cannot depend too much on

the name that they might have, because a little while ago, a comparatively short time, they called themselves "Conservatives", and then "Progressive Conservatives", and "National Conservatives", and all kinds of things, but at the moment I know them by the name they call themselves, but their fundamental policy, and their fundamental approach to the problems of the people of this province and of this country, are not one whit different to the problems of my hon. friends, who at least have kept their name intact, and have not bothered about changing it, - not very much, anyway.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): They are the reformed Liberals.

MR. WILLIAMS: They do not call themselves that.
4 Somebody else calls them that. I want to correct one thing that I was contradicted in in the last Session of the House, in order to prove that there was no difference in these parties. I was giving particular illustrations. I referred to some situations of labour trouble in Stratford at one time, and I made the point there were tanks sent up there, and that was under the Conservative Government, and the hon. Prime Minister interjected, and I read from the record, "They were not tanks, of course, but still --" and then something happened, and there is nothing more in the record.

Well, somebody in Stratford read the report, apparently, in the Press of what I was trying to say, and he sent me a lot of pictures of these things that the hon. Prime Minister said at that time were not tanks. Well, I do not know what these are --

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Well, Mr.

Speaker, perhaps I can assist the hon. member. The remark was directed, I feel sure he knows, to something which he knows from his own service in the last war. The remark was directed to the discussion which had been taking place about that time about the adequacy of equipment. Those are pictures of Cardinal-Lloyd machine-gun carriers.

MR. WILLIAMS: The first time I saw these things was on the Somme, in 1915. I am not saying somebody did not see them earlier, but the first time I saw them was about four o'clock one morning on the Somme, waiting to go into action, and these monsters rolled by, and they were like this, really they were, - maybe because it was four o'clock in the morning, and I was not quite awake. But, those were the things that were sent up to Stratford by the Conservatives of that particular day.

MR. WILLIAM DUCKWORTH (Dovercourt): How long ago is that?

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, never mind.

MR. WILLIAMS: I do not know, I cannot remember what year it was, but this says September the 28th, and it was before that. Mr. Henry was the Prime Minister. It was around about 1932, I believe, because, as you know, until the present hon. Prime Minister came on the scene it was not Conservativism that was in the government saddle. Someone says 1933, and I will take it as being around that date. Those were the things sent to Stratford at that particular time by the Conservatives.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, after all, I have tried to point out at different times we are not getting very far here, rattling dead bones of many years ago, but I might point out at no time in my recollection, and I am sure at no time in the recollection of the

Legislature, has this province owned tanks. The Cardinal-Lloyd machine-gun carriers, or any other army weapons, - all those vehicles belong to the Department of National Defence at Ottawa, and not to this Government, and there was a Liberal Government in power at that time.

MR. WILLIAMS: I am not saying who owned them.

MR. OLIVER (Grey South): In 1933 the Conservatives were in power.

MR. SPEAKER: We have had a very friendly discussion so far. Let us keep it in order.

MR. ROBERT LAURIER (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. Prime Minister said it was a Liberal administration in Ottawa. At times he has a wonderful memory, but at times it is faulty. I think from 1930 to 1935 the Honourable R. B.Bennett was in power in Ottawa.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I agree, it is most unlikely the Liberal Government had any army vehicles of any kind. So, perhaps the answer is right.

MR. LAURIER: I rise to a point of order. I appreciate my friend, the hon. Prime Minister, may be vague at times, and he is very Jesuitic, if he likes the expression. He is Jesuitic when he talks as he does.

MR. SPEAKER: You are making an address. The hon. member for Ontario may go ahead.

MR. WILLIAMS: I am not surprised all kinds of people want to get in on this, because I am finding it very interesting.

In order that there shall be no more controversy, may I pass on by saying these things were sent to Stratford, and if those were not tanks, I am quite certain these

people whose pictures are shown in the back are soldiers, and they were sent to Stratford during the time of the furniture strike, and at that particular time, in the province of Ontario, there was a Conservative Government. That is what they did at that time.

Since 1934, until 1943, it was the Liberals that were in the Government here, and they were not in the embarrassing situation in which the present Government finds itself. They were happy, with a large majority, and on several occasions during the time that they were in government quite a lot of difficulties and troubles, labour troubles, broke out. I have another picture here, and this one shows people on the picket line, and the Provincials knocking around, as well. They are not on the picket line; they are there to do anything except, - what is it, "keep law and order."

Now, I can refer to many, many instances in the life of the Liberal Government, between 1934 and 1943, when almost at a whisper the Provincials were sent in to any
6. place where there was any industrial trouble. I refer to Campbell's Soup, the MacKinnon Industry in St. Catherines, and Kirkland Lake. All over the place they were sent. And it is because of incidents of that particular kind that I can always see a distinct similarity in the attitude and actions of both parties that happen to be in the Government, whether they be Liberals or Conservatives.

Now, I was sincerely hoping that with the passing of time there would come a change of heart, but I am not prepared to accept, in the light of my experience, as well as of my knowledge of these situations, that the change of heart is effective until I see demonstrations of it. If I

am betrayed once, that is forgiveable, but if I permit myself to be betrayed a second time by the same people, or same kind of people, that is unforgiveable; actually, I ought to have my head read.

Not only during these days of industrial unrest, but I have also some unpleasant memories of my connection with reliefees during those troublesome days.

I am not trying to represent it was an easy job to govern during those ten years of depression between 1929 and 1939. It was a most difficult job, very difficult. But, with all the difficulties, there is no excuse, whatever, for the things that were done having been done.

The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) brought into a part of his speech a reference to an organization of which I am still immensely proud, The East York Workers' Association. I had the very distinct honour of being president of that organization for many years. We found situations that we were confronted with were not easy. They were very difficult, and I am sorry to say that we did not have our difficulties very greatly eased by the Government that was in power at that particular time. I used to come up to these buildings repeatedly with deputations, and it got so that when I entered the front door there would be provincials there asking where I was going, as though I was a criminal. They would accompany me right to the place.

On one occasion, in this present Session of the House,--I was going to refer to something, and I was stopped in the middle of it, -- but I can still remember -- I think the office is on this floor -- no, it was the floor below, in one of the offices, the office of the Provincial Secretary, where we were discussing relief problems, and the

provincial police were right inside the office. I did not mind their being there, but what they were there for I leave to your imagination.

I remember going down to Ottawa with a deputation, and, if travelling is uncomfortable in these days, you should have come with us on that trip to Ottawa. I must not recount that experience. Otherwise, I may be accused of killing time.

I went down there to meet a man whom I regard as
7. one -- who was one of the kindest gentlemen, - I refer to the late Honourable Norman Rogers. He was a gentleman. The heartbreak to me at that particular time was that here was a man who was so keenly desirous of doing a lot of things that he wanted to do, but found himself hemmed in with a policy and system that would not allow him the slightest room for action.

We came from Ottawa as empty-handed as we went to Ottawa. So, whether we went to Queen's Park or Ottawa, in the days of the Liberal Government, the results were just the same.

Then, because I had the temerity to address a meeting up in York Township, the riding of the hon. Leader of the Opposition at the present time, and I said some things up there, (and I do not mind saying them here,) but it was a huge public meeting, and I spoke not kindly about the Government of that day, the Liberal Government, and the very next morning we found in East York, because I had gone to York Township and made a speech of criticism and denunciation of the Liberal Government, they slapped a $100,000 extra tax levy on the citizens of East York. Now, you cannot expect me to think kindly of people who

do things like that.

Just before the election in 1943, in the Liberal Government there was some industrial trouble in the city of Galt, and I found myself in jail. The most amazing thing was we just went on thepicket line. We had made representations to this Government before the picket line was established, pointing out to them certain things, and we did not get any satisfaction, and we went on the picket line. The interesting thing is this, we picketed a plant in which there was no work,-nobody working there, at all.

(Page No. 1977 follows.)

The interesting thing is this, that we picketed a plant that there was no work in, nobody working there at all. We could not possibly have done any harm if we wanted to; but presently the Provincial Police came on the scene and, in their gentle kind of a way, which you know, -- they almost broke my arm I know, I found myself with another one thrown into a car and into jail. I was not there very long before I was out on bail, the first time I was on bail, just for going on the picket line.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not the last time.

MR. WILLIAMS: I hope it is the last time. Now, all of those things are part of the operation of a government of that particular day that we are now invited to join up with. I cannot do it. I do not dislike the members, as members of the Liberal group here; I like them immensely.

MR. DREW: How about our Arthur?

MR. WILLIAMS: All right, I might as well spread the honey, I suppose. That goes for the members on the opposite side of the House too. I will not say more, otherwise somebody is going to rise to a point of order and ask me to explain whom I do not like, and that would be rather embarrassing.

Now, what I said earlier about trusting people who have betrayed me, or trusting a government which had betrayed me, goes just the same in this instance as it did in the earlier instance which I gave. It also goes for my friends of the labour progressive party. These friends, by their criticism, have invited me to say what I am going to say. The reference was to the East York Workers ' Association, brought in, as I said before, by the Hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod). The very thing which we are asked to do and invited to do in this House and outside of this House by their press and by

their speakers, and by their resolutions which [illegible] in from all kinds of places, the East York Worker did the very same thing in those years of depression.

The organization had about twelve hundred members; and my friends here and there won't perhaps relish this, but the only condition of membership was that they needed to be anti-capitalist. We did not care whether they were socialists, labour people, we did not care whether they were communists, we did not care whether they were straight labour or C. C. F. We took them all in; and we used to hold four meetings a month; one business meeting and three public meetings; and at the public meetings we used to have all kinds of speakers, Tim Buck, Scarlet Betty, Buell, C.C.F., we have had Liberals, Mr. Roebuck, and so on, Britishers, and all kinds of people, so that we could get the right kind of information, so that we could be on the right track. We trusted them.

When we had deputations about relief, when we were preventing evictions in North York, stopping bailiffs, all the time we were doing that there was this constant undercurrent creating distrust and sabotaging the movement, until finally it took effect, and after two years East York Workers went out of existance.

My friend is pointing over here, not the Hon. member for Bellwoods or for St. Andrew. But notwithstanding that East York became a place where the bailiff could not operate and turn people out. They were challenging us all the time about our meetings, that there was no democracy, and that we were railroading, and that we were not doing things in the right way; until finally, we said, all right, if you know how to do it better. And we stepped out and the whole organization

fell apart. I would not do anything further until they have proved to me that not only can they go on the demonstration line and the picket line, but also they can act decently within the organization.

The Labour party wants to take stock of the overtures that have been made, in the light of the concrete experiences. I am not going to labour this about the East York experience. But here is a little document; "What the Communist party stands for. Plain talks," by M. J. Olgin. First edition, February, 1930. Second edition, December, 1934. Third revised edition, 1936. Cover design by Lawrence Hyde. Published by the Communist party of Canada, Toronto, Ontario.

Just one little book, but there are some gems in here:

> "The Communist party also participates in election campaigns as a separate and distinct political party. It nominates its candidates for Federal, Provincial and Municipal office and it solicits both. It is anxious to have its representatives in the legislative bodies. But its election campaigns and its activities within parliament are fundamentally different from those of, say, the C.C.F. We communists are not here to help the capitalists govern the masses."

Listen, this is worth while taking notice of:

> "We are here to help the masses/press their masters, Get from the capitalists and their government a maximum of concessions. We do not spread the false notion that there can be co-operation between the exploited and their exploiters. On the contrary, we go to the Legislatures to prove to the workers that such cooperation must not be, because it is good only for the bosses."

and lots more of it.

You see, while we were trusting them in the East York Workers in 1934 and 1936, this little book was being circulated among their people as to what they should do once they were inside.

You know, it is very tempting to spend the rest of my two or three hours that I am going to spend, reading from this.

Remember, Ottawa says, do not tell them that I am accustomed to speaking even to blades of grass. I have gone out and spoken only where there were blades of grass. So that if you all go I will still be here

Now, these are reasons why I said so emphatically that if the thirty-one other members left and went over and took part in this coalition, I would have nothing to do with it, because of my experience.

Without going along very much longer on that particular train, I just want to say one thing. I have had quite a deal of activity in Gilbert and Sullivan operas, and I must confess that when the Hon. member from Bellwoods quoted from "Utopia Limited" it was unknown to me. And he quoted some very trite sayings from that opera; at that time it was with reference to the Prime Minister. This parody in its approach is not just what it seems, and it brings to my mind another one of Gilbert and Sullivan's, H.M.S. Pinaforte, a very popular one; most of us have heard it. You know there is one part where Captain Corker and little Buttercup sing a duet. Now, don't tempt me to sing it. The words are like this:

> "Things are seldom what they seem,
> Skim milk masquerades as cream,
> High nose passes patent leathers,
> Jack Daws strut in peacock's feathers."

and Captain Corcoran sings:

> "Very true. So they do."

I did not do that for the purpose of getting any laughter or applause but because that is how I believe about these people.

Now, the next lesson which I am about to read refers to this much discussed question of P.C. 1003. That has been referred to at various times in this House but it has been dealt with in a very piece-meal way and today I introduced a Bill designed to correct the wrongs and evils in Order-inCouncil 1003.

It has been referred to on more than one occasion by myself, but when we discussed this P. C. 1003 in the last Session of the Legislature, only we on this side of the House were unquestionably against it. All the other sections of the House for for it. The record proves that, notwithstanding some remarks that were made about weaknesses, and so on. The House accepted P. C. 1003.

I want to take this opportunity of correcting one piece of false information which has been circulated in my own riding as a result of a visit there to address some trade unionists, by the Hon. member for St. Andrews. (Mr. Salsberg) On this particular night he was not satisfied with merely addressing the trade unionists in the riding, but he must give Arthur a kick in the pants; and in doing so, he quoted some alleged remarks of mine made in the House here. If he had taken the trouble to look at the record first, he would have found out that when I spoke on a thousand and three in the last Session of the Legislature, I was particularly directing my thoughts to two codes, and we had quite a cross-current discussion between the Hon. Attorney General, the Hon. Minister of Labour, and some other one, on this particular subject; because I was alleging that the acting Premier of that particular time, the Hon. member for Peel (Mr. Kennedy) due to the absence in England of the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Drew), and

they were unanimous that that first code, of December 7th, was all right except for its scope, and I was analyzing that thing, not P. C. 1003, and I made the declaration in regard to that particular December 7th code not in regard to P. C. 1003, that not outside countries, like Germany, Italy and Japan would he find such a repressive measure as that December 7th code.

But when the Hon. member from St. Andrew went out to these trade unionists, he forgot all about referring to the December 7th code, and made all his remarks about what I said about the December 7th regulation, as being applicable to P. C. 1003. That was entirely false and I want to take this opportunity of correcting it in this House.

I know that the Hon. member for St. Andrew is not going to be in the House to-night because he sent me a note that he was going to a banquet.

As I have said, I introduced a Bill to-day for the purpose of correcting the wrongs in P. C. 1003, and we have had the greatest difficulty in approaching this particular subject; to correct the wrongs it is necessary also to take the suggestion that I am going to make in company with the Bill that was introduced. I hope we are all agreed in this House that company unionism is a bad thing. I am going to have something to say later on respecting company unionism as it affects the government, but that can wait for a little while. But in this Order in Council 1003 there is this reference to employees' organizations. That is merely another term for a company

union. We find it over and over again in our activities in the trade union field. I had an experience only the other day of being in process of negotiation with a party here, an employer who had previously disclaimed any connection with a company union, and coming out quite innocently in this negotiating process and saying that they had set it up. It was called an employee's association, and it claims to be entitled to certification.

Over in Hamilton there is a bunch of nothing more nor less than three company unions calling themselves the Amalgamated. They find ready scope in areas where employers refuse to have anything to do with a bona fide trade uninn. They really started in Kirkland Lake, and they took a pass as the result of the trouble in Galt; and in both instances, Galt and Kirkland Lake bona fide trade unions were battling against definitely anti-union employers.

In East York the anti-union employers embraced the idea of company unions, and they are entitled to do that thing with the 1003 constantly repeating about company unions.

I want to say to the government that as proof of its unwillingness to accept company unions it should accept this suggestion which I read:

> "That the term imployed, as contained in schedule A of this Act, shall not apply to the continuance or promotion of such agencies shall be deemed to be an offence against the regulations."

The last part is put in because of two other important and influential and obstructive organizations which have been set up as a result of this fight about trade unionism.

Down in the Niagara peninsula there is what is known as an Industrial Relations Institute, and into that sink goes all the filth from these Company Unions for the purpose of

obstructing the purpose of trade unionism. And I am sorry to say that several prominent lawyers of the Province of Ontario are primarily instrumental and insterested in that industrial institute in the Niagara Peninsula. And we have the same kind of thing here in Toronto.

I have had the experience with these industrial institutes, where an employer has been willing to sign a contract with me for my union for the maintenance of membership and check-off, or for check-off, or for maintenance of membership, and the Industrial Institute has put a barrier against the employer, and because he is a member of the organization he is said that the business was in the hands of these lawyers, and we have been obstructed.

These are subversive of the interests of the Province of Ontario, and I want to suggest to the Hon. Minister of Labour that he accept the Bill as I introduce it to-day.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not wish to interrupt the Hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) because he cannot refer to his Bill. Please confine your remarks.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, I will not refer to the Bill again. I will only refer to these suggestions.

Now, on March 8th, when I spoke in this House I happened to look at the clock and it was half-past five, and because I was speaking on the subject of Labour it was most pertinent for me to declare that in about an hour or so from now a vote would be taken, and it would show another overwhelmingly victory for trade unions. My words were correct, because about seven o'clock that night I had a telephone call to the buildings here and the result of the vote was an overwhelmingly victory for the trade unions. That was on March 8th, and yet we have not been certified. Now, I know the Hon. Minister

of Labour could make considerable allowance for the delay, but, in view of the fact that this suggestion here effectively overcomes the delay, I do not think that any allowance which he makes is worth while.

I say here that the appropriate bargaining unit which has been determined as the result of either an investigation or a vote directed by the Board to take place shall be announced and a certificate given immediately upon the conclusion of such investigation or vote.

Now, you know, -- the Minister of Labour knows, because he keeps abreast of these things, that certain sections of the Order-in-Council 1003 are being used by the reactionary employer to offset the claims of trade unionists for a check-off and union security clause.

Now, when the Hon. Minister of Labour spoke about this matter a few days ago in the House, he referred to this question of check-off and maintenance of membership as something new; and then he went on to point out that they had had it in his own organization at sometime long ago, which would indicate to me that it was not something new because the Hon. Minister admits that his own organization have had it. It is a very old thing. The amalgamated clothing workers of America, for example, have had this closed shop for many years, as well as other organizations. The only thing that is new about it is that more organizations are wanting this very kind of thing that other organizations have had for so long.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): I would just like to correct that and keep the record straight, Mr. Speaker. I said that unions had had it and that they must have had it because they had been certifying for a great

many years but they had it because they were good unionists. They have convinced their employers that they would all benefit under this, not only for themselves but to the employer as well. They sold themselves to their employer; but they had not union security, because of regulations or because of government action, but they had it because they had secured it through their own efforts.

MR. WILLIAMS: I have the little bit of paper on which I took it down when the Hon. Minister said it. I know he said it and he said there must be tolerance. And he also referred to the forgotten man, the small business man. I am under no illusion as to what the Hon. Minister said on a particular day.

If we agree that it is something that is not new, that is satisfactory as far as I am concerned. The communists have proved themselves of unestimable advantage and benefit to their employers, and are still unable to obtain the check-off and maintenance of membership. And the most violent opposition is put up by employers against granting that; and the important thing is that the employers have used the regulations to justify their actions.

We all know about the Montreal Tramways strike. I am not going to labour this because it was mentioned the other day; but down there the Montreal employers refused to grant the check-off simply because they took refuge behind the peculiar wording of these sections of P. C. 1003, that they were not permitted, as they said, to coerce; and they said, If we give the check-off and the maintenance of membership, it was a form of coercion; and they were supported in their contention by lawyers, notwithstanding that the Hon. Minister of Labour and his assistant, Paul Martin, emphatically said in a letter to the Congress of Labour that there was no intention

or purpose in the minds of those who drafted P. C. 1003 to prevent the check-off and the maintenance of membership being included in a bargaining agreement.

So I want to suggest to the Hon. Minister of Labour that in regard to this particular thing, no sectional part thereof or schedule shall be regarded as preventing the inclusion in a collective agreement of the check-off and/or any of the several forms designed to provide union security.

(Page 1988 follows)

Now, we find this about the check-off, and union security, that frequently the workers themselves will decide by vote that they want the check-off and union security, but, notwithstanding that demonstration, the employer still refuses, so this other suggestion will take care of that:

> "A collective bargaining agreement shall contain clauses providing for the deduction of union dues from the wages of employees and for union security, if it be so decided by a majority of votes cast in secret ballot of employees eligible to vote, but nothing contained herein shall prevent the inclusion of one or both such clauses in an agreement by mutual consent of the contracting parties."

Now, this other suggestion I have here. I am not going to refer to it, only briefly, because I dealt with it at some length on a previous occasion in this Session, and that is we shall have the right to have whatever conciliation facilities there are existing, whether we have been certified, or whether we have had different contractual relationships with the employers. I shall be glad and happy indeed to provide the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) with a copy of the suggestions, and I hope that the hon. Minister will deal with them so that the Board can be helped in its most difficult task.

A very serious situation exists in regard to this Labour Relations Board of Ontario -- a very serious situation. I understand on very good authority that the Board is not going to order any further votes or

make any further important decisions until this question of the validity of the decisions they arrive at is cleared up by Ottawa, hinging on this situation in the Silvernite Mine, and one other one up in the North. And so incensed is the Board that next week is almost a deadline, and the Board's operations are likely to blow up in everybody's faces. They are so upset and disturbed; they have been trying to do a good job, and their good efforts are being frustrated and thwarted by these people in Ottawa, and the disposition of the Board is not to put up with it any longer.

I hope, Mr. Minister, you will take these suggestions and my additional amendment to this 1003, so that this Department of Labour in the Province of Ontario shall do its best to make improvements in this Order-in-Council.

I am also given to understand that some of these suggested improvements -- not the ones I have given you now, but other ones -- have also met with very serious opposition from the manufacturers who have almost made the manufacturers' representative on the Board decide whether they are going to get a job, or whether they are not going to have anything to do with the amendment. It is a very serious situation. If the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) challenges me to-night to give him chapter and verse of evidence to prove what I have said now, I will admit that I have not got the chapter and verse, but I am satisfied that where there is smoke there is fire, and I would advise him -- and strongly advise him -- in the interests of good relationships between trade union employers, the Department of Labour, and the Labour

Relations Board, to seriously concern himself about these matters, and lose no time about it.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): If the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) will excuse me, may I say that I will not challenge him, because I already know what is going on. I am very close to the situation.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to move over to another chapter --

MR. BLACKWELL: How many chapters has this?

MR. WILLIAMS: Oh, there are quite a number of chapters yet.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with another matter that was made law by the last Session of this Legislature, this Hours-of-Work and Vacations-With-Pay Bill.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I am always disturbed and worried when some law -- some Bill, becomes attacked in this House, because I do not know just what is going to happen after it has become law. I was worried about this Hours-of-Work and Vacations-With-Pay Bill, and I found afterwards that I had real cause of worry, because while we passed the Bill in this House, somebody else did a lot of other things called "Regulations", but long before the "Regulations" came into existence, the hon. Minister of Labour had done certain things.

Now, I only accidentally found out about some of these things when going to a plant one day on negotiations, and while I was waiting for someone to take me into the office, I was wandering about the outer office trying to find out what was going on, and reading various

things, and to my amazement I came across this particular card, headed "Bill 96, Ontario Legislature; Hours of Work and Vacation With Pay Act, 1944." And it says this:

> "In view of the continuing demand for war textiles, the shortage of essential civilian textiles, and the shortage of manpower, sub-section 1 of Section 2 of this Act is not applicable to this establishment named in this notice, so long as the present shortage of manpower exists, and the demands of war remain acute."
>
> "A similar notice has been sent to 185 other textile establishments."

Then the name of this company is here, and its location, and it is signed by the Ontario Labour Board, Mr. E. Billington, Chairman of the Board.

That was the first intimation I had. The Bill was passed here early in April and here were 186 employers given permission to pay no attention to the Bill at all. We in the trade union movement had not the faintest idea of what was going on -- none at all. Why we learned about it was when I happened to see this on the time clock of this particular plant.

Just to show the pressure that was being exercised by certain manufacturers, I have here a copy of a letter from the Primary Textile Institute, 80 Richmond Street West, dated May 26 -- May 26. And it reads as follows: the heading is about Bill 96, Hours-of-Work, and so on, Act, and goes on to say:

> "Dear Sirs:
>
> The Primary Textile Institute appeared before the Industry and Labour Board of Ontario on May 23rd, and presented and discussed a brief, of which you already have a copy. The following is the decision received this morning."

--And it finishes as follows:

"On enquiry from Mr. E. Billington, Chairman of the Board; we were informed that 'member mills of your Primary Textiles Institute' covered the mills listed in Schedule A. Enclosed herewith is a copy of Schedule A.

Holidays With Pay: The proposed regulations were discussed and we hope to report early next week, but in the meantime our understanding is that mills already giving holidays with pay will be allowed to continue on their established practice."

Then follows a list of those who were present at the meeting. That was put on by the Primary Textile Institute, and not by myself. It shows those present at the meeting to be the following:

"Mr. Charles Daley, Minister of Labour. Mr. E. Billington, Chairman. Mr. E. G. Gibb, K.C., Counsel for Primary Textiles Institute; Mr. Hugh Lawson, Chairman, Primary Textiles Institute, and President, Canadian Woollen and Knit Goods Manufacturers Association; Mr. A. V. Young, Past President, Primary Textiles Institute, and Past President Cotton Institute of Canada; Mr. R. H. Hommel, President, The Silk Association of Canada, and member of the Primary Textiles Institute; Mr. Ralph Presgrave, Personnel Manager, York Knitting Mills Ltd., Toronto; Mr. Douglas Hallam, Secretary, and Mr. W. I. Twilley, Assistant to Mr. Hallam."

Now, these people -- this group of representatives of the Primary Textile Institute sat in a conference on May 23rd, hardly a month after we passed a Bill here, without any knowledge on the part of the Trade Union Movement of such a thing going on, and decided that these textile employers need not pay any attention to the

(Page 1993 follows)

Forty-Eight-Hour Bill.

And I also have another document from the Primary Textile Institute which sets out the hours of work of these people, and the lowest is thirty-seven, and they go up as high as sixty-two. Sixty-two hours a week. There are all kinds of industries -- those making ladies' hose -- believe it or not; I do not see the ladies here to-night; oh, yes, there is one over there; according to this they are making ladies' hose.

Now, the reason I am picking this particular point is this; that notwithstanding the best intentions in the world, to make a blanket decision as was made by this group of people on May 23rd without adequate investigation is bound to get you into trouble.

We finally had a conference in September at which there were representatives from the Primary Textile Institute, representatives from the Industry and Labour Board, and our own Trade Union, and we thrashed the matter out, but we could not get to first base in finding out whether these extra hours were needed or not.

We claimed they were not needed; we still claim they were not needed; and here is the proof. This one firm from which I got this card -- I put in an application to the Regional War Labour Board for time-and-one-half for the hours worked in excess of forty-eight in a week. The Board granted the request. It authorized the company to pay time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of forty-eight. As soon as the employer got the letter of authorization from your Mr. Metzler, like a flash they cut the hours of the workers from fifty-four to forty. We are now conferring with the Labour Relations

Board for an adjustment because of that thing. It may come up to-morrow or Friday, because those are the days on which the Board meets.

Now another particular case where we also made application for time-and-one-half for over-time after forty-eight hours. In this instance, the Regional Board turned us down, but we appealed the decision to the National Board and the National Board upheld our appeal.

Now this direction from the National Board only came through about three weeks ago, and this company, despite the fact that it represented to these gentlemen in this meeting on May 23rd, and the next meeting in September that they must have these hours -- this company cut the hours from what it was, fifty-five, and in some instances fifty-seven -- down to forty-eight, and in some cases below.

Now, if because they have to pay time-and-one-half for over-time they cut the hours either to forty-eight or below, I do not think that shows much truthfulness in the claim they made -- and so strongly they made it -- that they must have these extra hours.

Now, I am mentioning this particular matter in order that we can avoid a recurrence of things of this particular kind in the future.

Do not do these things on representations from employers. Remember that there are two parties on the scene, and the one party, the employer, is helpless completely without the workers. Remember that. The employer can have all the capital he likes, and all the machinery he likes, and the finest building in the world, but if he has not got the workers to operate it, it is

just so much trash.

Now, please remember in the future not to ignore the most important Section -- or one of the most important Sections, because I included agriculture last night as the other part -- please do not ignore them in the future.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) tell me just how much organization there is in the textile industry. It is a pretty-well-controlled industry, is it not, as far as organization goes?

MR. WILLIAMS: Organization on which side?

MR. DALEY: On the workers' side. I do not wish to interrupt the time of the speaker at all, but I think I should say to this House that what the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) has read out is perfectly correct. I was there, and I accept the responsibility for the decision at that time, because as is said in what he read, the representations were made of the need for goods and the shortage of labour, and the necessity for the Board to carry on in a way that would not interrupt these operations. Now, feeling that the industry was pretty well organized, and that they have no doubt agreements which are pretty satisfactory, and in view of the fact that we had actually hundreds of cases to consider, we decided, just as it says there, that while the labour shortage continues -- but for any definite time -- to allow these people to carry on as they were.

Whether we were right or wrong, that was the decision, and in our judgment that was the best decision, considering the time.

MR. WILLIAMS: I am not going to, in any way, question the judgment of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) in this matter. We have gone over this together before. I only make a plea at this particular time not to do that kind of thing on the representations from one side only. I mean very sincerely that if my organization of textile workers with other organizations of textile workers in the province come to you and ask you to do a certain thing, I would ask you not to accept our sole opinion about that, but to take into consideration and consult the points of view of the other side, too. Because, I am quite certain if the Department of Labour acts as a connecting link between these two groups, the employers, if you like, and the employees, we are going to be on the high road to good industrial relationships. But if you accept our point of view and ignore the other man, you will create antagonisms in the minds of the other people, and similarly when you accept their point of view and do not consult us, it is only natural that antagonisms will arise in our minds, too.

I think I am giving very, very sound advice in this particular connection, and I do so very humbly because I do not want it to appear that I know all there is to know about it. But I do think it is the right road along which we should go.

I have been told by the Speaker, whose decision I wish to observe, that I must not refer to a Bill which has been previously introduced, and I will speak just for a little while on this question of the minimum wage.

Now, I do not know whether the hon. members of this

House are familiar or know just what these minimum wages are. Here I have got the schedule put out by the Department of Labour. They were given to me quite recently by the Department of Labour. These are the existing minimum wage schedules for various occupations, retail stores, for instance, telephone systems, office workers, hotels, restaurants, and refreshment booths, and so on. There are a lot of them here.

(Page 1998 follows)

They have all these various schedules for these different groups. I want to draw to the attention of the members in the House - at least those of them that are left. If any of the others want to go out it is quite all right; don't mind me - it is a well known fact I think that the minimum wage as existing at the present time in the City of Toronto is $12.50 a week for a 48 hour week. When you go to Hamilton, Ottawa and Windsor it is $12.

THE SPEAKER: Have you not a notice of a Bill on that minimum wage?

MR. WILLIAMS: I am not referring to the Bill.

THE SPEAKER: I just respectfully suggest that you consider the Bill when you make your remarks.

MR. WILLIAMS: I thought this was a good time to plant the seed. I am not going to refer to the Bill.

THE SPEAKER: As long as the principle of the Bill is not being discussed.

MR. WILLIAMS: I won't say anything that is in the Bill, Mr.Speaker, If you want to get the latest dope on that read your newspaper. No, I am only going to refer to things as they are; not things as we hope they will be.

I want you to just get an idea of minimum rates of wages in operation at the present time for hotels, restaurants and refreshment booths. The minimum wage, regardless of age and experience, in Toronto is 26 cents per hour. In Ottawa, Hamilton, London and Windsor 25 cents per hour. Cities towns, and villages and unincorporated urban communities are from 10,000 to 50,000,22 cents an hour. Cities, towns &c. are from 4,000 to 10,000, 20 cents per hour. 20 cents per hour. Now, it even goes lower than that. I know that it seems rather unthinkable that wages would go lower than that

but I want to draw that to the attention of the members of the House in order that they shall know what employers are compelled to pay by law in the province of Ontario to-dayo and unfortunately, there is a tendency on the part of employers to make a minimum a maximum. I had an experience. Do you want to say something?

HON.MR.DALEY: No, I say not to-day it is not the tendency.

MR. WILLIAMS: No, because there is a dearth of workers, and if there was a surplus of workers to-day that interest would still be operative to-day. It is no thanks to the employer that he still cannot practice that point of view.

Now, seeing that the minister has interjected that, let me read to you what one of the very big employers themselves says in this connection. It is taken from the London Free Press of Feb. 26th 1945. The necessity of housewives going back to their homes and other wartime employees returning to their former lesser civilian jobs at smaller pay was urged by C.C.Burton,Chairman of the National War Services Budget Committee when he spoke to-night at the Annual Meeting of the Y.M.C.A. Quite a good place to advocate lower wages. Mr, Burton said:

"Rapping Governments as conductors of business entertainment, Mr. Burton said, "so far as business enterprise is concerned, do we not well understand that Governments never do and cannot conduct business on a sound or economic basis. Do we understand that no matter how large the total of public spending by Federal, Provincial and municipal authority, the total employed by such public spending is a mere bagatelle alongside employment regukarly given in industry? Even in depression days this is a fact."

He referred to the promise made by businesses to give back jobs to those returning from the services, and if possible to give better jobs. Yet, he warmed, we must all feel when war plants close, there will be thousands who will find it necessary to return to their prewar vocations. Would it not make for better conditions throughout if our public authorites would recognize this situation and deal with it in an understanding way.

"It will be the duty of housewives to go back to their homes, he declared, to make place for returning men, and stenographers should go back to their offices, satisfied with lesser jobs, instead of expecting the same kind of job and the same rate of pay as they have had during the war."

Page 2001 follows.

That is the mentality of a depression era. This mentality has no conception at all of the Canada that we are wanting Canada to be. He could only think of Canada as it used to be, and if we start preaching this gospel of lower wages or maintaining minimum wages of this particular nature, then as true as I stand in this legislature to-night depression is going to hit us with much greater force in the years to come than it hit us during the black thirties. Does not matter how we approach this particular question. At the present time the average wages in Ontario is $33 a week, the average wages for all employees in the province of Ontario is $33 per week. In the depression days the average wage was down to $28.6. During those depression years, 4 years- I think I said this before; it is worth repeating so that we can keep in mind- during the years 1931 to 1935 between the Federal and the Ontario Government, $105,000,000 was spent by way of relief. Now, I think if we have to spend out money in that way or to that extent it is much better to provide it and keep people in jobs than just to give them a mere pittance and see them demoralized before our eyes. I think that we will betray a great trust to these people overseas if we do not live up to our promise to make Canada and the Province of Ontario a land fit for heroes to live in. According to what I have been told and what I have read about publication from Ontario House, Ontario already is a land flowing with milk and honey. Well, I hope if it is flowing with milk and honey we will keep it flowing with milk and honey and not let it deteriorate. Let us make it even better. I want to say a word or two about another situation

affecting civil service. When the Minister of Labour spoke the other day in the House he stressed very little- and I said this last night, how he was looking after all these kind of boards. Now, I do hope that he looked after the board or commission that operates the affairs of the civil service. In this province of Ontario all of these hundreds and thousands of employees working for the government have an organization. Its early stages of organization is just like a trades union. It has its locals or branches, its members pay dues but after it leaves that particular stage that is the end of its semblance to trade unionism. Further, than that it has nothing to being unionism, and I would like to know from any member of the Government, any member of the Cabinet, when they dealt with any of their employees through the medium of their organization with their particular problems. I will provide the answer for that. They have not done it at all. There is a barrier between the organization and their employer and that barrier was created as the result of the suggestion by the Prime Minister. That barrier is called the Advisory Council and try as they employees like they cannot get over that barrier to take up their problems as an organization with their employer, the Government. They cannot do it. The Advisory Council consists of three representatives from the organization, three senior civil servants representing the Government and the fourth one the appointee of the Prime Minister. So that the Government the employer, has four representatives against the employee three to start off with and all the problems that those civil servants are confronted with, including that which the hon.member for St.Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) referred to yesterday - cannot get a hearing with their

employer through their organization. That is, through that Advisory Council, and nothing goes beyond it, nothing whatever.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): If you will excuse me, I think I should correct that because I happen to be Chairman of the Appeal Board to which any person has the right to appeal, after having been to this Council. I have an appeal in my hand at the present moment. So I know of at least one that got to the Council and got past it to the Appeal Board.

MR. WILLIAMS: I am glad to hear the Minister of Labour say that the age of miracles is now with us. He has one case. Now, here is a case in point. If the Government really wants to interest itself in the well being of its employees I would advise the Ministervof Health (Mr.Vivian) to get busy in regard to the conditions of some of the employees in the hospitals that he has charge over. It is my information that there was a notice posted in the hospital at Penetang inviting employees to volunteer for extra work. Employees volunteered for the extra work but got no extra pay. Now, if you want them to work the extra hours I think you want to give them some extra pay. The Minister of Health, (Mr.Vivian) is not here at the present moment. If he were he would probably get up and as is his custom correct the impression that prevails. I like these corrections that are given. They correct something in the case but they do not seem to correct the evils that prompts the statement in the House.

I think the Provincial Secretary (Mr.Dunbar) - we have not had much to say to each other for quite a while;- so we will get together now - I think the Provincial Secretary

(Mr.Dunbar) is in charge of the reformatories, and the guards at the reformatories. Now, again, it is my information that when the 48 hour bill came into effect last July in this Province the guards in the reformatories were put on 48 hours, but the work could not be done. There were not enough of them so they were put back on their former hours but before the reduction took place the guard had been receiving a bonus every month of ten dollars. This was given by the Liberal government. So you see, the four of you, that I am giving you credit for having done something in giving these people a bonus of ten dollars per month. Now, when they went on the 48 hours the bonus was dropped, and when they were put back on the longer hours they did not get the bonus. There is a lot discontent. I was nearly going to say seething discontent on the part of the civil servants. I won't go so far as to say that. I will keep it as mild as I can by saying there is a lot of discontent in the civil service over problems that the Ministers really should concern themselves with.

HON. GEO. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Just a moment. I am very glad you brought that to my attention. I think you will accept my word when I say that that is the first intimation I have had of it. I knew we could not engage a sufficient number of men, we could not find them. We went so far as to advertise in the press. The member is not in his seat who came to my office and I suggested that in the Guelph paper and in several other paper s that we insert an advertisement asking for men. We were desirous of putting the 48 hours per day in use but we could not find the men. I want to say to the members of this House, since it is the first time it has been brought to my attention if any of these men are working the

hours they were before and that they were receiving a bonus before, they will receive it now.

MR. WILLIAMS: I want to say this to you the Minister, the Provincial Secretary (Mr.Dunbar) that I am quite certain that he will immediately inquire into this matter and if what I have said here is correct - and I am certain he will find it is - I am quite positive that no one more than the hon.Minister will take speedier and quicker action to have this problem remedied. I am quite confident.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without pointing out something that any of us - I don't know how many of us have been receiving this Civil Service Publication that the organization puts out once a month. I have received some of them and I have read them. I have read several of them containing proposals that have been made and suggestion for improvement in their status and all the rest of it,and I have also seen the Prime Minister's smiling face in the publication and I also saw one other thing, in one of the issues, that just after Tommy, Premier Douglas of Saskatchewan became the Prime Minister - to me it is very interesting reading that particular article which was sent from Sakatchewan by some of the civil servants to the organization here and published in this newspaper. The Federation of Civil Service waited on Tommy Douglas and they had a brief and after a few words Tommy took the brief and turned it upside-down and he said - now, look gentlemen, don't let us bother about the brief, let us talk as man to man as to the problems you are confronted with and the opinion of those civil servants on that deputation - and it is quoted in this article in the Civil Service News of your Civil Service

that never in all their experience in dealing with ministers of the Crown or Prime Ministers had they ever felt so much at home, and made the men so ready to do the thing that they wanted to do. I think I will read it to you, because the people in the galleries do not get this and it is interesting for them to know just the attitude of C,C.F.people:

> "The following is extracted from a long letter we received from Mr. G.F.Dawson general secretary of the Saskatchewan Government Services Association. The remainder of the letter is of a controversial nature and is concerned with the probable effect on the provincial service of the labour union connections, or leanings of the new government. We gather that our Western opposites favor a "Canadian Federation of Provincial Government Employees" rather than a tie-up with organized labour. They desure to know the views of Ontario civil servants to such a federation."

Now, that is a note that the editor of this paper starts at the commencement of this article and it goes on like this:

> " At the outset let me say that since the establishment of our C.C.F. government, we have been given ample reason to believe that they are determined to carry out their pre-election promises to take the civil service out of politics; to raise the standard of salaries; to improve working conditions in mental hospitals and such institutions; to arrange a complete classification of the service."

Hon. R.P.Vivian:(Minister of Health) Will the hon. Member for Ontario permit a question? I think it is important to bring these questions in at the time the statement is read. Perhaps at the time that he is reading from this publication could he furnish me with the information as to what happened. A man in the employ of the Province of Saskatchewan made an outstanding contribution in the field of Tuberculosis control, Mental Hygiene and municipal doctor system, the former Deputy Minister of Health of that Province who is not occupying that position at the present time.

MR. WILLIAMS: In perfectly and purely parliamentary manner I wish to say to the Hon,Minister of Health (Mr.Vivian)

that I will take the matter under advisement:

MR. VIVIAN: So will we.

MR. WILLIAMS: The article goes on:

" Very few persons have been requested to resign,and in every case which has come to our attention, we consider the government was fully justified, and many emplyees have intimated that in this one respect, the government has not gone far enough. Furthermore, without a single exception, some employee of the department for Branch concerned has been promoted to the vacancy created by such resignation. Under these circumctances, you will understand why our civil servants are going to have a great deal of respect for this Government.

Five days after it was sworn in, our Association Officers had a very satisfactory interview with Premier Douglas, and presented the skeleton of a Brief relating tommatters desired by the civil service- all of which had been presented to previous governments. The Premier merely glanced at the paper, turned it face down on his desk, and then proceeded to tell our President what was wrong with the Civil Service and what his Government intended to do about it. In doing so, he touched on more than half of the matters referred to in our Brief. He is the most approachable and understanding Premier we have ever had, and declares freely that he and his Ministers want the employees to bring their problem to the Government."

Now, that was the point I am making and I do not think it is necessary, although there is only just one more paragraph. I am quite satisfied that here in the province of Ontario our Civil Service are just the same kind of human beings as in the province of Saskatchewan and if our Ministers will only break down this favouring of company unionism and get at their employees through this organization, I am quite certain that our civil service will speak just as highly of our Government in Ontario as the civil service are speaking of the Government in Saskatchewan.

MR. DUNBAR: Now Mr. Speaker, do you know of any civil servant who was refused to have any matter regarding his salary, position, overtime, was refused admissionto me as Provincial Secretary during this year and half, I will be very glad to know it because I have had a great number come

and I have not been in the habit of turning any person out of my office.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Provincial Secretary I am not saying that you did not or are not willing to meet anybody. What I am saying is that these individuals have an organization which they formed for the purpose of collective bargaining and as an offset to the intentions of that organization there is this Advisory Council which stands as a barrier between you as Ministers of the Crown and the Organization. That is the only point I am making. I am not saying that any of you ministers are unwilling to meet individuals, but so many individuals are not willing to meet the minister; they are nervous, and so on. All kinds of things enter into the picture. That is why organizations are necessary to provide a medium of collective bargaining. They had me a little disturbed, some people. I have come to last chapter.

MR. DUNBAR; How many verses are there?

MR. WILLIAMS: But this chapter is the longest of all. I want to speak about this question of compensation, and, gentlemen, though we have had a pleasant time while I have been speaking - well, perhaps I had better speak for myself, I have enjoyed it, and by the repeated laughter that I have heard, I cannot help but conclude that at least some of you have enjoyed it, too - but this picture of compensation is not a laughing matter. Now, it is a long story, and because of its seriousness I cannot bring myself to cut it short. All of these things that I have referred to - has the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) gone out already? - all of these things I do feel that they ought to have been included somewhere in the Speech from the Throne. The fact that there has been no reference to any of these numerous things that I have spoken of, both last night and tonight - causes me to bring to the attention of the people in this House, and the

people in the province that labour is not a question of just two references in a Speech from the Throne, but is rather an important and huge and complex problem, and this one is the wrecks of industry and of labour and it is a very tragic story.

I do not want to start off this part of my speech about the Workmen's Compensation Act, as though there was nothing good in the Workmen's Compensation Act. I had quite a deal of experience when I wasin the old country with compensation matters, and the situation here in the province of Ontario from the standard of compensation is a lot better than what it was and what it is in the old country. I want to pay every bit of tribute that I can to the sound basis upon which compensation is based here in the province of Ontario, but even though I do that, I cannot overlook the necessity of serious defects which is causing much hardship and suffering to these people unfortunate enough to be injured in industry in this province. The principle upon which we work is good, but its operation is very unsatisfactory. Very unsatisfactory .

(Page 2011 follows).

This system of employers of labour contributing to a common pool I think is sound. That is a good idea, because, unlike --

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry. I must draw your attention to a notice of motion you made to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, and we have that motion pending. I do not want you to transgress the rules.

MR. CHARLES A. STRANGE (Brantford): I think the hon.member is quite justified in discussing the matter. The hon. Minister of Labour himself discussed a question of holidays with pay when he had the bill before the House for that purpose.

MR. SPEAKER: I have said I have no desire to interrupt him, but it is my duty to keep the debate within the rules of the House.

MR. WILLIAMS: I am not going to say anything in my remarks here about what is in the bill I introduced today. I can assure you that I will not say that. I am just going to point out in this part of my speech that suffering exists, and the things that are wrong. I am not going to refer, in any way, to what is contained in the bill I have produced.

Now, this that I am going to say is not referred to in the bill. This is a fact,that if a man gets his finger cut off he gets a certain amount of compensation. He gets a certain amount of money for the loss of part of the finger, but for pain and suffering, and this applies to all kinds of injuries, there is no compensation. The man is put on a lower standard of living as the result of the accident than if he had received no accident, at all. In other words, the man is penalized.

Now, by comparison with what happens to a man who receives an accident, I want to show you, (and I will quote from the report of the Workmen's Compensation Board itself,) that the employers who contribute to the pool are not treated in the same way. For instance, in 1942, (I am quoting from the report of the Compensation Board:)

> "In 1942 the average rate of assessment was $1.10 per $100 of pay roll. In 1943 that assessment was reduced to $1.03."

Notwithstanding this important fact, during the year 1943 there were 131,458 accidents, of which 121,237 received compensation. In other words, there were 10,000 people who were injured, but who did not receive compensation. I can well believe that somebody in reply to me on this particular matter might say, "Well, 131,000", and they would strike some kind of a percentage, or other, and figure it out that of the 131,000 so much percentage, meaning 121,000 received compensation, and the 10,000, another percentage, would be showing how little, by percentage, were the number who did not receive compensation. I do not like to approach things like that. For one reason, I am not very familiar with percentages. I understand them better when we use the figures I was taught in school. I did not go to school long enough to learn much about percentages, but there were 10,000 people who claimed insurance in 1943 who did not get it. While, at the same time, the employers' assessment per $100 of the pay roll was reduced from $1.10 to $1.03.

Now, much of the trouble about that particular thing arises from administration. I have a letter here dated February 28th, 1945, from the Chairman of the Compensation Board, Mr. Morrison, in which he tells me that there

were 123,820 claimants for compensation in 1944, and of those 116,381 were granted. In other words, there were, again, 7,439 people, claimants of compensation, who never got it.

I want to give this House some examples of the kind of thing that is going on. I want to let you know of some of the people who have been claimants for compensation, but who have not received it. Here is a case, (I have the name of the case number,) - I will summarize most of these as best I can. This is a case of a workman who was injured while working for the city of Toronto. A 40-foot poplar tree fell on him, fracturing his skull and injuring his spine. He was awarded $14 a week for six months, and then declared fit for light work, and the compensation was cut off. In the first year after the accident the city gave this man only three months' work, but in the second year the city gave him only four months' work. On November 26, 1937, - you see how far back these cases go, - the Board awarded this man $21.50 a month, on the basis of 25% disability. Since that time the man has been continually protesting. He and his wife have been starving, but he has had no relief from the city or the Board. I think the claim about the man starving is justified, when you remember he is getting $21.50 a month.

In connection with this particular case, (this is not disposed of,) that is just how the man is existing, on $21.50 for a month.

This next case: I have thirteen letters in connection with this particular case, and I do want to keep you

awake by saying I am not going to read all the thirteen letters. Here is a man who was injured on the 4th of July, 1943, when working for Sheppard & Gill Lumber Company. As he was lifting the front end of a heavy load of lumber, to hook the two portions of the wagon together, he seriously strained the ligaments and muscles of his back. Ever since the accident this man has been unable to work. It is not a case of malingering, for this man has always been a hard worker and a reliable man.

On the 13th of March, 1935, the Board granted him $250 for permanent, partial disability, but it refused to admit the man's claim that his disability was permanent and total, notwithstanding that: (a) the London Life Insurance Company, with whom this man had a disability policy, admitted his claim, and has paid $10 a month under it; secondly, the Sun Life Assurance, with whom this man had a disability policy, admitted his claim, and paid $1000 under it; thirdly, three medical men reported in favour of this man. The man has been unable to work. He has had to go on relief; his wife had to go out scrubbing, and the schooling of his children has had tobe reduced. The conduct of the Board in this matter is also subject to criticism on other grounds.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member knows that, as he relates there, the relationship between an insurance company that paid and the Compensation Board. A compensation case is never closed. That man can have that case reviewed at any time, as long as he lives. It is never closed, and it gives him, I think, more advantage over somebody that paid a certain sum of money and they are finished with him.

MR. WILLIAMS: I am well aware of what the hon.

Minister says. This man was only insured under this disability policy for the amount of insurance they gave him. He was not insured for $2000. He was just insured for $1000, and he got the $1000 because the insurance company admitted that he was disabled. But, the Workmen's Compensation Board will not admit that. That is the contrast I wanted to draw.

As far as the Board always having its doors open to the cases, I recognize that.

Here is one case here; the one I am quoting is 1933, and the door of the Board is still open, but I have got a letter here in 1945 which says the same thing in 1945 as it said in 1933. The door is always open, but this kind of door is like the door on Mother Hubbard's cupboard, - when you get inside the cupboard is bare.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): He evidently cannot justify his claim.

MR. WILLIAMS: I will come to that particular point, and show how difficult it is for an injured worker to be in a position to justify his claim. As I said, this is a long chapter, so be patient, Mr. Minister. You have been very good so far.

I want to say in this particular case the Board has been mean and niggardly in its award of temporary compensation. The Board paid nothing for compensation for a year after the accident. Then, on the 17th of July, 1934, it paid this man $295. This was apparently for temporary disability at the rate of $5.63 a week. Thereafter weekly payments of $5.63 were made to the 11th of February, 1935, when they ceased.

Section 38 of the Act says that where temporary total disability exists the compensation shall be two thirds

of the workmen's average weekly earnings during the previous twelve months. Section 42 of the Act says that the amount of compensation for temporary total disability shall not be less than $12.50 per week, or, where the average earnings are less than $12.50, the amount of such earnings.

This man had worked steadily for ten years for Sheppard & Gill, and had reached a permanent wage of $24 a week. On this basis his temporary total disability should have been $16 a week.

The Board's reason for paying $5.63 a week, instead of $16, is that when the depression came on Sheppard & Gill placed this man and other workmen on a three-day-a-week basis. This reduced his weekly income without disturbing his weekly rate. In so acting the Board appears to have acted without regard to Section 43.

It goes on, as I said, in this case that thirteen letters were written, where they tried to keep this case alive, thirteen of them, and here is a letter dated November 25th, 1944, when we took it up, and we had a reply from the Board on November 29th, 1944, and this is what it says:

> "We are in receipt of your letter of November 25, 1944, and can only refer you to our letter of November 24th.
>
> "The Board has directed that the claim cannot be re-opened unless new evidence is submitted which would warrant the Board in re-opening the claim. We regret that we cannot supply you with copies of the various medical reports."

This is not our letter to the Board, - that is the Board's letter to us.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Bring some new evidence, and I will re-open it.

MR. WILLIAMS: First I am told the Board is always open, the case is never closed, and now you justify the closing of the case by saying before I can have it re-opened I

must produce new evidence. Either the case is closed or it is not. It is closed unless I produce new evidence, and I cannot produce any evidence, because the Board says, "We regret we cannot supply you with the copies of the various medical reports."

I do not know what the medical findings are, or what they say about this man; I only know three other medical officers admit the man is permanently and totally disabled. That evidence has been given to the Board. What the conflicting evidence from the other doctors is I do not know, and the Board will not let me have it. There is no doubt about this, because I have letter after letter on it, and other cases substantiating the same point of view.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): I do not think the hon. member would object, in view of what he has said, if I just say a little. I do not just stand here and thimk that every case that the Compensation Board adjusts is absolutely perfectly adjusted. I would not go so far as to say that, but I will say they are very human people, endeavouring to do a fair job, but to say they were niggardly, - I just forget the expression the hon. member used, --

MR. WILLIAMS: Mean and niggardly.

MR. DALEY: It is hardly substantiated by the brief report which I have. You say you have some thirteen letters. I have had complaints, too, quite a few, but when you consider during 1944 there were 123,820 accidents reported to the Board, as compared with 131,458 during 1943, a decrease of 7,638, or 5.5%, and the benefits awarded amounted, in 1944, for a lesser number of accidents, to $12,485,599, as compared with a greater number of accidents the year before, of $11,144,754, the increase in the benefits is attributed to more generous allowances provided by the Act, and the lag from the prior years in which

the accidents sharply increased, now maturing, to some extent by the broadening of the application of the principles of the Act. 5.5% decrease in the accidents and -- I am not quick enough at mathematics, but the difference between $12,485,000 and $11,144,000, it does not look as if the Board is too mean
9. and niggardly.

MR. WILLIAMS: I think, -- this is not questioning the veracity of the hon. Minister, at all, -- but before I would be inclined to accept his statement based on the increased amounts of compensation paid this year or last year, compared to 1943, (in other words, as between $11,000,000 in 1943, and approximately $12,000,000 in 1944,) before accepting this as an indication of the generosity of the Board, I would want to know something of the nature of the accidents, because you can have less accidents, and yet pay more out, because the accidents you get are of a major character, as compared with accidents of a minor character. Still, I think we should check up between us as to whether there were more major accidents in 1944 than in 1943.

If I might go on from there, Mr. Speaker, to another case. In connection with this particular case I am going to refer to, I have six additional letters. This case dates back as far as 1935, and refers to exactly the same company. I am not charging the company with anything; I merely say it is the same company. This man slipped with a bag of coke on his back, and became involved with the horse and wagon, rupturing himself at the navel and straining his heart.

This man had always been in robust health, and was a hard and conscientious worker. After the accident he was never able to work again, due to his heart condition.

Reputable physicians made reports, and gave evidence to the effect that the heart condition was attributable to

the accident. The Board took the position that the case was not proved.

This man has since died, and his widow is in straightened circumstances. We cannot get information to show that his accident was attributable, so they say the accident was not attributable, the condition of his heart was not attributable to the accident.

Now, this is a fact, in this particular case, that until this man slipped with the bag of coke on his back, and became involved with the horse and wagon and ruptured his navel and strained his heart he was able to follow his work and earn his livlihood, but immediately that accident happened he never worked afterwards, and has since died.

How it is possible for anybody to conceive, because they attribute a man's disability, due to a heart condition which now makes him unable to work, -- that they set that completely aside and take no notice, at all, of the accident, even though until the accident he was able to earn his livlihood. Certainly there is something wrong there, Mr. Minister. The accident stopped him from working, not the heart complaint, yet it is the heart complaint the Board takes notice of, and ignores the accident. There should be something done in every one of these cases I mentioned. I will not labour with the case any longer. There are six letters, and it is a long chapter. I will skip over them.

Here is another case, dating back to 1935. This man was employed as a carpenter by a company. I can supply you with the names of all those, if you wish. Prior to the accident he was making 90¢ an hour for a 44-hour week, or $39.60 a week.

As a result of the accident this man suffered impairment of hearing to 75%, severe headaches, and dizzy spells, which have prevented him from following his occupation of a carpenter.

A reduction in income, by reason of change of occupation, of $16.50 a week, $23.08 versus $39.60.

This man's complaint is that he is entitled to permanent partial disability of a great deal more than the lump sum of $265.07 which was awarded him on April 26, 1936. Letters have been sent to the Compensation Board, and I will just read this one sent January 13, 1945:

> "I have been consulted by this man with respect to the injury suffered by him in the month of October, 1935, when his skull was fractured.
>
> "Since the accident this man's hearing has been impaired to the extent of 75%.
>
> "Prior to the injury this man, who was a carpenter, had been earning $39.60 per week, for a 44-hour week. By reason of the injury he was unable to follow his occupation as a carpenter, and was forced to accept a position at $100 per month or $23.08 per week.
>
> "In 1939, this man was examined by a doctor in the Medical Arts Building, who certified that his right ear was permanently injured and the loss of hearing was 75%. Youhave a copy of this letter.
>
> "This man has asked the doctor for a copy of the letter, who has stated that he cannot furnish a copy without your permission. I do not understand this practice. I should have thought that the physician was free to furnish the workmen with a copy of anything supplied to the Board.
>
> "I am making application on this man's behalf for compensation on the basis of the difference in pay between $39.60 and $23.08 per week, compensation for permanent disability, authority for the release of the letter from the doctor, and permission to examine the file.
>
> " Yours very truly,"

Now, I cannot get the information to check up on this matter. They will not let me have the information.

I cannot get the information to check up on this matter. They will not let me have the information. So we have got to fight this case as best we can. How is it going to turn out, I do not know.

Here is another one dated back to July 1937, and it runs up to January, 1945. This man was injured at the Hollinger mine on the 24th of July 1937, when his right eye was struck by a stone causing adhesion of the iris with a double vision and a loss in the peripheral field of vision of fifty per cent. I am afraid to read this for fear there are some more of these Latin words.

This man has three complaints:

First, he was given a disability rating of only twelve per cent, whereas the rating for double vision should be higher in his class of work. Second, the Board made an award for permanent partial disability of $11.25 a month, or less than forty cents a day, while his earnings had been as high as six dollars a day.

Third, on discharge from hospital he was told that he was to be given a job which would not be dangerous to his other eye. There are many such jobs at the Hollinger. Nevertheless he was sent to work on the scope, which is the most dangerous work in the mine. In self protection he had to leave, and he was out of a job for five and a half years.

Now, the man's case is still unsettled.

The answer of the Board is dated January 20th, 1945:

> "This claim has been further considered by the Board and I have been directed to write you in the matter.
>
> The man was injured July 24th, 1937, while in the employ of the Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines, Limited. As a result of this accident he was in hospital from July 24th, 1937, to August 19th, 1937. He was paid compensation at the rate of $24.83 per week from July 24th to

"but not including November 26th, 1937, on which day he returned to his former work at his usual rate of pay.

Subsequently a pension of $11.25 a month for life was awarded to him based on a clinical rating of 12 per cent. This rating is in accordance with the rating schedule. We might point out to you here that the rating for the complete loss of sight of one eye is 16 per cent.

With particular reference to the matter of his return to work after this accident we wish to advise that Doctor MacKechnie reported him fit for his regular work on November 26th. However, the company consulted with Doctor MacKechnie and as a result this man was given a job of cleaning up rubbish and refuse on the levels for a month although the doctor suggested a period of two weeks. At the end of the month the boss put him back on his regular job in A Cut and Fill scope. The man left this work on the grounds that it was too dangerous. The company pointed out that all the time this man worked after this accident he was always accompanied by a leader who was responsible for the safe working conditions wherever they were working. He left work on January 18th, 1938. In a letter from John Knox, General Manager of the company, he stated that he had looked into the matter and he was satisfied" --

Listen to this from the company boss:

"he was satisfied that there was nothing in his story of unsafe conditions under which he was expected to work and that apparently this man had made up his mind that he was going to get a living elsewhere.

It is quite apparent from the various reports on the file that during the years this man has been very badly advised and so far as we can see there is no reason why he should not have continued working for this company."

There is another case here with eight letters. It starts in 1942 and it goes up to this year.

All these particular cases, -- even I feel rather self conscious about the time I am taking in these particular matters, and I am going to curtail the reading of them somewhat in order to shorten my remarks.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Minister of Mines): I do not like to interrupt my friend's speech. I have sat here for two hours and ten minutes. We are apt to forget that

after all it is a compensation, to compensate a man for an injury or something which has happened to him during his employment, for which the manufacturers and his boss contribute a certain sum of money based on a schedule not established by me but a schedule which has been worked out and which is considered to be the most fair of that at any place that we know of, to compensate that man of his injury which can be charged to the industry.

We are sometimes inclined to mix social service with compensation. It is no such thing as social service. These amounts of money that are paid to these men are in no way intended to be for their full maintenance; but it is simply for the amount which he can receive as compensation for his injury received in the industry.

MR. WILLIAMS: I think I have mentioned the word "compensation" often enough to be understood.

MR. FROST: But you have asked how these rates, which are so niggardly can be expected to lived on. They are not. They are paid as compensation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.

MR. SPEAKER: Some Hon. member called out the word shame; and the word "shame" is contrary to the rules of every House.

MR. WILLIAMS: Surely the Hon. Minister of Labour is not standing up in this Legislature and claiming that a payment of less than forty cents a day is compensation for such an accident, and designating my words as mean and niggardly. If you wait a bit, there are some worse than that, although it is hard to conceive.

Here is a very bad case, -- Oh, I am going to get

into a jam on this, because this has some dreadful words.

This man was injured on the 22nd of July, 1944, while working at high speed for Devonshire Clothes, Limited. Prior to the accident he had been in good health.

On the day in question, he collapsed at his work and was never able to work again. He had strained his heart bringing on a condition known as auricular fibrilation.

The man was unaware that he had a claim for compensation until May, 1944, when he made application to the Board. In support of his application, he gave evidence of, first his previous good health; second, his heavy work; his collapse while at work; and, fourth, a diagnosis of auricular fibrilation made by Dr. T. W. Tickett on the 15th of September, 1942; fifth, a subsequent diagnosis of the same condition made at the Western Hospital and the Toronto General Hospital; and sixth, a report by Doctor W. J. McCormick, who examined him in 1944, and who said:

> "From a careful study of the history I regard this heart condition as having been precipitated by over-strain as result of cumulative effect of continued overwork."

Notwithstanding this evidence, the Board rejected the application.

An Appeal was made to the full board and, and verbal evidence was given in support of this man's application. No evidence was tendered on the other side. No decision has been rendered. The Appeal was heard on the 5th of December, 1944, and in the meantime the man has died. This is an example of the Board's refusal to admit that heart strain from work is an "accident". The Chairman of the Board has said that to admit such claims in Ontario would be to cause an increase in assessments.

That is an admission from the Chairman.

while at the same time the employer gets a decrease in his assessments.

The Board is away behind the courts in this matter as will be seen from the following cases, and I have four cases here where courts have rendered decisions on precisely similar cases to that of the man I am quoting, and the courts have awarded compensation. But the compensation Board here does not admit such claims. And, meanwhile, as I have already stated, the poor fellow has died,

In another case, five letters; and lots of cases here. I pass them up for a moment and pass on to another.

This is a case of a man in Preston. I have his name and all his particulars. This man was employed at the Eastern Steel, and on December 11th, 1942, he fell hitting his head and back, and has not worked since.

A few months after the accident he was X-Rayed by one of the compensation doctors, who claimed that there was nothing wrong. That was in March 1943. He was later re-examined and re-X-Rayed, and now, they find evidence arthritis. Just a short time after the first X-Ray, when the doctor said nothing was wrong, the second time the next X-Ray showed arthritis. And they now attribute, -- and this is interesting, Mr. Minister, they now attribute his present condition to the existance of arthritis in his system prior to the accident, or what they call a pre-existing disease.

The interesting thing is that the Compensation doctor, in March 1943, found there was nothing wrong. And then a little later on, the second X-Ray showed that there was arthritis. And now they turn it around and say

he had it before he had the accident.

Well, if he had it before he had the accident, he was at least working with it. And when he got the accident he was not able to work any longer. And now they will not give him compensation, because they claim he had a preceding disease.

Here is another one from the mines up north, from Tober Mine. This man worked thirteen years in a mine. He was injured on July 12th, 1944 at the knee, the elbow and the eye. He has recovered from the injury to the elbow and the eye, but the knee is still bad. He cannot work with it.

On October 7th, 1944, the doctor declared him fit for light work. He got compensation from between July when he got the accident, until August 7th. On August 7th he was declared fit for light work. He went and tried, and tried for three days; but in the three days he was only able to work sixteen hours and then he complained to the manager that he could not go on. And on October 19th he was put back on compensation. But between the time of August 7th, which would really be August 10th, because he tried for three days to work, and October 19th, he did not get any compensation at all, -- none whatever. And then on October 19th he got compensation.

I cannot see why, after that month or so of enforced idleness when he got no compensation, when, seeing that they gave him compensation afterwards, why they did not give it to him during the time of his enforced idleness.

MR. FROST: What year is that?

MR. WILLIAMS: Oh, you have not been listening as closely as I thought you were. This was in 1944. Now here

Now here is an interesting case. He is now cut off compensation. But this man too was insured for disability insurance; and the doctors have certified him to the insurance companies, and he is getting the full insurance for which he was insured from the company.

It is an interesting thing. Insurance companies too are very careful that they do not wrongly or unjustifiably make an award and yet these insurance companies will grant the compensation; but the Compensation Board refuses to grant compensation.

He has had clinical treatment down here, and he claims that he thinks he can do light work, and he is willing to try it. But the claim of the company is that they have no light work available in the mine, -- the Tober Mine has no light work.

I do not know whether this has any significance. I give it for what it is worth without expressing my personal opinion about it. This man happened to be one of Kirkland Lake strikers, -- whether that has any effect on a man who helped to organize a union in a mine, and went on strike with the strikers and kept solidly with the strikers,-- whether, now that he is out of the mine, that has any bearing on keeping him out or not, I leave to your imagination.

Here are other cases from the north. Here is a man who worked for twenty-one years with the International Nickel Company. He was transferred from the Mine to the smelter, where he has been employed since 1933.

The company doctor has pronounced this man as suffering from silicosis, and yet they are sending him to Muskoka and advising that he had got T.B. Now, if it is going to be switched from plain silicosis to T.B., so many of these things have happened, that I am afraid that this man will be out on a limb as far as compensation is concerned, and yet the company doctor admits, and has certified him as having silicosis.

Here is a rather bad case. I have here the name of the man, but I will not give it, because I have tried to avoid giving the names of any individuals applying for compensation. This is the case of a man who lives in Sudbury. This man was in an explosion in the Sudbury mines, with another one. His partner was killed. This man was badly blasted about the fact, with the result that pieces of rock are still deeply imbedded in his face. He has been told that if he had the money, and went to a certain specialist who does not happen to be in this country, but who is in the States -- that he could extract every bit of the rock from his face. But he has not the money. The Board has the money, but it will not let him get the rock out of his face. It comes out gradually; pieces can be squeezed out at various times.

This is a case I would like you particularly to take into careful consideration immediately, because the man -- I do not know if he is in the Legislature, but I know he is in Toronto -- I would certainly like to have the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) meet this man himself and see that something was done immediately for this particular case.

I have got references to five other cases from the

North. Here is a pretty awful one, and I do not know how to pronounce the words, but I will make a good stab at it -- as good as I can.

This concerns a man who sustained an injury on June 15, 1936, while shoot-blasting, and was hit by a big rock on the left shoulder. He suffered a fracture of the left collar bone, and the left shoulder, and his chest was bruised. By the way, this is a doctor's certificate.

The man claims he does not remember very clearly for about three weeks following the accident.

And I am quoting from the report:

> "On examination we find the left shoulder is 2" higher than the right. There is a great deal of Callus formation from the middle of the left clavicle. Supra-clavicular fossa is quite deep and large. Left scapula is up and forward considerably more than the right. On rotating the arm and moving up and down with arm extended laterally, there is marked crepitus over the pectoral muscles, and this also makes a great deal of noise."

There is a lot more of these technical references but nobody here understands them, unless it happens to be the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Vivian), and I cannot even pronounce them, let alone understand them. But that is what the doctor says. But now, you listen to this. Listening to the certificate, you cannot help but conclude that there is something wrong with the man. Now listen. Here is a letter dated April 21st, 1944, from the Claims Officer of the Workmen's Compensation Board, which reads as follows:

> "Replying to your letter of the 15th instant, we would advise that this workman was examined by one of the Board's Medical Officers on his visit to Sudbury last November.

> "About the first of February, 1944, the claim was further considered and it was decided to bring the workman in to the Board's offices for further examination. He was given an appointment for February 14th and examined at that time by one of our Medical Officers. In order to give the workman the benefit of any doubt, he was sent to Dr. G. F. Boyer and X-rayed. Following receipt of the examining doctor's reports the claim was reviewed by the Board's Medical and Claims Departments, and from the evidence on file it was decided that the Board would not be warranted in taking any further action in the case as the reports indicated he had no disability as a result of the accident which would prevent him from working."

He was given an appointment for February 14th, and was examined at that time by one of the Compensation Board's medical officers, and in order to give the workman the benefit of any doubt, he was sent to Dr. W. E. Gallie for further examination.

The claimant says it is the Board's doctors which have prejudiced his case, and the Claims Officer has assured the man that he is labouring under a misapprehension.

But here you have the Board's doctors who say this; that he is not suffering any disability from the accident, and you have this other one from this other doctor certifying it definitely establishes that the disturbance in the man's physical being is as a result of the accident, and yet he cannot get compensation. He cannot get it.

Now, those are just some of the cases, Mr. Minister, of these ten thousand in 1942 and those seven thousand in 1943, who did not get compensation, but who tried to get it. And I guarantee that if these cases were re-opened, if we had access to the files of the Board -- and we will reciprocate by giving the Board complete access to our files

-- I am quite certain that 90 percent of these cases would be completely and entirely established as entitled to compensation.

I just wonder if the Board is more mindful of its intention to continue reducing the assessment of companies rather than looking after the real interests of the injured workmen. Ten thousand in one year; seven thousand in another; that is a lot of people to be denied the right to compensation.

Here is a case I can prove to you or any other hon. member of this House to-morrow morning, in fifteen minutes.

Here is a man -- you know of this case, Mr.Minister and Mr. Prime Minister, because he has been passing some letters to you. You know of this case.

Now, look: instead of being prejudiced and influenced adversely about this man, in any way, shape or form, I ask you to meet me to-morrow morning prior to the meeting of the Public Accounts Committee -- I will be back in Toronto by ten o'clock -- and in fifteen minutes I can prove to you this man is suffering from the very things these people in all these letters, say he is not suffering from at all.

MR. DALEY: About four or five doctors -- specialists --have claimed he is not. I do not know how you can convince me in fifteen minutes.

MR. WILLIAMS: I do not know how you know that.

MR. DALEY: I have been on that case for months; that is not new.

MR. WILLIAMS: If you can get hold of that correspondence -- well, I will finish this first. If you can

get hold of that correspondence for me, I will be very grateful for your interest in this matter, because we cannot get hold of any of the things that the Board has, to know what any of the doctors say.

Quite recently we tried to get the information that another doctor altogether had supplied to the man and had gone to the Board and we could not even get that certificate back. Why are they afraid to let us know what is in the files? If they say a man is not entitled to something, surely we are entitled to know on what ground they come to such a decision. But they say, "No," they say, in substance, it is none of our business. We say it is. And this man can prove to any hon.member sitting in this House in fifteen minutes--

MR. DALEY: I don 't think you could.

MR. WILLIAMS: You do not know, because he has not shown you. I had him examined, Mr. Minister, and you, just as I, without any technical knowledge of this particular case, can see for ourselves the effect of what these people say he does not suffer from, in less than fifteen minutes.

Now, I have had information in connection with a lot of these things. I am not reciting them here just to hear my own voice; I am just stating all these things and taking all this time to bring to the attention of the hon. members of this House the information that things are not well down on University Avenue.

MR. DALEY: May I ask you, through you, Mr. Speaker, if you presented any of these cases before the Board. You never mentioned any of them to me. I do not know how long they have been in your possession, but have you taken any steps

really to get any of them adjusted, or they just kept for the House.

MR. WILLIAMS: Oh, no -- Mr. Speaker, I think that is rather an unfair statement, because this is where I erred, I am afraid, in trying to be brief in the long series of cases --

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Brief?

SOME MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, that is all right, if you just wait to laugh until I have finished, perhaps there would be no need to laugh.

MR. DREW: Of course, there are different ways of conducting a filibuster --

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WILLIAMS: If that is not a disgusting statement to make -- you should be thrown out.

MR. JOHN J. KEHOE (Cochrane North): It is not what we call a filibuster on this side of the House.

MR. WILLIAMS: That is the dirtiest remark that any swine could possibly make.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MRS. R. M. LUCKOCK (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, this speech we have heard to-night is full of meat, and if the hon. members on the other side do not want to stay and listen to it, that is their privilege, but I am certainly glad I have heard it. I have heard much worse speeches in this House than I have heard to-night.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. LUCKCOCK: I am glad he made it, Mr. Speaker, anyway.

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not abuse the privileges of

the House.

MR. KEHOE: Mr. Speaker --

MR. SPEAKER: Are you rising on a point of order?

MR. KEHOE: Yes, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

MR. KEHOE: I want to call the attention of the House to the remark made by the hon. Prime Minister who said that this was a "filibuster", and I say that is an insult to the people on this side of the House. I want him to say this is no "filibuster".

MR. SPEAKER: He has a right to his opinion.

MR. KEHOE: So have we a right to our opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: Then express them in a respectful way.

MR. WILLIAMS: This is no filibuster, Mr. Speaker. This is the first time in this House that these matters of Labour Compensation have ever been dealt with. I have sat in this House on many, many occasions, in one or other of the galleries, and I have never heard -- never heard --these subjects of compensation being dealt with. And when ten thousand people whom, as I have already pointed out, in one year and seven thousand in another, are denied compensation, for a man to come into the House, who has been absent most of the time, and declare that my efforts to draw attention to this particular matter is in the nature of a filibuster, is just plain impudent.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. WILLIAMS: It is really too bad he came in at all; is it not? We were getting along very well. Well, he will soon be out, I suppose.

I was wanting to say one word about the statement of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), however. When

I was saying at the risk of another laugh that I thought when I tried to be brief in connection with this part of the story, I think I erred, because I should have gone on and read all the letters. It might have been registered on the hon. Minister that we had taken the questions up with the Board. Did I not say that in this particular case I have thirteen letters, six letters in another, eight letters in another, starting from 1933, in a particular case, and coming up to 1944, and so on? So we have been taking them up all the time. Hon. members on this side of the House have taken up innumerable cases. The hon. member from Sudbury (Mr. Carlin) has taken up many of these cases, and I have a great number sent from the North. I wonder how many cases, outside of these, have been taken up by any hon. members representing the Government?

MR. DALEY: Quite a few.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Provincial Treasurer): What is that?

MR. WILLIAMS: If you listened --

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. WILLIAMS: I thought the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) wanted to say something.

MR. DALEY: No, I did not want to say anything.

MR. KEHOE: He is just uneasy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, we all have the consolation of knowing that this will not go on any longer than about another ten minutes.

Now I want to draw the hon. Minister's attention to something else about this question of compensation. As you

know, Mr. Minister, in the Act in Section 116, it is promised for groups of employers to get together and under that particular system to have these groups of employers employ an inspector, and the inspector is paid out of the funds of the Board.

Now, there is no provision in the Act at all which enables an inspector of the workers to be appointed -- none whatever. I have tried to get around it, and do something about it in the form of an amendment to the Act, but I have not been able to.

I do not know whether it is possible in this Session of the Legislature -- no, perhaps they would have to work too quickly; they could not manage it by to-morrow night -- to get an amendment to this particular thing through the Statutes, in time for this Legislature, anyhow.

But I think we ought to have provision for the workers having an inspector of theirs, paid by the Board, in just the same way as the employer or the group of employers have an inspector, paid by the Board, to represent them. It is a sort of a one-sided affair, at the present time.

Now, I want to draw to the attention of the House another thing, and that is that while most permanent partially disabled workers receive a permanent compensation, which is not reduced when the workers earn increased wages, workers with silicosis are not given permanent awards. In other words, they are paid on a different basis -- a different earning basis -- and their compensation is subject to reduction when they try to supplement the meagre partial awards by trying light work.

Now, I have taken, I know, a lot of time in this

speech to bring to the attention of this House the problems of Labour, and most of the time has been devoted to this question of compensation.

Now, I did that deliberately for the purpose of arriving at this conclusion: I said before that things were not well down on University Avenue. I think you, Mr. Minister, should find out how the Board does operate. I think we are paying a Chairman of the Compensation Board something like ten thousand dollars a year. I would like you to find out how many times that man sits as Chairman of the Board. There is a considerable hold-up in the attention being given to applications. Much of it now is due to the fact that they are handicapped for help. The administrators down there, the investigators and the claims officers are working as hard as ever they can, and as long as ever they can, but there is a lot of difficulty about these things, in regard to cases brought before the Board that the Chairman down there does not know anything about. I think you will find out for ten thousand dollars a year he turns up about one meeting a week on the Board, they would pay more attention than they do. The salaries certainly warrant it.

Now, all of these things are wrapped up in the attitude of the Board. It is not the investigators, nor the administrators, nor the claims officers who decide we cannot have information. It is the Board that decides that.

Also, the Act prevents any injured workman from appealing against the decision of the Board. The decision of the Compensation Board is the law of the Meeds and

the Persians, and nothing can be done about it. You cannot appeal a decision. Oh, I know you say the door is open, if we have new evidence. But the workmen should have the right of appeal if they so elect, and they have not it.

Now, I have tried my very best to present a picture of the things that are wrong with this administration of the Compensation Act. I have not dealt with anything concerning our Bill, nor even your Bill; I have dealt with things as they are, and they are not good -- not good. This situation in the Compensation set-up is deserving of the establishment immediately of some competent authority. I do not know whether it should be a Royal Commission, a Select Committee, or what it should be, but some competent authority should be set-up to immediately enquire into these kind of things.

If the Board can reduce the assessment on employers as they have, as have all these people denied compensation, as they and those who are getting such a miserly allowance do deserve the immediate attention of this Board.

I ask this Government not to just pass this up as another speech made on the Speech from the Throne. I did not get up for that purpose. I got up to bring to the attention of this House something which I think has been sadly lacking here for years and years, one of them being this compensation situation, and I do hope, particularly in regard to the compensation question, that you lose no time in going thoroughly into this matter or having some competent authority go into it, in order that it can be cleaned up. It is a disgraceful situation at the present time -- disgraceful, and I dare say that the

hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) is not abreast of the situation, mainly because his hands are so full with other pressing problems, but I beg of him to turn his attention to this now, in order that we can have some action -- satisfactory action -- in order that the affairs of this Board can be put on a sound and proper basis. And if you do that, Mr. Minister, -- if you do that -- I feel, notwithstanding other remarks that have been made, that the time I have spent in delivering this speech here in this Legislature will not have been wasted, after all.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one correction. It would appear that the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) information was incorrect regarding the amount of reduction in assessment. My records here show the average rate of assessment was $1.02 for each one hundred dollars of payroll, for 1944, and $1.03 for 1943 for each one hundred dollars. That is a reduction of one cent. I think you mentioned a ten-cent reduction.

MR. WILLIAMS: The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) is in error. I did not even mention any assessment for 1944. I just mentioned assessment for 1942 and 1943. The Chairman of the Compensation Board, in a letter dated February 28th, 1945, tells me -- which I readily admit -- that he cannot let me have a copy of the 1944 report before it is, first of all, passed by the Government and printed. He is only giving me some figures of claims for compensation. I only have the other thing about the assessment as shown in the report of the Workmen's Compensation Board for 1943, which says that in 1942 it was $1.10; it came down to $1.03 in 1943, and now you say it has come down to $1.02 in 1944. So it is still coming down.

MR. FRED O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour, I move the adjournment of the debate.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Lost.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the debate be adjourned.

MR. DREW: No.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the hon. Prime Minister has in mind, but I was unaware that there was any intention to carry on later than the usual hour of adjournment, and if there is any thought in his mind that the debate has been unduly delayed, I think he is aware that the hon. members of this group are prepared to co-operate in bringing the debate to a conclusion to-morrow night. I think he is aware of that.

(Page 2123 follows)

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I had no thought of suggesting a later hour but I feel sure that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) is perfectly well aware that at the time I made the comment that I had no expectation that we would be sitting beyond 11 o'clock this week I had before me the time estimated by the speakers who were speaking on the Speech from the Throne,given by the different whips of the different parties. I have not raised the question any more than any other member I imagine would raise the question as to speaker who had estimated half an hour - -

MR. C. A. STRANGE (Brantford)They were not the speaker's estimate but the whips sat together and we decided roughly what length of speech they would make. It is not the speaker's estimate at all. It is ours.

MR. DREW: Well, that helps to understand it but the whip will understand that we have been proceeding on the assumption we were within some striking distance of time, not with any thought anyone was to be limited to the exact time, but the speaker who has just finished and who has interjected his customary courteous remarks when anything is said that he does not agree with, the estimate for him was 60 minutes. Instead of thathe has been the best part of four hours. Now, if anyone else is going to conduct the same type of debate it is perfectly obvious we might well go on into the late spring before we even get to vote, let alone getting ahead with any business of this Legislature.

The Leader of the Opposition has given his assurance in the Legislature now that his group will co-operate in bringing conditions to a vote tomorrow. If he has the assurance then I would press the point of continuing the Debate now. This is now three weeks since we began and

it is certainly time in some way we brought this Debate to the Speech from the Throne to a termination. With your assurance, through you as Leader of the Opposition, if the Leader of the Opposition says there is co-operation and no intention to delay in view of the time given by the whips as compared with the time actually consumed, if that assurance is given I do not press--

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Happily enough, as far as I am concerned, I do not feel too much like opposing the suggestion that the Debate should continue tonight because I still happen to know there are a number of people who still would like to take part in this Debate and I would like to facilitate. As far as time taken up in this Session I assume responsibility with the Prime Minister and probably one or two others for that situation because it was only about ten days ago that we completed the round of the party leaders and that other members began to speak in this Debate.

I would like to hear the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) speak and there are a number of others want to speak and I would like to hear them. Although there may be some who do not agree with me, if it is going to give them an opportunity to speak in the Debate, as far as I am concerned, I would rather like to see it continued tonight. So that I am quite serious about that, although I know there are a number on both sides of thehouse would like to go home. I do not know how the member for Port Arthur feels about it but I am very much inclined to suggest we should go on for half an hour or forty minutes.

MR. THOS. P. MURRAY (Renfrew, South): If the Hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) did not wish

to go on I would go on for half an hour or so.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member (Mr. Robinson) is quite prepared to go on.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I do not just like to make an address at this hour of the night when everyone is tired. However, I am entirely in agreement with the words of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that it may give on this side of the house at least an opportunity for members to speak but I cannot help but point out this situation, that many of the key men of the Government side of the house have yet failed to give any message to the people of Ontario. I think the people in my constituency expected him to say something in this Legislature but even more so, Mr. Speaker, they expected to hear something from the Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Porter) and of all departments this is the department that the eyes of the people of Ontario have been turned to and we are depending on to help us through the period of days when this war ceases and we must find work for thousands of men. I do not know whether the eyes of the people of the rest of Ontario are but I can say that those of northwestern Ontario are turned to this Department and they fully expect toget a message from this Department at this sitting of the Legislature. I think they have every right to expect that message and they are going to be disappointed that they have not got it. Why the Government has chosen not to introduce this subject that the people of Ontario are waiting for is more than I can tell you. My guess is it is done as kind of effort to make it look as if the opposition are delaying proceedings by having speaker after speaker on their side of the house. That is my own impression. Either that or they have nothing to report.

There is also a Minister of Lands and Forests. People

in Northwestern Ontario expected a Forest Resources Commission to be set up by you. It has not been set up. They want to know why. They think the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Thompson) shouldget up and tell us why these things have not been done. Perhaps there is a good reason. But quite definitely they do expect to hear from him. Things are far from right in the forests in Northwestern Ontario and I think the people up there expect to hear from the Minister to let them know that he is aware of the situation, to let them know what he intends to do to iron it out, but apparently he does not intend to tell them. We on this side have a right to know why these speeches have not been delivered.

A very great highway programe has been laid before the people of Ontario in the past in the newspapers. I know quite definitely the people of Northwestern Ontario expected a message from the Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) That message too apparently is not forthcoming.

I could name several other departments. The Hydro is one. Yes, the people honestly and sincerely expect to hear from these men. They do not expect us to rush this thing through.

I do not intend to deliver a long address, but at the same time I believe that every man on both sides of the house should deliver a speech if he feels it is expected of him and definitely the men in key positions should all give some message and leadership and some idea of their plans to the people of Ontario. Even I on this side of the house could not tell you how I am going to return to my riding and explain these men have not laid their plans before this legislature. It will be up to them to do that the best way they can because definitely it is expected.

To begin with I would like to associate myself with the

other speakers in congratulating the hon. members who moved and seconded the Address. They did their job well and I extend my congratulations.

In the little time at my disposal I would like to diredt the attention of this house to Northwestern Ontario that it is regrettable that northwestern Ontario has not received the attention in the days gone by and in the years gone by in keeping with its contribution to Ontario. It is rich in forest wealth, rich in mining possibilities and has much of that rugged beauty which attracts the tourist and all of those who love to live outside life.

Almost in the centre of my constituency is Lake Nipigon. It is a beautiful lake, 70 miles long and 50 miles wide and creates the greatest natural reservoir for hydro development I believe in the world. The Nipigon river which flows from this lake into Lake Superior is famous throughout the world for its trout fishing.

I have often talked with men who earn their living fishing on Lake Nipigon and along the north shore of Lake Superior and they have pleaded for me to bring to the attention of the Ontario Government the fact of the gradual depletion of fish in these waters. Some of them have already laid some of their remarks before various inquiries into this subject and regulations governing fishing in spawning season and the need for more extensive rearing ponds to bring the fish to more mature size that they might survive. These are two of the most outstanding points but these men have also pointed out to me that there is need for study as to the effect of great rafts of pulpwood stored in the bays along the shore of Lake Superior. Fishermen not long ago told me this--you would be surprised the detri-

mental effect that just towing large rafts of logs over a fishing ground can have in that area for some considerable time after can affect the fish caught in that area. I realize that it is not an easy problem to meet, but I am just pointing out how careful study must be made if we are going to get at the root of the problems that in catches of fish are getting lower along the shore.

I have mentioned the great possibilities of the Nipigon watershed. Hydro is now developing around 130,000 H.P. at Cameron Falls and Alexander Landing, which will soon be augmented by an additional unit at Alexander. The famous Ogoki diversion has greatly increased the potential power possibilities of this watershed and we are now furnished some of the cheapest power in Canada. In spite of this fact visitors to that part of the country would be surprised to find many homes and schools and even whole villages right within the shadow of these great hydro transmission power lines that are without electric power, still using coal oil lamps. I do not think there is any comparison more striking than to go into a rural home that is serviced by electricity and into a rural home that is not. That great servant electricity that cooks meals, lights the home, washes the clothes and irons them, preserves the food by refrigeration, provides news and drama, &c. by radio in many city homes can perform all these things and even more in the farm home. Hydro pumps the water, milks the cows and in hundreds of other ways operates machinery that takes of the back-breaking loads off the farmer. I think rural electrification should be pushed to the limit into the back sections where it means so much to the people. I think that we should insist on new industries coming into our province, in particular pulp and paper mills which are naturally located at locations close

close to the store of raw material. I hope in the future we can reach into there so that we can use the hydro power. They may be able to present argument on the other side but I do not think we should measure them too far because the stretching of that power line down to that mill, wherever it is located, opens up great stretches of country and brings the service of electricity to a great many people when otherwise they would have to wait many years to receive it.

I think we should be proud of the record of Hydro, proud we have kept this great asset in the hands of the people and I earnestly hope the day is not so distant when we will apply some commonsense to more of our industries, that they may serve the people as economically as Hydro today.

I feel I really know that part of the province and, believe me, my constituency is a vast territory. I am not like some of these members for Eastern Ontario who can tour their constituency in a street car. When I start over my constituency, I kiss my wife and the kids good bye, go down and take a sleeper and disappear for a week or ten days and use freight train, automobile and truck and what not, if you are going to be in each section to hold meeting in the evening. Try it some time.

I was born in Port Arthur and lived there all my life with the exception of two years and I have learned to love that great rugged north country and I have tried to study it and know its needs. One of our great needs is highways and one of the great examples is that great highway along the north shore of Lake Superior to connect up Schreiber with Sault Ste. Marie.

It can safely be said that this highway will be, when it is completed, one of the greatest tourist attractions in the world. It will allow tourists to drive around the greatest body of fresh water in the world, and the rugged beauty of the north shore of Lake Superior is unsurpassed anywhere in the world. So, I sincerely hope, as soon as conditions permit, this great highway will be completed. It is not a question of measuring the present northern route against the Lake Shore Route. There is a definite need for both.

The northern route opens up the great mining areas. Although these areas were served by railway previously, the highway played a great part. The Lake Shore Route, by its scenic beauty and the shortness of the route, has a definite place, also.

Schools in the rural area in Northwestern Ontario present a great problem. More schools and better schools are needed, definitely, and many pupils at this time are forced to go long distances to go to high school, some travelling from Nakina to Winnipeg. I have said I sincerely believe that a careful survey would show that there is a place in the Northwest for a junior college, and I was agreeably surprised, in a conversation just recently with Dr. Dunlop of the Ontario Extension Department, to learn that he agreed with me entirely, and quite openly stated that Northwestern Ontario was deserving of first consideration, and we went over the records together, and he was very surprised at the number of students from that part of the country attending and studying arts courses that would be served with a university, to say nothing of the additional students who

would attend a university within a reasonable distance of their homes, but which seems so far away when it is situated in Toronto.

I do not think it is necessary for me to tell the hon. members of this Legislature that one of the outstanding assets of Northwestern Ontario is the forest. It is the life-blood of that part of the country.

There have been mistakes made time and time again in that area, trying to grow agricultural crops on land only suitable for the growing of trees.

The people in my section of the province are becoming more and more forest-conscious. They realize the whole economic life of that part of the province, and, to a great extent, all the province, depends on the way the forests are managed.

With monotonous repetition, the Liberal and Conservative regimes of the past have followed a policy which has permitted the ruthless and inexcusable exploitation of our forests in that area of the province. The people burn with righteous indignation that our Governments have permitted vested interests and the lure of provincial revenue lead to such callous treatment and wanton obstruction of our greatest natural resource.

Mr. Speaker, all of our boasts about what we are going to do in the future will not cover up the unforgivable policies of the past. Government after Government has taken power in this province with vivid denunciation of past methods of exploitation and concession allotment, etc. There have been great promises made to conduct sweeping investigation, to set up a forest resource commission, to adopt proper cutting methods, and so on and on. But, each

time the people wait in vain for the promise to materialize.

The reaction of the people to all this is that the vested interests, which have reaped a fortune from forest exploitation, are still in the saddle.

I have recently talked with men who have spent their lives in the forests of this and other countries. These men, many of whom are in positions where they cannot say publicly some of the things they would like to say, know, down in their hearts, we are not doing what is right by the forests of this and other countries. Many of these men are in positions where they cannot speak their views in public, muqh as they would like to do so, but down in their hearts they know we are not doing what is right.

Those responsible for the forest management of large pulpwood and timber concessions will soon have to
2. face the rising tide of popular opinion. We have failed to insist on proper cutting methods, which has resulted in the cutting of thousands of immature trees.

We have failed to utilize the tops of our trees, often cutting trees for saw-logs and ties, up to a seven-inch top, leaving the balance of the tree in the woods. Most of these tops contain at least one full eight-foot pulpwood stick. There is a question whether we cannot cut down lower than that.

These tops are left in the bush to dry and rot and become a great fire hazard. I know that it can be argued that it is not economically possible to use this portion of the tree, that it is difficult to bark these sticks in the mechanical barker, and also that there are more

branches to remove in limbing the top of the tree. However, I feel that these conditions can be met by modern scientific research and methods, which would end a waste which reaches a staggering sum each year in this province. I am not going to give you the figures I have, because, after all, they were just given to me by a man who has spent his life in the forests, and I have no further substantiation, but he has given me the figure. Even if one pulpwood stick was taken out of each of these trees which is cut to a seven-inch top for saw-log or ties, it would amount to a staggering sum, and could be created into pulpwood. We have failed to utilize all of our tree species.

We should strive, ever and always, to use every specie of tree we have. The sulphate mill which is to be located at Marathon does it, and we need more of this type of mill. There is a great possibility in the field of plastics, and we must learn to use all the by-products we now throw away. Because we are blessed with large quantities of spruce, we are lagging behind in learning to use our lesser trees, and we are inclined to turn up our nose at trash trees, and I venture to say countries in a less fortunate position have learned to use a greater percentage of the so-called trash timber in the manufacture of pulp. I am definitely sure it can be done. Yet, a few days ago, in the Lands and Forests Department, I saw a piece of newsprint that contained no spruce pulpwood, at all. I think there should be a more accelerated effort to use these great quantities of trees which we have, to conserve our spruce, and use the so-called trash trees.

There is a definite need for more extensive fire protection. We need more rangers, more towers, more equipment and more telephones, and more radios. I realize the war has upset many of these things. It is difficult to get equipment, and it is difficult to get staffs, but I would like to see a greater effort made to serve this Department better, because I do not think there is any department in forestry where an ounce of prevention can be said to be worth a pound of cure more than it is in that part of the country.

Many foresters have gone back to their most-liked spots and have found them seared by fire. In realizing the great damage this can do, we can realize the great need for equipment and assistance to the men who work in the forests. I have talked to forestry men, and last year I had the opportunity to fly over our forests. We have a good Chief Ranger in that part of the country, and I know quite definitely he feels the need for greater fire protection. I know he feels there should be additional protection, towers set up.

On the west side of Lake Nipigon, where there are so many lumber camps, the fire hazard is greater. I fully realize during the war the difficulty of getting equipment.

There is one point I should like to make, which you don't often hear. I am thinking of the life of the men who work in the lumber camps. I know it can be said they are much better off to-day than they were in grandfather's time, but that is not good enough. Their wages to-day are on a better level because of labour shortage. Nevertheless, these men live an isolated life, engaged in back-breaking

toil. We must strive to make it possible for them to live a normal life, to live with their families, and to have proper, healthy recreation.

The Forest Community seems to be a possible answer,
3 and I am glad it is to be given a trial.

There is a need for a complete survey of our forest resources, as to location of stands and location of specie. The result of this survey should be available to all interested parties.

There is a need for more portable saw mills close to the source of supply, and less need for large, permanent mills far from the source of supply, because, after all, it is not the saw-log mill you are interested in supplying; it is the permanent mills create the problem, which is not doing that part of the country any good.

Men who know the forest much better than I suggest that serious consideration should be given to establishing some relation between Crown dues, or bonuses, and the market value of the finished product, so that we, the people, may get some fair return from increasing market prices.

I know the Department has given some consideration to that angle, but I bring it up because I think it is worth consideration. It was mentioned just the other day a man might buy a tree for $15, a tree worth $75. I would like to ask, if he gets that tree legitimately, how much the province of Ontario would get. It would be far less than $75.

The policy we follow to-day is to lease pulp-wood and timber concessions to various interests. This procedure

puts these people in the business of forest management, logging and transportation of logs. This method of selling our forest wealth has been in vogue for many years, years which have heard a constant crying for a real effort to correct the mistake of the past, to stop the destruction of our forests in a mad rush for profits.

The companies into whose hands we deliver our forests invariably use the age-old argument that insecurity of tenure or shortness of tenure is to blame for all the shortcomings of the past. With all due respect for their case, and their may be some logic in it, I cannot accept this as a plausible excuse for the shortcomings of the past.

Mr. Speaker, we, the people of Ontario, own these great forests. We still own them, even when they are let out in a concession. Up until they are cut they are ours. We have the right to re-possess if we think the tenants are ruining the house.

These forests of ours contain not only trees, but also furs, game, tourist attractions, lakes plentiful with fish, to say nothing of the great part the forests play in conservation of the water supply upon which our hydro power depends.

Some are advancing the argument that we should pass our forests over to private hands, with the stipulation that they can be re-possessed for breach of good forest practices. Surely it is clear to all of us that we cannot let an asset as essential to all of us as our forests any further from our control than it is to-day. On the contrary, the trend must be toward greater control by the people, not less.

I realize that one must be practical about this problem, and I do not pretend to know all the answers. Certainly, if our present mills must be awwured of an adequate supply of wood, we must encourage and build new mills. We must have a sensible export policy, cutting up to our annual increment, supplying domestic mills first. I also realize that unusual export needs during wartime have, of necessity, affected our export positions. I am of the opinion that we must do all possible to maintain our American market. It is all very well to say cut off their wood supply, and they will have to build mills in Canada; it is not as easy as all that. We must remember that the American market is also the market for around 70% of our newsprint, which we manufacture in Canada. We must also remember that this market will have a new source of supply from Russia and the Scandanavian countries after the war.

I do not want to be misunderstood on this point. I am all in favour of building mills in Canada. I am sure that all of us are. I think we should strive, always, to encourage by every legitimate means the building of Canadian industry, but I also realize that this cannot be done by slamming the door in your customer's face. Let us remember he is the customer for our finished products, as well.

So, I say we need a sound and sensible export policy, and as soon as the war ends I think it should be carefully reviewed. Definitely, we must supply mills first, but I think it will be agreed by all in this House that the American market will have to be carefully protected after the war, in view of the source of supply.

To get back to the question of a policy for cutting and marketing our crop each year, in view of the fact that we, the people, are being asked to assume the building of the roads, the improving of the rivers and lakes for log-driving, of supplying , of supplying forest-training schools, of fighting the fires, of fighting the budworm and other insects, and that, in itself, is a tremendous problem, and if we develop the forest-community idea we must assume some obligation in the control of townsites.

In Northwestern Ontario you must view the affected forests from the air to appreciate and really get some idea of the tremendous damage which is caused by the budworm. In all fairness, I think I should say there is no easy cure, but it just makes your heart ache to view it from
4 the air, and then walk through the forests on the ground and see thousands and thousands of balsam which are stripped of their foliage right down to the lowest branches. The first thing you ask yourself is, Surely we can find some way of salvaging these trees?

I was pointing out some of the things we must assume to-day. To repeat, we must assume some obligations in the control of townsites, in building roads and schools, etc., and tourist promotion and colonization.

(Page No. 2056 follows.)

Most of these obligations are now assumed by the government; and, in view of all this, it is my opinion, in view of all these things which we now assume, and in view of the great extent to which the whole economy is dependent upon the forests, I think we might give serious study to the question of cutting and marketing our crop ourselves, guaranteeing to supply the mills with their needs, but reserving control over where and when the trees shall be cut. The Province should get a fair share of the profits which are available from this business, and which profits might be used, for years, at least, to promote forest conditions which are so long overdue.

I know this is a big order and some of them may be regarded as revolutionary; but I say, Mr. Speaker, that the problem calls for such a cure. We have been fooling along with this for too long. I feel it can be done in a period of time without doing harm to anyone, and with benefit to the common people of Ontario.

With these features in mind, I urge that if and when forest units are set up to permit conservation and utilization of our forests, that they do not be used for the benefit of any company, but rather for the benefit of the people; so that we may avoid the repetition of the old company town. Let us keep our resources where they belong, in the hands of the people.

I realize also that this would have to be a long term project, as it must be with any project involving forest management.

If we had done something to test out the feasibility of such a plan long ago instead of dancing to the tune which lead us into this position, we would be better off to-day.

Oh, I know there would be a great hue and cry from some sources, if this plan were advocated, and they would shed crocodile tears about the cost to the state. However, due to the havoc which these people have created over the years and the plan which has cost so many dollars, I do not believe we should pay too much attention to them.

Mr. Speaker, no puny policy is going to solve this question, it calls for courage, determination and far sightedness. Let us get on with this, our most needed reform. We have made a success with Hydro. Let us do at least as well for our forests. Obviously the first thing to do is to set up a Commission, as we did with Hydro, and get our forests away from the political football field. We depend upon our forests for so much more than just logs, -- they supply us with water power, our tourist attraction, and so on, our whole economy depends indirectly upon the care we take of out forests.

To this end we need a forestry school in North Western Ontario, and I sincerely feel that any money laid out by this Province for such a school would be returned tenfold in better forest care and better citizens. The location is ideal, right in the heart of our richest forest resources in Ontario. If we can establish a forest school to teach proper forest care, and could establish some sort of an apprentice training system in the industry, where young men can get practical training right on the job, like they do in many other industries, we would be meeting one of the outstanding needs of our forests, and also it would put industry in the place of paying their share of the shot.

Furthermore, these trainees or apprentices, or

foresters in training, or whatever you call them, can get their practical training in forest care within the Nipigon Forest community, which has as its basis the sound practice to produce perpetual yield from a comparatively small area. Because of that fact, this would be the ideal location for students to receive that part of their training, in a sound combination of school, industry and forest community, where it could be worked out.

I have tried to make the picture clear as to the type of school we have in mind up there. It does not need to be a great big expensive institution. It would be the school where they could get the practical training in forestry. In the Nipigon forest area they could get that practical training, and in industry, let them learn the practical end of it. If some of them are going to be bush blacksmiths, -- not every blacksmith shop can you see them shoeing horses, but they will shoe horses in the forest blacksmith shops.

Mr. Speaker, this school is definitely needed, for the sake of our forests and can be worked out in that part of the country on a practical basis so that this school can fill a definite need in that part of the country.

There are certainly definite needs for such a school, and I do not need of anything that could be set up in that part of the country which would serve better our returning men from overseas service. Northwestern Ontario is not blessed with big industries, and when the war activities slow down, even the most optomistic men realize that these war plants are not going to be able to keep up the tempo. You

are not going to be able to find places for these returned men in those plants; but there is a big field in Northwestern Ontario forests and in that school, where you can train men to take their places in industry in that part of the country; and many of these men could find a place in the forest industries, which I hope will be set up in the days to come.

I had hoped that the Hon. Minister of Lands and Forests would have delivered a speech and cleared up in my mind some of the questions as to what they were going to do.

Who knows if such a school might not easily become a Faculty of a NorthWestern Ontario University or College in the not far distant future.

Mr. Speaker, I realize a proper forest policy is no over-night task; but I deplore the fact that this matter has not received the attention or the action of government after government. I admit I am only a layman, but I have long been interested in this question and I have spent many hours talking it over with men who have had great experience; and one of these men said to me, not long ago:

> "Piece meal schemes like cutting to diameter limit, planting a tree for each tree cut, selective cutting, fire protection, embargoes, and so on and so on, each in themselves a specific problem, are not the answer."

He put it this way:

> "These panaceas dodge the real issue, like a re-paint job on a 1914 fliver. We are looking at the trees, not the forest. It may take twenty years to get our forests under elementary forest management, in fact the job is never done. But the first ten years will be the hardest."

Mr. Speaker, I see that I have talked over the time that I intended to use, or as one of the members said, that the Prime Minister allotted; but I would like to close with

this remark, without any sense of trying to be funny: The sixty-four dollar question, up in my part of the Province is, Where is Drew's Forest Resources Commission?

MR. T. P. MURRAY (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I will be pleased to move to adjourn the debate.

Motion agreed to.

MR. DREW: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I take it that we are going on tomorrow afternoon, with the Hon. member from Renfrew South (Mr. Murray).

The House adjourned at 11.50 o'clock p.m.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SIXTH DAY

Toronto, Ontario,
Thursday, March 22, 1945.

SPEAKER: Honourable William J. Stewart, C.B.E.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The House met at 3 o'clock.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. JAMES de C. HEPBURN (Prince Edward-Lennox) : Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the Fourth and final Report of the Standing Committee on miscellaneous bills, and move its adoption.

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

The Committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:-

"Bill (No. 18) - An Act respecting the Township of Crowland.

"Bill (No. 22) - An Act respecting the Township of Teck.

"Bill (No. 23) - An Act respecting the Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League, Branch 51.

"Bill (No. 24) - An Act respecting the Town of Paris."

The Committee begs to report the following Bill with a certain amendment:-

"Bill (No. 16) - An Act respecting the Township of Stamford.

The Committee would recommend that Bill (No. 21), "An Act respecting the Village of Swansea," be not reported.

The Committee would recommend that the fees, less the penalties, if any, and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill (No. 23), "An Act respecting the Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League, Branch 51," and that the penalties only be remitted on Bill (No. 24),"An Act respecting the Town of Paris."

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

HON. DANA H. PORTER (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Daley, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "The Town Planning Act, 1945," and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MR. CHARLES A. STRANGE (Brantford): Would the hon. Minister explain? It may be our only chance to find out about it.

MR. PORTER: I do not know why the hon. member says that. This bill provides for the establishment of planning boards in municipalities, it outlines the function of the boards, and provides for the preparation and the adoption of official plans, comprehensive zoning of lands in municipalities, and it provides for the procedure which will lead to make the official plan of that kind more or less permanent.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Game and Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Vivian, that leave

be given to introduce a bill intituled "The Game and Fisheries Act, 1945," and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MR. JOHN H. COOK (Waterloo North): Would the hon. Minister give an explanation?

MR. DUNBAR: This is a revamping of the entire Act, and it will be considered at the beginning of the week, and you will be given an opportunity in committee. You are a member of the committee, and we would welcome any other hon. member who desires to come and give his opinion.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON (Brant): Are there any important amendments to the bill?

MR. DUNBAR: No.

HON. WESLEY C. THOMPSON (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Daley, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Provincial Parks Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MR. FRED O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Would the hon. Minister explain?

MR. THOMPSON: This bill, and two other bills which I will introduce, are complimentary to the bill to amend the Game and Fisheries Act, which was just introduced by the Provincial Secretary, making the necessary amendments to the three Acts which I amended by these three bills.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Vivian, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Vital Statistics Act," and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Vivian, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Wartime Housing Act, 1944," and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MR. WILLIAM C. RIGGS (Windsor-Walkerville): Would the hon. Minister explain?

MR. DUNBAR: That is to add one or two sections to the present bill, so it might be possible for municipalities to enter into the Federal scheme of permanent housing, instead of the temporary.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Vivian, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Assessment Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Would the hon. Minister explain?

MR. DUNBAR: These are on recommendations of the different municipalities, rural municipalities, and also urban, amendments which they wish, and they will be before the Committee before it comes back to this House on Municipal Bills.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Vivian, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Local Improvement Act," and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MR. GARFIELD ANDERSON (Fort William): Would the hon. Minister explain?

MR. DUNBAR: That is in all districts where they are putting through a drain or a sewer where they are defective, that cost would be spread over the area instead of on the abutting properties.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Vivian, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Department of Municipal Affairs' Act," and that same be read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Vivian, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Ontario Municipal Board Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

2. MR. HARRY C. NIXON (Brant): Would the Minister explain the last two bills?

MR. DUNBAR: It is in order to facilitate the work of municipalities where they have been called upon to make application to the Municipal Board. Supposing you had an amount set out in your estimates, and that was not all used up during the year, they had to come to the Municipal Board for permission to transfer it to another department. We feel they should not be put to that expense, and the Municipal Council should be responsible, and for any local improvement which is going to be paid out of the current revenue which they have provided for in taxes. They should not be put to the expense of coming to the Municipal Board, applying for permission.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs):

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Vivian, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Municipal Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MR. ROBERT D. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Would the hon. Minister explain?

MR. DUNBAR: There are about sixty amendments that will all go before the committee. You will have an opportunity. We will be there prepared to explain everything. Those have all your own recommendations made from different recognized boards throughout the province, and I do not want to take the credit for them. They are not all my making, but I think it is my duty to bring these, if they are within reason, -- to bring them before the committee and before the House.

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Daley, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Long Point Park Act," and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I have no slip attached to this to put my name and Mr. Vivian's, but I would like to move, with the permission of the House, first reading of an Act to amend the Industrial Farms Act, and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MR. GARFIELD ANDERSON (Fort William): Would the hon. Minister explain?

MR. DUNBAR: In your part of the country it has been in the Act that the Government could establish government farms, and it has not been in southern Ontario or eastern Ontario. It has already been enacted that municipalities could join one municipality, such as Toronto, so that their industrial farms, or a number of municipalities, might join in order to establish industrial farms.

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Daley, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Presquille Park Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

MR. CHARLES H. MILLARD (York West): I wonder if the hon. Minister would explain the Presquille and Long Point Park Acts?

MR. THOMPSON: Both these latter two are complimentary to the Parks Act which I introduced, and they are to bring the Act in line with the amendments, as suggested, to the Game and Fish Act.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to provide for voting at the election of the Benchers of the Law Society in the year 1946 by members of the Board on active service in His Majesty's Forces, and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

MR. MITCHELL F. HEPBURN (Elgin): Would the hon. Minister explain?

MR. BLACKWELL: I thought, in view of the lengthy wording of the Act, it was self-explanatory, but I will try and explain it further. The Benchers of the Law Society have periodic elections for the appointment of Benchers, and 1946 is the year when that election next comes, and provisions for that have to be made, and in view of the large number of members of the Board on active service, there has to be a provision to permit them to vote. As far as the definition of the members on active service, that is provided by the regulations under the present Act, and that determination, by the Bill, is delegated to the Law Society.

MR. SPEAKER: Further bills.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Money Lenders Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Would the hon. Minister explain?

MR. BLACKWELL: The registration section of the Ontario Act became obsolescent by reason of the Dominion Act, and there has been confusion since as to whether money lenders were required to register under our Act when they are actually regulated by the Dominion Act. In order to get away from this confusion, we are repealing the Registration Section of the Ontario Act.

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL (York North): Are they proposing to require money lenders to lower their rate of interest?

MR. BLACKWELL: The quick answer is "No". The long answer is it is not within the jurisdiction of this Legislature.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Coroner's Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

(Page No. 2070 follows.)

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, will the Minister explain the Act?

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, this is really an Act for the sole benefit of the constituency represented by the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost). It is an Act to extend the jurisdiction of the County of Haliburton.

Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by Mr. Frost for leave to introduce a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Surrogate Court's Act, and that the same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to. The first reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further Bills?

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition desires leave to speak.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (York South): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I believe the Hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Drew, will recall that in either the first or second week of the Session I asked him to state the government's position in respect to the acceptance of a directorship in a private corporation by a public servant. The case being that of Doctor Hogg, Chairman of the Hydro Electric Commission, who was reported as having accepted a directorship in the Chartered Trust and Executor Company. Is the Hon. Prime Minister prepared to answer the question?

MR. DREW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was not aware at the time the question was asked as to the circumstances. I may say that a few days after that, I received a letter from the Chairman of the Hydro Electric Commission containing his resignation, and he has resigned from that position.

MR. G. H. DUNBAR(Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the forty-eighth annual report for the Loan corporations for the year ended December 31st, 1944.

Also, the sixty-sixth annual report of the superintendent of insurance for the year ending December 31st, 1944. Also the annual report of the Inspector of Legal Offices for the year ending December 31st, 1944.

Also the annual report of the Secretary and the Registrar of the Province of Ontario for the year 1944.

Also the annual report of the Commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police for the year ending December 31st, 1944.

Also, the thirty-seventh annual report of the Game and Fisheries Department of Ontario.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams).

MR. A. WILLIAMS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, last night, at the close of my speech, I became involved in what to me is the most regrettable incident, and, as a result of the incident, I uttered some words that I ought not to have uttered.

Immediately at the conclusion of the sittings of the House, I did go to the Hon. Prime Minister and apologized to him; but I said that that was not a staisfactory way to do the thing. I had made the statement in public, and I said I ought to withdraw the statement in public. And I want to assure the Hon. Prime Minister that I unreservedly withdraw the unfortunate statement that I made last night.

MR. DREW: Mr. Speaker, I unreservedly accept it. I do wish to say, in addition to the statement made here, that I can only reiterate what the Hon. member has said, that he came to me immediately after we rose last night and expressed his regret, in most generous terms.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third readings.

Third Order, Third reading of Bill No. 3, intituled, An Act respecting the City of Welland. Mr. Brown.

MR. HOWARD E. BROWN (Welland): Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 3, intituled An Act respecting the City of Welland.

Motion agreed to. Third reading of the Bill.

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

CLERK OF HOUSE: The fourth Order, third reading of Bill No. 6, intituled An Act respecting the City of Woodstock. Mr. Dent.

MR. THOMAS R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 6, intituled an Act respecting the City of Woodstock.

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. SPEAKER: The fifth order, third reading of Bill No. 8, intituled, An Act respecting the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Niagara. Mr. Roberts.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 8, intituled An Act respecting the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Niagara.

Motion agreed to: third reading of the Bill.

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

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order, Third reading of Bill No. 10, intituled An Act respecting the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada. Mr. Cook.

MR. JOHN. H. COOK (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 10, An Act respecting the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada.

Motion agreed to. Third reading of the Bill.

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

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order, Third reading of Bill No. 11, intituled An Act respecting the City of St. Thomas. Mr. Hepburn (Elgin)

MR. M. F. HEPBURN (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 11, intituled an Act respecting the City of St. Thomas.

Motion agreed to. Third reading of the Bill.

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

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The Eighth Order. Third reading of Bill No. 5 intituled an Act respecting the City of Peterborough. Mr. Scott.

MR. HAROLD R. SCOTT (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 5, intituled An Act respecting the City of Peterborough.

Motion agreed to. Third reading of the Bill.

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

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The ninth order, Third reading of Bill No. 9, intituled An Act respecting the City of Kingston. Mr. Stewart.

MR. HARRY A. STEWART (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 9, intituled An Act respecting the City of Kingston.

Motion agreed to. Third reading of the Bill.

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

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The tenth Order. Third reading of Bill No. 12, intituled An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur. Mr. Robinson.

MR. FRED O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 12, an Act respecting the City of Port Arthur.

Motion agreed to. Third reading of the Bill.

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

CLERK OF HOUSE: Eleventh Order. Third reading of Bill No. 4, intituled An Act respecting the Royal Ottawa Sanitorium. Mr. Laurier.

MR. ROBERT LAURIER (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 4 intituled An Act respecting the Royal Ottawa Sanitorium.

Motion agreed to. Third reading of the Bill.

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

CLERK OF HOUSE: The twelfth Order. Third reading of of Bill No. 7, intituled An Act respecting the City of Peterborough Civic Hospital. Mr. Scott.

MR. HAROLD R. SCOTT (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 7, intituled An Act respecting the City of Peterborough Civic Hospital.

Motion agreed to. Third reading of the Bill.

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

CLERK OF HOUSE: Thirteenth Order. Third reading of Bill No. 13 An Act respecting the City of Ottawa Separate School Board. Mr. Laurier.

MR. ROBERT LAURIER (Ottawa East Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 13, intituled 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.

CLERK OF HOUSE: Fourteenth Order, Third reading of Bill No. 44, intituled An Act to amend the Public Health Act. Mr. Vivivan.

HON. R. P. VIVIAN (Minister of Halth): Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 44, intituled An Act to amend the Public Health 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.

CLERK OF HOUSE: The fifteenth Order. Third reading of the Bill, No. 56, intituled An Act to amend The Dog Tax and Live Stock protection Act.

MR. DOUCETT: (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 56, intituled An Act to amend the Dog Tax and Live Stock Protection 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.

CLERK OF HOUSE: The sixteenth Order. Third reading of Bill No. 64, An Act to amend The Mining Act. Mr. Frost.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the third reading of Bill No. 64 intituled an Act to amend the Mining Act.

Motion agreed to. Third reading of the Bill.

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

CLERK OF HOUSE: Seventeenth Order. The third reading of Bill No. 57 intituled An Act to amend the Statute Labour Act. Mr. Doucett.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker,

I move the third reading of Bill No. 57 intituled an Act to amend the Statute Labour 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.

CLERK OF HOUSE. The Eighteenth Order. Third reading of Bill No. 47, intituled. An Act to amend the Workmens' Compensation Act. Mr. Daley.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 47, intituled an Act to amend the Workmens' Compensation 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.

CLERK OFTHE HOUSE: Nineteenth Order: Third reading of Bill No. 58 intituled An Act to Confirm Tax Sales. Mr. Dunbar.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary) Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 58, intituled An Act to Confirm Tax Sales.

Motion agreed to Third reading of the Bill.

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

CLERK OF HOUSE: Twentieth Order. Third reading of Bill No. 59, intituled An Act to amend The Bees'Act. Mr. Doucett.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 59, intituled An Act to amend the Bees 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.

CLERK OF HOUSE: The twenty-first Order. Third reading of Bill No. 73 intituled An Act to amend The Liquor Authority

Control Act, 1944. Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 73, intituled an Act to amend The Liquor Authority Control Act, 1944.

Motion agreed to. Third reading of the Bill.

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

CLERK OF HOUSE: The twenty-second Order. Third reading of Bill No. 46, intituled An Act to amend the Public Hospitals Act. Mr. Vivian.

MR. VIVIAN: Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 46, intituled an Act to amend the Public Hospitals 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.

CLERK OF HOUSE: Twenty-third Order, Third reading of Bill No.74 intituled An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act. Mr. Doucett.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 74 intituled 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.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-fourth order, Third reading of Bill No. 76, intituled An Act to Amend The Fire Departments Act. Mr. Blackwell.

MR. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 76 intituled an Act to amend the Fire Departments 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.

CLERK OF HOUSE: Twenty-fifth Order. Third reading of Bill No. 79, intituled An Act to amend the Public Vehicles Act. Mr. Doucett.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 79, intituled An Act to amend the Public Vehicles 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.

CLERK OF HOUSE: The twenty-sixth Order. Third reading of Bill No. 80, intituled An Act to amend the Commercial Vehicles Act. Mr. Doucett.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 80, intituled an Act to amend the Commercial vehicles 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.

CLERK OF HOUSE: Twenty-seventh Order, Third reading of Bill No. 82, intituled An Act to amend the Trustee Act. Mr. Blackwell.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I now move the third reading of Bill No. 82 intituled an Act to amend the Trustee 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.

MR. DREW: Mr. Speaker I would now ask permission to leave the Chamber and bring the Lieutenant Governor in.

His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Chamber of the Legislature, and took his seat upon the Throne.

Mr. Speaker then addressed His Honour as follows:

"May it please your Honour:

The Legislative Assembly of the Province have, 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."

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: The following Bills have been passed:-

An Act respecting the Town of Barrie

An Act respecting the City of Welland

An Act respecting the Royal Ottawa Sanatorium

An Act respecting the City of Peterborough

An Act respecting the City of Woodstock

An Act respecting the City of Peterborough Civic Hospital

An Act respecting the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Niagara.

An Act respecting the City of Kingston

An Act respecting the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada

An Act respecting the City of St. Thomas

An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur

An Act respecting the City of Ottawa Separate School Board

An Act to amend The Counties Reforestation Act

An Act to amend The Crown Timber Act

An Act to amend The Public Works Act

An Act to repeal The Political Contributions Act

An Act to amend The Judicature Act

The Securities Act, 1945

An Act respecting Prospecting Syndicates having a capital not exceeding $35,000

An Act to amend The Public Health Act

An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act

An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act

An Act to amend The Dog Tax and Live Stock Protection Act

An Act to amend The Statute Labour Act

An Act to confirm Tax Sales

An Act to amend The Bees Act

An Act to amend The Public Trustee Act

An Act to amend The Mining Act

An Act to amend The Evidence Act

An Act to amend The Liquor Authority Control Act, 1944

An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act

An Act to amend The Fire Departments Act

An Act to amend The Public Vehicles Act

An Act to amend The Commercial Vehicles Act

An Act to amend The Trustee Act

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: In His Majesty's Name, His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these Bills.

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order number twenty-eight.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-eighth Order: Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for the consideration of the Speech of the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session.

MR. THOMAS P. MURRAY (Renfrew, South): Mr. Speaker, as you know, I am not in the habit of making speeches, so I am a little nervous. However, I hope that my speech does not defeat the government, because I would not want to be that prominent.

Now, first of all, I think we should almost say a prayer of thankfulness for being all back here again in this very honourable House, after a long summer, and a hard winter. We know in many parts of the world they have many troubles, and naturally we have in this country of ours certain troubles, and we will continue to have them.

Now, I was going to congratulate some of the hon. members on their good looks, and good behavour, and I will start in by complimenting the two lady members who we have with us. We all know the prominent part women have taken in the affairs of government in the world, and although I will not compare them with a Queen Victoria or Harriet Beecher Stowe, I do wish to compliment them on the work they have been doing to put through good legislation for this province.

Now, I am very glad to see all of the cabinet in their seats. That is an honour. I suppose they are all there, because they knew I was going to speak. However, it reminds me of the time when I made my first speech in parliament, I think it was the 13th of March - not the 17th - 1930, and I spoke after one of the most remarkable men who ever entered this House, the Reverend W. J. Martin, a great congregationalist minister, and I had quite a hard time to get started following a man who had such great words and expression.

I had quite a lot of experience since I have been here, during the last sixteen years, and many changes have taken place. Many men have retired; some have been defeated, and others have died and their souls have passed on before the last and greatest tribunal.

However, the cabinet which faces us today is perhaps as good looking as any cabinet that I have seen, and although I have seen cabinet ministers whom I admire more, and was more inclined to follow, after all, they are a good looking lot.

Now, coming down to my hon. friend from Carleton, (Mr. A.H. Acres) and my hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. H. R. Scott): they have been here a long time. I heard they were going to be moved over into a new field and left over there. That is something I was sorry to hear, although if they were left there and became mumified then of course our children and our grandchildren could go over there and see the famous men who once sat on the floor of this chamber.

Now, in regard to my hon. friend from Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod). When I first came into this House, Bellwoods was represented by a big man who weighed three hundred and ten pounds in his pajamas. He was "Bell from Bellwoods", and with respect to some of the remarks that have been made upon my hon. friend now, I am sorry I cannot agree with all of them, but I do agree with part of them, although I do not think he is a bad, bad man, I do think he is something like St. Paul of old, who reformed and perhaps the hon. member from Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) will continue to reform. So for that reason I would have no great objection to associating with him.

Now, I wanted to compliment my good friend the hon. member for St. Andrews (Mr. Salsberg) because, according to the parliamentary guide, he is of Polish descent, and I am glad to see the Polish people in this Province represented by such an able debater.

I had the good luck and the good fortune to be raised amongst the Polish people, and I know them very well and I admire them very much. The men are strong, able and clever, and the women are also good looking and clever, therefore, I am glad to see the Polish people represented, and although the hon. member does not happen to be of the same religion as we are, I still hope that he will come to Renfrew some day and visit my Polish friends down there.

I am also glad to know that there are lumbermen in this House, and I include among them the hon. member from Peterborough (Mr. Scott), and I want to congratulate him on the speech he made in the seconding the motion in reply to the speech from the Throne. That is an honour that comes only to a few of the hon. members of this House. As you know, there are hon. members who have been here a long time, like my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Acres) and have never reached the promised land as yet, although they seem to get quite close to it at times. I do not want to discourage him, but he must remember that Moses was an old man before he reached the promised land, and so there may be hopes for the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Acres) yet.

The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) is contradicting my remarks in regard to the scripture. Well, perhaps I do not know it as well as some others. He said that Moses only saw it from afar. I thought that Moses actually had got there. Perhaps my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Acres) is in the same position as Moses.

I want to congratulate the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Martin) who moved the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. I knew his brother when he was Minister of Agriculture, and was very intimate with him

and I feel that he done honour to this House by the speech he delivered.

I am sorry that my good friend, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is not here. He is one of the best Irishmen in this House. When you read Irish history, you will find the O Kennedey's. I think the mother of one very prominent irishmen was an O Kennedy, and you know how they have gone down through Irish history.

So my mind goes back to the time when he was appointed Minister of Agriculture, and one hon. member in congratulating him - old man Henry, as we called him, - said he was pleased, because he looked like a farmer. I at that time congratulated him, and said he reminded me of Miles Standish, who was a great old soldier, and fought on the fields of Flanders, the same as the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) did. Standish came over on the Mayflower to protect the people against the dangers that existed at that time, and my good friend, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is here to protect the farmers against the bugs and parasites which prey on the good farmers in our Province.

Now, I do not want to take up too much of the time of the House, and you can blame the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Kelly) for my speaking. He insisted on my speaking, last week. I told him I felt something like the lady whom Brigham Young asked to marry him. Brigham Young was sixty-one years of age, and had settled in the great city of Salt Lake, and he owned one hundred miles all around, and was the head of the Church there, and when he proposed to this young lady, she said "How many wives have you got", and he said "twenty-four", and she said "what do you want

me for?"

So I said to the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Kelly) "You have many good speakers; what do you want me for?" However, he insisted, with his famous smile, and finally persuaded me at last that I should get up in this House and do the best I could.

Now, I want to say a word about my hon. friend who spoke for four hours. I admire him for being a fighting Welshman, but I disagree with him upon so many things. First of all, about these policemen. I looked around this Chamber and I saw four policemen standing here, one at each door, and I was wondering what they were doing, and if the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) would complain of these policemen being here.

Now, in regard to the policemen and their efficiency: Our laws would amount to nothing, if we did not have good, efficient policemen, and did not obey them to a certain extent. I know we cannot live up to the letter of the law one hundred per cent, but there is one thing we can do; we can make every effort to obey the law, and we should respect the policemen and other government officials.

Whenever you hear talk about Lands and Forests, the feeling toward the policemen is something that I feel downhearted about. Some lumbermen, and men who call themselves lumbermen, do not want to see the government rangers and government officials coming around. They despise them. Then we have men and women who despise the officials who enforce the Game and Fish Laws, and the liquor laws, and so on, all along the line.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have to have men to enforce those laws. If we did not, then, Mr. Speaker, our

democracy would fall down and amount to nothing.

The hon member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) and some of the other hon. members in this House, have mentioned Kirkland Lake so often. I disagree with them entirely. One of them last year - I do not know which one - went so far as to say that those policemen came up there, and they were all good fellows, and they obeyed the laws themselves, and tried to enforce the laws, and the C C F party sold them their bill of goods, the C C F ideas. Well, I want to say to some of the hon. members of this House that if that was the case, why did they object to having those men go up there? I feel there should be no objection, because these men went up there to protect the workmen and the business men, their families, and everybody else. It is quite true, there was no real trouble, but, as the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) mentioned last night, where there smoke there was fire, and I think there was smoke there alright, and there was apt to be a fire break out at any time. I think there going up there was quite proper.

Now, let us consider the state of Europe at the present time, as to what is going on there, and what has been going on. If Europe had been properly policed, nothing would have happened. But Chamberlain went over there with his umbrella and his pipe, and he tried in his nice way to persuade them to keep the peace, but it was of no avail, and now we have one of the greatest calamities which has ever befallen the human race going on at the present time.

I think that after this war is over, it will be necessary to either send police over there, or organize them over there, and if they do not do their duty,

if they fall down, we are apt to have another war more disastrous than the present one. So I am sorry, that I have to disagree with my hon. friend in the C C F. I admire them. Most of them are well educated, and they mean well, but meaning well is not enough. We have a big society which mean well. They meet together, and draw up a constitution, and the constitution is alright, and then they go out and sow the good seed, and then up comes the crop. That is about what happens in a good many cases in political parties.

Now, in regard to the twenty-two points, which my hon. friend spoke about in 1943. I will not say much about the twenty-two points because other hon. members have already dealt with that subject.

But what I was going to speak about was the one hundred and twenty-two points which my good friend "Jim" Maloney, and my opponent made,- one hundred and twenty-two promises down at Renfrew County, which were never fulfilled, and perhaps it is a good thing that they were not.

Unfortunately the hon. Prime Minister made one, and that was too bad. Before we were defeated in 1943, we had arranged with Mr. King with regard to the Rapids Development above Pembroke, and the hon. Prime Minister came down and promised to stop it and did stop it -

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, knowing how extremely fair the hon. member for Renfrew, South (Mr. Murray) is, I know he would not wish to leave an inaccurate impression, and I can assure him that nothing we have ever done has stopped that work. There is no possibility of any action there until the war conditions permit it to proceed.

MR. MURRAY: I am sorry I have not the Pembroke paper -

MR . DREW: They do not run the Hydro Electric Commission yet.

MR. MURRAY: If I had the paper here, I could read just what the hon. Prime Minister said.

He was charged with saying it was not a good thing . It was not a matter of money, but he seemed to want to create a little bit of difference between the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario, and that was the part I did not like. I did not like his party, because he was going to stop this work, and the idea was to create in the minds of the people of Ontario, prejudices against Quebec. I took that thing up, during the election campaign.

(Page No. 2095 follows)

the idea was to create in the mind of the people of Ontario a prejudice against Quebec. I took that thing up during the election campaign and I said "It is too bad that we would be thinking evil of the Province of Quebec." Of course, that is no new thing. I am an old man now and I can remember back in 1885 they talked so much about Quebec at the time of the North West Rebellion that I asked my father and I pointed - I was only five years old, and I was pointing in the right direction too - I asked him if that was the direction for this. This is not a new thing. It has been going on ever since. I remember an election in 1886 and I remember documents,and this is no new thing. I told the people of Renfrew we were not going to be ruled by the fanatics of Ontario, or Quebec. We were going to be ruled by the sensible and level headed and women of the province of Ontario and to pay no attention whatever to the fanatics of Ontario - and we have lots of them. I was sorry that a word would be said that would create a bad impression. I do not know how my Hon, friend from North Renfrew (Mr.Hunt) got elected. He must be a very popular man because this big project is in the next constituency and I do not know if they used the Hon. Premier's (Mr. Drew) words against him at all because he seems to have got a good vote.

Then a matter that has been discussed here - I am not going to take them all up, but only a few. I was going to talk on Lands and Forests a while. Last night my Hon. friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) - he did not refer to me, but he mentioned Trees worth $15, and so I don't know whether the Government got their dues out of those trees, but they were properly paid for trees when they were worth $15 a piece. There are trees worth $15, $25, $50, and $100,but

there are few and far between now on the old timber limit which have been cut over and burnt. However, there are quite a few of them. To show you, going back about five years when the Hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) was Premier of this Province, he postponed the session for a while and I went back to my Lumber business. We had 8,000 hardwood logs and about 30,000 soft wood logs. They were opening up a new road and I went down with my snow shoes and I went to put them on. A young man was working on the road and he said, "there is no use you going in there, everything is cut." I said "I am just going out to try my snow shoes," - it was the first time I went in there; this was cut all through, and I went through 100 ft from the road and I came to some old birch trees. They were old trees. When they get old they develop certain defects and one of them had like a cancer coming down the side and the other had what we call squirrel nests, and I went back and I borrowed an axe and marked these trees. After a while I got a gang and I cut those trees and one of them I got like 22 dollars and the other I got like 30 dollars. Now, I am to be complimented on this and I think the Minister of Lands and Forests should give me sometime timber limit because I am a good bush man. Our foreman is a man that gets logs; he knows all about it and yet I had to go back there and go all over the work again and pick up those trees because if left there for a few years the top would break off, and the best log in the whole 20,000 would not be cut. Beautiful birch, that mahogany birch with red colour, which is worth $125 per thousand. Now, when a man goes out he is not going to take a bad tree; he is going

to pick out the best tree there and for that reason it is quite alright to charge them $15.

How does the Government get their money out of those trees? There are many ways they get their money out of the trees. I think the Hon. member for Elgin (Mr.Hepburn) when elected Premier of this Province, he started out with real efficiency, knowing where to go where the money was. I heard Billy Fraser talk on that thing. He said the Hon,member knew where the money was; he went where the money was. His grand-mother told him to get a rich wife, to go where the money was,and he went there. The Hon.member for Elgin (Mr.Hepburn) went to the rich man - I have not anything to substantiate my statement but I know he got millions of dollars. The big end of the lumber profits go to Ottawa in income taxes and then when you die they hit you again with Succession Duties. So that they get you living or dead. If I cut those two old trees and if we made a big profit on them, if they did not get me in the income tax or the timber dues they will get the money when I am gone. So my Hon friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) don't need to worry.

The other day I went to a lumber man's meeting in the Royal York and nobody talked to me at all. I went back to my hotel and I said "I think all my old lumber friends are dead". "No" they said, "they are not dead; they are making so much money they won't talk to any common man." Well, I was invited the next day back to a luncheon, and I happened to have a little better luck and I met one of the prominent lumber men in the City of Toronto and he said,"Look here, Tom, I pay more income tax than all the farmers of Ontario", and I said " I don't doubt that a bit," and I said " I pay more income tax than all the farmers in the

Province of Quebec," and so we sat and ate together. This is what I say - the lumber men pay their taxes all right because if they do not get them one way they get them the other.

I have some figures here. I read them out before. They are about lumber, and it is not very encouraging -that is, for the Conservative Government. Those are the most ridiculous figures that I think the C.C.F. over here would be interested in, and all members should be. You know in 1930 when we had a fairly good lumber business there were 1,239 men engaged by the Department of Lands and Forests protecting the forest, fire rangers and all that kind of thing, 1,239, but at the height of the depression in 1933 there were 8,411. They took over 400 of these men protecting the forest and put them on relief. Now, I know the way that thimgs happen. I was never a Cabinet Minister and I do not want to be, but take the Minister of Lands and Forests. I said the revenue was small and the Prime Minister turned around to me and said, "You have to cut your expenses, revenue gone down," and he cut his expenses. This is one of the most ridiculous thing that possibly could have been done. For the sake of cutting this expense hundreds of thousands should have been spent in protecting the forests. We have a disease on the trees - and it is a strange thing that it cannot spread when currant bushes and gooseberry bushes and you go through the forest and you have these bushes, you will have no blister. This is very serious among young white pine. Now, as I said sometime ago - I spoke in this House sixteen years ago and I have changed my mine on one thing - that is, on the protection of the

forest. At that time I figured fighting bush fires was the biggest item to protect and I made fun of the University over here. They had men go down and examine it. The bug is there alright and I have discovered that since and we have a lot of other diseases on the trees and the blight is very well controlled. Of course, we are going to have big fires too. When they get started in dry weather they are going to go a distance before they are stopped, but at that time we were having a lot of trouble with incendiary fires. We had on the limit some settlers and my Hon. friend would hardly believe how bad some of those people are. You would wonder what they mean. In 1932 we put up a notice offering a reward of $100 for information that would lead to the arrest of these men setting fire to the bush and next Spring the Government put another notice on the same tree and it was signed by my good friend the Hon. William Findlayson. Those men went out at night and they burned those things off the trees, just to show how daring they were and how they were going to despise the laws of the Province. Now, that is true. I was there before the fires went out. We had incendiary fires there and men went to the asylum for observation and some of them went to gaol. You would be surprised the good citizens who would go to work and hire lawyers to defend those men who are destroying the forests, and I am very afraid of incendiary fires up in our part of the country. Here is a little book and this book saved my life one time because I was pretty near as unruly as the Hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Williams) was. I got into so much trouble fighting Bill Findlayson. This book was sent to me afterwards and it substantiated everything I said at that time. At that

time I was looked upon as a pretty fair speaker, they used to send me out and I was always the guest s eaker and I made a speech down here in West Toronto and I made a statement there and the statement was not extravagant but it got the headline in the newspapers. I said that if the fires of Ontario had been properly handled, honestly handled, over the years back that they could have saved at least $5000,000,000, and that got a headline. One day I was away from home - I used to sit in the same seat as the Hon. Member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson), and Findlayson gets up and lambastes me, and I am not there. At that time I was more of a fighter than I am now and I used to lose my head and I come back and I read the newspapers and I got very vexed and I got up before the Orders of the Day and for half an hour, as the newspapers said at that time, we went to the mat about the Lands and Forests. I talked until they ordered me out of the House. Well, this book was sent to me afterwards by a good Conservative. You will find it in the Lands and Forests Department. It is no new thing for me and any other Hon. member in the House to get up and talk about Lands and Forests. Away back in 1865, I believe A. Campbell, Commissioner of Crown Lands, he talked the same way as we are talking. In 1855 the Hon. H.C.Gault talked the same way we are. Well then, in 1900 there was a big movement started by a great many of the wise men of Canada and they appointed a Committee to go into this Lands and Forests business and see if they could not be remedied. I see one of the men is Dr. Howard Murray and William Snowball of Chatham, and Senator William Cameron, Charles A. McCoomb and about twenty of those men got together and the result was

they sent three men right up to our country and right around Peterborough. I guess my Hon. friend has read the book and they made a report and this report substantiated everything that I said on that particular day that the Hon. Wm. Findlayson said I had lost my head entirely. He even went further than that and they wrote to the Municipalities - they were doing something - this letter advising what they should do. There was one letter from the township of Bright in the County of Renfrew. There were several letters wrote from the County of Renfrew but this letter I think amounted to quite a lot. It was wrote by a man who had spent eight years in Forestry Schools in Germany and he come out to Canada and this is what he said in his letter:

> " Yours of the 2nd inst. to hand. In regard to your letter I will give you my opinion on the matter. There is a lot of land here not fit for agriculture and if it be efficiently protected from hunters and fishermen so that we could keep it from getting burnt over again, this waste land in 25 or 30 years would be worth more than all the farms and farm buildings, as in most places the pine is coming up again.
>
> The whole of this country is not fit for agriculture."

He is referring to his own municipality.

> "If the Canadian Government establishes forestry under the same plan as there is in Germany I could give you very good advice on it as I have served that country for eight years in the forestry branch. The only safest plan is to protect bushes to keep the people out of it as there is plenty of good land in new Ontario where the farmer is able to make a living. I cannot tell you how much exactly. The land is poor for that purpose but I am sure half of Raglan Township and a big block in Raglan is not fit for cultivation."

Now, what had happened down there? They did follow this man's advice about half and the result was there was hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of lumber in tithes and pulp-

wood from that section at Barry's Bay this summer. If you come down to Barry's Bay to see me last summer you would find me there with the rest of the gang loading lumber and you would see perhaps fifteen or twenty cars being loaded in one day, products of the forest from that particular district. Now, I wanted to chastise the Hon.Member for Parry Sound (Mr.Smith) he is a young fellow and it is a good thing to see an old man chastising a boy, shows that he takes an interest in him. If a man does not chastise me I get offended. So I was going to tell a different story altogether from what you told here last year. He had quite a tale of woe. There was Brian O'Lynn - he was an Irishman and very optomistic and there is a story that Brian O'Lynn and his wife's mother were crossing the bridge together and the bridge fell down and they all tumbled in. "We will find granny at the bottom," said Brian. Sometimes I refer that to our Government of Canada and they will find ground at the bottom. Our country up there is so rich in timber - so rich they want to raise the taxes in the back townships. They had a right to raise the taxes. I got off the train after my Hon. friend had made that speech here last year, that melencholy speech I called it, and the first thing I saw was a big load of balsam that a farmer was getting in his truck. We have up there all kinds of lumber and timber being cut and loaded and going into war production. If you come with me for a drive through there with some politician - my hon.friend over here the Minister of Re-construction, he is the sad Sam Jones of the whole Cabinet,but anyway I think he is a good fellow. I thought he would come up to see me but I think he is afraid of his Conservative friend there because

if they saw him driving around with me they would not be pleased. They need not be worried about that because the Conservatives up there are fighting amongst themselves. If he came up with me or any other member of this House that wants to get real appreciation and spend a couple of days in the bush, we will visit those places. I will tell you what happened because I have been in that country now over sixty years and I know just what happened and for that reason it is a mistake when a man comes up there and he runs all over the country. My Hon. friend the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Dunbar) I think he has the right idea. He promised to come and see me and you can start out - I am starting a farm now - you can go to work and take ten square miles right East of Barry's Bay, and if you had good game wardens and policemen and follow them up and did not let them get in among the people and advise them and try and teach them what is good for themselves and in five years I don't know how many thousands dollars worth of fur would grow on those places because beaver if they are left alone they will do well. There is a fellow who gets five hundred dollars worth of fur and I pay the taxes because it is on my farm, and I do not even get a decent look. However, a fur farm is something that will always pay and those are the things we could talk about. We would not talk politics at all. We would just talk about developing that country and making it rich, and if that country is not rich and if Barry's Bay village does not contain three thousand people in twenty years from now it is the people's own fault.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I want to promise my good friend after this next election I will make you Deputy Game Warden.

MR. MURRAY: Anyway, I am very pleased by this kind

offer that the Hon.Minister has made but I am looking for a job. I had an offer one time of a far better job and I refused. I have all the work I want. I have a timber limit one hundred square miles and I am a bush ranger. There is the Deputy Warden, he is the most hated man. Even the clergymen talk about him and the Game Warden is hated and they should be respected. Game Wardens and public officials should be respected.

Another thing I want to talk about. My hon. friend from Bruce (Mr.Duff) he lives in the kind of country I do and he made a speech and he outlined to the Government everything that would be beneficial to Canada, similar to myself.

The Hydro Electric Power Development is one of the things. Take things away from politics -- you cannot do it-I am going back on Lands and Forests again. You have Lands and Forests Department now set up by the Liberal Government. With all respect to the good Irishmen who is Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr.Thompson)- his predecessor was a wonderful fellow. He was no politician, that is why he got licked. He set up the Lands and Forests Department and made a great job of it. He got a good man for Deputy Minister and a wonderful man for assistant Deputy Minister. I think they were good fellows too. But, however, there was no politics and he had everything set to build up the timber limits all over the province of Ontario and I am glad to see that the Hon.Minister who controls that Department now is going very easy and he is making no drastic changes- that is, in the personell of the Lands and Forests Department because those men - I talk to them, I am over there quite often and they are having no interference with by politicians.

Another point I want to make of the Lands and Forests set-up the way it is now, that is, from the Deputy Minister down is so honest and efficient that they will go ahead and pay no attention to the politicians, if at all possible. But down in my own County it is altogether different. The political heelers are running around from place to place making all kinds of promises. I was going to talk about some of those promises made during the election campaign by my opponent. He promised to build a big hospital at Mount St.Patrick. I think it was a two hundred thousand dollar hospital on the mountain so that the Irishman would be looked after. I had no objection to that promise but the promise they did make - they went out and they said "Elect a Conservative Government and there will be no game warden, there will be no timber wardens, get beaver when you want to, do everytjing. We will have a real free-for-all. We will go back to the good old days." You know, away back in 1908 just before the election they opened up the whole township of Burns, and Tom McGarry got up and he said,"We will give the people of Milnough the whole township of Burns." Tom could put it over too in a big way and the result was there was a rush into the township of Burns just the same as a gold mine and they got in there and located ten thousand acres of timber land and not one settler there.

There are thousands and thousands of acres of great timber land, and there is not one settler. These timber lands are being burned, and all we see is the black smoke rolling up, with the result that half the township is burned. That was going on when MacMurray got elected and we got fire and smoke.

Now, I being a lumberman, I think I know what I am talking about, and I would invite, as I said, the hon. members up to see me. I do not care whether they are Liberal, Conservative or CCF.

Now, much has been said with regard to the waste in forests, and I want to mention that. I know I am taking up too much time, but this may be the last time I am here. I sometimes get so disgusted that I think I will never contest the riding again. I think I can come here with a fundamental knowledge which will be of some value, but I sometimes think I can do better when I go in to see the members and talk with them, and do more good than I am doing here. I have a document here in my pocket regarding the waste. This goes back to 1925.

We went in to cut timber, hemlock and other kinds of timber, where the pines had been cut. I saw pine logs lying on the ground, and being a judge of logs, I went to the owner, and I said, "How much do you want for the pine logs lying on the ground." He said, "$2.50 a thousand, and you pay the Department the other $2.50." That is $5 altogether. So we started, and picked up 5,309 logs, and the Government officials came along and measured them, and they measured 60 feet to the log. Ontario got $867.67, and the lumbermen got the same amount of money. You cannot

always blame the lumbermen for that. The men refuse to do those things, so the lumbermen who are honest in their endeavour, and have an honest purpose, find it impossible, and particularly the big lumbermen.

I go back to the timber limit, and go through where everything has been cut, - I was there in the fall, and I looked over the work myself, and for that reason I am getting more lumber off 100 acres than the other men are getting off 500, because we are cutting clean. We get a lot of bad stuff, but you have to take the bad stuff with the good.

There is one thing I was going to refer to. (I am sorry the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) is not here.) I believe in these young men and women being brought up the hard way. There is too much petting. That is so with the hon. member of the CCF. We all have to take it, and generally we all have to suffer a certain amount. I do not know whether it is true or not, but I am told the hon. member for East York went down to Kingston Penitentiary, when she was a Dominion member, and she petted Red Ryan, and went back and told R. B. Bennett about it, and he went down and did the same thing. So they let Red Ryan out, and you know what happened after he got out, - he robbed a dozen banks and killed people until he was shot himself. Do not think I was keeping bad company, but I hired a man who spent two years in the penitentiary.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Mr. Speaker, I do not want anyone to think I had anything to do with releasing Red Ryan. All I ever had to do with him was that I shook hands with him twice, - once in the Kingston Penitentiary, and again at the funeral of Mr. Harry Anderson, the editor of

"The Globe and Mail". I had nothing, whatever, to do with his release.

MR. MURRAY: I thought she was a very kind-hearted woman. She went down and saw the handsome man.

MISS MACPHAIL: He was handsome; I will say that.

MR. MURRAY: I think parents that bring their children up the hard way are good parents, because a parent that does not chastise children does not think much about them.

I had a man who worked for me that spent two years in the penitentiary with Red Ryan, and used to go with me through the bush. I was trying to reform him, and I did, and when he came to where this timber was stolen, he would say to me, "I got two years in the penitentiary because I misused a certain company's money, but stealing timber does not seem to be a crime." He was an intelligent fellow, and used to accompany me. In fact, he accompanied me in East Hastings the day of the great by-election. We were not electioneering.

He is reformed now, and has a good position.

There is one thing I wish to touch on before I sit down, and that is the Workmen's Compensation. The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) spoke long and loudly
2. on the Workmen's Compensation Board. I agree there is something hard to understand about it. We have as many as 250 men employed at one time in the lumber business, and long before the Workmen's Compensation Act was put on the Statutes we seemed to get along fairly well. We had a few men injured, and after the Act went into force for awhile we did not understand it, but there is something wrong about it. I have nothing to say about the Chairman of the Board and the people that constitute the Board. I

know Bill Morrison pretty well. He was one of the men that I scolded in my first speech. I remember he sat away over there (indicating), and he was talking on the national policy, and I told him he was too young, and to let me talk about it. But later I got to be a great friend of his. He was a Labourer and a lawyer. He is down there now, but I feel he is fair. Yet they do some strange things.

Coming to Toronto the other day there was a man with a broken leg, one of our citizens, and I asked him where he was going, and he said, "I am going to the Compensation Board." I said, "It is a wonder they would not leave you in the hospital until you have recovered. You are liable to get hurt again." But they are very harsh. They are that way with everybody. I remember in 1928 one of our closest relations died suddenly, and an offer was closed, and we were supposed to send a cheque for $2000, and neglected to send the cheque, with the result we were fined $166.

The same thing happened during the depression, when I was away, and we were to send a cheque, and did not, and we were fined again.

I have heard only 7% of the money collected is spent on administration. That is not very much, and if the men are getting the other part, they are getting pretty nearly all they require, but it looks to me that the Board or the legislation was set up just so a man would get so much, but he would not get 100% of the money that he should get. A thing my friend mentioned last night about the man who lost his eye: we had a man who lost an eye, and worked for us, just a ground chopper, and after he lost the eye

he went on, and is now one of our key men, and as a result he is working in the camp every winter, and gets bigger wages than he did when he had two eyes. You would not know he had lost an eye.

In the summertime he works on the cars, and he does not seem to be affected. So it is pretty hard to figure out just what you would call a real injury.

The other day in the paper I read of a man playing ball in a big league with the left arm, one arm, and we see many men who cannot play ball with two arms. That shows you what determination will do.

Now, I have talked too long. That is one of my wife's complaints. I should take her advice. I hope you hon. members will continue to behave yourselves. I just want to recite a poem of my own. It is very unpopular. It is like liquor, the older it gets the better it gets, but my poetry is too recent. However, what I was going to say is this:

"March on, march on; gold far ahead we see;
The time is short and we must busy be.
Our friends have died long 'fore reaching
The castle that they saw,
Obeying nature's most uncertain law.
If we remain perhaps a longer time than they,
Will we accomplish much or spend an idle day?
We retire at night, to wake again at morn,
Another millstone or another turn.
The eve appears before our work is done;
The battle is started, but not yet won."

(Page No. 2111 follows.)

MRS. R. M. LUCKOCK (Bracondale): Allow me to join with the other members in our appreication of your appointment to the high and honoured place in this Legislative Assembly of Ontario. May you have many many hours with us in seeing that democracy is justly administered - and may those who follow after you look with pride on your achievements.

Miss Macphail and Gentlemen: Many new faces were seen in these Chambers last year. We all have a responsibility in this building for progress. I know you all feel this as keenly as I do. No greater monument could be raised to the memory of our efforts than a better society for the next generation. If we continue sincerely to work to this end, our children will rise up and call us blessed.

Mr. Speaker: I want to commend the Hon. Members who moved and seconded the throne speech. I understand it is an honour to be chosen for this task. I have no doubt their hearts beat fast and at times their spirits rose high as they realized the importance of the occasion.

Mr. Speaker: I also want to pay my personal respects to the Hon. Leader of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition. He is young in years, young in experience of this kind, but I am very very proud to be able to sincerely say, he conducts himself as a statesman, in all his debates and actions in these Chambers. He truly is a statesman. I am sure he will go far in leadership. I am happy to recommend all the members to follow his example. I am not alone in this assumption. A number of people, people whose names I do not know, people who do not belong to my party, tell me he is a statesman. I once heard a speaker say "What do people see when they look at you? What do people feel when you are talking to

them? What do they hear, not only the words you say, but your voice also tells what kind of a person you are." The quality of the voice always tells whether a person is a democractic person or an autocratic person. One cannot hide from the truth.

A wonderful mind once said: "From every power that the human mind enslaves, man frees himself when self-control he gains."

Speaking on the speech from the throne at the Second Session of the Twenty-first Legislature, may I speak with reverence of the great sacrifice our young men and women are carrying out with brave hearts and a steadfast resolve to do what they can to build a better world with equality of opportunity for everyone and a special privilege done away with forever. I am sure they realize the truth of the following quotation "A task without a vision is drudgery -- a vision without a task is a dream -- a task with a vision is victory." Let us all work towards this vision.

Education is one of the most important planks (if not the most important plank) in the 22 Points of Premier Drew's election pledges of July 1943. "Point number 10 - "To give every child an education to the full extent of its mental capacity, together with vocational instruction for farm or city life." There is no more important person in society than a good parent and next to a good parent is a good teacher. A good teacher is born a teacher. They and the parents have the task of moulding the lives and habits of our youth. In the not too distant future we must have free University education for all those having the desire and the ability to absort it. So

that the very best minds can be developed to help build this great country of ours.

That could mean only, first, the very best Primary School Education, which is the foundation of our educational system. In these schools from Kindergarten up, should be the very best of teachers, and this year many school boards raising the public school teachers' salaries is (according to my opinion) a step in the right direction. This will encourage the very best teachers to take up for their life's vocation the teaching profession. Refresher courses for all teachers are needed. What does it matter if a few more mills are added to our tax-bill as long as we get value for the mills, and improve our children's children's chances of developing into better citizens. We must take a long viewpoint so that progress will take place in the building of our country. Early in life children start developing character, learning to live with other people, cultural appreciation developed, human values are realized. What are we adults but grown-up children. All of us at times have seen adults who conduct themselves not as good as many children would. Indeed in this Assembly I have seen Hon. Members behave in such a manner that if a child acted as they do, you would reprimand the child and put him in the corner.

Secondly there are too many children in a class. No child is good in all subjects, one needs a little extra help in arithmetic or grammar, another a little help in spelling or reading; with 35 or 40 or even more in a class there is too little time for individual help.

Third; educationists and educationists only, should make up the Committee who choose the text books to be used.

Those responsible should have the good of the pupils their sole interest. As is done now, I am told publishers and politicians have a great deal to do with the choice of text books, -- this in my opinion is a mistake.

Fourth; Equipment should be of the very best and up-to-date. Physical training equipment in a great many schools is either lacking or there is no proper place for its use. Science equipment is also inadequate. Sports at school more efficiently carried out will help keep children from developing into delinquents. Youth must have something to do to work off their surplus energy. Many schools purchase their own equipment. This should not be. It should be the responsibility of the Department of Education to see that proper and adequate equipment is provided.

Fifth: buildings are disgracefully out of date, and unsuited to the needs of a modern school system. Every school should have a room large enough to assemble at least half of the pupils at one time. Teacher's rooms and lunch rooms are frequently a disgrace.

Sixth: the surroundings of many schools would not be a credit to a jail. There is inadequate space for play, and no spaces for grass or flowers.

Seven: a great many of the drawbacks in the local educational system are due to the fact that teachers who are fully aware of needs have no say whatsoever in planning improvements. Sometimes the teachers advice is asked but no widespread improvement is possible without consulting those most in touch with the teaching situation, and planning to spend for what is required. At present the whole situation is upside down. We are making an educational system to fit

an educational system.

Eighth: There is a complete lack of office equipment in most cases (desks excepted). Most principal's offices are not as well equipped as any one-man office downtown. We in Toronto are running a business with a $12,000,000. annual turnover on the office equipment of 1895.

Ninth: New books for each pupil in each grade each year. This is a health suggestion as well as an educational one. A constantly revised up-to-date text work book in each major subject is suggested. Such might be fairly thin, paper-bound, and would cost little in quantity.

These improvements could be made possible if increased Government grants were used to promote educational opportunities and facilities in Toronto and other large centres, as well as the improvement of rural schools through the consolidation of several school sections.

In the 1945 Throne Speech I read,

> "The Provincial scholarship plan has been considerably expanded to aid able but needy students. Five hundred and eighteen winners of scholarships and bursaries are now studying in our universities, normal schools, and other institutions of higher learning."

(Page 2116 follows)

In the 1945 Throne speech I read, "The Provincial scholarship plan has been considerably expanded to aid able but needy students. Five hundred and eighteen winners of scholarships and bursaries are now studying in our universities, normal schools, and other institutions of higher learning."

I would like to ask the hon. Premier who gave those scholarships? Has the Government done anything to make it possible for students and more students to be able to go to University? What is the Provincial Scholarship Plan?

One paragraph is given to Rural Education. A reform that is long overdue. One quarter of the old school sections have been merged into Township school area. This is a plan I quite agree with, but teen-age boys and girls are too young to be removed from home environment, and the advice and care of parents. Children who have a considerable distance to go to school/to attend the Township Area Schools have this problem facing them. These schools should be closer together and bus service provided to take students to and from school. This is being done in some localities. Specialization courses in Agriculture should be available in Secondary Schools for students wishing to continue living a rural life.

Taxation reduction of 50 percent of the total cost of elementary and secondary education throughout the Province has been promised, and the statement that this will equalize educational opportunity as never before. Much more than this enters into the problem of equality of opportunity. Parents being unable to clothe their children in as good clothes as others, causes a child to

suffer from inferiority in the class room. The parents pay envelope and wage envelope should be sufficient so that parents will not become so discouraged that arguing and bitter words will take place. If this happens in the home the children suffer from fear and inferiority. Then when a child passes into secondary school what happens? If Social Security is not in the home, the child so often feels the urge to get a position so that they can at least keep themselves, and perhaps help the parents in their struggle financially to keep the home together. No student can do his best while these problems bother and worry him, while endeavouring to study and concentrate.

Health examination each year, compulsory but free, will go a long way in building a healthier nation. Let us remember a healthy nation is a wealthy nation. Pre-natal care for both mother and child; every child has the right to be well-born, physically and mentally. Medical examination for both the sexes before marriage is long overdue.

There is another problem facing society, in our youth. I have had many complaints about boys and girls with their wagons hanging around brewers' warehouses after eight o'clock in the evening to take home for customers their beer and what-have-you. There are quarrels and angry words. Cannot something be done to protect our youth from this atmosphere,—what of their moral standards? Indeed some of our children are apt to be run down by cars as they cross the roadway with their load. Something should be done to remedy these conditions. This is the Government's responsibility. There are rumblings, and so often rumblings break into eruptions. Remove the cause,

and there will be no need of rumblings.

STOCKYARDS: How could a Government which does not believe in socialization efficiently run such a project? Management needs to be changed. Frank Fletcher is old, seems uninterested. I think one of the first things we need is a new one.

PROFIT--is made only on sale of hay.

Three men at night on duty used to be fifteen men.

Cattle coming off cars used to be fed in one hour, now they often go five hours before being fed.

SHARES--offered for sale (through an estate) before the Government took the stockyards over once were put on the market at eighty-five dollars per share; there were no takers. The price now offered to paying off shareholders is $133.00 per share.

If this project which was taken over by the provincial Government for the people is to be made a paying proposition, some drastic changes will have to be made in management, services, and the price paid to shareholders is more than could be found one year ago.

There is no reason why this Government cannot bring in good legislation. When elected representatives are fairly evenly divided in numbers, it should follow we should get better government.

OLD AGE PENSIONS--as now administered are a disgrace to those responsible for the treatment of our aged citizens in the evening of their lives.

What and where is women's place in this scheme of things? The time has come when every thinking man and woman must answer this question. Examination results in our schools and universities prove conclusively that brain

power is divided equally between the sexes. A woman's brain is as fertile, receiptive and adaptable as a man's, when given the opportunity.

Men and women should take fresh stock of each other and instead of indulging in a sex war, they should co-operate in order to build a new world in which we may all enjoy a full life.

Now why is it that even intelligent people are unable to speak and think rationally on the relationship of the sexes? Men and women are equal--and they are complementary to each other. Since the Stone Age the world has been dominated by masculine values. Brute force has been extolled. More tolerance and understanding are called for on both sides. Men must be prepared to sacrifice that power they found so sweet in the past. We must establish feminine values. Maternity, the rearing of children, and caring for the home must be recognized as work of inestimable value to the state.

A woman must be proud of her special function and demand if necessary rights unknown to men, in order to protect her interests and those of her children. Men and women have a different but equally important contribution to make to the community. Why should not the women teachers, engineers, architects, doctors and lawyers or civil servants have facilities provided in order that they may have their children and then continue their outside interests?

The community must make provisions in order that all individuals can give their contribution to our common life. In those homes where a woman devotes herself entirely to the work of rearing children and caring for

her family, then the home must be recognized by giving her a legal right to a share of the family income after the expenses have been paid. The husband's wage or salary must be adequate for these necessities. Many mothers receive only what money they can catch "on the fly" to purchase much needed clothing for themselves. The present status of the housewife is a reflection on our so-called civilization.

I am sorry to say that some people are still old-fashioned in their views. Unlike the little lad who told his father the following fact:

Tommy told his father that he was second in the class at the end of the term. "Who was first?" asked his father. "Oh, one of the girls." replied the boy. "Well, I'm surprised at your letting a mere girl beat you," was his father's comment. "Don't forget, Dad," replied the lad, "that things are different from the days when you were a boy. Girls are not half as mere as they used to be."

Women have taken their place beside their men the world over. The sexes must work together on a basis of comradeship. Females as well as males are human beings. Let us all face the fact that in the future there may be relatively little stationary home life. The airways have pushed back the limitations of distance. The women of to-day are the prophecy of a new kind of life in Canada. It calls for a new terminality in the widening circumference of daily living. Every human being of every colour, race, or creed has an equal right to life, liberty and happiness.

Career women are not new. They are really ancient

history. They have had their place in business, politics, and the arts, from the beginning of time. In Egypt they worked at trades -- in Babylon, married women engaged in business, and in England they were the textile and needle trades, and at the same time managed their marriages. To-day in Russia there are women engineers, instructors, plane-ferriers, doctors, lawyers, nurses, soldiers, officers of merchant marine, farmers, and they also man the anti-aircraft guns and stand guard duty. Guard duty for the nation. This is not a new field for women have always stood on guard duty for the home, for the children, and quite often they have had to guard their husbands. Gentlemen, I said "guard", I could also have used the word "guide", for it is a truism that behind every great man stands a woman, and this all men know.

A post-war world will include women in every walk of life. In Canada there are 1,200,000 women employed, double the number employed at the outbreak of war. May I quote Mrs. McWilliams, Chairman of the Sub-Committee on post-war problems. "When the war ends, 750,000 women will remain in commercial and industrial life, 280,000 will marry and 180,000 will be in search of means of support. Domestic training should be given as some women will prefer this field. A recommendation is made for the extension of unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, etc., to cover household workers."

Every woman wants some kind of work outside the home -- no woman wants to have her entire life swing around a solitary, boring repetitive business, which means exhausting herself washing the same dishes, the same clothes day in and day out -- cooking food for the same people, seldom seeing a living soul other than a tired husband and

her own children for more than a few hours.

When the war ends women will have to be demobilized -- some will go back to their former work, such as domestics, stenographers, book-keepers. Others who are married will go back to their homes and start raising their families. Others will never be satisfied to go back to the humdrum every-day life of doing over and over again the same tasks. They will crave a different environment -- an environment that will provide change, action, and excitement.

Women have been forced to do all kinds of work to help win the war. Her voice will, and must, be heard and heeded in the winning of the peace. If single girls wish to remain in industry, they must have that privilege, or any vocation they desire to enter. What would a father with several daughters do if they did not work? Could he possibly support them in the manner in which they have been accustomed?

Gentlemen, remember, please, you all have wives, daughters, daughters-in-law, granddaughters, sisters, sisters-in-law, mothers, mothers-in-law, and some have grandmothers who must be supported. Are you prepared to support this regiment of women? It would indeed be a brave man, braver than any I have ever met, who would be willing to face these women, let alone supply all their various needs.

If you face these facts and realize that after the war there will be a surplus of women the world over, I think you will readily agree with me that equal pay for equal responsibility must be given to women.

Since 1917 women have been citizens. As citizens

they must be treated. A world controlled by man-made laws must be changed. As I understand the meaning of democracy, it is an organization where everyone works together for the mutual benefit of all, so that the heritage that belongs to the next generation shall be passed on unmarred, where women and men can pick up the torch honourably and feel that the freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and the freedom of action and freedom from fear (all within the bounds of a decent social order) are all a part of our priceless heritage.

MR. CYRIL OVERALL (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I have some misgivings about entering the debate at this late hour, but I feel I should say a few words about the riding of Niagara Falls.

I could not help but notice the remarks that were made in this House a few days ago about Ontario House, and it occurred to me at that time that as Ontario House will be in the post-war years a kind of advertising agency for our province, possibly at the city of Niagara Falls we might have a display window which would serve somewhat the same purpose.

I have in mind that there are many tourists coming to Niagara Falls who do not know anything about what lies beyond. I am quite sure of that, and I can read you a few clippings to illustrate that fact.

In England, of course, there will be many people visiting Ontario House to find out, "How about Ontario", and I think in Niagara Falls we might have a display of exhibits somewhat similar to what we used to have down here at the Canadian National Exhibition, where people

learned for the first time about the natural resources of the province, and something of its wild life.

So I would like to see, some day, a small zoological garden, where tourists, who come from all over the world to visit the city, could see the wild life of this province, and would know that beyond a doubt we have natural resources, and possibilities that are not given the publicity, I think they should be.

We have talked a good deal about our natural resources, and many people from the United States, and the rest of the world, who visit that Mecca, are quite ignorant of what we can do. Maybe it could be patterned after Ontario House, and as the hon. Prime Minister said of Ontario House, perhaps there might be some Canadian girls there who would look after the handling of that institution.

I am not going to make the kind of speech that is usually made here. I would like to make some comments about some of the arguments which have gone back and forth across the floor.

We hear some people saying a great deal in favour of free enterprise, and speak as if free enterprise was the only thing that mattered, and we hear other people saying that state socialism is advocated for this country.

Now, neither is strictly true, I think, anyway. That is, we do not have free enterprise in the province of Ontario, for the simple reason that the largest industry --industrial enterprises in this province of ours is a publicly - owned utility, and its assets, I believe are four hundred and eighty millions of dollars.

And the next largest industrial enterprise that could compare with the hydro, has assets of one hundred

thirty millions of dollars, so we have public ownership in the province of Ontario on a great scale, dwarfing any other industrial enterprise, so that no one can say that we have not public ownership already in Ontario, and those of us who use that as an example to expound that sort of thing are sometimes accused of promotion state socialism which means, of course, the dictatorial supervision of all the resources and the industries in the country.

We do not advocate that, and never have.

I would like to make that plain, that there is a place in our economy for the small businessman who is, of course, in free enterprise, and the small businessman is there to serve a purpose; he is there to take care of the distribution of goods and services in our country, and out-numbers, by a great deal, those who are employed in industrial enterprise. So that as long as we live, we will have free enterprise in this country, whether we like it or not, and we see some who would prefer that sort of thing, but I would like to point out to this House, Mr. Speaker, that no one on this side of the House is advocating the abolition of free enterprise, and as far as I know, never has, although that has been attacked on, and thrown at us.

There is a place for social ownership, and, as I see it, if we are going to have an industrial society in this country, we have to measure up what is ahead of us, and establish the proper health and medical services, which should be provided for the people.

Now, all over the world there is, at the present time, in the minds of men, that we are in for marked social changes. It is said that the war has brought about disloca-

tion and social changes, which have come about. I want to read to you a short speech that was made some years ago, along this line, which I think is very appropriate to-day.

This speech was made by the Right Hon. Winston Churchill, at Nottingham, England, on January 30th, 1909, and he said this:

> "The main aspirations of the British people are at the present time social, rather than political. They see around them on every side, and almost every day, spectacles of confusion and misery which they cannot reconcile with any conception of humanity or justice. They see that there are in the modern state a score of misfortunes that can happen to a man without his being at fault in any way. They see, on the other hand, the mighty power of science, backed by wealth and power to introduce order, to provide safeguards, to prevent accidents, or at least to mitigate their consequences. They know that this country is the richest in the world and in my sincere judgment the British democracy will not give their hearts to any party that is fuller, more elaborate, more thorough social organization, without which our country and its people will inevitably sink through sorrow to disaster and our name and fame fade upon the pages of history."

It is said, in his little speech, that the "mighty power of science will introduce safeguards and order". Well, what happened -- what has happened since 1909? Shortly after that, there was a world war, and we are now engaged in a second war, and in between them we had the worst depression in history, so that no one can say that the "mighty power of science" has brought about the introduction of order.

The "mighty power of science" will do what it is directed, and how it is directed. Who has done the directing over the years, as to what the "mighty power of science" will do? Now, we have in the last twenty or thirty years seen the growth of large corporate enter-

prises, and it is usually called "big business". "Big business" has had some influence upon the direction of public affairs, and so have members of the Parliaments, and we hear criticism, day by day, that there is a decline in the prestige of Parliament; that controls are now vested in a central authority, and that the people are not represented as they should be.

Well, I think it is high time that members of this Parliament did something about the direction of affairs, and that they did something about the direction of the "mighty power of science", to solve our troubles.

We have had introduced into this House several Bills concerning planning and development. We hear a good deal about that, and it is an answer to such an upsurge of criticism, that there will be something happen in this modern world of ours; in other words, the proper direction of the resources and facilities we have right here at hand. We will have to do some planning in an objective sense, and we will have to do things, in a bold and daring sense, and they will not be done if we are to depend upon such a document as we have had presented here known as the "Speech from the Throne". That is not the kind of a document which can be described as "bold and daring" in its scope and meet that challenge at the time. I do not think anybody could say that, and be perfectly honest about it. If we are to realize that, and meet that challenge of the times, we will have to do something a little more constructive than what is represented in this Speech from the Throne.

I want to emphasize the fact that planning does not mean regimentation. We have a hodge-podge all built up of civilization, all over the world. I am not criticizing that. It served its purpose. But we do not have to go on and

continue to waste things in our economic system, such as is going on now, and there is a great upsurge of opinion that we have to change things, and we have to so order things that no one can say we are extremely inefficient.

We have heard criticism on all sides of the House about the waste that goes on up north in the forests. I am not trying to make out a case one way or the other. Most people will agree there has been despoiling of our forests. That is waste and that is a natural resource of the people, and if lumbermen say they cannot make a profit under existing conditions and still preserve the wild life and the forests up there then it must be done some other way. If they find by competing amongst themselves that they despoil the forests, the people will have to so order things that waste does not come about. And that, of course, is part of the planning and conservation. We, of course, will have to fill the gullies in our lands and plant trees, to reforest areas and reclaim land that has been wasted and spoiled over the years.

Well, we will have to face up to it, and take the view that if private enterprise cannot do these things -- private enterprise cannot solve unemployment, for instance -- then, some other agency will have to do it. That will be done, and it does not matter a great deal, as far as I am concerned, what will solve the problem, but that problem will have to be solved by somebody if our civilization is going to continue and develop.

(Page 2129 follows.)

There are some people probably old enough to remember the gay Nineties and it is said they were called the Gay Nineties because of the fact that everything had been invented and everything solved and from now we will have a good time and not worry about anything. Well now, that situation has not developed in these days. It is actually getting worse because we are now involved in a war that surpsses in destruction and savagery everything we have known, and we will have to do something now about preventing another one and I hope all conferences and all agreements made will solve that problem but I have a fear that all this talk about world co-operation does not mean a great deal until we have some co-operation at home. Co-operation begins here. There are world figures, some of them who talk about co-operation. When it comes to co-operation in their own bailiwick have no regard about doing much about that sort of thing.

I hope this whole new order of world affairs will keep in mind that co-operation begins at home. We can learn something about co-operation right in this country of ours. There has been a good deal said about disunity,&c. That I do not care to comment on. However, the development of our civilization will depend upon how much thought we give to emphasizing co-operation. How much co-operation, for instance, do we teach in the schools? We teach boys and girls not to steal pencils, &c. but we do not teach them much about whether they should steal our natural resources or not. We do not co-operate at all. People have to work together. There is such a thing as collectibe effort. We have got to get together and solve this problem and it is not by divided people, setting them apart, not creating disunity

that we are going to solve it. I would like to think that these people who are interested to solve the international security of nations would give some thought as to how much co-operation is going to be shown right in this country of ours or taught right in our own schools. As I have said, we have to do a lot of planning and if we are going to plan properly we have to do it democratically. I do not believe anyone in this group subscribes to any dictatorial way of planning. This can be done democratically. It is certain that anything obtained by force in any social organization of any type that is got by force, it must be maintained that way and naturally I do not subscribe to any such thesis. We have got to measure up to the challenge at the time. We have got to see that these problems must be solved. We can sit here in a quiet and peaceful atmosphere and not bother much, not think too much possibly about the bombing and burning that is going on overseas, about the mutilating and maiming of human bodies in Europe, but sooner or later it is going to come home to us that something has happened over there. It is going to be a boomerang and I would like to think when the boys come back from overseas that they will find we have done something for them, that we have ordered things, they can come back here and fit into our community life without the disturbance that occured after the last war. Now, as regards co-operation, I notice someone had upon a monument that lies down the street here a couple of blocks and I went by it the other day and I noticed what was written on the bottom of it and I would like to read that to you:

"Erected in grateful, commemmoration of the public service of Sir Adam Beck whose labours have insured that the citizens of his native province under cooperative ownership shall enjoy the benefit of low cost electrical energy derived from water power resources to serve the industrial and domestic needs of the Province of Ontario."

It occured to me then how faulty our educational system is in its lack of teaching co-operation; that collective effort is not mentioned. That team work is alright on the football field and basket ball courts, &c. but when we want to teach co-operation in the schools we leave that out and we do not tell children much about how society is organized for some reason that you can probably imagine. We seem to be reluctant to tell the students there are unions in this country, how industrial enterprizes are organized. How people live down in Nova Scotia. How they live out in British Columbia. We do not know much about that and we will have to teach more about co-operation. I would like to say, too, and I do not mean it in an unkind way, that I was born an Englishman, but I do not go parading that fact around the country and I do not admire anyone who is who is afraid of the fact that they are attached to Britain and everything that Britain does is right &c. I do not think anyone can question my personal loyalty to England. I happened to be born there and brought out here but I deplore the fact of anyone emphasizing the fact - well, British is British and there is nothing else like it. I do not think it serves a useful purpose in magnifying that particular situation. I would like to think I am a Canadian. I want you to know that I believe in Canada and I believe in her ethics and her brain and her brawn. I believe nothing could stand in her spiritual and material development. I would like to think that some day we would have

an economy in this country that would make it possible that everyone would have clothes to wear, good food to eat, a beautiful home of their own to live in, useful work and sufficient wages for all.

MR.A.BELANGER (Prescott): Mr.Speaker, the custom in this House and generally in Canadian Parliament regarding the debate on the Speech from the Throne or on the Address following the Speech from the Throne is to leave the debate as a preserve for the younger members of the House. The following address breaks through that custom for the simple reason that it is inspired and prompted by a deep sense of duty. Duty to this House. Duty to the party to which I belong, because certain things have to be expressed from a liberal point of view and the new members in our party are very scarce, so that the burden of that expression falls back on the older members. If they consulted their own ease and their own comfort they would like to abstain from such a debate. Still as I say, the duty devolves upon them which they cannot shirk, and there is also the duty of treating expounding in the House certain general principles which would find no place in the other debates of the House because they are not specific enough - because you cannot tag them upon a bill or upon a resolution does not mean that they are not important. As a matter of fact their importance may transcend the question which would be more specific, more particular because they permeate the whole political life or economic life of the province and the country. They impregnate, so to say, all the political questions which may come piece-meal before the Legislature. Questions of general principle that are, so to say, the marrow of our national life.

an economy in this country that would make it possible that everyone would have clothes to wear, good food to eat, a beautiful home of their own to live in, useful work and sufficient wages for all.

MR. A.BELANGER: (Prescott) Mr.Speaker, the custom in this House and generally in Canadian Parliament regarding the debate on the Speech from the Throne or on the address following the Speech from the Throne is to leave the debate as a preserve for the younger members of the House. The following address breaks through that custom for the simple reason that it is inspired and prompted by a deep sense of duty. Duty to this House. Duty to the party to which I belong, because certain things have to be expressed from a liberal point of view and the new members in our party are very scarce, so that the burden of that expression falls back on the older members. If they consulted their own ease and their own comfort they would like to abstain from such a debate. Still as I say the duty devolves upon them which they cannot shirk, and there is also the duty of expounding in the House certain general principles which would find no place in the other debates of the House because they are not specific enough - because you cannot tag them upon a bill or upon a resolution does not mean that they are not important. As a matter of fact their importance may transcend the question which would be more specific, more particular because they permeate the whole political life or economic life of the province and the country. They impregnate, so to say, all the political questions which may come piecemeal before the Legislature. Questions of general principle that are, so to say, the marrow of our national life.

And it is because on account of peculiar and particular circumstances such principles must have arisen and must be discussed and problems must be solved, that it is the duty, especially of the more experienced and older members of the House to take advantage of the Speech from the Throne, which is the only occasion where they can be expressed to put them before their fellow members.

The remarks will be brief, as brief as is compatible with their importance and with the circumstances in which we find outselves at the present juncture in our debate. It is not the intention to itemize the Speech from the ThronEas, for instance the 22 points were itemized, and very properly, by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr.Jolliffe). When I say the 22 points I do not think I need detail what I mean, or as the Workmen's Compensation situation was itemized in detail and exemplified by the member for Ontario (Mr.Williams) and I wish to say here, Mr. Speaker, that I accept at its face value what was said by the Hon,member for Ontario (Mr.William) as to the motive which animated him in maling that long address. I am quite willing to agree and I believe he agrees, perhaps, now,that it might have been summarized a little more but I believe that his sincerity cannot be impugned and I think that this House must grant to him this compliment, must make to him this compliment that he has been inspired throughout that address with a desire to put so clearly, so forcibly before us the points that he wanted to make, what he deserves as I say our compliment and not our strictures. And we took a great deal of interest in what he said either on that subject or on the rest of his address. In the rest of his address I greatly agreed, as I may have the time perhaps, not to expound later on. Many of us like my friend the other day were apparently

accused of filibustering and purposely prolonging the debate in the House. Mr.Chairman, I have a long experience in the House, and I do not agree with that, especially when you see that the affairs of the House have been opened by some 65 or 67 paragraphs in the Speech from the Throne, implemented or increased with a full address by the Prime Minister of the House.

by the addresses of the mover and the seconder of the motion. I do not see that the other hon. members of the House have taken, in view of that -- and in view of the length of the Speech from the Throne -- too much of the time of the House. And may I say this in passing -- it just occurred to me -- that if the Leader of the House, who is particularly responsible Mr. Speaker, for the manner in which the affairs of this Legislature are conducted and as to the amount of time -- had curtailed some of that debate, how many minutes, how many hours, could they have saved, and how much farther ahead we would be at the present time.

I wish to refer to the hon. Prime Minister, the Leader of the House, sitting over there very complacently and allowing members who are not quite versed in the rules and regulations and procedure of this House to carry on, when they were very clearly out of order.

I do not blame you, Mr. Speaker, because I believe the Speaker has the right to think that when no objection is raised, and there is no appeal for order, -- you have a perfect right to believe that there is unanimity, -- unanimous consent for the suspension of the rules of the House. And that is why your tolerance must not be taken as condoning all these breaches of procedure of the House which have been getting more and more frequent, and becoming longer and longer this year in the House.

Now, I do not want to lecture the House, but may I say that if the speeches which have been made before the Orders of the Day, presumably on questions of privilege, when there were no privileges at all -- if those speeches had been left out, we would have been much further advanced.

And I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, -- not unkindly, -- to the hon. Prime Minister, that I appreciate he is overburdened with work, and especially with cares during this Session -- but if he had called the hon. members to order more often, we would be very much further advanced, and I do not think it is for him now to rebuke the House and those who have something to say at this late hour of the Session, for getting up here and saying it.

I, with the other hon. members who have spoken, congratulate the mover of the address on his ability to congratulate. He has been exhaustive; he has been exaggerative, he has been hyperbolic but that is as it should be, with the mission he had to fulfill, but really, Mr. Speaker, at some times in his address there was visible on the faces of some of the heads of the Departments opposite, who had not yet come to their congratulations, to think they might have been forgotten, and I congratulate the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Martin) on his memory, because not one single department was forgotten, and from his "I congratulate this Department", and "I congratulate that Department", I noticed he forgot nobody, and it brought to my mind, as I listened to it, Zola's j'accuse in the Dreyfuss affair, and as I sat here I thought the people here were very lucky that he did not have a slip of the tongue, and instead of saying, "I congratulate", say Zola's words, "J'accuse, j'accuse, j'accuse." -- "I accuse, I accuse, I accuse."

It also came to me that memory is a very peculiar faculty. Another thought coming from my past experience, so far back, when I used to sit, because I have been a teacher, at exercises at the end of the year, there was the graduates going to leave, and they did not forget anything;

they would bring souvenirs to their playgrounds, their class-rooms, to their teachers, to their study-halls, and they would not forget one, and they had something nice to say about every one of them. And I was asking myself, as the hon. gentleman from Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Martin) was speaking whether or not he was not thinking what some of us really may have thought was a valedictory for the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I must take exception to a few things that were contained in that address. There were certain innuendoes -- oh, they did not go very far, -- and they were simply a repetition of what had been said before by the hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Drew) and by other very important citizens in this country, and as they were repetitions, they took on a special meaning. There was one thing he said, which, if he had not said it, I might not have had the reaction from his remarks, and it was this; he emphasized -- not expounded it, but emphasized it -- that there must be equal responsibility, equal sacrifices, and so on. Well, Mr. Speaker, where have we read that before? Where have we heard it over the radio? Of course, the innuendo is apparent, because it has been repeated in the press, and shouted from the housetops, that equality of responsibility, and equality of sacrifices did not exist at the present juncture in this country, because Quebec was not doing its duty, and the French-Canadians were not doing their duty.

I have no fear of saying that that is the insinuation, and I would be lacking in my duties, both to the people in my riding, and to the French-Canadians of this province and of the province of Quebec, from which I came, if I did

not deal with that insinuation. And it is always the same, of course; following in the footsteps of him he admires most, he ended by waving the flag. Oh, Mr. Speaker, we have heard all that before; it is so easy to get applause in the province of Ontario by saying, "The Union Jack is our flag and will remain our flag; our National Anthem is 'God Save the King', and will remain 'God Save the King'." That is easy.

I remember the first time I spoke to an entirely English audience at the King Edward Hotel here. There were no others but English-speaking in the audience. There were professors from the University, men high in finance, and so on, and we were discussing a very important matter, and we dealt with the unity of this country. I had been speaking for about three-quarters of an hour, and I had had no applause. I said to myself, "It is peculiar; it is a terrible thing that you do not agree with me." There they were, smoking their cigars after dinner, and looking at me, but there was no reaction. I said again to myself, "That is not natural". I know now that the Anglo Saxon is not like the Latin American audience. However, I am not like that at all. I am not uneasy now when speaking to an English audience, even if there is a lack of applause, such as we get from a Latin audience. Because, here it is; if it is something new, they will follow it very closely, and they have no time for applause, and so when I saw how easy it was to arouse them, I abandoned my subject and followed a practice used in many public utterances and over the radio by our public men and newspapers, and I simply wave the flag and I get the applause. Then I go on and it is all quite easy.

"Equality of responsibility and sacrifices," Quebec and French-Canada share in these. Let me say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that the matter of what is the best method of the other side, for our contribution to this war, whether it is the voluntary system or conscription, is a matter of opinion that can well be discussed, and it could have well been discussed from the very start. If I, for one, should think that the voluntary system goes further and produces a greater and better effect, and is more efficient under the present circumstances, or under the circumstances as they were at the beginning of the war, you have no right to impugn any motive of strife or cowardice or disloyalty or otherwise to me, Mr. Speaker. It is a matter of opinion that can be discussed between intelligent people.

But no, instead of preaching, and going far and wide in this province and making speeches before the people, and asking them to volunteer, showing them that it was their duty to volunteer, what have we seen on the part of certain public men? They spoke of conscription immediately. And I may say this -- and I do so, Mr. Speaker, without fear of contradiction -- that when I see the political use that is being made in certain quarters of that question of conscription, may I say that these people would have been exceedingly sorry if the province of Quebec had indorsed conscription, because it would have taken away from them that material to create against the province of Quebec in this province a feeling of animosity. It is so easy, and I think I will be able to show that it is not the first time that this method has been used politically.

I am speaking this way through a moral duty. These things must be said somewhere, and this is the forum where they should be said.

Let me say this, without fear of contradiction, as I have so often said -- so often, in fact, that it is now threadbare. People who use their intelligence, and leave aside their politics for a moment, leave aside the sentiments, and study this matter as it should be studied, and examine the minds of the province of Quebec, will soon understand.

The previous speaker, Mr. Speaker, in this House, I was glad to hear, was born in England and he said, "Now that I am here in Canada, I am a Canadian, but I deprecate those who go around and say this province is a British province and must remain a British province, and that, 'We are Britishers, and we must remain Britishers.'" I believe that was the gist of what he wanted to convey to the people of this province.

Well, we are not Britishers in the province of Quebec, nor are the French people in the province of Ontario. Why are we not? Because our roots in Canada date back over three hundred years ago, while those of a large number of the population of Ontario only go back a few years, perhaps ten years, perhaps one hundred years, if you like, but what is one hundred years as compared to the time that the roots of the French-Canadians have been planted in Canada?

So when the bell struck and the appeal was made, would it have been reasonable to see the French-Canadians rise up as Britishers in Ontario, and in as large a number? And yet they did.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that it is six o'clock, and while I do not need to move the adjournment of the debate, I will continue after dinner.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare it six o'clock, and I now leave the chair until eight o'clock p.m.

(Page 2143 follows)

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SIXTH DAY

Toronto, Ontario,
Thursday, March 22, 1945.

SPEAKER: Honourable William J. Stewart, C.B.E.

EVENING SESSION

The House resumed at 8 o'clock.

AAA

MR. AURELIEN BELANGER (Prescott): Mr. Speaker, before this Debate is resumed this evening, let it be made clear that there is no personal animosity of any kind, but my esteem for the person who may be quoted in the course of the address, and should it happen, on account of my customary strenuousness in addressing the House there does happen a "slip of the tongue", which may savour of personality, I withdraw it beforehand. I am not concerned the least bit with persons and personalities, but merely with ideas, proposals, suggestions, policies, statements and declarations.

That said, Mr. Speaker, I wish to take up where I interrupted before the recess, and reassert to the mover of the address that there is no necessity for attacking part of the population of this country which accounts for one third, at least, of the whole population, - that there is no necessity of affirming with great emphasis that the

Union Jack is here to stay, and that "God Save The King" will continue to be the national anthem. We are fully in accord with that, So long as the Union Jack is the Canadian flag, we shall salute it and salute with veneration for what it stands, the proud emblem of a proud Empire. So long as this prayer, which is the national anthem, "God Save The King" will be recognized as the Canadian anthem, so long as we sing it with reverence of the full meaning.

I might say, in passing, if it does interest some of the hon. members here, "God Save The King" is a translation of an original French hymn, and it was composed for the girls of St. Cecelia in France in honour of King Louis XIV, and was adopted later, — a translation of it was adopted in England as the English national hymn.

But, I may be permitted to say this, Mr. Speaker, if the Union Jack floats over this country and this province, and if "God Save The King" is sung by young and old in this country in our public manifestations, is it unpardonable pride if I say it is due to the French Canadians of Canada, that were it not for the French Canadians of Canada it would not be the Union Jack, but the "Old Glory" that would float over us, and there would be a forty-ninth star to mark a forty-ninth state of the American Union.

Unfortunately, the teaching of our history in our schools is deficient. Let me give two instances, only, of what I have just asserted.

In 1776, only a few years after the Treaty of Paris, when there were still 65,000 French who were bound by the ties, which no more exist, to Old France. The United States' colonies and the British colonies, by emancipation, sent over to Canada three commissioners, whose mission it was to win over to the American cause. The French Canadians were

practically the only Canadians at the time of the American Revolution, and an attempt was made by American leaders to persuade them to join the American Revolution. These men were very well chosen. They were Franklin, - Benjamin Franklin, who had been in France, and who just a year after was sent to France, where for seven years he was worshipped by the Frenchmen of France, even more than was the great Voltaire. He was sent to Canada with Samuel Chase, another great American with great powers of persuasion, and with the great Catholic, Charles Carroll, who belonged to a family that had given to the Roman Church, and has since given to the Roman Church, some of its most distinguished prelates, priests and members of religious orders, and who had studied in France, made his complete studies in France, in Paris and elsewhere, and who was most sympathetic to the French Canadian population at the time.

For over a month they stayed in Canada, and the priests and rectorates used all their powers of persuasion to win over the French Canadians, and the French Canadians refused, and they refused under the direction and at the behest of the clergy. Now, put that in your pipe and smoke it.

If it had not been for the French Canadian clergy at that time in Quebec, then Canadians would have united with the American colony, and, remember this, if you read your history in detail, Mr. Speaker, you will find that the English traders in Canada, at the time, would not have defended very strenuously this country from annexation. It would not be the first time, however, that it was the French population which prevented the annexation of Canada to the United States.

Let us pass on to 1813, and the war of 1812, when 7,000 Americans were crossing over to take Montreal. Whom did they meet in their path, who forced them to turn back? Those 7,000 Americans under Hampton met at what we would like to call the "Thermopylae of Canada", they met 700 French Canadians, under Colonel de Salaberry and the 700 French, like the Greeks of old, conquered those at Thermopylae, and de Salaberry, at Chateaugnay, turned back those 7,000 Americans, and Montreal was saved by the loyalty of the French Canadians led by Colonel de Salaberry.

That is something we should know, but I am afraid, and I have ample proof, that very little emphasis is placed in our schools on that. It is not given. If we wanted, really, to bring unity in Canada, why not start with the younger generation, why not start in the schools and teach in the public schools of Ontario the great deeds, greater than which there are none in any history of any country in the world, the magnificent, heroic, wonderful deeds of the French discoverers and explorers before 1760 and 1763.

I had the experience here some years ago there were a number of pages. It was in the morning, and they did not have much to do, young boys ranking from twelve to fourteen and fifteen years of age, - I like, always, to gather them around me, and talk about things of interest, and especially probe what they have learned, so far as history is concerned, in their schools. I asked them, "Will you go around," - and they did,-"in this Hall, in this Legislative Hall, in this British, exclusively British, as you want it, the province of Ontario, and tell me, - you will find some inscriptions along the wall. Find out, copy, and bring back to me all those inscriptions that are in the official language of

Ontario, the English language." They scattered all over. They rose on the shoulders one of the other, and came back, and they said, "There are none. They are all Latin." I said, "Is that so? Go and look again." So, I had to show them the inscription above your head, Mr. Speaker, and they went and read it,(unfortunately a very small proportion of them could pronounce what they brought back to me,) but they found there what? "Honi soit qui mal y pence Dieu et mon droit," in the French language on the English coat of arms. I said, "What does that mean? What is the origin?" Not one of them could tell me what it meant or where it came from. That is the kind of history they are being taught.

How can we, when we teach that kind of history, or when we omit to teach the history which should be taught to the children in our schools, - how can those children grow up with the proper appreciation of their own origin? It would have been so easy for a teacher in a school, in explaining the coat of arms, to link with that the origin of the majority of the population of this province and of Canada, and then they should have been told, and we should tell them, that the French of Canada and the English of Canada are cousins, that they all come from the same Norman stock which William the Conqueror came from. If that was impressed on them, there might not be, perhaps, that hatred, or that animosity, - and I say hatred advisedly, - because it goes that far when we read and lucubrate some of the articles published in our newspapers. There is a way of approaching unity. Instead of emphasizing our differences, why not emphasize what unites us, and this would apply more especially to our leaders.

(Page No. 2148 follows.)

But, so far as the back-benchers are concerned, I would not mind them. A few years ago a member, at that time on this side of the House was to address the House, and he asked a friend of his on the other side, "while I am talking, just ask me" -- that was the last Session, just before the last Session, he was making a speech for his election, and he asked his friend, "will you ask me", he says, "what I would do if I were Prime Minister?" And his friend said he did not know what he wanted of it, but he asked him, "what would the honourable member do if he was Prime Minister of this Province? And he said, "The first thing I would do would be to abolish all separate schools in this Province."

May I ask, Mr. Speaker, is that the kind of talk which tends to bring about unity? And because that man wanted to stir up, in his particular riding, the sentiment against separate schools, against the Roman Catholics, he thought he could get some votes, and he did not hesitate, -- he, a legislator who should have been a leader to bring about unity in this Province, he did not hesitate to have recourse to such a trick.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been read in the House the report of an interview, signed by Beverley Baxter, a member of the British House of Commons, an interview with the Hon. Prime Minister of this Province, in which Beverley Baxter asserts, --

MR. DREW: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention at all of interrupting this speaker. The remarks will carry on in a steady flow; but I would correct him by saying it does not purport to be an interview; but it was remarks about which I have made comments already.

MR. BELANGER: Mr. Speaker, I say I am taking facts and statements, and it has nothing to do with the personality of the Hon. Prime Minister of this Province, but this is such an assertion that I feel justified in commenting on it and trying to bring the attention of this House to the harm which it has caused, and which it will cause, which justifies me in saying to leaders of thought, the leaders of both political and other thought, social thought, instead of saying things that will be taken up by the extremists of Quebec or of the French and will be used to deepen the chasm which we thought we were bridging, -- which I thought since 1927 or 1925 we were bridging quite well here in the Province of Ontario, but the bridges are being blown up by things like that.

Mr. Speaker, I will quote: "Mr. Baxter said," -- it is an interview, I did not want to use that unfairly, when I asked sometime ago the Hon. Prime Minister whether that was said. The Hon. Prime Minister said, "I have no recollection." I take his word of course, Mr. Speaker, and without any afterthought.

When two Honourable men appear as witnesses before a Court and one says, "I do not remember having seen that, or having heard that, or having said that", and the other one says, "I heard it, I saw it, he said it" then, between the two, the court, under the rules of evidence, will accept the word of him who is sure he has heard or seen, as against him who has no recollection.

Mr. Beverley Baxter, a member of the House of Commons, well known in Canada, a regular writer and contributor in the MacLean's Magazine here in Ontario, states, -- and the article is long, in "Everybody's", a publication, I believe,

in London, in a whole page article, headed "will he like Canada"? And, speaking of his meeting with the Hon. Prime Minister he says:

> "The other night as we sat in his suite at the Savoy" -- ver precise, -- "and talked into the small hours of the morning", -- perhaps that accounts for it, -- "we went over the past, but we eventually turned to the future."

now the rest that follows is within quotation marks:

"Bax, he said, I want British stock for Ontario," -- another leader of the people said; I want alien stock for Germany, -- and it is much wider than British stock. Here in Ontario, a leader, who is at the head of the government says he does not want Irish stock but, "I want British stock for Ontario." We can take thousands and thousands of your people. " Now, why? We should have agreed with him if he had stopped there, Mr. Speaker. I, for one, would have agreed. I have the greatest appreciation for the Britisher for his staunch qualities, the more so that we of the French race who have lived in Canada for over three hundred years, after mingling with the Britishers of this country, have transformed some of our traits and we are proud of that transformation, because I think it gives us some superiority over the French from France. However, the reason is not because it would be a nice thing to have them, and all that, and his own opinion is that there should be more British in Ontario. No, but why does he want them? The one thing that can keep the French Canadian pressure within bounds is a strong Ontario peopled by British stock.

Again one third of the population of this country, of Canada, hear of that without resentment. And then the same people who utter those things turn around and they say

the French Canadians do not want to go with the Britishers in this war!

Mr. Speaker, is there not some reason, some explanation, some justification for those who are luke warm among the French Canadians, before crossing the sea, when, if they believe, as many of them believe and as many of you believe, that Canada was not immediately in danger at the beginning of this war?

I spoke in this House, and without mincing words I said that I thought it was the duty of Canadians because it was Canada's war, -- not because it was Briton's war but because it was Canada's war. But everybody does not think like I do, and it is no wonder .

Well, there is, of course, nothing so very mysterious and fraught with such consequences. There is very often some element of fun, or at least of ridicule, and I think we have reached it in the rest of this quotation. Why? In order to fight the French Canadian pressure in Canada.

> "That is why I rejoice that so many British girls are coming back as Canadian soldiers' wives"

And I welcome every British bride that comes here; from the bottom of my heart I welcomed them, not because they will come as breeders of British stock, but because they are our boys wives. They are their choice at a time when their hearts were full of the fear of losing their lives, and they wanted someone on whom, -- how did he say it? -- someone on whom to Diverser the overflowing of their hearts. I welcome every single one of them. I welcome everyone of their babies, and I hope they will be good British citizens of Canada, -- no, no, not British citizens of Canada, but that they will be purely and simply good Canadian citizens

of British origin:

"We shall do all we can to make them happy."

and this is the last nail:

"We need them and we want them" --

always for the same reason.

It is too bad that the Premier of this Province had not a little more confidence in the Canadian girls, for those girls who, perhaps, had been left at home when our soldiers went across. I think perhaps they might be as good breeders of Canadian stock, -- breeders of a British stock, a Canadian stock, as if we were dealing in breeding stock.

Think of it. I see a soldier and his girl in one of those London parks that I have read so much about, and the moonbeams are coming down into their eyes, while, at the same time, the beams of love are in their hearts. Oh, do you love me, dear, Oh, yes, I do. But, I will tell you this, Are you a good breeder? You see, because we are told that what we want in Canada are good breeders of British stock. I find you comely, I find you beautiful, and I like your conversation, but that has nothing to do with it. If you are not a good breeder, I must go elsewhere?

Well, Mr. Speaker, if this is to tend to permit or even to preserve unity!

I told you a while ago we thought we were bridging that awful chasm which some are doing their best to dig deeper and deeper, since 1925 and 1927, -- and why did I cite those dates? There has happened in this House, Mr. Speaker, in 1925, an event of great importance. There was a man as Prime Minister who was strong enough and big enough

and I submit his name to the appreciation of the Hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) keeping in mind the invitation she gave the Hon. Prime Minister of this Province, to recognize that he had the heart and mind of the wise. Well, there was a man in this Province in 1925, and especially in 1927, who sat where the present Hon. Prime Minister is sitting, and that man was great enough, big enough, to say, I made a big mistake, and the Province behind me, and now we must correct it; and he did. That was the Honourable Howard Ferguson.

For twelve years, that is since 1912 for thirteen years in 1925, the French Canadians of this Province had been made to suffer untold suffering as a race and even personally, and regulations had been passed in this Province banishing from our schools as a language of instruction, what is called the French language. What were called bi-lingual schools were abolished, and the fight was on.

Is it not strange, Mr. Speaker, and you younger men who are in this room, who were either unborn or in wrappers at the time, is it not strange, -- yes, I am alluding to the Hon. Leader of the C. C. F. party, is it not strange that between 1912 and 1925 there was a fight day and night between the government of the day and the French Canadians of this Province in order that the French Canadians might keep their mother tongue on the lips of their children? That it might keep to their descendents the splendid inconquerable culture of the French language and the French character? And is it not wonderful that we in Ontario, -- there was not any rankling left in the hearts of the French Canadians of Ontario after the battle was over? And why? Because we always took care,

we who were leading that fight, we who were organizing the strategy which at last won our fight, we always took care not to tell our children a word of bigotry. These people do not understand, -- let us educate them to their mistake.

(Page 2155 follows)

CCC 1

3-22-45
Mr. Belanger.

Let us educate them to the best interests of the province and the country.

I remember seeing, many a time, when an official inspector of schools were to come to a school, when he entered the class-room, there was a walk-out. Perhaps some of the hon. members here know what a walk-out is --the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams)?

Well, there was a walk-out. It was very orderly. It was not an insult, not a sneer -- no, we did not want that. We knew we were going to win, and we wanted after the hour of victory our children to have love for their country-men in Ontario, but we were always afraid -- and in our councils we always said -- "Let us beware, let us take care, let us see that national unity in Ontario is not broken."

And we succeeded -- very much so.

I well remember when the hon. Minister of Hydro (Mr. Challies) appeared before seven or eight representatives of the Eastern municipalities, and he said -- because he was talking politics -- to those representatives who were asking him, Mr. Speaker, to help them get hydro and get electricity in the East, in those municipalities -- he answered, -- and I suppose very properly, although I was very surprised when it was related to me -- "If you keep on electing Liberals, how can you expect that we will give you electricity? You elect our member, and it will not take a year before you get electricity."

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, may I object? I presume the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Belanger) is referring to me?

CC 2

3-22-45

MR. BELANGER: Yes.

MR. CHALLIES: No such statement was made whatever. What I said was that the critical situation with regard to Carillon Falls power which belonged to the province of Ontario would serve an immediate source of power for that area, the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Belanger) voted for giving Ontario's share to Quebec, and that was the situation in that area which we would have been very pleased to serve. It was the situation of your making, not ours. I made no reference to the French vote or anything else.

MR. BELANGER: Of course, Mr. Speaker, I accept the statement and I leave the people to judge the effect of such a statement. But I may say this -- and I will not press the point -- that there is at the present time ample sources of electricity, and that other parts of Ontario are taking it right through, and it passes right through these municipalities to come into Ontario.

MR. CHALLIES: May I say here in that respect, it is very unfortunate that the only solution for low-priced power on the Ottawa in Eastern Ontario was Carillon Fall site. The nearest site is on the St.Lawrence, which is international, and we do not know when it will be developed. But the Act was passed, and you gave Quebec Ontario's share, and now we have to go up to the Des Joachims Falls, which is economically impossible, to give that source of supply to you in your area.

MR. BELANGER: Then, on account of my actions in the House, these people will be penalized and not receive their electricity, until they elect a member of your Government?

MR. CHALLIES: No, I said no such a thing.

MR. BELANGER: I will not labour the point.

MR. CHALLIES: Will you take my word for it, I said no such a thing. I deny it here.

MR. BELANGER: Well, I accept your denial, but my illustration is just the same. I say that the French-Canadian electors of this province are not to be bought, either wholesale or individually with promises, or even more substantial favours.

But I will tell you what will buy them, in the face of history. Treat them well; do not fight them; do not publish any statements of this kind; do not show that there are some influential men in this province who do not want the French population to develop itself in a normal way, and you will get their votes.

Proof? In 1925, after the hon. member for Russell in this House made as long a plea as the speach by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) -- because it was needed -- explaining the whole thing, the then Prime Minister, Mr. Howard Ferguson, got up immediately and said -- practically said -- that he was converted to the idea, and he appointed a commission of three who worked for two years investigating, and at the end of that time, in 1927, the obnoxious regulation was abolished, and a normal system was restored.

And what was the result of that? Although it was known all over the Hon. Mr. Ferguson was the man who had written with his own hand Regulation Number 17 -- although it was known all over -- because he was big enough, because he was man enough to acknowledge his mistake and to correct it, at the next election, in 1929 -- two years after -- every French county, or French dominated county, or every county where the French electorate counted, even the county

of Russell, supported Mr. Ferguson. That is the way to buy my people, if you want to buy them. Give them their rights, treat them well, and especially do not try anything like was being tried, according to what I have just said a moment ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will say that the French-speaking people in Ontario have done a wonderful work toward unity, even after fifteen years' injustice, and they will continue to do so, but they must not meet on their way people who do their best to create sentiment in Ontario against the province of Quebec, and against the French population of Ontario. Then the task will be too big; the difficulty will be insurmountable, and we will be faced with the most disasterous disunity amongst the people of this country of ours.

The hon. Prime Minister in the House, had his little fling at what he called the "Liberal-Communist Alliance", and that was pounced upon by his newspaper in Toronto and long editorials and cartoons, and so on, were published to try and impress certain parts of the province of Ontario that there was an alliance between the Liberals and the "Communists" -- as he called them -- or between us and our friends on the other side.

Well, let us be logical. Just because this side, as well as that side, is not satisfied with the present regime, and with the present Prime Minister and what he is doing, does that mean an alliance? Can we not be separated on other essential things and still work towards the same goal? So I say to him, in that case, be logical. Perhaps logic is something foreign to the hon. Prime Minister's make-up, but let me say to him, "Be logical".

CCC 5

3-22-45
Mr. Belanger.

I will tell you of another alliance, an illegitimate alliance, a drafted alliance -- at the present time, and that is between our friends on the other side, and their friends at Ottawa at the present time, and upon which our friends on the other side, and their friends at Ottawa are counting in order to oust Mackenzie King in Ottawa, and that alliance is an alliance between the Conservative Party of this province, and the extremists of the province of Quebec, men like Chalout and men like those composing the Bloc Populaire.

Mr. Speaker, they are counting one upon the other -- oh, you can laugh.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney General): Do not be a comedian.

MR. BELANGER: I am glad it makes you laugh, but the laughter does not seem to be very sincere, nor very spontaneous.

Now, I can see what is happening in the councils, sitting around the table, saying, "Do you know that King is going to lose lots of seats in the province of Quebec; the anti-conscriptionists are against him, because he has brought in a measure of conscription, so it is time for us to get busy at Ottawa, so let us 'go to it'." and that is the combination, or the alliance, which is much more manifest and much clearer than what he calls in this House the "Liberal-Communist Alliance".

But that is where history really is repeating itself. Some of you may not remember it, but in 1911, when the question was to oust Sir Wilfred Laurier, as Prime Minister at Ottawa, how was it done? Just by an alliance of this same

kind. The Bourassists, the nationalists of Quebec, and the extremists of Ontario -- oh, I know well whereof I speak -- instead of casting their vote on that question of reciprocity, they fought their fight on the lowest, bitterest racial prejudices. History repeats itself.

I remember in 1911 walking the streets of Toronto here, and seeing big posters in some stores, if you please -- and in big stores -- where Sir Wilfred Laurier was represented as kneeling before the Pope with a tiara on his head. That is the way they were fighting the elections.

And in Quebec Sir Wilfred was being represented as too liberal -- and I am not talking in a political sense -- he was being represented in Quebec for paying for volunteers to send to the war in South Africa, and there in Quebec, in order to break down Sir Wilfred Laurier, they represented him as pro-British to an awful extent, and the Conservatives here -- well, they were as unprogressive Conservatives at that time as they are to-day -- they took advantage of this combination, or alliance -- call it what you like, -- Bourassa, and the Nationalists. And so you see that history repeats itself -- is repeating itself in what is being done at the present time.

It is very easy to understand why you cannot get a French-Canadian in Quebec to run in the next election as a Conservative. They run as Independents. They are Independents, don't you see? They are not Conservatives, I can name them to you one after the other -- people who belong, and still belong, and have always belonged to the Conservative party and to Conservative Associations

who are running as Independents, because they do not want to run as Conservatives.

That is what happened in 1911. They ran as Nationalists but -- oh, the beautiful combination -- the beautiful combination.

Everyone knows that after Sir Wilfred was defeated and Borden came in at Ottawa, Blondin, Monk, Sevigny, etc., accepted immediately portfolios in Borden's cabinet, and in fourteen months Bourassa left the country, disgusted and broken-hearted over the treacherous manoeuvres of those whom he thought were his friends, but were simply Conservatives in disguise. And so, history repeats itself. Now, let me speak, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the province of Ontario and to everyone in it, and say to them not to let themselves be carried away. Do away with that; get away from it.

I remember years ago when there was a big convention here in Toronto, just during the very fiercest part of the school fight, there were young people coming from universities from all parts of the world, from Czechoslovakia, from Japan, and from all the Christian universities, and we had a delegation from Montreal, from McGill University, which was composed of a strong delegation of Jewish students, and the question I was asked to present for discussion for five minutes was the school question in Ontario.

After I was through, the Chairman put this question to me: He said,"How is it I am fully in accord with what you said, but how is it, if I walk on the street and I hear two persons in front of me speaking French, I cannot prevent a feeling of revulsion, and yet I am fully with

you."

I said, "I will tell you." Of course I had to answer immediately; I said, "Go and see a specialist."

It is a bad system, and, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to all right-thinking persons in this province of Ontario to get away from these feelings, and these appeals to their lowest nature, and step higher, Mr. Speaker, and I will appeal to the hon. Prime Minister of this province to set an example; let him be a leader, but I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, -- oh, I know it irks him not to have a full majority in the House; I know that some time ago when Ottawa passed Legislation about family allowances, he thought suddenly he could again stir up provincial sentiment here against the province of Quebec, and he did, and took all the means he could to bring about a snap election; everybody said it -- even those around him -- but he found he had made a mistake.

If he wants to make a big leader and a big man out of himself, I say, let him come to the stature of men like Mr. Ferguson, or let him go further, and emulate the very finest one, the founder of the Tory party in Ontario and in Canada, Sir John Macdonald.

I will finish here, Mr. Speaker, although I have something else I wanted to speak on, which would be very interesting indeed, but let me say this to these Conservatives in Ontario, that the last Session before Confederation Sir John Macdonald, in the Session of 1865, I think it was, introduced a resolution -- although everybody was preparing for Confederation -- which was intitled, or intituled, or named this way:

CCC 9

3-22-45
Mr. Belanger.

"To provide that the province of Upper Canada will grant to the minority in Upper Canada the same rights and privileges which are granted to the minority in the province of Quebec."

(Page 2165 follows/

What happened to that Bill from Sir John A MacDonald. His Minister from Upper Canada struck against him and in order not to jeopardize the passing of Comfederation, which was of paramount interest at the time, Sir John A.MacDonald, to prevent the larger disaster, withdrew the Bill,with comments however, and he said to those of the majority of lower Canada: in that case I withdraw the Act granting to the English minority of Quebec the same right that the majority have got. I do it since Upper Canada does not want to follow me on that question. And the people of lower Canada did not withdraw their bill and since that time the minority in lower Canada in the Province of Quebec enjoys the very same freedom,very same liberty, very same privileges and rights as does the majority. Those are men that we should look up to. Those are men, although Sir.John A. MacDonald could not on account of the paramount interest, as I say, could not carry on did what he thought was the best thing to do. Still, we who now succeed him - succeed such men as Sir John A. MacDonald and in the other party Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the king of tolerance, of conciliation here in Canada, we should take a lesson from the lives of those great Canadians. Oh, when I think of the responsibility public men are taking who do not refrain from widening this chasm of this unity here. I pity them, Mr.Speaker, but history will not pity. Posterity will judge their actions as it should be done without any considerations of persons or personal interests. I pity the place that they will occupy in history in all the Canadian nations.

I wanted to speak on family allowances. I will not do so. I wanted to say a few words about two pamphlets

that were sent me, one by Miss Charlotte Whitton. She happens to be a specialist on babies - I don't know. Another one by C.E.Silcox. I wonder if that Mr.Silcox is the person who some years ago when, what we call down our way, the woman palmer, was brought before the magistrate for circulating contraceptive instruments, anti-contraceptive information, going in around Canada from house to house and teaching not only a sick woman but young married brides and unmarried girls, was teaching them how they could prevent a family. The man who saved her from gaol is that man Silcox who came along with his theories expounded in that book and confused the mind of the magistrate. Does not he state here that the small family is really what is wanted in this civilization of ours? And this is the kind of people who come and unite their efforts with those who are making politics out of that important question. I fear comment because I think I was the first one in the House when I was sitting on the Opposition benches over there and got up in this House and talked about family allowances. The older members will remember it. The member from Carleton (Mr.Acres) will remember it, and it was taken up and there was a municipal doctor here in Toronto who took up the cudgels for what was called eugenics, the prevention of families, and wrote a letter about it and was taken from ocean to ocean in the newspapers and I just want to say that he did not have the best of the argument.

I have a word to say about school grants and I am through. With apologies for keeping the House so long at this juncture. The Leader of the Opposition struck the right note when he was on his feet. If there is some principle

that has been promulgated by the Prime Minister and Minister of Education and that has been repeated behind him by those who favour this new system of grant, it was of great importance that every child in Ontario should have equal educational opportunity, quality of opportunity. It is the dominant thing. It is the great cry and now they have quality of opportunity. UH! Let us see where that quality lies. I am taking the schools of Ottawa as an example. The public schools of Ottawa pay a rate of 4.33 mills. That is the public school rate there. The separate school there pays a rate of 7.10 mills. That is in 1944. The 4.33 mills of the public school rate brings them $978.781 or $1,000,000 in round numbers. The 7.10 mills that the separate school rate payers pay leaves them just about half. Equal opportunity for the children. The puglic schools have to educate in 1944, 8,806 children for which to educate whom they have $1,000,000 to cover, which they paid 4.33 mills. The separate schools as against this figure 8,000 have 10.527 children to educate upon only $474,000 which is accumulated by the payment of 7 mills. Now, how come? Because with the famous system of companies such as exists to-day and which is so criticised by our friends on my right are paying all their taxes to the public schools, and yet they levy as amuch from the separate school supporters as the public school supporters. The public utilities that belong as much to the Catholics as to the supporters of the public schools pay all their taxes to the public schools, nothing for the separate schools, So that there has grown in the City of Ottawa, in Toronto, in London and Windsor and all over there is a rich public school section

besides a poor and getting all the time poorer, separate school section. Where is that quality of opportunity? And is it not worth while that some effort at least should be attempted to equalize a little bit that opportunity.

HON. GEO.H. DUNBAR: (Provincial Secretary): I would like to ask you a question about that. Would it not be fair to say to the House that the separate Schools of Ottawa are paying for two classes that carry on in the high school. That amounts to $52,000. The public schools are not; they are paid in the secondary schools. Therefore the public school supporters are paying in these two forms and also pay again in the secondary schools. So that if they did not carry on those two classes it would cut off about 2 mills.

MR. BELANGER: As the high school did not come to the level of the need of our children, then Mr.Speaker, we are ready to make a sacrifice of paying double in order to give our children the education which they have a right to have.

Now, let us see what those companies amount to. The assessment in 1945 from the Companies was $38,000,000 assessment, the public utilities $16,000,000. Now, properties occupied by the Crown. Is the Crown in Canada only for the public school rate payers. Is not the Crown over the Catholic Ratepayers over the public school rate payers? Why should our laws be such that the Crown has to be assessed to the amount of $39,298,000 only in one City. Legations from abroad, they are not Canadians, but the houses that they occupy in Ottawa are assessed at $1,321,943. Now, there is something remarkable. You know, in order to carry out the war effort at Ottawa the Dominion Government has appropriated.

MR. DUNBAR: I think I should correct the Speaker about the legations. There is no taxes paid at the present time by legations in Ottawa. The Federal Government did pay some years ago, and two years ago they refused to pay that to Ottawa and the City of Ottawa has asked us to change the Act so that it would be.

MR. BELANGER: It was at one time.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, but not for two years. So I say, here is a wonderful situation. As I said, in order to help the war effort the Dominion Government in Ottawa is taking hold of certain properties. Now some of those properties were assessed to separate schools. The Monument National do pay taxes to the Separate Schools and the Dominion Government took it over, put officers into it, and $62,875 of assessment was taken away from the separate schools to the public schools.

I could ask you here a question and I know I would not lose my money on it, by paying this you could not possibly imagine the situation. That building belongs to the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Ottawa, just being forced that way to withdraw its support from the separate schools and paid to the public schools. Why, there is something a great deal more. The separate school board has got a property on Bolton Street, the Bolton Street School. It is its own property, the separate school. The Dominion Government at Ottawa for war purposes took it over and the assessment would amount to $11,400. The property of the separate school pays to the public school. Beautiful laws where things like than can be done. Splendid quality of opportunities and treatment in this province of Ontario. La Salle Academy, a Catholic Academy, which is the property of a religious

order, the Brothers of the Christian School. It belongs to them and since the Dominion Government has installed offices in there, there has been $22,575.00, of assessment taken from the Separate Schools to the public schools. We would not care so very much if the public schools were not so rich as not to know what to do with their money. They are paying $119 per pupil - that is their cost - and the separate schools something like $78. There is opportunity for you. Now, you would think that in a new scheme of distribution of grants that something would have been done to help remedy this inequality, this growth, unjust inequality. What has been done? Cities above a certain population have a different way of receiving their grant. Ottawa, Hamilton, Toronto, Windsor, there is a different basis for the distribution of grants. Before the new grant and the new system of grants a poor school would get more than a rich school and that is why in Ottawa it would help to equalize, and the separate schools were really getting a greater amount than the public schools and that is as it should be. It was not attendance. A school that had a high assessment would get less than a school that had a low attendance, so that there was a little equalizing between the two boards. That has been done away because the basis has been put on the expenditure. So far as the public schools, which have a greater budget, expend more than the separate schools because they are richer. Over twice richer. They get their greater amount over twice or three times what the separate schools get, although they have more children, ten thousand children compared with 8,000. Is that a proper way of giving an equal opportunity to all the children of this province? Why were they singled out? Now, I suppose,

gentlemen, you say -- here, he must be exaggerating. The situation must be different from that. Why should the Government have taken that basis and not do as they did in the rural schools, make the basis on school attendance and assessments. The higher assessment the less grant.

HON.MR. ~~CROSS~~ Dunbar: May I say the Hon. member (Mr. Belanger) is wrong with that. The school assessment has nothing to do with the assessment in the rural places.

MR.BELANGER: Nothing to do, but why the difference? A letter was written to the Minister of Education and the question was asked very properly: Wjy should they pay on the basis where the richest school gets the greater grant? Why has the basis of attendance and assessment been abandoned,although it is kept for the high schools and for the rural schools.

A letter was written to the hon. Minister of Education, and the question was asked, very properly, "Why should that be the basis, where the richest school gets the greater grant? Why has the basis of a tenacious system been abandoned, although it is kept off the high schools and off rural schools?"

Now, the reply was very simple. Why, you could not guess what the hon. Minister of Education, with all his staff, with all his officers, wrote back. "We have adopted that system because it is simpler, simpler to compute." Isn't that wonderful, Mr. Speaker, the head of the Department saying simply "We are doing that inequality, --" which amounts to iniquity, " -- we are doing that in order to have less work to do in the Department. It is simpler to compute."

I thought I might take the time of the House, with your good will, Mr. Speaker, and try your patience to that limit, in order that you might know just exactly what is the meaning of that inequality.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I might tell you this: I think, from what I know, of my own knowledge, -- I think that that was not the advice given to the hon. Minister of Education and to the Cabinet as to the distribution of these grants by officers of his Department, the experienced officers of his Department.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I did say I did not intend to interrupt these endless words, but I do wish to correct the statement. It is a rather strange form of injustice that when the schools to which the speaker is referring got $53,000 in grants in the Government that he sat in this year is getting $135,000 in grants.

MR. BELANGER: But, I placed them on the 50% dis-

tribution, and the schools have been increased. That is not the answer to what I say. I say there is a discrepancy as between the public and separate schools, which is unequal and which is iniquitous, and which is unjust.

MR. DREW: I am only going to make one more comment, to keep this on the track, because the speaker, I am sure, knows perfectly well he is giving a picture wholly out of keeping with the facts. I am certain he knows perfectly well why the Ottawa schools are having that difficulty. The Ottawa schools are having financial difficulty because of the fact that over $5,000,000 of assessed property which previously supported the separate schools has been withdrawn by those who supported the separate schools.

MR. BELANGER: That is exactly my point. The separate schools have been treated in such a shoddy way we are obliged to raise our rates on the schools and property, and when they see their rates rising and rising, and that inequality, — they are not all heroes, — some of them found the sacrifice too much, and they have shifted their funds, and our schools are getting poorer and poorer, due to the fact the laws of this province are unjust, and I am not afraid to say so. I will say more than that, and I mention Premier Howard Ferguson. In 1929, prior to the election, and here I appealed to the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Acres), and I appealed to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and I appealed to the hon. member for Brant, and I appealed to the hon. member for Bruce, and to those who were in the House in 1929, the last speech of the Session of that year prior to the election, the general election of 1929, the speech which was delivered by me in this House at one o'clock in the

morning, or two o'clock in the morning, on that question of separate schools, and instead of defining and instead of interpreting and trying to answer my contention, Mr. Ferguson got up in this House, and we have a long record, if this is being put down, and he gave, to my recollection, (and I am sure the gentleman I have mentioned will bear me out,) - he said, "I have already heard, many times, the question of taxation and companies' inequality of taxation, and the taxation, as between the systems of the two schools pleaded before me, but never have I understood it as much as I understand it tonight." And he said, "If the hon. member for Russell will continue to educate the public opinion on this question, as much as he has done on bi-lingual schools --" (I have no doubt he said it) "-- he will succeed in this case, as he has succeeded in the bi-lingual
5. schools."

My last word will be a word of appeal to this House. I will not say "Work for unity," but for the sake of our land and our country, in order not to sow elements of disruption. I ask the leaders of public opinion, and I ask the hon. members of this House, in their ridings and localities, not to utter a word that may do harm or may enhance disunity between our races. We are not ashamed, neither the Britishers, nor the Irish, nor the Italian citizens, nor the French; we are not ashamed, none of us, of our origin. We are all citizens of Canada, and let us be, first and foremost, citizens of Canada; let us be Canadians first, and have the interest of Canada first, and, especially, let all of us, whether in this House or outside of this House, shut our hearts to those spontaneous movements, as against one another of the races, because,

perhaps, of our upbringing, and because of influences with which we have been united, and then, if we do that, we may succeed, at length, in having, both in this province of Ontario and in the Dominion of Canada, a united people, without disunity. With disunity there can be no prosperity or grandeur for this nation of ours.

MR. ROBERT H. CARLIN (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, rising to participate in this discussion, I want to join with the other hon. members in extending congratulations to the mover of the motion. I want, however, to go a bit further. I want to extend my sympathy, and I do so because I think the hon. members were given a rather difficult task, to do the task of taking something from nothing, and making it appear to be everything.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is something that attracts me very much as I enter this Legislature almost every day. Perhaps this attraction is due to the part of the country that I come from, the mining part of Canada. Perhaps it strikes no one else, other than my hon. friend from Cobalt (Mr. Taylor), - that is, the samples of ore from Cobalt, Kirkland Lake, Timmins, and particularly Sudbury, the constituency that I represent, - they are so reminiscent of the various things that have happened in my life and in the lives of the people I know so well, the miners of Northern Ontario. It is the Cobalt that I first came to when I left my home in the province of Quebec that I was reminded so much about in listening to the last speaker, due to his reference to the French people of that province. However, these nuggets remind me of something perhaps more than just classes of people. They remind me of the economy of our country, and again remind me of the ever-present colossal richness of this country, the

great richness of this country on the one hand, and the extreme poverty on the other.

I recall the fine young men that I met when I first came to the north country and Cobalt, the miners, who are approximately my age to-day, and I meet them now and they are broken down men, completely worn out. In the mining industry there seems to be a change. When I first came to the town there were, as a matter of fact, stakes and small shack houses which have grown into a large city. Timmins, the same. The flow of wealth has left that great, rich country on Ontario, falling into the hands and pockets of people who are already so rich they do not know how to spend their money, and the people I hope I represent, and that I try to represent, the great miners, who have produced this wealth, are living, in the main, in poverty, not so much, perhaps, now, but back in the black '30's. No one, perhaps, will ever know how much they have suffered, because there is no scale to weigh, and no yardstick to measure, the sufferings of the miners and working people of Canada during the hungry '30's.

They remind me of other things, particularly the one from Cobalt, from the Crown Reserve that I worked in. I worked in that mine on the very day they made the great discovery. Little did I know that it and I would be here in this building, or little did I think it. The sample from Sudbury, of course, reminds me of things that have happened during my recent years. It makes me think when I first came down from Kirkland Lake, (that was during the famous Kirkland Lake strike,) to help the workers. Our Union office was broken into by twelve paid "goons". That has been officially printed in the Press. They were sent

in to break up our office, and, in the words of the men who were members of that "goon squad", and who have given sworn statements to us to-day, they were to get the organizers, to do a job on the organizers, and they did, (some of them went to the hospital,) and to do a job on the office. Well, they did such a job on the office and such a job on the organizers. They destroyed everything we had in the office, and they put two organizers in the hospital. I am quite mindful of that, and I am mindful of representing members of that great union of the International Nickel Company when they learned of these members that would have been discharged the following day.

Well, out of that has come democracy to Sudbury. At the present moment the highest degree of democracy that ever existed in that town exists there now due to the International Union of Mine and Smelter Workers, and others. That is just the north country. What we said of the suffering of the miners was borne out here, in some statement made by the hon. member from Ontario. I have got an endless amount of statements, sworn statements, and statements as they were read yesterday. There are men right in here at this moment, at this very moment, who I am trying to get something for through going to the Compensation Board.

I do not want to be construed to mean that the Compensation Board is not doing something for the people. I think it is doing something, but it certainly is not doing all that the people know and think it ought to do for them, and, particularly for a class of our people who are doing the hardest task of our people, and I refer to the New Canadians, among whom are some of the greatest citizens of this country.

I am not going to deal at any length with the Compensation Board, because I think that was well looked after last night by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams). However, even since last night I had occasion to go to the Compensation Board to handle two cases. One of them is here in this building, and one is not sufficiently well to be here at this hour of the evening. Those two workers are typical of the men whose cases are not properly handled by this Board. They are New Canadians who do not speak English too well, and it is rather difficult for them to make themselves understood when they go in, with the result -- You know what the results are. While, perhaps, the Board keeps the door open, no remuneration is ever passed, or, very seldom.

Just while I am on that I would like to elaborate on one case brought up last night. This is a case of a very young man with all his life in front of him. Due to a handicap received about fourteen months ago, the rest of his life will be a very miserable life. This young man drilled into a hole at one of the mines in Sudbury, and working with him at the time was his partner, who was instantly killed. This young chap was blasted, and parts of his body badly injured, but his face is so marked and so scarred and so discoloured that he is like the men you perhaps have seen, the men who work in the coal mines, and who have had an injury on the face. It leaves a black scar, or a sort of a blue scar, and this man's face is almost entirely black and blue, with little portions of rock all through his face. I am trying to do something about his case, but they tell me he does not come under the scope of the Act. Rightly so, but there is no other

legislation in this country to look after him, none whatever. He went to a face specialist, and the doctor said a job could be done for around a thousand dollars, but he has not got it, and he has a job to work at now. He hides, because he is ashamed of his face. He is typical of hundreds of cases.

For all practical purposes wages are frozen in this country, and frozen at a level that I think is a disgrace to the people that run this country. When you consider this fabulously rich nation, yet our people -- Why should any of our people be paupers? We have hundreds of them in that category. Here are the figures that I think prove how disgraceful it is:

> "50% of the wage earners earn less than $450 a year."

That was 1941.

> "54% of the men, and 89% of the women, earn less than $950, and only 9% of the men earn over $1950 a year."

(Page No. 2180 follows.)

This welfare brief that was prepared by the Toronto City Council, which, I believe, is accepted by all authorities on this question, says that a minimum wage for a decent standard of living for a family of five is thirty-five dollars and forty cents a week, or one hundred and four dollars, seventeen cents a month or eighteen hundred and sixty dollars and twenty cents a year.

The greatest majority of our workers do not earn that much money to keep themselves in decency, yet the speakers here tell us about the educational set-up and what we desire.

Well, we have not got the money to dress our kiddies up properly to send them to school, if we have the schools to send them to. Many things we have to do, many things we have got to do if we are to save our positions as leaders of the people. Our aged people, how do they fare? Did you know that we have got an old age pension which covers a lot of them, but there is a group of people in this country about whom I wish to say something, that is the new Canadians, and there are more and more of them coming into this country all the time, and more power to them because I believe they are second to none; and most of those people have not got citizenship papers, not because they do not like this country as well as you and I do, and as the last speaker does, but because they do not know; and the result is that we have a great number who have perhaps reached the age of eighty or eighty-five years of age, and they have no security, and they have no jobs, and you cannot get them old age pensions. I see there are hundreds of those people. What is to be done about it? They were invited to come out to this country. They did not come here of their own free volition.

The great advertisements put out by the Corporations of this country induced them to come here. If the great corporations who invited them to come over here cannot look after them, it is up to us to look after them and see that they are treated like human beings.

Uppermost in the minds of all the people in this Province and in this nation is the war and the winning of the war. I will not say much about that; other speakers better qualified to speak upon it have spoken. I would say that the best we have to offer them when they come back is only half as good as it should be.

While I hope we may agree on many things, I hope we will all agree on that. I hope and pray that the war, which perhaps should never have begun, may end to-morrow, so that our boys may come back. But, at times, I fear what is going to happen when they do come back. I know that the war is going to end sometime, whether it will be this week, this month or next year; and it strikes me that when it ends you will not need soldiers. And if you do not need soldiers, you will not need guns; and if you do not need guns, you will not need ammunition. But where do we go from here? There is no adequate plan in this nation, let alone in this Province, to cope with the post-war problems, which will be on us perhaps in the very near future. No adequate plans with which to cope with them; and I fear that the men coming back, and not being needed in the ammunition plants, and with nothing to absorb them, what will happen? That, I think, we will have to answer.

I would like to say something about the people whom few ever mention, that is, the new Canadians. I know of no group of people in the Dominion to whom we owe so

much, because they have put up with so much, suffered so much, and say so little about it, that you have got to live close to them and talk with them to find the limits of their suffering; because often they will be suffering beyond your imagination without saying a word about it.

I say we have got to reach out to those people and let them know we are friends of their's and make them part of us so that when they ask for their democratic rights, as they did during the depression, we will not label them as reds and blues and deport them on a wholesale basis.

Now we are begging those men to stay on the job, and you do not have to beg with the overwhelming majority because they know that there is a war to be won; and there is no more patriotic people than they are, not a more honest people in the nation than they are, nor any more interested in ending this war.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to conclude by saying a few words regarding my own constituency. I come from Sudbury, the home of nickel, the town which has produced twenty-five per cent of the nickel of the world and is almost as much responsible for the winning of this war as anything else in the world, because almost everything you touch has some nickel content. Therefore, nickel is a pretty important product.

But there is one thing which disturbs me a little bit, that while from the smelter there is poured out daily thousands of pounds of nickel, which we are very glad to get at this hour, yet there is another thing which ought to be done as to it, and that is against the fumes from

the refinery and the smelter. This is doing untold damage to vegetation, to the forests, and to everything that is composed of metal, for instance farm equipment and machinery.

Farmers for years have been asking this government to do something about it. Last year I did mention it, and if I recall right, the Hon. Premier stated that was one reason for establishing a department of scientific research. Well, I hope he is getting along well with that department of scientific research because just to-day I received a petition which I would like to read into the records here and with the petition I have got close to a thousand signatures. And this is the type of resolution or petition:

> "Whereas it is a known fact that the sulphur fumes emanating from the smelter of the International Nickel Corporation of Copper Cliff are causing great damages to the farmers of the surrounding country since 1915, or thereabouts:
>
> And whereas if the farming industry is to continue in these districts the farmers must be given fair play:
>
> And whereas unless a fair compensation for damages done, is given the farmers, they will have no aother alternative than to vacate the farms:
>
> And whereas the arbitration of damages caused by sulphur fumes, under the authority of the Arbitration Act of Ontario has never been satisfactory:
>
> And whereas it is a known fact that the corporation could treat the fumes emanating from its plant so as to render them harmless to land, crops, fences and forests:
>
> Therefore, we the farmers grievances Association of the districts of Sudbury and Nipissing, beg leave to request as follows:
>
> 1. That the International Nickel Corporation take means to treat the fumes emanating from its smelter at Copper Cliff so as to render them harmless to crops, fences and land and forests.

"2. That such treatment be put into operation with the least possible delay."

This is a petition which was sent to me to-day, accompanied by that number of signatures. So that the people of Sudbury are very reasonable. They are not asking this or any other Government that they should close the mines or shut up the smelters. All they ask is for fair remuneration.

There are scientific formulas now being used in smelters in this country in Trail, British Columbia, plants in which almost every atom of gas from the smelter is used. And I think we owe it to the farmers of the Sudbury and the Nipissing district.

I would like the government not only to set up an arbitration board which would be better than the present means, to investigate and see what can be done about this smoke, and if it cannot be remedied, set up a board, for instance that will allow the farmers to select a man from their own ranks to represent them, and let the International Nickel Company do the same; and let the government appoint a fair arbitrator.

I have sworn statements to the effect that the farmers, who went to the company complaining about the damages which had been done to their crops have been offered as high as, in one case, seventy-five dollars for the damages. The farmer felt that was not sufficient damages, and he went to the arbitrator, and the arbitrator forced him to settle for seven dollars and fifty cents, -- that is quite a common thing. Yet the people of North Bay have never heard about it.

So I urge the government, this year, or whatever

government succeeds them, to do something about it for Sudbury.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, one wonders at this stage of the debate, looking at the volumes of words that have already been spoken on the Speech from the Throne, what is left to say. And certainly, when the members, I feel, are anxious for the conclusion of the debate and the taking of the vote, which may make history in this old Province of Ontario, it ill behooves me to take up much time this evening. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I had no thought of participating the debate until it occurred to me, as one who is rather used to the atmosphere of this chamber, that the signs are that this may be the last debate of its kind in the Twenty-First Legislature and probably the last debate of the Session.

After listening to the many fine addresses from the newer members of the House, to all of whom I offer my sincere congratulations, but so many of them, particularly on the government side, sound so like swan songs that, as one of the older members of the House, realizing that if a general election is held this summer, so many of these newer members will not be with us again, I felt that it might be opportune to say what a pleasure it has been to meet them under these happy circumstances, as fellow members in the Legislature of Ontario. Because, in the quarter of a century and more, Mr. Speaker, that I have had the Honour of sitting continuously as the member for Brant, I have seen several hundred members go; and, as you know, sir parting is always sweet sorrow, -- sweeter sometimes than at others, but always sweetest when I see the conservatives on the way out.

Now, if you will pardon me just for a moment in a

little lighter vein than we have been hearing tonight, if I refer to an incident which occurred last Friday, when the Clerk of the House was reading the report from the Committee, I was engaged in rather earnest conversation with my friend here from Elgin (Mr. Hepburn), and hearing a ripple of applause going over the House I joined in with gusto; but, happening to look up, I saw that the eyes of the chamber were directed towards me, and I asked my friend from Temiskaming, Mr. Taylor, what was going on, and he said, Why, they are going to paint your portrait. My face became very red indeed.

I am not suggesting any ulterior motives whatever, but I do ask if you see any person sitting in the House who has been done in oil and hung in the corridors, because I do not recall that any may be here; and I assure you I have every intention of being a candidate again in the constituency of Brant; and I know that the Hon. members would not want me to start in with two strikes against me.

I gave some little attention a few years ago to this matter of portraits, because I thought it was assuming almost the position of a racket, because formerly splendid portraits had been provided of Speakers, Governors, and Premiers at around three or four hundred dollars; and the price had gradually risen until the price was over five thousand dollars because the charge was all the traffic could bear. And, in one instance, I do recall where a portrait was painted with the ex-Premier wearing a pearl grey vest. He found out afterwards that it was not just in good taste to wear that with a morning coat, and we had to give him an additional vest at an additional cost. So, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Treasurer

need not in his estimates lay aside any sum of money this year upon portraits of the Hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) or of your humble servant. I do not know how I could stand to walk under such a portrait for ten or twelve years, but after we intend to leave this chamber, we may take into consideration this important matter and provide the portraits, I assure you, at our own expense.

Now, because of the changes in the recess in this particular group, Hon. members opposite have given us quite some attention, and, in many instances, have gone back years to dig up old straw and thresh it over, in the hope that they might glean a little grain out of it and possibly cause dissensions in our ranks. If it gives them any pleasure to do so, I would be the last to deny it to them.

(Page 2188 follows)

and if it gives them any pleasure to do so, I would be the last to deny it to them. I am very frank to say that certainly in the past years there were very sharp differences of opinion between my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) and myself, based entirely on war issues, and the conditions which existed at that particular time, and those days were the most distressing in my public appearance, but never at any time did they interfere with the warm personal friendship which had existed so many years between us, nor did it interfere with my very great admiration for his outstanding qualities of leadership, nor did it interfere with the amenities of extending hospitality one to the other, and there was no one at that time, nor at this time, that I have greater pleasure in welcoming into my home, nor take greater pleasure of visiting, than that of my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) and his very lovely family.

But, Mr. Speaker, the causes of these differences are ancient history. Nothing is to be gained by my hon. friend taking them up and thrashing them over now, and they are causes such as never will occur again, I am certain.

War issues in Canada have to-day the effect of causing great dissension, seemingly much moreso than in any other of the allied countries, but even at that, would to God it were the only thing we had to suffer from when the full impact of the war strikes home to our individual families, and in this connection I want to extend my deepest sympathy to my good friend and neighbour, the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Martin) who in so recent months has suffered the loss of his very gallant son. I know what that means in the family, when the dreaded messenger comes up the garden path, and although it was

years ago, nevertheless the passing of the years does not seem to lessen the sense of loss -- utter loss -- that so many families in this fair Dominion have had to endure during the last years of this terrible war.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am happy indeed to sit here beside my good friend from the county of Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) who has returned to his rightful place as leader of the Liberal members in the Legislature, and in a few short weeks I hope will be the leader of the Liberal party in the province of Ontario, and at the earliest opportunity afforded to the people of this province, will again head the Government of this province.

The hon. the Prime Minister has on several occasions referred to what he termed the "dual leadership" in this group, but I can assure him that that will be corrected at a very early opportunity, and will not, therefore, be a matter for his concern.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are again a very happy and united family, and quite ready to "go places".

Now, another difference which I am sure has occurred to you, and that you have observed, is the rather different attitude this group has taken towards the Government this Session. Last Session we came into this House, after the general election, and the Government was in a minority, and we frankly announced the intention of extending that measure of support which would make it possible for them to put into effect the policies upon which they were elected in this province, and to the extent even that they should not be embarrassed by their lack of a majority in this House.

We have carried that policy throughout the Session,

notwithstanding the many provocations from the Government itself, and from our good friends of the C.C.F. They realized that we were carrying through such a policy, and they took every opportunity to force divisions in the House and it is rather a laugh at this Session, Mr. Speaker, in recalling those actions, when our hon. friends to my right here have repeatedly swung to the defence of the Government in the divisions of this Sessions.

MISS MACPHAIL: Somebody had to do it.

MR. NIXON: But, Mr. Speaker, it was our sincere wish and frank intention to carry that policy through the term of this Legislature, because the people, having gone through an election, I believe, wanted the members to do their utmost to see that the business of the province was carried on in an expeditious and proper manner.

But, co-operation works both ways, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Prime Minister of this province is not an easy man with whom to co-operate, and, in fact, in my opinion, he deliberately burned the bridges upon which we were making a very honest and sincere endeavour to co-operate with the administration, when he delivered that address on August 9th of last year, over a network of radio stations in this province, which has already been referred to so frequently during this Session. I will not take the time at this late hour to quote at length from that address. Many hon. members have already done so, including the hon. Prime Minister himself, but certainly he knew when that address was delivered, that it made it impossible for the Liberals in the Legislature to further extend such a measure of co-operation.

And in this connection I would like to read a short

extract from an address which I myself delivered over the radio a short time afterwards, on October 11th. In that address, I said:

> "After the defeat of the Liberal Government in August of '43, the Liberal Members of the Legislature believed it to be in the public interest that the present administration, though a minority of 38 in a house of 90, should have every opportunity to put into effect the promises on which they obtained power. Believing this, the Liberal members assisted the Conservative Government on many occasions and sought to support measures on their merits. There has been little appreciation shown by the government for this assistance. Certainly there have been wholesale dismissals of civil servants throughout the constituencies who received their appointments under the Liberal regime, notwithstanding Premier Drew's assurance, quote: 'I hope every member of the civil service will continue his work with confidence, that those who are performing their duties well and are competent will be retained'. And when Colonel Drew states that his one ambition in the political field outside Ontario is, quote: 'To see an end to the weak and incompetent government at Ottawa and to assist in every way he could to assure that John Bracken became the next Prime Minister of Canada', he shuts the door to friendly co-operation in the face of every self-respecting Liberal. It is not, however, because of this and not because of his administrative record, bad as it is, but because he strikes at the very basis of Canadian unity in his shocking speech of August 9th that I make this announcement, with the unanimous approval of every Liberal member, all present at the caucus. Last year at this time after a caucus of Liberal members, we stated frankly we would assist the Government to put into effect their pledges on which they were elected and ase that they were not embarrassed by their lack of a majority in the House. Following the caucus of yesterday I, as frankly state, that, come what may, the truce is ended."

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a dark cloud indeed which has no silver lining, and I could almost thank the hon. Prime Minister for his address I have just mentioned, since it solidified and consolidated those of Liberal thoughts through-

out Ontario and Canada.

In this address, as you will remember, an attack was made on the Family Allowances Legislation, which was passed at Ottawa by the unanimous vote of the Federal House, with every Conservative member in the House supporting that Legislation, and yet the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario, notwithstanding that, made the statement in his address:

> "I assure you that the Government of Ontario intends to do everything within its power to make sure that this iniquitous Bill does not go into effect."

Referring to the Family Allowances Legislation --

> "It is not this Bill alone, but the whole principle involved which we intend to resist."

Well, of course, as was pointed out by my friend, the Leader of the Labour Progressive Party (Mr. MacLeod), he made a very notable retreat from that position, and, as a matter of fact, the Legislation for Family Allowances is now under way, I believe, throughout Canada, and in due course the families will receive their allowances, in the very near future.

But also that address, in addition to consolidating the Liberal and Reform opinions, also was wholly responsible for the return of my good friend from Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) to the Liberal, and while my hon. friend the Prime Minister has taken great delight in reading from that little black book which he always carries with him --

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I have two of them.

MR. CASSELMAN: One for each.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. NIXON: --Filled with quotations from statements of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn), I have not heard him yet quote the statement with which he announced his intention last October 3rd, and I am reading now from the report in the Glove & Mail of that date, in which he notifies the Liberals of the county of Elgin, who had invited him to be their candidate in the Federal election, now approaching, that he would not accept their invitation. He said:

> "After due consideration, I have come to the conclusion that my main responsibility as a Liberal is to do battle against reactionary Toryism as it rears its ugly head in Ontario to-day.
>
> While I have been for the most part politically inactive since resigning the Ontario Premiership two years ago, nevertheless I have continued to take a keen interest in public questions and have given a great deal of thought to our turbulent Canadian political scene. Taking a carefully considered view of the situation, it is my opinion that at no time since Confederation have we been faced with such a political crisis in both our Province and our Dominion.
>
> For more than a year we have had a Tory Government in office in Ontario, a Government which has evaded its responsibility by subterfuge in the form of a multiplicity of boards and commissions, with no responsibility to the Legislature, and certainly no results for Old Man Ontario."

To that, Mr. Speaker, I can certainly add my "Okay, Amen."

> "When the Legislature was in session last spring, I, as an independent Liberal, in common with other Opposition members, believed that every opportunity should be afforded the Government to implement its 22 pre-election pledges, and at all costs everything possible should be done to avert another wartime election.
>
> From this perspective, and in the light of its own record, the Government must be considered a failure. On that I am confident the vast majority of those

who voted for the Tory Party, are in complete agreement. We must, however, consider the record of the Drew Government in relation to the effect of its policies on Canada as a whole.

Attacks Drew Speech:

In this connection we must turn our attention to the radio speech delivered by Col. Drew over a Provincial hook-up on August 19 last. The speech, in my opinion, was the most irresponsible utterance ever made by a Canadian public man within my memory. It was, in the first place, a clear incitement to hatred against a neighboring province, but, worse than that, it was an incitement to hatred against one-third of our own Ontario population. I shall have more to say about the other implication of that infamous speech at a later date.

Furthermore, without the authority of the Legislature, Premier Drew during his recent mission to Europe made commitments clearly outside his jurisdiction, particularly in the field of immigration. At this point I should like to ask the Premier to what extent he has involved the people of Ontario in this matter of bringing in new immigrants before adequate provisions have been made for the re-employment of our own servicemen and present war workers.

The Premier's recent statement regarding the opening of an Ontario House in Paris has astounded me."

MR. DREW: It would.

MR. NIXON: May I ask if that Ontario House in Paris has been opened.

MR. DREW: No, that was never even mentioned. It is just another dream of his.

MR. NIXON:

"Is this a forerunner of further duplications of services already being paid for out of Federal funds?

Does the Premier propose to Balkanize Canada and give the impression to other countries that they must deal with nine Canadian jurisdictions in the fields of trade commerce and foreign affairs?

It begins to look as though Col. Drew aspires to become the president of a

separate republic of Ontario.

Just about 14 years ago I was given the signal honor of leading the forces which ultimately drove the Tory cabal from office in Ontario. While I no longer wear the mantle of leadership, I am satisfied to take my place in the ranks of reform Liberalism to rally the forward-looking people of Ontario against the new Tory menace, whether it be in the Provincial or Federal field.

Canada stands on the threshold of a great future. That future can only be realized if we are a strong and united nation."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Prime Minister has not this statement in his black book of "Hepburnism", I will be glad to send it over to him.

MR. DREW: I have it.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Speaker, we were smart enough not to leave the very able member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) in the ranks, and we took the earliest opportunity to again place him at the head of the Liberal members of the Legislature, and I am sure the people of the province of Ontario will again, as I have said before, take the first opportunity to place him at the head of the Government of this province.

(Page 2196 follows)

Now, there you have the situation which faces this this house tonight. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) was just as anxious as we were to give that measure of support to the Government under the circumstances which would make it possible to carry on the business of the province for the term of this legislature and certainly till awhile after the end of the war but, as I have said, that measure of co-operation was deliberately thrown away by the Prime Minister in that August speech already referred to.

Now, there are amendments before the house on which we are very shortly to vote. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Hepburn) has placed an amendment in five parts prefaced by the statement in his address, from which I quote:

> " And now at the outset of this session,
> "with the end of the war swiftly drawing
> "near, we find nothing in the Govern-
> "ment's legislative programe to suggest
> "that they are seriously prepared to
> "deal with the problems a post-war crisis
> "will bring upon Ontario.
> " We have no confidence in such a
> "Government. We take our stand against
> "the policy of unpreparedness for peace
> "represented by the present Administra-
> "tions at Ottawa and at Queen's Park, and
> "here in this House we take our stand
> "against the forces of reaction repre-
> "sented by the Conservative party

And then follows the amendment in five parts:

> "That the Motion now before the House
> "be amended by adding thereto the
> "following words:
>
> " (1) that the attitude of the Government
> "of Ontario towards the Dominion and
> "other provinces has not assisted in
> "creating conditions of national unity;
>
> "(2) that after more than 18 months in
> "office the Government have failed
> "to implement their promises with
> "respect to education, health services
> "and other important matters;
>
> "(3) that the Government have failed

"to forecast legislation that would
"assure adequate prices for farm
"products and security of farm
"tenure in the post-war years;

" (4) that the Government have failed
"to recognize the immediate seed for
"legislation that would provide union
"security and other collective bar-
"gaining rights for labour in the
"post-war years;

" (5)that the Government have failed
" to accept their own responsibility
"for planning and organizing the
"resources of Ontario to guarantee
"productive employment in the post-war
"years for men and women now in
"uniform and for those now engaged in
"war industries."

Those matters have already been discussed at length, Mr. Speaker, in this Debate and I think I am in accord and when the opportunity offers will vote in favor of that amendment.

MR. DUNBAR: Why delay?

MR. NIXON: The leader of this group has added to these 5 clauses in a sub-amendment consisting of two additional reasons why this Government does not enjoy any longer the confidence of the people of Ontario. In these words:

"1. That the Government has reversed our tradi-
"tional policy of non-sectarian public schools
"by introducing a programe of religious education
"which has caused disunity among large sections
"of our people, and had thereby violated the
"cherished democratic right of each to worship
"according to his conscience, free from inter-
"ference by the State.
" 2. That the Government, without any mandate
"from the Legislature, has given ill considered
"encouragement to large scale immigration before
"providing adequate safeguards to assure full
"employment for our war veterans and present
"war workers."

The second clause in this sub-amendment, Mr. Speaker, has already received a good deal of debate in the house and it is not my thought to attempt to duplicate the matter any further and certainly at any length to-

I want to congratulate the hon. member from West York (Mr. Millard) who, in his splendid address on his return from overseas recently, dealt so effectively with this matter of the immigration policy of the government of this Province.

I did say in this same address to which I referred some months ago, if I may quote "The London office recently opened by the Government is certainly encouraging thousans of people to emigrate to Ontario." At that time I had not seen the literature being distributed by the Agent-General at that London office or I should properly have said "hundreds of thousands." Let me say emphatically that I am entirely opposed to encouraging immigration to this country until every man and woman in the armed services and war indistries are re-established in civilian employment at rates of pay and at hours of work that will ensure their enjoyment in the good things of life and until our boys come to maturity. We want no repetition of the conditions that existed in Ontario in the early thirties under the then Conservative Government of Mr. Henry. I cannot stress this too strongly--statement made yesterday that Ontario must not be flooded with immigrants from any source at this time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with the langauge of the sub-amendment I would like to pause for a very few moments-

> "That the Government has reversed our traditional "policy of non-sectarian public schools" &c, &c.

I believe the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor), and I am extremely sorry to learn to day, Mr. Speaker, of his illness-in his address to the House the other evening asked us how we would dare vote for such an amendment and then go back to our rural constituencies and explain

vote to the good church people in the rural parts. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no qualms, uneasiness in this matter. I think most of the hon. members of the house are church people and those at home are no different than we are ourselves and they are busy and they are just as broad-minded and anxious for the proper solution of this matter as we are in this house. This is a subject that the hon. member for Wellington, South (Mr. Hancock) said, that hon. members hesitate to touch with a ten foot pole. Mr. Speaker, I cannot see why we should shy away from discussion on such an important matter as this and now that it is before the House in the form of an amendment from this group I think that something further should be said on the subject, because although this new course of studies is only recently initiated, already it is causing wide spread discussion and disunity throughout the Province and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Resolution on the Order paper should receive the support of honorable members of the house. Now, this is not a question that can properly be solved by simply counting the Ayes and Nays on the subject because it has all the elements, all the explosive elements in it of the super TNT of which we have recently heard so much. It may be that in the rural sections at the moment there are more in favor of the course of these instructions that has just been initiated than there are those opposed, although I have not received any indications of it myself, and hon. members who have received resolutions or letters asking them not to support this amendment, I may point out that they may not be entirely spontaneous, because I know that the Secretary of the Ontario Educational Association has circularized the province urging the people to immediately write or telegraph your member of the Provincial Legislature to in-

form him of the endorsement by the group which you represent on religious education in public schools. All right, as I have stated this problem has brought about the spontaneous organization of the Association for Religious Liberty, and in the issue of the Toronto Star of February 6th, it reports the meeting in which that organization was effected and I find that many then present, and evidently one of the charter members, was my good friend from Bracondale, and she is even reported as having given her experience, certain knowledge that came to her of the great distress in families among the pupils because of the ill-advised teaching.

MR. DREW: I think, perhaps, in fairness to the member from Bracondale (Mrs. Luckock), without forcing her to the necessity of doing so, I should point out that the case she mentioned at that meeting took place long before that change had taken place.

MR. NIXON: It is certainly an indication of what we may expect in the development of this policy.

MR. DREW: When your Government was in power.

MR. NIXON: I have every hope, in view of this, that I may have the pleasure to-night for the first time of voting with the hon. member for Bracondale (Mrs. Luckock) in this matter. Now, I have no thought -- nothing could be further from my mind, than to treat this subject lightly, and I want to give the Prime Minister all credit for having placed this matter on the curriculum of the schools with the best intention in the world. It is just possible that in this, as in some other matters, the Prime Minister and Minister of Education, made a mistake, Mr. Speaker.

He is a new Minister in this Department. I have known many ministers of education, all of them splendid, good, fair men, and just as anxious to do the best by the youth of this province as our present Minister of Education, and they all had to consider this question because it has been up before for many, many years, and without exception they decided contrary to the decision reached recently. I am not prepared to say that they were all wrong and the present Minister alone is right. It may be that he is rushing in where angels fear to tread.

One of the first effects, I believe, of this new course is to change the attitude of our Boards of Education in employing teachers. In our own local school, those teachers during the time of my recollection -- we have had many, many teachers of different faiths and creeds, many Catholic teachers, although I do not think there have been but very, very few Catholic children in attendance at the school, and I do recall that the first French-Canadian girl I ever saw was the teacher who came to our local school -- and a very fine teacher, indeed, she was. Had she remained a little longer, I might have been able to acquire some knowledge of that beautiful language which she made so very attractive. But the point I want to make is that these teachers of various denominational backgrounds, have left their broadening influence upon the community, but I very much fear that if this policy is carried out, that one of the first considerations the Boards will have in mind will be the religious background of the teacher employed, and I think that that would be an unfortunate matter, indeed, to be brought about in the choice of teachers in our schools throughout this province.

There has been a good deal of literature placed at the disposal of the hon. members during the Session in connection with this matter. I have no thought of going into it in any detail at this time, but certainly the churches are far from being a unit behind this new course of studies, and I hold in my hand a copy of a letter addressed to the Prime Minister and Minister of Education as of May 8th, 1944, and signed by 27 ministers representing many denominations -- by the Reverend Mr. Jamieson, President of the Ministerial Association and pointing out to the Prime Minister the dangers involved in this new course of study, and I also have the editorial comments of many of our leading daily papers -- Toronto Evening Telegram, Star, Durham Chronicle, Kingston Whig-Standard, and others which hon. members have read for themselves and certainly at this late hour I will not quote. Also in the Globe a couple of days ago, in the column of that very popular writer, J. V. McAree, he deals with this subject and says in a brief paragraph which I have extracted:

> "Religious teaching in the schools or anywhere else must mean some particular kind of religious teaching, for there are as many kinds of teaching as there are religious sects. Obviously trouble must arise when any one kind is taught. But there is something else that can be taught which could offend no religious sect, and which would have all the advantages that are ascribed to religious instruction.
>
> We refer to ethics to the moral principles that are equally acceptable to--" etc., etc.

(Page 2203 follows)

Certainly those who have read the sermons, recently, of Rabbi Abraham Feinberg, Holy Blossom Tabernacle, will realize how seriously our Jewish citizens regard this new subject being taught in those schools.

Now, I want to make it very, very plain, Mr. Speaker, that we are not in any way criticizing, nor are we opposed to the religious practices that have been carried on for many years in our schools without serious offence to anybody, - the reading of the scriptures, properly chosen scriptures, without comments, The Lord's Prayer, - and we desire arrangements being made for instruction in religious matters by the local clergymen, and so on, and all those have been acceptable, and we are not suggesting that they should be changed, but I do submit that as this course has developed and has been placed in the schools, that very serious difficulty and dissension is going to be the outcome.

Many years ago a very famous Canadian said these words,—the Honourable George Brown, in 1859, said, "State religion in the schools will lead to an increase of separate schools. The separate system might gradually extend itself until the whole country is studded with nurseries of sectarianism, most hurtful to the best interests of the province and entailing an enormous expense."

No one suggests that our Catholic friends should give up the rights which they have under the laws of the country, but I think we would all look with regret, indeed, at any extention of the separate school system to others among our citizens, and I cannot expect anything else but that our Jewish friends, certainly with their well-grounded objection to the courses that have been placed in the

schools, will demand certain privileges if that is continued. My hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McEwing) will bear me out, in the discussion the other evening, that a very, very responsible individual from his riding gave an instance where in a section that was Lutheran they had come to the point where they could no longer tolerate the particular teacher and his method of interpreting this course of study.

So, Mr. Speaker, I very earnestly and sincerely urge upon the administration to modify this policy and withdraw this course of study from the schools and not let it become an issue of reglious or political nature, which might well cause disastrous results.

Reference has been made to an action by this Legislature of some years ago, when a very honest attempt was made by the Government to provide better and fairer opportunities for education to all the children of the province, but when we learned that it was causing dissension, rather than the purpose for which the amendment to the Assessment Act was introduced, we did not hesitate to acknowledge our mistake, and we withdrew the objectionable piece of legislation, and I hope that the Government of this province, in this case, before dissension reaches further afield than it has, will take a similar action and withdraw this course of study which, although offered, as I have said, I am sure, with nothing but the best intention, is working out similarly, as it did some years ago. I leave this with the Government, without any thought of attempting to make political capital of such a subject, that they will listen to the voice of Ontario in this matter, and act accordingly. I leave the issue with the House and with the Government, and

thank you, Mr. Speaker and hon. members, for your kind attention.

MR. JOHN H. COOK (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, owing to the lateness of the hour, I want to say I think it is only fair that I forego, at this time, my part in this Debate.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, as the House was reminded a few moments ago by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), I spoke at some length in the early stages of this Debate, and moved an amendment, since when an amendment to that amendment has been moved by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn).

I do not propose to speak in any way about the amendment I moved some time ago, but I rise tonight to speak to the amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn), and what I have to say will be brief, not because a great deal more could not be said, but because we are now drawing to the close of the Debate upon which the whole House desires a decision.

2. I shall first state the position of the CCF opposition in this Legislature, with respect to the subject of the amendment to the amendment. And then, before I conclude, I shall also say a few words on my own behalf. Speaking as the leader of the opposition of Ontario and the leader of the CCF, I have these observations to make: The amendment to the amendment, as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) has pointed out, deals with two subjects, the Government's religious education policy and the Government's immigration policy.

As to the paragraph about immigration, the view of the CCF opposition is that the present Government has ,

in fact, without any mandate from the Legislature, given ill-considered encouragement to large-scale immigration before providing adequate safeguards to ensure full employment for our war veterans and present war workers. We are fully conscious of the need for a planned immigration policy, with due consideration for the employment of war veterans and war workers, and we believe that in this respect the policy of the Government is to be condemned.

Unfortunately, however, more attention has been attracted by Paragraph 1 of the amendment to the amendment, and, in fact, this has become, in the minds of many of the public, the real issue, and perhaps the only issue raised by the amendment to the amendment. On that paragraph, I have this to say on behalf of the CCf opposition. It is of high importance, particularly at this time, and particularly in the land where we live, that we should avoid further disunity and division among our people on racial or religious grounds. The early history of this province, Mr. Speaker, was disfigured by bitter strife upon religious issues, and we want no repetition of those unhappy episodes.

We acknowledge that serious differences of opinion exist with respect to the new system of religious instruction in the public schools of Ontario. Differing opinions are strongly held, and, without a doubt, sincerely held, by many who support and many who oppose the new system.

We think it would be a tragedy for those opinions, so strongly and so sincerely held upon religious or other grounds, to be converted into the tools of political party warfare. It might lead to a still greater tragedy. In

that passion, prejudice and irrational animosities would be inflamed in the sacred name of religion, and in the cherished name of individual liberty. We cannot believe that the teachings of Christianity or any other religion would countenance such an unseemly quarrel in this province. Yet, such is likely to be the result if a party in power becomes identified with one side of the issue and a political party in opposition becomes identified with the other side of the same issue, a controversial religious issue.

So far as the CCF is concerned, and so far as it lies within our power, we shall not lend ourselves to partisan warfare upon any religious issue. We have people of many different faiths in the CCF, just as we have people of many different faiths living throughout Ontario, and we intend to govern ourselves accordingly, with understanding for each other on a basis of mutual respect and consideration.

We believe that this is not an issue for partisan controversy, and that it ought to be dealt with here, according to the individual consciences of the hon. members who are required to vote upon it, and we hope that view prevails in other parties, as well as in our own.

All the members of the CCF opposition are free to vote on the amendment to the amendment, as their consciences direct. This may seem an unusual course, particularly in connection with an amendment to a motion of no confidence in the Government of the day. We believe it, however, to be the necessary and proper course in the best interests of all the people of Ontario, with

3. respect to an issue having religious significance.

It might be added that the Ontario convention of the CCF, where rank-and-file delegates each year decide the policy of this party, has not passed judgment on this issue. It was not placed on the agenda, in the hope and expectation that no such issue would ever be raised in a province having people of so many different races and so many different creeds.

The hon. CCF members of this House know that I personally hold strong views on the question. I believe they respect those views, and they know I respect theirs. To each of the hon. CCF members I say, "Let your conscience be your guide."

Now, I have stated the view of the CCF opposition in this House.

And now, speaking for myself, there is much I could say in expressing my own view. To say it in a few words is perhaps impossible.

For my part, I regret that the Government did not make a more serious effort to explore the alternatives to the present scheme, alternatives which I believe might have led to very different and more desirable and more satisfactory results.

As the matter stands, I am faced with the fact, because it is now an accomplished fact, that the state represented by the Government of Ontario has assumed some of the functions of some of the Protestant Churches of Ontario. I do not believe that is the business of the state. I personally believe it to be harmful both to the state and to the cause of the Churches, for their functions to be merged in the way in which that has been undertaken by the

present Government of Ontario.

I believe that the teaching of religion should continue to be the work of the clergy and of their duly qualified assistants.

On principle, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shall record my dissent from the policy of the Government with respect to religious instruction in the public schools, and also with respect to its ill-considered encouragement of the premature immigration.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the lines are apparently clearly drawn. At last we have come to the end of what appeared to be an interminable Debate, and we are now in a position where all those charges that have been hurled back and forth, and all the expressions of criticism, lack of confidence, either mean something or do not.

When we assumed the responsibility of Government on the 17th of August, the year before last, we did so stating clearly what our policy was, and we proceeded to carry out that stated policy. We have heard a great deal during these past five weeks which has occupied so much time with just the same sort of thing that the public, who are here tonight, can hear. They will realize how much a great deal of that had to do with the business of the state.

But, we are now terminating this Debate on which any vote, which is not an acceptance of the Speech from the Throne, obviously, in view of the terms that have been expressed, is a vote of want of confidence, and which we will accept as such.

I must, at least, before I deal with the extremely serious subjects which have been raised, deal with the more humourous picture to-night. The Hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) has explained to us that all was well until I made a speech over the radio. And he has told us to-night one of the reasons for the ending of that cooperation, come what may, -- it is a familar expression of his, -- and he has recalled that I said that my one ambition in the political field outside of Ontario was to contribute in such way as I could to see a change in the government at Ottawa, to see the end of the leadership of MacKenzie King as the head of the government, and in his place John Bracken. By that, to use his own words to-night, by such remarks about the Prime Minister of Canada, which I would consider under the circumstances, moderate remarks, to use his own words of me "he shut the door in the face of every self-respecting Liberal". But, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) to go back for a short time and see what the Hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) was saying about the Prime Minister of Canada at that very time. At that time he was predicting, come what may, that John Bracken was going to be the next Prime Minister of Canada.

Now, if, in my case, it shut the door in the face of every self-respecting Liberal, I wonder how the sweet amity has come over that group, because, I must say through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) that I never called the Hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) a mud turtle. Now, we have sweet amity restored, and love is ever going to reign in the front group over there.

The Hon. member for Brant remembers the two occasions

on which he resigned from the government of the Hon. member for Elgin because he could not sit with him. On the left of the Hon. member for Elgin is another member who had to resign his seat in the government because he could not get on with the Hon. member for Elgin. And another member on that side resigned because he could not get on with him. But now there is love forever more.

Now, let me deal with the more serious aspects. I have no intention of reviewing the main amendment because it is, by the words of the Hon. leader of the opposition himself, a straight want of confidence motion. He made it so by the words immediately before the resolution, "We have no confidence in such a government"; so I need not deal with that. It is a straight want of confidence motion dealing with generalities which neither affect nor change that motion. But I am going to deal with the two subjects raised in the supplemental, because they were not covered either in the remarks of the Hon. ledder of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) or in my own remarks which had taken place up to that time.

Before I pass to those, however, I only want to refer to one thing mentioned by the Hon. leader of the opposition, a thing which should not go unnoticed. The leader of the opposition just now, in referring to that part of the sub-amendment which condemns our introduction of the present system of bible reading or religious instruction, -- call it which you will, -- in the schools, says that on this occasion the C.C.F. part of the opposition is free to vote according to their conscience because there has not been a conference of the C.C.F. to decide what they should do otherwise.

I hope no one in this Province will miss the significance of that statement, because if, by the course of the members here to-night, the vote that is to be taken forces an election, then let every person in Ontario who is going to vote know that the C.C.F., when they come in here, are bound by somebody outside of this Legislature.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, we are bound by a democratic organization.

MR. DREW: I have never heard a franker admission of the misconception of democracy which permeates the C.C.F. party. It is democracy to them when members who are elected to come here and do the business of the people of Ontario cannot do that business day by day unless they have a conference of people outside who tell them what their vote shall be.

Now, we can deal with these things ourselves as they arise, and we will.

This sub-amendment raises two new points, and we do not have to wait for any conference to decide how we are going to vote; and we will show quite clearly where we stand. The sub-amendment is worth re-reading, and I will re-read it from Hansard. I start with the introductory remarks of the Hon. member from Elgin (Mr. Hepburn):

> "I move, seconded by Mr. Nixon, that the amendment now before the House be amended by adding thereto the following words:"

"by adding thereto," -- so that this sub-amendment is accepting the amendment already on the Order Paper and adding further material to it. I mention that for this reason, rumours that pass about here are not always reliable, but sometimes, in the close associations we have here, there is some ground for believing that it may have reality

behind it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Not very often.

MR. DREW: Oh, don't be too sure. And there may be some reality behind a rumour which has been caught, something that if the sub-amendment of the Hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) is defeated, there will be a new sub-amendment from the corner to my right. Now, that, of course, is the liberty of anyone here. We have all had the opportunity of expressing our opinions, There is really no need for it. There is a straight want of confidence motion. Tear all the rest away and get right down to the fact that the amendment to our motion to adopt the Speech from the Throne is a want of confidence motion, which we accept in that light, and let everybody vote on that without letting us bring in a lot of sub-amendments, but let us have a clear issue on this vote.

Now the first paragraph of the sub-amendment of the Hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) reads as follows:

> "1. That the Government has reversed our traditional policy of non-sectarian public schools by introducing a programme of religious education which has caused disunity among large sections of our people, and has thereby violated the cherished democractic right of each to worship according to his conscience, free from interference by the State."

Then the next paragraph is:

> "2. That the Government, without any mandate from the Legislature, has given ill considered encouragement to large scale immigration before providing adequate safeguards to ensure full employment for our war veterans and present war workers."

Now, everyone is at liberty, seeing that there has been no convention of the C.C.F., to vote according to their conscience; and, that being so, it is up to everyone to do so. But, at least in voting on this sub-amendment, let us vote

upon the basis of facts as they are, and not upon the figment of some disordered imagination.

Now, I am going to put on record here exactly what I have said before in regard to the subject of immigration; and, while that is a repetition to many, it will put on record here, before the vote, exactly what the position of the government is in regard to immigation, so that there need not be any doubt afterwards about it or any misunderstanding as to how we voted.

That is something to which this and every other Provincial government should have devoted considerable attention. Canada has more than doubled its population in the present century largely by immigration, -- considerably more than doubled. Unless we are to believe that we will reverse our course for the first time since the earliest settlement created the beginning of what is now a powerful nation, then we must expect that at some time in the not distant future there will once more be immigration into this country.

KKK 1

3-22-45
Mr. Drew.

There are many who seem to think that immigration is a subject with which provincial governments have nothing to do. The fact is that both in law and practice the provincial governments have much more to do with immigration than has the Dominion Government. By the British North America Act, the provincial and dominion governments were given concurrent power to pass legislation dealing with immigration. That is still the law. But what is even more important from the practical point of view is the fact that provincial governments must, of necessity, assume the major responsibility for the social security of those who come to live within their boundaries. For that reason it is not only the right but the duty of this and every other provincial government to assure a type of immigration which will bring the best results, both for our present population and for the immigrants.

In view of some strange statements that have been made about Ontario's plans for immigration, I think I should tell you exactly what they are. We have taken the position that no large-scale immigration should be permitted until such time as the re-employment of our veterans and munitions workers has been assured. But with our confidence about the future of this Province and of Canada and our faith in its expanding production and prosperity, we are convinced that immigration will be resumed throughout the whole of Canada, and we believe that when the time comes for such immigration we should have plans which will assure the very best type of new citizens in this province.

As soon as we opened Ontario House in London a little more than a year ago, people began to make inquiries about the possibility of coming to Canada after the war. Those

inquiries reached such proportions that it soon became apparent that it would be necessary for us to establish some selective basis which could be adapted to whatever plans for immigration might emerge after the war. Throughout the United Kingdom, the interest in Canada, and particularly in the Province of Ontario, is so great that in spite of the fact we have never inserted an advertisement or notice of any kind in any newspaper in England asking people to call at Ontario House to place their name on record, nearly 25,000 people have called at Ontario House and indicated their desire to move to Canada after the war. When you realize that this has been done without invitation of any kind, you will understand something of the extent of the interest in this province throughout the British Isles. The applications which have been made are from people of the very finest type. Full particulars have been obtained. With the information which will be in our possession, it will be possible for us to assure the very best type of new citizens for Ontario whenever an immigration program is revived under plans agreed upon between the Dominion and Provincial Governments.

Our immigration policy is that and no more. We will take the necessary steps to fulfill our obligations on behalf of the people of Ontario, and of those who wish to come here whether it be from Britain or elsewhere. We will do our utmost to make sure that when they do come we get people who will be suited to life in this province and will make citizens of whom Ontario can be proud.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What was the date of that speech?

MR. DREW: I am sure the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) knows.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, indeed I do.

MR. DREW: Yes, of course you do, and you did not need to ask. But, nevertheless, as the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) well knows, this was on March 14th, and at no time have I made any statement which was not entirely consistent with that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. DREW: Now, I have said, and said in this Legislature, that this province has a right to know why the Dominion Government was refusing to enter into any plans which would even create a preferential treatment, when the time came, for men of the armed forces of the United Kingdom, who had served here in Canada. And I notice a report in the press of March 15th --

MR. WILLIAMS: The day of the great speech?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. DREW: We will keep all this right in order. I am quoting from a despatch from Ottawa dated March 15th, which quotes an interview with Minister of Resources Crerar, who said that he knew nothing whatever about my suggestion that there had been any reluctance or unwillingness on the part of the Dominion Government to give such preferential treatment to members of the armed services from the United Kingdom.

Now, I will admit that on the last occasion I saw the hon. gentleman, was an occasion when the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) and I were seeing more eye-to-eye, when we actually met the Cabinet at Ottawa, in the first months of the war; at that time I recall that he did not apparently really follow a good part of what went on --

MR. MILLARD: Which one?

MR. DREW: Mr. Crearer, -- oh, on that occasion the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) followed everything closely, and I can assure you that there was not quite the affection between the Right Hon. Prime Minister of Canada and the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) that there is now.

And because he may perhaps be forgetful, I do want to put on record his exact words to jog Mr. Crearer's memory, and I will ask Mr. Crearer, through the records, -- and in the hope that at least one of the newspapers may take the words I quote, because these words are from a cablegram regarding the decision of the cabinet meeting at which Mr. Crearer was present last April -- and this cablegram said that the Canadian Government was not willing -- I will quote the exact words:

> "Was not in favour of granting preferential treatment to United Kingdom service men, even those who were serving, or had served in Canada."

I will repeat them, so there will be no doubt about them:

> "They were not in favour of granting preferential treatment to United Kingdom service men, even those who were serving, or had served in Canada."

The date of that cable was April 28th of 1944. I give the date, so that Mr. Crearer may be able to check up and find out the circumstances under which it was sent.

MR. A. BELANGER (Prescott): May I ask a question?

MR. DREW: Yes.

MR. BELANGER: The cablegram says: "preferential treatment" -- as to what?

MR. DREW: I am, of course, jogging Mr. Crearer's memory. This cablegram deals with plans for immigration,

after the war.

MR. BELANGER: There is nothing mentioned in it.

MR. DREW: Oh, yes, there is. Oh, yes, there is. That is what he is dealing with, and if the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Belanger) has the desire to pursue the subject further, he will find where the Right Hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. King) was at that time, so he will perhaps know the reason for the cablegram.

Now, I am mentioning that for this reason; that we have had in this country many thousands of young people from the British Isles, and we have seen these lads amongst us here; they have come to know our way of living; they have come to know exactly whether they would like to live here or not, and those lads are anxious to come back here, and the question simply is whether or not at such time that there is to be immigration, they can have some preferential basis for coming here, and in view of the fact that this Government has a very direct concern in the problem of immigration, whenever that is opened up under agreements between the Dominion Government and the Provincial Governments, we have a right to know why they are not willing to do that, and we have a right to ask that they give these men preference, when the doors are finally opened.

Now, that is all I am going to say on the subject of immigration.

But I am going to say something about the other part of the sub-amendment, which deals with what has been termed a "departure from our traditional principles of religious education" -- "our traditional policy of non-sectarian public schools".

Now, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) has placed

great emphasis upon the fact that dissension has been caused by giving this instruction in the schools, in reading to this Legislature statements which would indicate what people are thinking about this, and it might have been helpful, perhaps, if the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) -- in view of his own personal opinion -- had read to us the results of the Trustees and Ratepayers' Association of Brant County, heartily endorsing the present system we have. It might perhaps have been of interest to have had the result from the Brantford Local Council of Women dealing with the same subject, in the heartiest terms of approval. And also of the General Ministerial Association of Brantford, with definite approval, without reservation, of what we are now doing. And also what has happened in Brant County. And those are only typical of what is happening in every other county in this province, including the county from which the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) comes, where the Ministerial Association and other bodies have approved the same thing.

That does not say this is necessarily right, nor does it say that a brief has been prepared, which is of a contrary opinion, that that represents any substantial part of thoughts.

But when the suggestion is made that pupils are compelled to submit themselves to sectarian teaching, that statement can only be made in complete ignorance of what the Regulations are because not a single School Board of Ontario is under the slightest measure of compulsion to have this Bible reading ormits instruction in the schools unless they approve, and it is significant that out of more than 5,000 school boards in this province only about 40 have indicated, for different reasons, that they do not want this course given. In most of those cases there were circumstances that had nothing to do with objection to the course as such but for other reasons of an entirely different nature. When the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon)-I know with complete good faith-quoted from material that was forwarded to himlast spring I feel that he was unaware that the very body which raised objections last spring is now one of the most enthusiastic supporters of this plan. The briefs that have been submitted to members quoted from a statement by the Interchurch Committee of last spring in which some dangers were indicated in the course. Why, Mr. Speaker, the books that have been put in the schools, with which this course is given, are books that have been gone over, amended and approved by that very Committee, Interchurch Committee, since then and amongst the tremendous number of communications approving of this course and urging that it be maintained is the very strong recommendation of that very Committee.

Now, again, in spite of that fact that it may pain the ears of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Jolliffe, to hear it twice, because I dealt with this subject at a time that many of the members were in the legislature, I am going to put on record again what I said elsewhere on the subject of religious education, because I believe it is

very pertinent to this amendment.

We have been talking about plans for the future and, Mr. Speaker, there has been far too great emphasis upon plans for the future in terms of dollars and cents without sufficient emphasis upon plans for the future in terms of the character of the youth we are going to build, and I wish to put on record what I said. There are plans for the future which are just as important as those which can be reduced to terms of roads, buildings, power or anything of that nature. There are other plans affecting human relationships which we have not ignored. One of those is immigration. And the other is the subject that we are dealing with now. It was as part of the training of character for the citizens of tomorrow that we expanded religious teaching throughout the public schools of Ontario, and last September made it part of our regular public schoolcurriculum. The regulations under which religious instruction is given in our public schools do not vary our traditional policy in this province in any way. They merely extend a policy which began a hundred years ago and they now make it possible to give this instruction to all pupils whose parents or guardians wish that this be done. As I have said already, no School Board is compelled to permit the schools under its authority to give this instruction. Any teacher who does not wish to give this instruction may refrain from doing so. Any parent or guardian may indicate a wish that their children should not receive this instruction. In that way freedom of conscience is fully protected.

I am not going to go through the various points I made on another occasion in regard to this but I am going to refer to the closing remarks of a statement I have made. We have seen dramatic evidence during this war of the strength of a simple and abiding faith in decent and honor-

LLL 3

able things. We must never forget, that terrible year when the British Empire stood alone against the full flood of Nazi power at the very peak of its fighting strength. And may I emphasize that to those who talk here in a slighting way about flag waving. I am not attempting to proclaim the fact that I have the most unbounded admiration for these people of the British Isles who, unlike ourselves, were in the front line of the battle during the year when this Empire stood alone and it is because of their fortitude and support from the rest of the Empire that we are able to conduct this legislature as a free forum here tonight. One of the main reasons for the strength of those people was because of the strength of character which underlay everything they did. There was little then to sustain British people throughout our wide world fellowship except some faith in a higher purpose which defied cold logic and the dreadful disparity of weapons and trained men. Because of that great historic fact and of the part played by one man to whom free men everywhere owe so much, I would like to end my remarks to you tonight with words which were spoken by Winston Churchill two years ago. They are words which you may take as a clear statement of the present position and the future purpose of the Ontario Government in regard to religious education in our schools, and I quote the words of Winston Churchill: "Here we have freedom of thought as well as freedom of conscience. Here we have been the pioneers of religious toleration. But side by side with all this has been the fact that religion has been a rock in the life and character of the British people upon which they have built their hopes and case their cares. This fundamental element must never be taken from our schools."

Mr. Speaker, as long as I am head of a Government

of this Province - -

Hon. Member: It wont be long.

MR. DREW: All right. Predict what you will the people of this Province know what will happen if by any strange chance the Liberals will be returned. They know that this religious education will be taken out of the schools. They know that the C.C.F. have no convictions because they are not prepared to say what - -

MR. JOLLIFFE: You are making a party football-

(Page No. 2225 follows.)

MR. DREW: They are giving a typical example of their estimate of our group. The position is perfectly clear, --

MR. SPEAKER: Order. If this interruption does not stop I will have to adjourn the House.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): We want the vote.

MR. SPEAKER: You will get it if you wait for it.

MR. WILLIAMS: Carry on. He is going to adjourn the House.

MR. DREW: Let me tell the hon. member, through you, Mr. Speaker, that I know that you served in the last war, and also the hon. member to my right (Mr. Dunbar), who spoke, also did.

MR. WILLIAMS: That is a riddle to me. I do not know what it means.

MR. DREW: I was not suggesting you said it. I said I knew you would know that, and would not make the remark thrown across to the hon. member on my right (Mr. Dunbar) by another hon. member on your side. It is not a riddle.

We have made our position perfectly clear.

MR. L. GREIVE ROBINSON (Waterloo South): The gentleman across the way has not the "guts", apparently.

MR. SPEAKER: Withdraw that remark.

MR. ROBINSON: Very well, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to withdraw the word. Intestinal fortitude is the word.

MR. DREW: I did not ask for any withdrawal, because we can judge his.

Now, we have made it quite clear that we have introduced a system of religious instruction in the schools which is neither final nor in any way put forward as the last word on this subject. And, in the front of every

textbook, as those hon. members know who have examined them, it is stated that these books are only provisional, and that the Department of Education will welcome suggestions, and that the books will be amended in the light of experience, and the Department of Education has welcomed, and will welcome, any suggestions in regard to anything that might appear to provide any cause of friction or that might possibly be presented in a better way. But, that does not affect the principle. We stand by that principle, and we will vote on that principle here tonight.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the first vote is, of course, a sub-amendment which includes these two points, and in view of the fact that it has been publicly stated from the very beginning that these books are provisional, open to any suggestions, to be amended and brought in keeping with that experience, then, in effect, this sub-amendment can only be a vote to take that course right out of the school. It cannot be regarded in any other way. We stand by that, and we will certainly abide, with the very best of grace, by the decision that is made here, because there is no group of hon. members in this House that has greater confidence in the judgment of the people of Ontario than we have. And, if the hon. members here, without even having touched the legislation that has been introduced or the things we have done, vote a want of confidence, we will accept that vote, and the result will be that the people of Ontario will have a chance to make their decision.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

NNN 1 3-22-45

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members, I have the motion, an amendment to the motion, and a sub-amendment to the amendment. I will read the sub-amendment first:

> "The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the amendment to the Motion for consideration of the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session, having been read,
>
> The Debate was resumed and, after some time,
>
> Mr. Hepburn (Elgin), seconded by Mr. Nixon, moved an amendment to the amendment in the following words:
>
> This House further regrets:
>
> 1. That the Government has reversed our traditional policy of non-sectarian public schools by introducing a programme of religious education which has caused disunity among large sections of our people, and has thereby violated the cherished democratic right of each to worship according to his conscience, free from interference by the State.
>
> 2. That the Government, without any mandate from the Legislature, has given ill considered encouragement to large scale immigration before providing adequate safeguards to ensure full employment for our war veterans and present war workers."

The House divided on the sub-amendment as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Alles	Acres
Anderson	Arnott
Begin	Bennett
Belanger	Blackwell
Carlin	Brown
Casselman	Challies
Dickson	Connor

Yeas	Nays
(Cont'd)	(Cont'd)
Downie	Cook
Duff	Daley
Gordon	Dennison
Grummett	Dent
Hancock	Docker
Hepburn (Elgin)	Doucett
Jolliffe	Downer
Kehoe	Drew
Kelly	Duckworth
Laurier	Dunbar
Leavens	Frost
Lockhart	Goodfellow
Luckock	Hall
MacGillivray	Hanna
MacLeod	Harvey
Miller	Hepburn (Prince Edward-Lennox)
Murray	Hunt
McEwing	Johnston
Nixon	
Oliver	Kennedy
Overall	Macphail
Patterson	Martin
Robinson (Port Arthur)	Millard
Robinson (Waterloo, South)	Mitchell
Salsberg	Murdoch
Smith	Murphy
Taylor (Temiskaming)	McDonald
Thornberry	McIntyre
	McPhee

NNN 3

3-22-45

Yeas	Nays
(Cont'd.)	(Cont'd)
	Patrick
	Porter
	Pringle
	Reynolds
	Riggs
	Roberts
	Robertson
	Robson
	Scott
	Steel
	Stewart (Parkdale)
	Strange
	Thompson
	Vivian
	Warren
	Webster
	Williams

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the sub-amendment lost.

I have an amendment as follows:

"Mr. Jolliffe moved, seconded by Mr. Lockhart.

That the Motion for consideration of the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor now before the House be amended by adding thereto the following words:

But this House regrets:

(1) that the attitude of the Government of Ontario towards the Dominion and other provinces has not assisted in creating conditions of national unity;

(2) that after more than 18 months in office the Government have failed to implement their promises with

respect to education, health services and other important matters;

(3) that the Government have failed to forecast legislation that would assure adequate prices for farm products and security of farm tenure in the post-war years;

(4) that the Government have failed to recognize the immediate need for legislation that would provide union security and other collective bargaining rights for labour in the post-war years;

(5) that the Government have failed to accept their own responsibility for planning and organizing the resources of Ontario to guarantee productive employment in the post-war years for men and women now in uniform and for those now engaged in war industries."

The House divided on the amendment as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Alles	Acres
Anderson	Arnott
Begin	Blackwell
Belanger	Challies
Bennett	Daley
Brown	Dent
Carlin	Doucett
Casselman	Downer
Connor	Drew
Cook	Duckworth
Dennison	Dunbar
Dickson	Frost
Docker	Goodfellow
Downie	Hall
Duff	Hanna
Gordon	Hepburn (Prince Edward-Lennox)
Grummett	Hunt

Yeas	Nays
(Cont'd.)	(Cont'd.)
Hancock	Johnston
Harvey	Kennedy
Hepburn (Elgin)	Martin
Jolliffe	Murdoch
Kehoe	Murphy
Kelly	McDonald
Laurier	McIntyre
Leavens	McPhee
Lockhart	Patrick
Luckock	Porter
MacGillivray	Pringle
MacLeod	Reynolds
Macphail	Roberts
Millard	Robson
Miller	Scott
Mitchell	Stewart (Kingston)
Murray	Thompson
McEwing	Vivian
Nixon	Webster
Oliver	
Overall	
Patterson	
Riggs	
Robertson	
Robinson (Port Arthur)	
Robinson (Waterloo, South)	
Salsberg	
Smith	

Yeas	Nays
(Cont'd.)	(Cont'd.)
Steel	
Strange	
Taylor (Temiskaming)	
Thornberry	
Warren	
Williams	

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment carried.

The motion is as follows --

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): The same vote on the same motion.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Yes, the same vote.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I will agree to that, if the hon. Prime Minister and others pass it.

MR. DREW: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried as amended.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I have a motion, Mr. Speaker. In view of what has just taken place in this House, I think this House, and the people of the province, require some time to consider what has taken place here to-night, and I am moving, seconded by Mr. Anderson, that when this House adjourns to-day, it stands adjourned until three of the clock of the afternoon of Tuesday, the 27th day of March, 1945.

MR. DREW: I accept that motion.

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I move the House do now adjourn.

MR. M. F. HEPBURN (Elgin): We have already had an adjournment.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think the position that upon the previous motion being approved, that when the House adjourned, it stand adjourned until Tuesday -- however, I move now and no doubt the hon. Prime Minister will second the motion, that the House do now adjourn --

MR. DREW: Oh, no. You are not here, and you are never going to be here. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

MR. BERTRAM E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): Do you know any more good jokes?

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): You will not be back here, anyway.

Motion agreed to; the House adjourned at 12.05 a.m.

- - - - - - -