

tirely to recital of events that had occurred during the interim, events which, he contended, no newspaper would think of in any other light than "stale news."

Swinging back to the work of the 1930 session, he assailed the Government for passing a lot of legislation which was not in the public interests.

"Last year," he announced, "the Government passed an Executive Council Act—I can see that some of the members recall it. This act increased their salaries by \$2,000, until they now get \$12,000 a year. Not content that this act became effective on April 3, 1930, they made it retroactive, if you please, to Nov. 1, 1929.

"It was pointed out in the by-elections how some Ministers liked to use such terms as 'ultra vires,' 'sub judice,' and so on, but I venture to say that no word was quite so sweet to the ears of my honorable friends opposite as '\$12,000 retroactive.'

#### Suggests Salary Cut.

"Now I respectfully suggest that we have this changed back to \$10,000, and make it retroactive. Surely this new bunch, these neophytes on the Treasury benches, are not worth what the old got. They should not want to start off on the same rung, attained after years of climbing, as their predecessors, and I think most people in Ontario today would admit that the Cabinet was well paid at \$10,000 apiece. Goodness only knows where some of them will get one-third of it when they look for jobs when the electorate gets a chance at them.

"It is written on the wall, Mr. Speaker. A prominent Toronto paper suggested editorially that the old chief was the one that made a lot of ciphers look like a million dollars. I would not care to go quite as far as that.

"When this action has been taken and we are back where we were last session in the matter of salaries, I am prepared to recommend, and cheerfully accept, in view of the serious situation in which the country finds itself today, an all-round reduction of 10 per cent. This might well apply to all of the higher-paid officials in the Civil Service—say, to those receiving over \$3,500—but certainly not to apply in this way to our Liquor Commissioners. Their salaries should be cut straight in half, and then the 10 per cent. reduction applied.

"New Zealand, you have noticed, has taken similar action. The Federal Government are disposing of their limousines, and I believe it is high time for this Government to take action along the lines I have suggested.

"Another law which we should repeal is that requiring a \$200 deposit to be made by all candidates for election. This law can do no good, and might seriously embarrass, at the present time, the entrance of very proper individuals to an election contest.

#### Plight of Farmers.

"I know that if we were to continue for another three years under the scourge of the Federal Government policy and this Government taxation, it would be a difficult matter to find an independent farmer who has this amount of money to put up in addition to the costs of an election. It may be different, of course, for those so fortunate as to be attached to the Conservative Association, with its alleged campaign funds, but the bona fide candidate in this Province has always been amply protected by the requirement of 100 signatures to his nomination paper, and I am certain that, in the minds of the vast majority of the people, it is ample security today."

Speaking briefly of the Attorney-General's earlier announcement of a Commission to administer the Security Frauds Act, Mr. Nixon said that, "after a year of stewing in his own juice, and after the special parboiling handed to him in the recent by-elections," the Attorney-General had thought it well to make this transfer.

Mr. Nixon called attention of the House to his advocacy at the 1930 session of a one-man Commission to handle the act, and added that when he had made the proposal the Attorney-General and the then Prime Minister, Mr. Ferguson, had poohpoohed

it. "Certainly," said he, "there was no indication before the House at that time that this Commission—as the Attorney-General claims—was contemplated by the Government."

#### Away From Criticism.

The Attorney-General was very anxious last year, he stated, to retain for himself all the kudos of the Security Frauds legislation, but when the criticism became "severe, and justifiably so," he was quite ready to point out that most of the administration of the law came under the Provincial Secretary. Urging the appointment of a Commission, Mr. Nixon warned that it should not be a board with several members, but a one-man Commission.

"I suppose," he added, "it would be too much to ask that this Commissioner be not a partisan; but if the right person is appointed, he would be as much above suspicion of party favoritism as any Judge upon the Bench, which certainly cannot be said of the administration of the Attorney-General or any other member of the Crown.

"Another act passed last year was the Milk Act. I opposed this strongly at the time, and am now more opposed than ever, now that it has been put into operation. This Legislature, if it has any function to perform, should do the legislating, and not give the Cabinet Council blanket power to legislate by Order-in-Council and Regulation, and I hope that under this new Administration there will be a change of policy in this regard.

"When I pointed out to the Prime Minister last year the objectionable features of the Milk Act, and how it discriminated against the farmers in favor of the great, wealthy, milk-distributing firms, he seemed impressed, and assured me the farmer would be taken care of in the Regulations. Well, he was—just like the cat takes care of the mouse.

#### Leave the Farmer Alone.

"One thing I ask of the new Minister of Agriculture is this: If your department cannot do anything for the farmer, for heaven's sake stop doing things to him. Now, I claim the Government had no business horning into this situation at all. These matters had always been settled, and satisfactorily so, between producer and distributor. It was practically the only branch of agricultural activity that had not felt the withering blight of Governmental regulation and interference, and, strangely enough, the only branch that showed any profit for their work and investment; but it was too much to expect that these numerous and extremely officious officials of the Government could refrain from meddling.

"Although those lawmaking regulations were not drafted till September, and not made law till January, the great distributing firms knew what they were going to be as early as last May, and farmers were so advised. Evidently the dairies knew before the Government what the Regulations were. Well, the Regulations became law, and the following day The Toronto Globe, with remarkably shrewd insight into this situation, said editorially:

"Highly important changes in the price of milk and the system of grading went into effect on Jan. 1. Not only was the price paid by the dairies to the farmers reduced to \$2.20 per hundredweight, but the new Provincial act, which went into force on the same date, provides for grading and inspection of milk quality in a manner which may seriously affect the income of the farmer.

"The statement of one of the dairy Presidents throws some light on the importance of the changes. Mr. J. A. Caulder, President of the Dairy Corporation of Canada, Limited, says:

"If a man sends in 3.3 milk he will be docked four cents and get \$2.16. If he sends in 3.5 milk he will get an additional four cents, or \$2.24."

"Obviously the new system provided by the Ontario Government will need to be carefully scrutinized if justice is to be guaranteed to the farmer. The inspectors who are to grade the milk under the new act are ostensibly civil servants. But they are to be paid by the dairy corporations. There is an old adage to the effect that 'the man

who pays the piper calls the tune." The Henry Government will therefore need to be especially vigilant to protect milk producers against victimization, and to guard zealously against undergrading and to make sure that milk which enters the dairy as 3.3 does not become standard grade immediately after inspection.

"There is every reason to believe that the new act was framed in an earnest attempt to better conditions for all concerned. But the possible disadvantages and dangers to the farmer are self-evident. The dairy farmers are already working under conditions which border on the unbearable. Their interests deserve even more energetic championing than would ordinarily be the case."

#### Right Under Regulations.

"Then I notice in the discussion of recent producers' conventions that the companies are taking the right under the Regulations to say what proportion of milk they receive shall be surplus milk. Section 5 of the regulations says: 'Surplus milk or milk received at a distributing plant, but not sold or distributed for human consumption, shall be paid for on a straight fat basis. So we have these companies, days or weeks after the milk has been delivered, notifying the farmers that a proportion of their milk will be paid for only in this manner, at, I suppose, about 35 cents per pound butterfat, making for 3.3 milk \$1.15 per hundredweight for what the farmer expected to get \$2.16, and on which he probably paid 50 cents per hundredweight to have delivered. And there is also the suspicion: that some of this milk for which the dairy paid less than 3 cents per quart might find its way into the retail bottle at 13 cents per quart. This whole law, and the regulations under it, is wrong, playing directly into the hands of the great, wealthy distributing corporations.

"The people you need to protect, Mr. Minister, are the consumers in the city and the producers in the country.

"These great multi-millionaire corporations are well able to look after their own interests. Talk about the New Zealand butter, and what it did to the King Government. This act has cost the farmers affected \$10 for every 10 cents the New Zealand butter ever cost them, and, unless it is put on a fairer basis should have, and will have, the same effect against this Administration that New Zealand butter had against that of Mr. King."