

GENERAL APPROVAL OF HYDRO INQUIRY IS SEEN IN ADDRESS

Argue Martin Expresses Unshaken Faith in System's Future

GOVERNMENT IS LAUDED

Voicing his unshaken faith in the future of Hydro, and declaring that it is "unwise and prejudicial to the public interest for criticism to be levelled against this enterprise if such criticism be levelled upon hearsay, rumors and misinformation," Argue Martin, Conservative M.P.P. for Hamilton West, stated that he believed the appointment of a Royal Commission to "investigate certain payments of money" would be approved by "the public generally," when he moved the adoption of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne at Queen's Park yesterday afternoon.

"This Government feels that it is a matter of paramount importance that public confidence in the affairs of Hydro should be maintained, and has adopted this method of probing all relevant facts," he said. "I am confident that the public generally will approve of this course of conduct, although for various reasons it is not to be expected that this approval will be unanimous."

Records Exemplify Success.

Detailing the extent of "the astonishing and amazing success of this great public-ownership concern," and citing facts and figures which would, he said, "testify to the almost impregnable position occupied by the Ontario Hydro System," Mr. Martin said: "The vast majority of persons and enterprises in this country were very proud indeed of their efforts if they could equal in 1931 the results of 1930. The Hydro Commission has done much better, and has actually shown staggering increases. Nothing could better exemplify the foresight and ability of those who guide the destinies of Hydro, and the strength and essential soundness of Hydro itself, than these records of its actual achievements, and I say that this House and this Province have faith in Hydro and in those who direct it, and believe that its future will be as brilliant as its past."

Laudatory reference was also made by Mr. Martin to the work now being carried on in this Province on the trans-Canada highway, and to the activities of the Department of Labor, particularly in "bringing together the manless job and the jobless man."

His belief that the outcome of the forthcoming Imperial Conference at Ottawa would be "a new future for the British Empire" was conveyed by James A. Sanderson (Conservative, Grenville), who seconded the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. "We all feel, I am sure," he said, "that no greater contribution can be made to the welfare of the Empire than by securing reciprocal trade among all its members."

Economy is timely, Mr. Sanderson considered, remarking that "it has not been popular for a long time for a municipal candidate to make a determined stand against public expenditure. He would likely be told that he was blocking progress and that more enterprising men were needed." He stressed the thought that, "in applying the principles of economy, a clear distinction must be drawn between luxuries and necessities," and remarked that the efficiency of public services must be maintained; that the farmer is anxious that the assistance of agriculture be continued, but that some curtailment of highway expenditure might be expected.

MORATORIUM BILL GIVES WIDE POWERS TO ONTARIO JUDGES

Permission of Judge Required Before Recovery Under Foreclosure

INTRODUCED YESTERDAY

Giving wide discretionary powers to Judges, who would be enabled to refuse or grant permission for proceedings for the recovery of principal, and also to postpone mortgage foreclosures, Attorney-General Price's bill providing for a moratorium of mortgages was introduced to the Provincial Legislature yesterday.

Originally scheduled to be brought down today, the bill was introduced ahead of time, since Colonel Price had secured the special consent of the House in order to get the bill in motion as soon as possible.

Act Is Retroactive.

Without the permission of a Judge, no proceedings of foreclosure or sale for the recovery of principal secured on mortgage, and no proceedings in court, whether or not commenced before the passing of this act, which is entitled "The Mortgagors and Purchasers' Relief Act, 1932," may be taken. Without such leave, no forfeitures under contracts for sale or purchase may be declared or taken advantage of, and no proceedings may be taken on covenants.

The section of the act, giving discretionary powers to the Judge, reads as follows: "On any application, the Judge may grant the leave applied for, or if he is of opinion that the time should be given to the person liable to make any payment, the Judge may, in his absolute discretion, after considering all the circumstances of the case and the position of all the parties, by order refuse to permit the exercise of any right or remedy, or may stay execution or postpone any forfeiture as the case may be, for such time and subject to such conditions as he thinks fit."

Security Conditions.

Provision is also made for additional security as a condition of the Judge's refusing leave, and for his discretion in fixing the costs of the application, which, however, are limited to \$15, where the amount involved is less than \$3,000. In cases where later circumstances render it desirable, the Judge would be empowered to suspend, discharge or vary the order. That it would not be essential for the operation of the act for the lands involved to be in the Province of Ontario is made clear.

Questions About Hydro

Pointed interrogation of the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission's contracts for Gattineau River power was launched yesterday by the Progressive group of the Legislature, under the leadership of Hon. Harry C. Nixon, with the filing with the Clerk of the House of a series of questions dealing with these contracts from the point of whether the power must all be paid for in United States funds, down to the matter of whether any commissions were paid or promised in connection with the negotiation of the agreements.

The questions, which will appear on the House order paper in the name of Thomas K. Slack, member for Dufferin, are as follows:

(1) On what dates were contracts made for Gattineau River power by the Hydro-Electric Commission of Ontario? (2) What was the amount of power, price and duration of contract in each instance? (3) Does each

contract provide for payment in United States funds? If so, what has been the total extra cost to date because of adverse exchange rates? (4) Were these contracts approved by Order-in-Council or validated by the Legislature? (5) How much power is being delivered on Gattineau contracts? (6) Has all power delivered been sold to Ontario consumers? If not, what disposition has been made of it, and at what price? (7) What commissions were paid or promised in connection with this contract by the Government, Hydro Commission or Gattineau company?"

Further questions, with respect to the Hydro Commission personnel, their remuneration and services, are asked by William G. Medd, member for South Huron. "Do the Commission duties require full-time or part-time attention of the Commissioners?" one query reads. "If part time, what other public offices do the Commissioners hold?"