

SUM FOR LABOR IS INADEQUATE, MILLARD HOLDS

Expansion of the Labor Department estimates of \$437,231, which he felt necessary if the department was to carry on the extensive work allotted to it, was advocated in the Legislature yesterday by C. H. Millard (C.C.F., York West). Mr. Millard compared the Labor Department estimates with the \$2,453,000 for agriculture and criticized also the Labor Department report for its brevity—59 pages. It compared, he said, with the report on prisons and the Niagara Falls parks.

"I'm serving warning on the House," said Mr. Millard, "that we've got to have more money and more effort in the Labor Department."

Mr. Millard did not believe the department could carry on its work adequately on the allowance stated in the estimates.

Not Spending Enough.

"We're not spending enough money," he said, "to deal with the industrial workers in this Province as they should be dealt with." He did not see how sufficient staff, inspectors and conciliation officers could be employed under the announced budget.

Discussion of the Insurance Department estimates brought from William Dennison (C.C.F., Toronto-St. David) a suggestion for a municipal fire insurance scheme. He pointed out that Toronto in 25 years had paid out \$2.3 million in fire insurance and got back only \$442,000. If Toronto had instituted such a scheme in 1911, he said, the interest would have covered fire losses and the city would have had \$3 million.

French-Canadian Protest.

Passing of a \$15,000 estimate for the Royal Commission inquiry on agriculture, which so far has cost \$20,000, brought criticism from Aurelien Belanger (L., Prescott) for the Government's failure to appoint a French-Canadian to the commission. Premier Drew replied that appointments had been based on recommendation of agricultural interests themselves, but agreed that he would discuss with Agricultural Minister T. L. Kennedy, who is ill, appointment of a French-Canadian member. "No slight was intended," the Premier said.

Robert Laurier (L., Ottawa East) joined Mr. Belanger in his criticism. Discussion caused A. H. Acres (P.C., Carleton) to comment on a Minister of Agriculture in the Hepburn Cabinet: "Senator Duncan Marshall was one of the worst four-flushers who ever sat in the Legislature."

Report of the commission is expected soon and will be sent to the members, the Premier told the House. The commission is a fact-finding body which will not continue indefinitely, the Premier said.

USE OF POLICE IN DISPUTES UNDER FIRE

Criticism of the use to which the Ontario Provincial Police force was put in connection with industrial disputes in recent years was voiced in the Legislature yesterday during consideration of the estimates for the Provincial department.

Answering the two Labor-Progressive members and other Opposition speakers, Attorney-General Leslie Blackwell declared that, in so far as he had a duty to perform to enforce the law, he would do so with restraint, with toleration and with respect to the rights of the individual. He proposed to do his duty at the time, under the circumstances which might exist as he saw it.

"I am not here to defend past Attorneys-General and their conception of what the duty of the Ontario Provincial Police was," said Mr. Blackwell. "I am not here to answer those questions nor to bear responsibility for what was done."

Opinion of Workers.

J. P. Salsberg (L.P., St. Andrew) said it was the view of an overwhelming number of Ontario workers that the Ontario Provincial Police was an instrument to be used against them when occasion arose. He was making no reflection on the individual members of the force, but their actions were dictated by policies of the Government of the day. It would create a better feeling in the Province if the Government could give assurance that the force would be used for specific and useful purposes and not kept for the purpose of repeating what took place at Hespeler and Kitchener and other centres where industrial disputes occurred.

A. A. Macleod (L.P., Bellwoods) said there was a lot of "ugly history" behind the use of police power in Ontario. He hoped the day had gone forever when police authority would be used in the fashion it had been used in the past.

Jolliffe in Argument.

C.C.F. Leader E. B. Jolliffe and the Attorney-General became involved in argument when the former charged that the Attorney-General had declined to give more than a general review of the duties and functions of the Provincial force. This the Attorney-General denied, and recalled what he had said in this regard when asked by Mr. Jolliffe.

Mr. Blackwell said that when the time came for the exercise of his authority he hoped the Leader of the Opposition and every other member of the Legislature would help by interpreting his duties fairly instead of agitating "if I have to enforce law and order in any labor dispute."

Mr. Jolliffe said the difficulty was that former Attorneys-General also did their duty as they saw it, but they saw it in rather a peculiar way. It should be kept in mind that there was a distinction between public necessity and some special private interest, he declared.

"There is also a distinction between what is public duty and what may be political preference or class bias," Mr. Jolliffe said.

A. A. Casselman (C.C.F., Nipissing) defended the members of the Provincial force, declaring that 75 per cent of the force sent into Kirkland Lake on the occasion of the strike became converted to union ideas.