

March 22

Drew Pledges No Unfair Advantage By Government

Assurance that his Government does not intend that its "rather substantial majority" should be used in any way that could be considered "unfair" came from Premier George Drew yesterday, when he concurred with a Liberal and a C.C.F. member that a private bill should be sent back to committee for "further consideration."

The Premier's pledge arose from an issue brought into the Legislature by Aurelien Belanger (L., Russell) and taken up later by Robert Carlin (C.C.F., Sudbury). As the Speaker called for orders of the day, Mr. Belanger rose and began an address on rules of the House, recalling their gradual evolution through years of democratic progress, demanding that they be respected, and finally reaching the real issue: refusal earlier in the day of Chairman J. deC. Hepburn (P.C., Prince Edward-Lennox) to call for a poll of members on a division of the Private Bills Committee.

Asked for Vote

Quoting Rule 102 (B) from House rules, Mr. Belanger said the Legislature was now being asked to adopt acceptance of the report of the committee, including an item which merely reported that a certain bill had been "deferred." On this bill, he said, he had requested in committee a vote when the members could not agree. This had been refused, he said. It could not, he claimed, be accepted by the Legislature now when combined in a report because the rules, which compelled taking a vote in committee, had been "grossly and unfairly ignored and flouted."

Up to this point it was apparent that Premier Drew was not quite aware of the full purport of Mr. Belanger's remarks. As they dawned on him, he straightened up quickly. When Mr. Belanger then moved an amendment to Mr. Hepburn's motion, and Mr. Carlin moved a subamendment, he glanced at the order paper and rose.

"I do not believe that, on the facts pointed out here, any member would wish this report accepted as it is," said the Premier. "I have said before that I feel we should be careful not to permit use of our very substantial majority here in any way that could be considered unfair. I suggest that this matter should go back to the committee for consideration."

Legislature Whittles at Pile Of Government, Private Bills

In a steady sweeping of the order paper, to maintain its record of not allowing legislation to pile up toward the session's end, the Ontario Legislature yesterday gave third reading to four Government bills, advanced nine through committee stage, gave second reading to 20, and second reading to six private bills.

Among important legislation were bills establishing the new departments, Travel and Publicity, and Reform Institutions. For the first time in the House, Premier Drew drew formal attention to Hon. Arthur Welsh as the future Minister of the former. He explained this department would be the one variously called "tourists and recreation," "vacation and tourism" and other names.

As to the second department, he declined to discuss its future head. He explained, in answer to ques-

tions, that the Government had within its ranks competent and able members from which to choose a chief. Rumor has been a present Cabinet member would assume the position, probably Provincial Secretary George Dunbar.

Premier Drew assured Joseph Salsberg (L.-P., Toronto-St. Andrew) that a true spirit of reform was the intention of establishing a new department, separating those institutions intended to assist and reclaim young offenders from "duties unrelated at present to that end." Mr. Salsberg had declared that the old department (the Provincial Secretary's) with a new spirit might do more than a new department not motivated by the "proper inspiration for real reform."

The bill, originally introduced by Mr. Carlin, provided that Sacred Heart College in Sudbury be permitted to become the University of Sudbury, with full powers and authority of a university. In committee hearing, the chairman had pointed out that a Royal Commission on Education was at present sitting and its chairman had requested no major changes or extensions of educational institutions until its report was prepared. Sudbury delegates had expressed anger at having been permitted to come all the way to Toronto without being notified of this. When some of the committee disagreed with Chairman Hepburn's proposal that the bill be "deferred," which often means indefinite pigeonholing, they had demanded a vote.