

MORGAN BAKER, NORTH YORK M.L.A. APPEALS FOR UNITED EFFORT TO SOLVE OUR NATIONAL PROBLEMS

(Continued from Page One)

decrease to the farmers, and the large number who have installed in the last two years would still be without Hydro; and the millions that have been saved to the people would have been lost, and not a thing to show for it. I mention these things because our opponents will now say, "I told you so", and will try and justify their speeches and their attitude toward this question because of the contracts entered into a short time ago. I am not criticising the new contracts. I think those who negotiated for Hydro made a good bargain, but I believe, as I said a year ago, that Parliament is supreme. The people speak through Parliament — Parliament is the people. William Pitt, who will not be questioned as a great constitutional authority, told us that Parliament has the right to alter the succession to the throne; and Sir Robert Peel said, "I never would sanction the view that parliament is incompetent to entertain a measure that is necessary for the welfare of the community. If you would admit that doctrine, you would shake the very foundation on which many of our best laws are placed."

I hope the time will never come when the people of Ontario or Canada will be willing to take second place on any matter, provincial or national. It is the acceptance of that principle that opens the door to dictatorship.

As I said in the beginning, I am not criticising the recent contracts. Was not an attempt made to revise the contracts before cancellation, and a refusal on the part of the companies to negotiate on reasonable terms. Not until after cancellation in 1935 were some of the companies made willing, and they were made willing in the hour of the people's power through parliament. It was then that new contracts were made, satisfactory to the government and the people. After October the 6th, the rest of the companies were made willing, and accepted the same terms reducing the cost, eliminating the objectionable clauses, and prolonging the years for acceptance. Why, Mr. Speaker, we have accomplished the very thing we set out from the beginning to attain. The Government is to be commended for the good bargain it has made. I accept the word of the Vice-Chairman that there will be no increase in the cost of power, and intend to support the Bill. I hope the Federal Government will permit the export of power. I see no reason why we should not export power to the U.S.A., just as we do pulp or any other commodity, and the people of Ontario stand to gain one and a half million dollars.

Another matter of the utmost importance was and is the government policy toward interest on our borrowings and government bonds. During the war, large fortunes were made. Those who had money got more wealth. After the war they discovered there wasn't a safe investment in all Europe or America. These same men conceived the idea of loaning government's money. Their worries were over if they could get five and six per cent on government bonds. Prime Minister King, leader of the Federal Government, would not be drawn into this trap, and between the years 1924 and 1930, paid 257 million off the national debt, and reduced taxation in every department. What happened in Ontario? Premier Ferguson and his government allowed themselves to be dominated by these same money lenders—borrowed their money at large rates of interest—increased taxation in every department, and added \$35,000,000 each year to the debt of this Province. Not only that, but the Ferguson government encouraged the municipal governments to spend money. There never was a war that was not followed by depression, and the government should have followed the lead given by the Federal Government, setting the pace in economy instead of extravagance. What was the result of this reckless policy of our predecessors? Why, Mr. Speaker, when we took over the reins of office in 1934, it was discovered that it required 40% of our entire revenue to pay interest on our borrowings. 40% of all provincial taxes paid by the people went back into the pockets of those who corralled the wealth of the nation, and had more money than they knew what to do with. Again the Premier took his stand for the people, and backed by the government, fought the money lenders of this country, forcing them to accept a lower rate of interest. As long as these men could get 5 and 6% on government bonds, the farmer was asked 6, 7 and sometimes as high as 8%, and he had to give good security if he could borrow at all. Today as a result of the government's policy, farmers are borrowing as low as 4%. This certainly has

improved the farmer's position. The Building Industry was at a standstill. Today building contractors are busy because they can borrow at a rate that enables them to build, and sell at a reasonable profit. Thousands of men are working who were, and still would be idle, had we followed the policy of the old government of 5 and 6% on money. The government will continue its policy of cheap money, refusing the various issues as they come due, and I hope the savings will be used in a more extensive road programme and public works of various kinds.

Mr. Speaker, I might mention the government policy as it has affected our Forests and Mines, the Income Tax and Succession Duties. Sufficient to say that taken together it has meant surpluses where we had deficits, less unemployment, a balanced budget, and most important of all, a re-birth of confidence by the people in the government. Who wouldn't be proud to be a member of a government that has accomplished so much, and yet we are not out of the bush. The Industrial Standards and the Minimum Wage Acts have done much to appease labour in many districts. They have also helped to bring to time those heads of industry who gave no thought to the human element, who took advantage of a surplus of labour, and hired for as little as they could pay. The Conciliation Officer is also doing some good work. Where dissension exists in factories, he brings employer and employee together, and in a conciliatory way seeks to have them iron out their differences — a most commendable work, and meeting with wonderful success. That is the only way to settle disputes. The dispute that is settled with the iron heel can only prolong the day of strike and riot. Under the same administration of the Minister of Labour, this good work will go on in a way that will be satisfactory to both employer and employee—but those industrial heads who are determined to accumulate more wealth without a willingness to share profits with labour, can expect labour and the people of Ontario to follow them, even though it is necessary to follow them to Nassau. Another matter of importance to labour is that they should have some security against the day of sickness or some other cause that will force them out of the labour market. I believe that unemployment insurance is the security they are looking for, and I hope all the provinces will permit the necessary amendment to the B.N.A. Act, which will enable the Federal Government to pass a dominion-wide unemployment insurance act.

The unemployment problem is still unsolved — not as bad as it was a few years ago, and yet we find a large number of men and women out of a job. We have always had a number of unemployed. Those who are unable to work, those whose work was seasonal, and now we have some who won't work. My experience is that these are a very small minority. For them I have no sympathy, but I feel very strongly for those young men and women who are anxious for work and find life's hopes blasted because there is nothing to do. Is it possible that a country like Canada, with our vast area with all the wealth of our natural resources and a population of only eleven million, must tell young Canadians there is no place here for them to serve. The problem of finding gainful employment for our young people is too serious a matter for the political arena, and demands the united effort of all parties and all governing bodies in this country, both church and state. European countries are fighting for more territory, some place to put their surplus population. Here we have more productive land than we know what to do with. We have been educating our boys and girls away from the farm, until today we have a scarcity of experienced farm help. We should start now a campaign to put our unemployed young people back on the land. A balanced budget is very important. We can't go on piling up debt, but if we must choose between a balanced budget and the spending of a few million to start our young people on the road of service in the up-building of the nation, I think we should choose the latter. The setting aside of a definite sum for the express purpose of teaching practical agriculture and domestic science with a view to placing them on the land must be the final solution of our unemployment problem. The idea that a man who can do nothing else can farm is an insult to the intelligent farmer. Young people who are not afraid of work should be taught the necessity of good plowing, a good seed bed, the importance of clean and healthy seed, the depth that different grains should be planted, how to operate machinery, how to milk, how

to feed stock, how to grow fruit and vegetables, and the necessity of keeping the garden well cultivated and free from weeds. These are some of the practical points in successful farming. The Dept. of Agriculture is to be congratulated for the two year course in practical agriculture one may have at Guelph at a minimum of expense, but the 5 or 6 dollars that is needed per week bars thousands of young people throughout the province. The selection of a few farms in good sections of Ontario, supervised by practical men, to teach the young men how to farm will pay dividends in the future that cannot be reckoned in dollars and cents today.

And then, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of those who are unemployed, there should be a check on those who are holding jobs and don't need them. There are today altogether too many married women working, whose husbands are well employed and making sufficient to maintain the home. I know I am treading on dangerous ground now. These women will charge me with taking away their liberty. They will charge that this is a discrimination against married women. I want to tell them that their liberty ends at precisely that point where it infringes on the liberty of someone else, and I charge those married women with keeping single women who have neither work nor income in a state of poverty in order that they may surround themselves with all kinds of luxury and have a good time. How often do we read of a relief recipient being hailed into court and given a fine or jail term because they hid from the authorities a small sum they had put away in case of an emergency. I am not condoning this kind of thing, but I say their crime is a virtue in comparison to the married woman whose husband is well employed, and yet she too holds a job, while many of her own sex live in misery and poverty, walking the streets begging for work. I don't know how the members of this House feel about this, but I want the people to know that I for one would compel a registration of all married women who are working, with a view to putting a stop to this kind of thing.

The question of the beverage room is one that is being discussed a good deal today. His Majesty's Opposition are making a strong bid for the temperance vote. They would have the people forget that they placed the campaign of 1934, when they didn't dare discuss their record with the electors, and said beer was the only issue. Their criticism now sounds like Satan reproving sin. Some blame the Premier. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is just as much concerned for the welfare of the youth of this province as any man in Ontario. Some charge the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner with being the friend of the breweries. I will speak of these men as I have found them, and I will say that no two men could have given more genuine and kindly co-operation than I have had from them when in 1935 it was found that the hotel at Woodbridge was violating certain regulations. Their license was immediately cancelled, and the hotel closed. The rights of those municipalities that are wet as well as dry must be respected if we are going to hold a democratic form of government, and these men are doing their best to administer the Act with this in mind.

I think I voice the sentiments of every member of this House when I say I would like to see something done to check drinking among the people. If that is true, then let us get above party politics on a question that is not political but moral, and unite to correct what we all believe to be an evil. If the beverage rooms could be closed to the women, that would be a long step in the right direction. If such a step would seriously interfere with our tourist trade, then I would pick out and close to ladies those rooms that are less particular about the surroundings in their establishments than they ought to be. I believe too that we should have a course of temperance teaching in our public schools to warn the children against intemperance.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to have the same efficient service in every department that we have had since 1934, but if we are going to make progress, if we are going to make our position secure for the future, then it is important the people of Canada stand united. It is questionable whether the whole of Europe has ever been as near complete collapse as at the present time. If those nations are going to continue to spend on armament as they have this last few years, a terrible crash will come, whether they fight it or not. When that time comes we will be thrown more on

our own resources. That is why I say we must stand united, united among ourselves, united with the Empire, and united with those nations who still believe in and stand for democracy. What amendments to the British North America Act will be necessary, I do not know, but we must guard with a jealous eye any attempt to take away from the provinces rights guaranteed in the B. N. A. Act. The Fathers of Confederation built not only for their own day, but for the future as well, and dreamed of the day when Canada would be a great nation within the British Empire. It will depend on the attitude of the people of Canada in the next few years whether that dream comes true. Ontario can have no permanent prosperity unless Quebec enjoys a like prosperity. The Maritime Provinces can have no permanent prosperity with poverty in the Western Provinces, and so I say if some amendments must come in the B.N.A. Act to meet changed and changing conditions, it should be done by having representatives of all the provinces sitting around a common table, and there, in the spirit of conciliation, of compromise, and perhaps a little sacrifice, work out that which will be in the interest of the nation. It will be only natural for each representative to pull for his own province, but all questions will be settled satisfactorily if we keep in mind the words of Laurier when he said, "We are a nation of various elements, farmer, manufacturer, lumberman, miner and fisherman; a nation of English, Irish, Scotch and French, and each with his own prejudice, but there is a common spot of patriotism on which we can all stand, and the only true policy is that which reaches that common patriotism and makes it vibrate in us all."

And then, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to make the future of this country secure for those who are to come after us, a land where a man may think and worship as he pleases, a land of freedom, it is imperative that all appeals to racial and religious prejudice must cease. I hold in my hand a letter that was circulated prior to the election of October the 6th, not calculated to bring the people together, but calculated to divide the people for political gain. I know that during a political campaign we are apt to utter words we would not think of saying in our calmer moments. I have no desire to read the document, but wish to say that such appeals are as wicked in their conception as they are vicious in their tendency. I am not disposed to blame the Conservative Party as a party, but I charge there are those within the party who would be willing to sacrifice the peace and harmony of the whole British Empire for personal gain, and to secure for their party the reins of office. I think we should resolve to put elections on a little higher plane, rather than drag them down to the level of some countries in Europe. If this kind of thing is to continue, then we can only expect the Province of Quebec to retaliate, promoting trouble, the end of which no mind can foresee. In order that the minds of the children of this Province may not be susceptible to such appeals, I feel there are certain historic facts that should be taught in the public schools of this province. Almost every day I meet someone who is howling his head off, saying we should have in this country one language and one school. The B.N.A. Act sets forth very clearly and defines the rights of the people. You cannot disassociate the Act of 1867 from the Treaty of Paris of 1763. Until 1759 France and England had been contending for possession of the northern part of the continent of America. The dispute was finally settled on the Plains of Abraham, and this became a British possession. At that time this was Quebec. There isn't one child in a thousand that knows that fact, and it is surprising how few older people know. At that time almost 90% of the people were French Roman Catholics. England had trouble at home, and trouble was brewing with the Americans to the south, who were making a bid for their independence. England knew the danger and saw the necessity of making all these new citizens of French origin loyal British subjects. And so she said, "If you will be true to the British Crown, we will grant you every right and privilege you enjoy under the French government," and wrote in the Treaty of Paris, "your language, your religion and your customs," and went so far as to say, "No Act that shall be written hereafter shall take away from you these rights." The same words are to be found in the Quebec Act of 1774, "your language, your religion and your customs." In 1775 the war broke out. The Americans sent their agents into Quebec, who said to the people, "Now is your time to break away from England. Join with us for your independence, and we will make of Quebec the 14th state in the union." And the French replied, "We made a bargain with England,

and she gave us our liberty in exchange for our loyalty." Then these same agents said, "What hope is there for you, fighting against the three or four millions of Americans to the south, and all your wives and families driven out into the Canadian winter?" And these people replied, "We will sacrifice home and everything we possess for these liberties." When the war broke out, these people went out and fought under the British flag behind the old walls of Quebec, and saved this country for England. No more solemn covenant was ever written on the pages of Canadian history than that contained in the Treaty of Paris, the Quebec Act and the Constitutional Act of 1791. And yet there are those who would repudiate that contract for political gain. Again in 1812 these people played their part in retaining this country for England. And now there are those who say that separate schools was the price paid to bring Quebec into Confederation. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The price of separate schools was paid 160 years ago by separate school supporters, and that with their own blood. It was this historic background that caused the Fathers of Confederation to write separate schools into the B.N.A. Act, and it was this historic background that made Sir John A. Macdonald the chief friend and supporter of separate schools. To me these are important events in Canadian history, and I would suggest to the Minister of Education that the bare facts at least, should be taught in the public schools of the province. Such appeals as were made at the last election will no longer be made, because they will have no weight with those who know the truth. I mention this today, Mr. Speaker, because there are in the riding that I represent, as there are in many ridings, a large number of Roman Catholics who are separate school supporters, and I want them to know that as long as this Government is in power, we will not stop to consider a man's race or religion. He may be Jew or Gentile, Roman Catholic or Protestant — as long as he is a good Canadian citizen, he will have meted out to him all the rights and privileges that come under citizenship.

It was in a time like this, when there was general dissatisfaction throughout Canada — some sections talking annexation, others secession. The Western provinces were clamoring for free trade and the Eastern provinces, protection and more protection. The young Catholics of the Province of Quebec threatened to build up a republic on the banks of the St. Lawrence, and right here in the City of Toronto, the Orangemen had threatened to ostracize every Roman Catholic in the Province of Ontario. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, addressing thousands of young Canadians in Montreal, pointed out the danger, and after citing what had happened in Europe because of appeals to racial and religious prejudices, he told how the streets of cities ran red with blood, said to those young Canadians, "Let us resolve that never shall we introduce in this country the disputes and quarrels that have drenched Europe in blood, that in this country order and freedom shall forever reign, and all the people shall dwell together in peace and harmony, and the rights of the strong shall weigh no more in the balance with us than the rights of the weak." Hon. George E. Ross, referring to these words of Laurier's, said they are the echo of Wolsey's words to Cromwell, "Let all the ends thou aimest at be thy country's, God's and truth, and then if thou fallest, Oh Cromwell, thou fallest a glorious martyr." Mr. Speaker, it is this policy and this policy alone that will settle differences between employer and employee. It is this policy that will cause all the elements that go to make up the nation to have respect, one for the other. It is this policy that will unite

all the people in a common purpose and determination, giving us strength to withstand depression, and courage to march on shoulder to shoulder until the clouds that have and still are overshadowing the nation have disappeared, and we find ourselves in the sunshine of a better day and a more glorious civilization.

You can't recognize a natural-born boss. He'd rather hold the wheel and risk disaster than to feel safe with somebody else driving.



CHILDREN of all ages thrive on "CROWN BRAND" CORN SYRUP. They never tire of its delicious flavor and it really is so good for them—so give the children "CROWN BRAND" every day. Leading physicians pronounce "CROWN BRAND" CORN SYRUP a most satisfactory carbohydrate to use as a milk modifier in the feeding of tiny infants and as an energy producing food for growing children.



Dependable Milk for Your Table

Milk is one commodity you cannot afford to take chances on. You are wise to demand that your milk supply reaches you in the best possible condition.

You can be assured of a dependable supply by having our driver call daily.

Richmond Hill Dairy

G. S. WALWIN, Prop.
Dependable Milk & Dairy Produce
Phone 42 Richmond Hill

BROTHERTON'S Steamship BOOKING OFFICE

Special Sailings to the Homeland by Canadian Pacific, Cunard and Anchor-Donaldson lines at Lowest Rates. Photos and Passports Secured. All enquiries confidential. We look after your wants right from your home. Phone Willowdale 63J. Office Stop 6 Yonge St., Lansing

Phone 12 for
Towing Anywhere
— AT —
ANY TIME
Reasonable Prices
Headquarters for Goodrich Tires & Tubes
Automobile Accessories
General Repairs
CITIES SERVICE GARAGE
RICHMOND HILL