

The Address—Mr. H. O. White

it got a problem off the government's doorstep. The government got rid of it for the time being. That may be a way to get rid of problems, but it does not solve them. The difficulty and the blame are still on the doorstep of the government. We have a commission on freight rates, but we also have the board of transport commissioners. It seems to me that they should not be afraid to go ahead and do the work for which they were established. The government should not pass over its duties in that way. After all, what is a government for, if not to carry on the business of the country? And the question of freight rates is the business of the country.

In the speech from the throne we notice that we are to have a commission which will cover everything from the cradle to the grave, and it will probably last until we are all in the grave. That seems to me to be another attempt to get rid of responsibility. Yet we come here and talk about such trivial things as the government chooses to worry us with.

I notice that they very kindly offer to return rental control to the provinces. If they wish on them a dead horse, the provinces will have to pay for the funeral.

I am pleased to extend congratulations to the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply (Mr. Winters) upon his appointment; it has proved to be a popular choice. We wish him well in the task ahead of him. It is a difficult one; and at this time I would point out to him, and to other hon. members opposite, some of the problems our people back home are worried about.

We hear a good deal from our friends to the left about the meaning of subsidized housing. All that subsidized housing means is that every farmer in Canada will not only pay for his own house but help pay for somebody else's.

I have another quotation from the *London Free Press* which I should like to place on record—and it may be that hon. members will form the impression that this is a pretty good newspaper. This is the report of a meeting of city council of June 30, 1948, when the mayor of that city used these words:

We have had several housing schemes in London—and they were schemes all right . . . That's all federal government building has been—one experiment after another, and the people are the guinea pigs.

They have a lot of high-paid help working on these schemes down at Ottawa and they have to keep those birds working . . .

The private contractor doesn't ask for anything. He goes out and builds a house and pays his taxes and is a good citizen of London. Some of these other fellows aren't; they are just fly-by-nights, and they are not interested in London.

The city contractor builds cheaper than a government contractor, and when he is finished you have a more desirable house.

[Mr. White (Middlesex East).]

I hope the new Minister of Reconstruction and Supply will take that into consideration.

Nothing was said in the speech from the throne about the creation of more consumer goods. So far as I could see, there was no reference whatever to labour. I did notice something about forest conservation, and that brings up an important problem, because we realize that in this country our forests produce an enormous amount of wealth. Much has been said but little has been done about that matter. The forests in western Ontario are rapidly diminishing.

In the setting up of income tax provisions for the future, allowance should be made for farmers who are prepared to set aside certain areas of their land for the development of wood lots. Hon. members will realize, as I do, that any farmer who will set aside a tenth or some other fraction of his acreage will not in his lifetime reap any great benefit from so doing. He will be dead and gone; but the generations following him will reap the benefits of his foresight. For these reasons I say that provision should be made in the income tax regulations to take care of planning of this kind. If the government were to do the same type of work on the same land, someone would be paid for it; but it expects the farmer to do this work for nothing.

I do not happen to be a lawyer, and for that reason what I shall say about the law must be limited. However, the changes made last year in the Criminal Code will be costly to the counties in Ontario. I refer to the amendment permitting trial by jury of petty offences. Costs will be extensively increased.

This is what Judge Ian MacRae said to county council in London, Ontario, respecting this matter:

Wednesday night council heard Judge Ian MacRae outline the changes in the code, which would give persons charged with theft, false pretences, receiving and retaining stolen goods under a value of \$25, assault (including assault occasioning bodily harm and common assault), obstructing a police officer, keeping a disorderly house and betting offences, the privilege to elect trial by judge and jury, or by a county judge only.

He pointed out that if those so charged were allowed to elect trial by jury, it would slow up procedure and delay justice.

Nothing is causing greater worry to the people of Canada today than the matter of taxation; therefore I shall take a moment or two to discuss this important problem.

I have before me a further quotation from the words of Benjamin Franklin, which, I suggest, we might well take to heart. He said back in 1758, a long time ago:

Friends and neighbours, the taxes are indeed very heavy, and if those laid on by the government were the only ones we had to pay, we might more easily discharge them; but we have many others, and much