

7. The Hydro-Electric Power Commission

Almost all the hydro-electric power distributed in Ontario is produced by this Commission. The power is distributed direct to rural consumers, and to other consumers through municipal public utility commissions which the provincial commission closely supervises. The credit for the growth and economies of this system is shared by both the provincial Commission and the participating municipalities.

In the other provinces, provincial agencies of a like nature have or may exercise similar powers over municipal governments. All the Provinces, except Prince Edward Island, have special administrative departments entrusted with the supervision of municipal affairs. The first department of Municipal Affairs was established in Alberta as early as 1911. The Ontario department came into being in 1935. In addition, certain of the provinces have a municipal or local government board or tribunal. Each of the Prairie Provinces has an assessment commission, and each of the Maritime and western provinces has a board of commissioners of public utilities.

Generally speaking, the chief ground for criticism of these various agencies is their lack of coordination. This is particularly true of Ontario where, it is sub-

mitted, they do not sufficiently consult each other. One department recommends to municipalities the setting aside of a fund to provide for future replacement of equipment; another department advises that to be an unsound practice and contrary to law. Sometimes there is rivalry and jealousy between the provincial agencies. Because some of these agencies carry on their work without consultation with the others, their recorded information about the municipalities is not pooled and made mutually available as it should be.

Municipal criticism of provincial oversight is seldom heard. The members of local bodies change so frequently and municipal officials receive so little remuneration and encouragement, that they are eager and grateful for provincial guidance. The methods of most provincial officials who deal with municipal matters are to suggest, to advise and to persuade, in such a way that responsibility for local decisions remains in the municipality.

If the improvements in municipal administration that are being produced by this enlarged provincial oversight of Canadian municipalities are accompanied by increasing interest and competence on the part of the citizens who participate in that administration, democratic government in Canada is thereby gaining in effectiveness.

Manpower Mobilization in Canada and the United States

By JOHN J. CORSON

AS the war lengthens additional manpower must be found in Canada as in the United States. In each country that manpower must be squeezed out of

a steadily dwindling reserve. Yet, the needs of the armed forces, of industry and of agriculture must be met in each country. Winning the war requires that. It requires the replacement of all the young, able-bodied workers which are withdrawn from industry and agriculture for service in the armed forces. It requires

EDITOR'S NOTE: John J. Corson, now Director of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance in the Social Security Board, Washington, was formerly head of the U. S. Employment Service. His recent book *Manpower for Victory* is reviewed in the Bookshelf.

the supply of the additional manpower that is needed by expanding industries and by more intensive agricultural production.

In both countries the reserve from which this additional manpower is to be drawn consists of the same component parts—if markedly different in size. The component parts are four in number: (1) the women, young people, older people and physically handicapped who are not yet in the labor force; (2) the men and women who remain unemployed, including the Negroes and aliens and others whose labor has, as yet, been wholly or partially unused; (3) the men and women who are working in industries not essential to the war effort; and (4) the workers already employed on war work or in essential civilian industry whose labor can be used more effectively.

In the United States it is estimated that there will be 63.2 million men and women in the labor force—military and civilian—in July, 1943. Between the date when war was thrust upon us at Pearl Harbor and July, 1943, the labor force in the United States has been expanded from 56.1 million to this estimated total of 63.2 million in July, 1943. But the end is not yet! Between July, 1943, and July, 1944, it is now estimated that this labor force must be increased by an additional 1.2 million men and women.

This addition to our labor force must be drawn from reserves already becoming depleted. A total of 2.4 men must be inducted into the armed forces. In addition to this military requirement, our munitions industries must expand from 10 million in July, 1943, to 11.3 million in July, 1944, an increase of 1.3 million workers. From the total of those needed for military purposes and for industries, i.e., 3.7 million, there may be deducted the total of 2.5 million workers representing the workers expected to be drawn from civilian activities by rationing, shortages of raw materials and the general shrinkage of all civilian activities. The balance, 1.2 million men and women,

can come only from the first two component parts of the remaining reserve.

In Canada it is estimated that during the year ending March 31, 1944, 160,000 additional workers must be added to the armed services, agriculture and war production.¹ This number represents very nearly the equivalent, in proportionate numbers, to the 1.2 million workers to be added to the labor force in the United States. And in Canada, as in the United States, the additional number of workers required to meet war schedules during the next twelve months is to be added to a total labor force—in the armed forces, war production and agriculture—vastly expanded since 1939.

The additional numbers required in Canada, it is estimated will come from the component parts of the manpower reserve in approximately the following proportions. Approximately 130,000 workers will be obtained through the employment of more women and from the young men (of less than military age) and young women who are entering the labor market for the first time. The balance of this net increase will come from the further curtailment of civilian industries and the replacement of male workers in these industries by women, and particularly the im-mobile women who do not readily move from their home city.

Difficulties Ahead

Obtaining the additional workers needed during the next twelve months will constitute a more difficult task than the obtaining of even larger numbers during the past twelve months. There are five reasons why this is true.

First, schedules for the induction of men into the armed forces will cut even more deeply than in the past into the working force in industry and agriculture. Only the most effective manpower management will insure that these induc-

(1) McNamara, Arthur, *Administering Manpower in Canada*, Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science, Vol. XX, No. 3. May, 1943, pp. 269-70.

The Administration of Manpower Mobilization

Administrative Problem	Great Britain	Canada	United States
Of the total manpower the volume to be allocated to the armed forces, to industry, and to agriculture is determined by:	The War Cabinet of which the Minister of Labor is a member	Manpower Committee of the Cabinet of which the Minister of Labor is a member	Secretaries of War and Navy after consultation with the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission determine manpower required for the armed forces. The War Production Board determines the manpower requirements of war industries through its production schedules.
After over-all determinations as to the numbers to be allocated to each, what agency, (a) "calls up" those to be inducted into the army? (b) recruits those to be employed in industry or agriculture? (Induction and recruitment activities centralized in a single agency in the three countries.)	District Manpower Board Employment Exchange	National War Services Boards Local employment offices now known as Selective Service offices	Local Selective Service boards. Local public employment offices.
To what agency may the individual appeal from a determination that:	(1) Local Tribunals for conscientious objectors (2) 44 District Manpower Boards for occupational deferment (3) Military Service (Hardship) Committees	Regional National War Services Board	Local Selective Service board.
(a) he is to serve in the armed forces?	Local Appeal Boards set up through local employment committees of employment exchanges	Regional National War Services Board	Area Management Labor Committees (workers may be requested to comply; they are not as yet compelled to obey).
(b) he is to move from one job to another or to remain in a job? In mobilizing the added manpower required for essential industry what agency is responsible for mobilizing each of the available reserves:	Employment Exchanges "call up" registered women and orders who, by law, must serve where needed	Registration does not yet include women who are unemployed or not gainfully employed except for voluntary registration	Local employment offices advertise for, appeal to and seek these workers; simultaneously private employers seek these same workers directly
(a) New entrants into the labor force; i.e., women, young people, older people	Employment Exchange	Local Selective Service office	Local public employment offices
(b) Workers not generally employed; i.e., Negroes, aliens, physically handicapped	With all labor reserves practically exhausted, including the curtailment or elimination of less essential activities these two activities become one	Local Selective Service office	Local public employment offices offer jobs to workers located through occupational questionnaires; their offers are supported by general appeals by local War Manpower Commission Management— Labor Committees
(c) Workers still employed in less essential activities who must be transferred to essential war activities	They are performed by the Labor Supply Inspectors	No organized effort yet established other than encouragement of in-plant training	No organized effort yet established; training within Industry Division and U. S. Employment Service aid employers on breaking down and upgrading workers
(d) Workers employed in essential war activities whose time and efforts are not used at maximum capacity	Ministry of Labor	National Selective Service System	Request by War Manpower Commission
(e) Workers in essential industries who must remain in their jobs regardless of their desire to leave	Determined by collective agreements nationally and locally, except in those industries which have wage boards, e.g. agriculture	National War Labor Board	National War Labor Board
What agency controls wages and salaries which may facilitate or make more difficult the recruitment of workers for particular types of jobs; i.e., "hard" jobs, "duty" jobs, etc.?	Employment Exchange	Local Selective Service office	None
What agency, if any, pays:	Ministry of Labor	Agreements worked out between Dominion and Provincial governments	None
(a) Transportation, and			
(b) Training costs?			

tions do not impair the productive capacity.

Second, the groups who were willing to move into munitions work have, to a large extent, already changed jobs. Shifting the remainder will require more direct efforts to facilitate or even require transfer. More workers will have to move larger distances.

Third, community facilities of many war production centers are already severely strained. Further increases in the working force in these centres will necessitate even more carefully planned expansion of facilities for housing, transportation, medical care and other needs.

Fourth, the required employment increase in war production will not be smooth and even. Some industries or plants will be laying off workers while others will be further expanded. These shifts reflecting the developing pattern of military needs cannot be predicted far in advance. They will require extensive transfer of workers and changes in the entire manpower program for specific communities.

Fifth, the remaining workers to be moved out of civilian industries into war production are in general the least adaptable portion of the labor forces. Extensive training will be necessary to fit them for their new jobs.

There then is the problem. It is the same, or at least a similar problem, in each country. A substantial additional number of workers must be added to an already expanded labor force to meet the demands of waging war. This additional number of workers must be derived from manpower reserves which are already nearing depletion. In each country there are now at work in the armed forces or industry a larger proportion of the total population than has ever previously been employed.

Machinery and Methods

How then is the additional manpower to be obtained? The answer must be in terms of machinery for manpower mobilization and of the methods to be used in mobilizing additional men and women

to serve either in the forces, in industry or on farms. In the accompanying table there is provided a comparative analysis of the job to be done, its relationship (where pertinent) with war production planning, and the governmental machinery established in Great Britain, Canada and the United States to perform each part of the job.²

The methods and machinery this chart depicts are dynamic institutions. They are changing now almost from day to day. Hence, it will doubtless be true that inaccuracies in this chart can now be pointed out. Yet, the cardinal difference that it depicts remains substantial and significant.

The problem of manpower mobilization is, as one writer has indicated, "the result of the essential conflict between democracy and war. It is difficult to have both at the same time."³ The problem focuses on the extent to which each of these three great democratic nations have chosen to use compulsion in the mobilization of men and women when and where they are needed. The policy in the United States has continued to the present to be nominally that no compulsion shall be exercised in the mobilization of men and women for jobs either in industry or in agriculture. In contrast, in Great Britain, and to an increasing degree in Canada, it has been found necessary and desirable to obtain more efficient use of scarce supplies of manpower by resorting to the compulsory assignment of manpower where needed. The British people essentially take the position: "How do I know where I am needed? Who knows but the government whether I should be in an aircraft plant or in a shipyard or in the armed services?" So they authorize their government to tell each citizen where his services should be employed.

From the sidelines the most significant contrast to be noted between the experience in Canada and in the United States

(2) See also *Wage and Manpower Controls in Canada*, by Bryce M. Stewart; Personnel Management Series, No. 59, 1942; American Management Association.

(3) Ogburn, W. F. *The New York Times*, May 9, 1943.

to date in the mobilization of manpower, is the greater use made in Canada of direct compulsion upon employers and employees in mobilizing manpower for industry and agriculture and the lesser or later use made of direct compulsion in mobilizing manpower for the armed forces. In succession, the issuance of the War-time Salaries Order in November, 1941, the establishment of the National Selective Service in March, 1942, the amendment of the National Selective Service Regulations September 1, 1942, and the issuance by the Minister of Labour on April 24 of the orders in council providing the procedure for the compulsory transfer from less essential to more essential employment⁴ have represented the forthright acceptance in Canada of the necessity of governmental direction and control over the role of each citizen in the war effort.⁵ Through employment stabilization agreements

established in most urban centres of war industry similar controls have been exerted, within the limits of these communities, in the United States. They have been obtained, however, through agreement by employers and labor in the area affected. As yet each successive proposal that government in the United States be authorized by legislation comparable to the Canadian National Selective Service Act to see that each citizen serves where needed has been defeated or deferred.

In the post war period comparative appraisal of methods used for manpower mobilization and their relative success in these two democratic countries will offer a significant analysis of democratic processes. Before then, however, it is to be hoped that the experience in each country with manpower mobilization will enable us to cope with the equally difficult tasks of demobilization with less hesitation and uncertainty.

(4) As described in *The Labour Gazette*, Vol. XLIII, Nov. 4, April, 1943, pp. 449-50.

(5) See also *Canadian Regulations for Employment of Civilians*, *Monthly Labour Review*, Vol. 56, No. 4, April, 1943, pp. 673-677.

Ten Years of Tennessee Valley Authority*

By JOSEPH S. RANSMEIER

ONE of the most interesting proposals of the recent "American Beveridge Plan"¹ prepared by the National Resources Planning Board, was for establishment of joint public-private corporations to administer certain businesses in which the federal government will be deeply involved at the close of the war. Another suggestion of the report was for establishment of a number of regional public authorities to deal with the problems of conservation and development of natural resources

within drainage basin areas. In the light of these proposals it may be timely to survey the program of the TVA the nation's first great regional public corporation, which this spring is celebrating its tenth birthday.

The passage of the TVA act by Congress and the signing of this measure by President Roosevelt on May 18, 1933 terminated a legislative debate as to federal policy on the Tennessee River which dated from the conservation struggle at the turn of the century. The controversy had become particularly severe after the first World War had left as a legacy a great half-finished hydroelectric-air nitrate project at Muscle Shoals near Florence, Alabama. Partisans, on the one side, had urged that the government should dispose of this plant to the highest bidder; advocates on the other had urged that the

EDITOR'S NOTE: Jos. S. Ransmeier, Ph.D., holder of a Brookings Fellowship, worked for a year as an interne at the Tennessee Valley Authority in Knoxville. Before enlisting he was for two years at Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, an instructor in Economics.

*For information here presented which has not before been published the author is indebted to the kindness of the Tennessee Valley Authority. For a more complete treatment of the same subject see *The Tennessee Valley Authority* by Joseph S. Ransmeier (Nashville: The Vanderbilt Press, 1942)

1. The plan is discussed in an article by Eveline Burns on p. 190