



Legislature of Ontario Debates

Tuesday, March 30, 1971 — Friday, May 7, 1971



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, March 30, 1971, being the first day of the fourth session of the 28th Parliament of the Province of Ontario for the despatch of business pursuant to a proclamation of the Honourable W. Ross Macdonald, Lieutenant Governor of the province.

TUESDAY, MARCH 30, 1971

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having entered the House and being seated upon the throne, was pleased to open the session with the following gracious speech.

Hon. W. Ross Macdonald (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker, and members of the legislative assembly of Ontario, I extend warmest greetings and a sincere welcome to each of you.

Since this Legislature last met, we have witnessed significant developments in the political life of our province. On behalf of our Sovereign, I extend congratulations to the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) and cordial greetings to the new ministry.

Je tiens à vous souhaiter à tous une bienvenue des plus chaleureuses.

Depuis la dernière réunion de cette assemblée, nous avons assisté à des changements importants dans la vie politique de notre province. Au nom de notre Souveraine, je présente mes félicitations au Premier Ministre et mes vœux les plus cordiaux au nouveau cabinet.

The responsibilities of the new ministry will be many. Challenges of a nature and complexity unknown to us only a few years ago now affect the daily lives of the people of Ontario whatever their interests or pursuits, wherever their place of residence. A sense of rediscovery and reappraisal reaches to the foundations of our society. We pray that the members of this Legislature will be given strength and wisdom so that your decisions will yield greater benefit to all the people of Ontario and, in so doing, enhance the vitality, maturity and unity of Canada.

The demands and pressures upon us all during the 1970s will differ markedly from those of past decades. The men and women of Ontario are establishing fresh values to apply to the quality of their lives and to attain for their children a legacy which goes

far beyond older criteria of attaining personal material goods. To this end, the people of Ontario have indicated their preparedness to work, participate and make sacrifices.

This search for new values stimulates and challenges government to match the zeal of the citizenry. The structure of government must evolve accordingly so that the instruments of public service will continue to be perceptive and sensitive to the needs of the people and responsive to the requirements of responsible democracy. The government and the new ministry are committed to such evolution.

During this fourth session of the 28th Parliament of Ontario, the government will place before you an extensive programme in response to the requirements of life in Ontario during the 1970s. The ministry will listen closely to the problems of the people and will act swiftly to resolve them. Policies will seek to expand and nourish individual initiative and private responsibility.

The current unconscionable levels of unemployment which have been forced upon the Canadian people will be combatted with every means at the disposal of this provincial government. The budget will be presented on April 26. Its purpose will be to restore the inherent vitality of our economy so far as this is within provincial competence. This vitality is of extreme importance to the economic prospects of all areas of Canada.

Already several programmes, providing 12,000 immediate new jobs in Ontario, have been announced as part of the government's drive to relieve unemployment. The resources of many departments will be directed to providing further employment opportunities.

To combat unemployment and to provide for the needs of our people, the government will commence a new home construction programme. Using funds generated from the private sector and the governments of Canada and Ontario, one half billion dollars will be injected into the economy of the province. This will establish a potential for 132,000

jobs during the next year, the construction of 30,000 units of housing and shelter for 90,000 people.

Summer employment for students will also require increased government assistance. Programmes have been created to enable students to demonstrate their personal initiative, respond to their concern about the environment and acquire funds which will permit their education to be continued. Some 14,000 young people will be employed this summer by the Ontario public service, a substantial increase from previous years. Among these will be 2,000 participating in the Students Working in an Environmental Enhancement Programme. As participants in this programme, to be known as SWEEP, young people will clean up land, streams and lakeshores, plant trees and maintain parks.

Maintaining a healthy climate for both Canadian and foreign investors is essential to the economy of Ontario and the full employment of our working force. At the same time, the government believes that the people of Ontario should have at hand the means whereby our own economic, cultural and social objectives and priorities are determined in Canada by Canadians.

So that we may more clearly understand the effects of participation in our economy by non-Canadian investors and companies, and so that solutions in this clouded area do not race ahead of adequate and unemotional analysis, the government will convene a conference on foreign investment. Representatives of all segments of the community and the federal and other provincial governments will be invited to take a full and active part in the deliberations. Through this conference, the government seeks to bring together the knowledge and experience available from all possible sources in the assessment of the implications of foreign investment.

Immediate steps will be taken to enhance opportunities for Canadians to participate in the development of Ontario. The government will give preference to Canadian-owned businesses seeking grants and loans under the various incentive programmes. To further encourage Canadian enterprise and ownership, a venture capital fund will be established to assist in the financing of small businesses which have exceptional potential but which involve greater risks than are acceptable to conventional lending institutions. Additional assistance will be provided to small businesses to develop technology and products. Increased emphasis will be placed on helping industries in such areas as environmental services, transportation, and data processing.

Existing regulations and standards of the Ontario Development Corporation and the Northern Ontario Development Corporation are being revised so that assistance will be more readily available to small Canadian-owned businesses and to certain segments of our service industries. A programme of immediate assistance has been launched to improve or relocate tourist establishments.

An advisory committee drawn from Canadian-owned industries will be formed to assist manufacturers in such matters as tariff policy, the changing structure of ownership of industry and multi-national corporate activities.

Detailed consideration of one area which could have a major bearing on our cultural development is now under review by the royal commission on book publishing.

To further preserve our heritage, Crown lands will henceforth be made available only on a lease basis. The government will thus retain control over ownership. Canadians will be given preferential treatment when Crown land is to be made available for cottage lots. Canadians will have one year to lease the property before it is offered to others.

As the last decade has demonstrated, and the 1970s will reinforce, the full enjoyment of our daily activities is closely related to conditions within our cities—ease of and access to transportation, equality of services in rural areas, adequate housing, readily available recreational facilities and the elimination of pollution. The government will take those steps within its power to create an atmosphere in which a high quality of living and other special and enviable characteristics of life in Ontario are available to all.

Present programmes will be intensified and new approaches will be sought to eliminate pollution and prevent further contamination. By court and other actions, the government has already indicated its determination to enforce its policies and is examining other means by which those who pollute can be made to pay for the damage they create. To achieve this objective, all provincial programmes involved in environmental conservation, management and protection will be brought together in one department. Key branches of the Ontario Water Resources Commission, together with specific functions of the environmental health services branch of The Department of Health will be integrated with the existing Department of Energy and Resources Management. All will be reconstituted as The Ontario Department of the Environment.

The government proposes to introduce a comprehensive bill to deal with all matters related to environmental conservation. Among the many benefits which will result from the creation of this new department will be the ability to mount a stronger programme to preserve our recreational lakes and rivers. Closely related to the new department will be the appointment of an environmental council to investigate and report upon potential new pollution hazards.

The government is determined to assure the adequacy of our energy supplies for the future. It will ensure that the energy is used as efficiently as possible and that its use will not adversely affect the environment, health or life. The government will strive to maintain a choice between the various types of energy to match them with those uses for which they are best suited. To this end the committee on government productivity has been asked to review the function, structure, operation, financing and objectives of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario. The committee has also been asked to advise the government with respect to the long-range energy requirements of the province.

The rapid and convenient movement of people, goods and information is central to the social and economic well-being of the residents of Ontario. The government will give increasing consideration to the creation of functional, integrated and balanced transportation systems encompassing those types of public and private transportation best suited to the needs of each area.

To accomplish this objective, the existing Departments of Highways and Transport and the facilities and services of the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission will be brought together in a Department of Transportation and Communications. The new department will develop and employ ways to move large numbers of people and goods and stimulate the economic growth of the province, while being more sensitive to the environmental and aesthetic sensibilities of our people.

The Department of Transportation and Communications will be called upon to achieve a better balance between public transit, commuter services and motor vehicle traffic. It will take steps to integrate road, rail, air and water services throughout the province. It will continue to expand and improve our road system. Special emphasis will be given to the total transportation system of the larger cities and their surrounding commuter areas. To help accomplish this,

assistance will be given municipalities for the development of transit facilities.

An immediate function of the new department will be to undertake a review of the costs of transporting goods into and out of northern Ontario.

The Department of Transportation and Communications will also develop a telecommunications policy for Ontario. This policy will ensure that the interests of the people are fully represented in the developments associated with radio and television broadcasting, educational television, cable and special-purpose video, data transmission systems, telephone and telegraph services, and the use of the Telesat communications satellite.

The provision of a sound and efficient system of education is essential to the well-being of the people of Ontario. During the last decade unprecedented expansion was required to meet an enrolment which doubled during a span of 14 years. Very large expenditures were needed for additional accommodation, more equipment and larger teaching staffs. During the 1970s the population of our schools can be expected to drop somewhat, allowing the government to concentrate its efforts and resources on the quality of our educational system and to ensure that every child will have the opportunity to achieve his or her full potential.

A major development will be the concentration of all post-secondary education within a reconstituted Department of Colleges and Universities. The responsibilities of this department will include, in addition to universities, colleges of applied arts and technology and such other institutions as Ryerson Polytechnical Institute. Ryerson, which over the years has grown in stature and achievement, will be authorized to award a new type of degree which will reflect a pattern of accomplishment in which work experience is required in addition to the regular programme of study. This would appear to be consonant with the main thrust of the work of the commission on post-secondary education. The government looks forward to receiving, within the year, the report of the commission dealing with the further development of post-secondary education in Ontario in the 1970s and 1980s.

It is imperative that our resources be husbanded so that full value is received for the investment made in all levels of education. Current restraints are now stabilizing the operating costs of the school system. As the province assumes a greater share of the local

cost of education and provides increased money to post-secondary schools, further steps will be taken to ensure that our financial resources are used to the best advantage to provide a continued high standard of education. This is a goal that is both essential and practicable.

The government is concerned about the problems encountered by the people of rural Ontario as our countryside changes in response to population pressures, technology, urbanization and recreational demands. Steps will be taken to resolve the difficulties relating to farm assessment and inequities in property taxation. To help relieve these inequities, the government will continue its efforts in co-operation with its municipal partners to lighten the burden of real estate taxes. The capital grants programme of The Department of Agriculture and Food will be expanded and revised to more adequately reflect the requirements of Ontario farmers.

One of the crucial tasks in the coming decades will be to ensure that the land of the province, particularly in and around urban and recreational areas, is preserved in the interest of future generations. The government intends to create a new land bank programme. This will be a major instrument in the implementation of regional development, recreational, housing, transportation and urban development plans.

It is the government's conviction that the expanding regulatory and administrative apparatus of the state must be accompanied by continually expanding safeguards for the civil rights of individuals. Measures to further enshrine such rights in the statutes of Ontario will be brought forward. These will be related to procedures and the rights of individuals before the boards, commissions and tribunals established by the Legislature and the exercise of administrative discretion.

The government will accelerate its programme of consumer protection to provide assistance and guidance to our people in dealing with today's complex market place. Uniform interprovincial legislation is being developed, as are policies and practices in the area of consumer protection, securities and insurance legislation.

New policies designed to promote a more efficient economical and comprehensive system of delivery of health services will be brought forward during this session.

In a society which has concentrated on material and economic growth, the development of our culture must also be encouraged.

Living in Ontario are people of virtually every national and cultural heritage, including our native people, all sharing their strengths with others to create a dynamic family of people. The government proposes to convene a congress of ethnic culture to encourage greater communication and interaction between all groups within the Ontario family, and between these groups and the government.

Government can be successful in serving its constituents only if it is able to adapt and respond to their needs. Fundamental changes are planned to enable the Executive Council to meet the challenges of the 1970s and beyond, and will be based to a substantial degree upon the detailed analysis now being undertaken by the committee on government productivity.

Initial attention is being given to the activities and structure of the Executive Council itself. To confer reasoned flexibility upon its policy-making and management capacities, a number of committees of cabinet will be created to deal expeditiously with the co-ordination of policy in a number of related areas. Two major committees will be established by statute. One will deal with policy and priorities and will ensure, by continual review, that established policies and expenditures remain relevant to the needs and wishes of the people. This committee, assisted by a strengthened secretariat, will provide a vehicle to deal thoroughly with specific policies.

The other committee will incorporate advanced management techniques and the traditional role of the Treasury Board. In this way the Legislature will be guaranteed levels of administrative accountability and executive competence fully commensurate with the sophistication and complexity of these times. In addition, a small number of functional committees of cabinet will be created to better integrate the multitude of government programmes in broad fields of policy.

The changes in departmental responsibilities which have been described are the beginning of restructuring of the departmental design of the government of Ontario which will be undertaken in the months and years immediately ahead.

Priority will continue to be given to constitutional review. The ministry will work with other governments to produce early agreement on a revised constitution and mechanism of amendment which will be fully compatible with the needs and conditions of Canada in the 1970s and beyond.

The highlight of this session will be the opening of Ontario Place, now being completed on man-made islands in Lake Ontario. Ontario Place is a showcase of the achievements and aspirations of the people of our province. It will be a major cultural and recreational centre for all of Ontario. At the request of the government I extend a warm invitation to all members of the Legislature and all residents of Ontario to join in ceremonies on May 22 to officially open Ontario Place.

As this address has indicated, the new ministry is fully aware of the existence in Ontario of many problems of a serious and urgent nature. Measures to deal with these matters have been described.

In conclusion I ask the members of this Legislature to assign proportion and balance to their assessment of problems by remembering the enormous evidence of accomplishment that is the handiwork of all the people of Ontario. In Ontario, successive ministries have created machinery and implemented programmes which have contributed substantially to the advancement of our society. More importantly, each individual has combined his intellect, skills and labour in the eternal search for a better and more rewarding life for all. But in acknowledging our problems, let us also take pride in our accomplishments. Let us have confidence in our capacity to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow.

May Divine Providence guide you in your deliberations.

God bless the Queen and Canada.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was then pleased to retire from the chamber.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that to prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy of His Honour's speech, which I will now read.

(Reading dispensed with.)

THE WILLS ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Wills Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves that the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor to this House be taken into consideration on Thursday next.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, prior to some brief discussion from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) and the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis), I would like to take this opportunity to welcome all members of the House back to the session. I would like to assure them it will be a very constructive one, a very progressively conservative session, and one that I am sure will indicate to the people of this province the desire of all members of this House to find solutions to the problems that we presently face.

I would also like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all members of this House, and I would like to think on behalf of our guests here on this occasion, to express a very simple thank you to the member for London North (Mr. Robarts) for the contribution he has made to this province over the past number of years.

Mr. Speaker, to give some indication to the members opposite of the work that will evolve from the Throne Speech of the next few days, I have given a motion to the Clerk of the House requesting that Monday of next week be set aside to debate the very serious problem of unemployment that exists in the province of Ontario.

I will also tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, as has been the tradition, introduce a resolution with respect to the striking committee. I am also indicating on this occasion that we will move ahead with the report as it relates to the standing committees and their restructuring, which I would feel would warrant some discussion in the next sitting of this House.

Thursday, as the notice of motion indicated, we will immediately move into the consideration of the Throne Speech. Of course, I expect the members opposite will wish to move ahead with this on Friday, and Monday is set aside for the debate on unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, once again I welcome all members here, and our guests. As I said, I look forward to a very, very constructive session.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to extend our congratulations to the hon. member for Peel North on this first occasion when he enters the Legislature as leader of the government. I am sure he will realize that all of us, on all sides, watched the selection of the new leader of the Progressive Conservative Party with a great deal of care and interest. I am sure that in the

days that lie ahead there will be a number of occasions when we can comment on this in some more particular.

I think, sir, also that you will consider it a truth and a part of your own experience when I say that members on all sides welcome the statement that the Premier has made that this is going to be a working session—because we are here to work for the development of a better community in Ontario. As far as that goes, we on this side wish the Premier and his new cabinet every success.

Another matter that I want to raise just briefly, is to add my comments to those already put before us by the Premier on the new capacity of the member for London North in our midst. When we left this chamber a few weeks ago he was leading the government and the House. I do not say that it is a real demotion that he now occupies seat number one immediately to your right. Certainly I want to join with all members in expressing our appreciation for his career in public service and also for his personal friendship which has been extended so freely to us all.

There is just one area in his career, of course, which I feel has been a substantial omission, and that is that he has never had any experience in opposition. I do not know who is responsible for that but I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this is one omission that we do not intend to be a part of the career of the present incumbent.

I appreciate also the Premier's statements ordering the business in the first few days of the House. I look forward to participating in

the debate on Thursday on the speech which His Honour delivered to us, and also in the special debate on Monday next. With these thoughts in view, we look forward to the work of a productive session.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): As part of the gilding the lily ceremonial, Mr. Speaker, may I express on behalf of my party in the Legislature our great pleasure in seeing the new occupant of the premiership in his place, conducting himself in the fashion to which he will become accustomed for a time and to which others of us aspire. We are indeed pleased that the next few weeks will be vigorous weeks, albeit a brief and passing interlude in the life of this government. We are extremely happy to see the order paper used as the Premier has indicated and look forward to the next few days.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, as well, for all of us here, and it is deeply felt, that the presence of the member for London North in the Legislature today—and, I hope, a great many days hereafter—is an immense contribution to the life of the Legislature. We appreciated his leadership of the government when he was here and we trust that he will participate hereafter to some considerable extent.

With that, let us proceed with the battle of political life in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on that very happy note I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3:55 o'clock, p.m.

APPENDIX

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF THE MEMBERS OF THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

(117 Members)

Fourth Session — Twenty-Eighth Parliament

Speaker: Hon. Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk of the House: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

Member	Party	Constituency	Post Office Address
Allan, James N.	P.C.	Haldimand-Norfolk	411 Maple St., Dunnville
Apps, Hon. C. J. S.	P.C.	Kingston and the Islands	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Auld, Hon. James A. C.	P.C.	Leeds	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Bales, Hon. Dalton A.	P.C.	York Mills	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Belanger, J. Albert	P.C.	Prescott and Russell	Sarsfield
Ben, George	L.	Humber	1134 Dundas St. W., Toronto 3
Bernier, Hon. Leo	P.C.	Kenora	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Bolton, Ven. Kenneth C.	N.D.	Middlesex South	589 Piccadilly St., London 24
Boyer, Robert J.	P.C.	Muskoka	620 University Ave., Toronto
Braithwaite, Leonard A.	L.	Etobicoke	Suite E, 1500 Royal York Rd., Weston
Breithaupt, J. R.	L.	Kitchener	90 Church St., Kitchener
Brown, John L.	N.D.	Beaches-Woodbine	339 Millard Ave., Newmarket
Brunelle, Hon. René	P.C.	Cochrane North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Bukator, George	L.	Niagara Falls	Box 280, Chippawa
Bullbrook, James E.	L.	Sarnia	881 Tudor Close, Sarnia
Burr, Fred A.	N.D.	Sandwich-Riverside	4005 Howard Ave., Windsor
Carruthers, Alex	P.C.	Durham	Garden Hill
Carton, Hon. Gordon	P.C.	Annourdale	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Cass, Hon. Fred McIntosh	P.C.	Grenville-Dundas	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Connell, T. Ray	P.C.	Wentworth North	R.R. #2, Dundas
Davis, Hon. William G.	P.C.	Peel North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Davison, Norm	N.D.	Hamilton Centre	122 Sanford Ave S., Hamilton 22
Deacon, D. M.	L.	York Centre	Glenburn Farms, Unionville
Deans, Ian	N.D.	Wentworth	38 Beaconsfield Dr., Hamilton
Demers, Gaston	P.C.	Nickel Belt	Chelmsford
De Monte, Dante M.	L.	Dovercourt	29 South Kingslea Dr., Toronto 18
Downer, Rev. A. W.	P.C.	Dufferin-Simcoe	Box 239, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Dunlop, Hon. Edward	P.C.	York-Forest Hill	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Dymond, Matthew B.	P.C.	Ontario	Port Perry
Edighoffer, Hugh	L.	Perth	147 Nelson St., Mitchell
Evans, D. Arthur	P.C.	Simcoe Centre	Box 87, Bradford
Farquhar, Stan	L.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Box 421, Elliot Lake
Ferrier, Rev. William	N.D.	Cochrane South	292 Cedar St. N., Timmins
Gaunt, Murray	L.	Huron-Bruce	Wingham
Gilbertson, Bernt	P.C.	Algoma	R.R. #1, Richards Landing
Gisborn, Reg.	N.D.	Hamilton East	26 Martin Rd., Hamilton
Gomme, George E.	P.C.	Lanark	Box 550, Almonte
Good, Edward R.	L.	Waterloo North	175 Tennyson Place, Waterloo
Grossman, Hon. Allan	P.C.	St. Andrew-St. Patrick	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Guindon, Hon. Fern	P.C.	Stormont	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

Member	Party	Constituency	Post Office Address
Haggerty, Ray	L.	Welland South	R.R. #1, Sherkston
Hamilton, Maurice	P.C.	Renfrew North	R.R. #5, Pembroke
Haskett, Irwin	P.C.	Ottawa South	3 Frederick Place, Ottawa 1
Henderson, Lorne C.	P.C.	Lambton	R.R. #3, Oil Springs
Hodgson, R. Glen	P.C.	Victoria-Haliburton	P.O. Box 240, Haliburton
Hodgson, William	P.C.	York North	R.R. #1, Kettleby
Innes, Gordon W.	L.	Oxford	R.R. #1, Woodstock
Jackson, Donald	N.D.	Timiskaming	Box 333, Kirkland Lake
Jessiman, James	P.C.	Fort William	1105 Arthur St. E., Thunder Bay "F"
Johnston, Allister	P.C.	Parry Sound	South River
Johnston, R. M.	P.C.	St. Catharines	10 Canal St., St. Catharines
Johnston, W. Erskine	P.C.	Carleton	Carp
Kennedy, R. Douglas	P.C.	Peel South	120 Harborn Rd., Mississauga
Kerr, Hon. George A.	P.C.	Halton West	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Knight, Ron. H.	Ind.	Port Arthur	Duke's Trailer Court, R.R. #3, Thunder Bay "P"
Lawlor, Patrick D.	N.D.	Lakeshore	154 Lake Promenade, Toronto 14
Lawrence, Hon. Bert	P.C.	Carleton East	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Lawrence, Hon. Allan F.	P.C.	St. George	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Lewis, Stephen	N.D.	Scarborough West	19 Parkcrest Drive, Scarborough
MacDonald, Donald C.	N.D.	York South	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
MacKenzie, Harold	L.	Ottawa Centre	Box 5226, Ottawa 5
MacNaughton, Hon. Charles	P.C.	Huron	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Makarchuk, Mac	N.D.	Brantford	Apt. 609, 19 Lynnwood Dr., Brantford
Martel, Elie W.	N.D.	Sudbury East	46 Ferguson St., Capreol
Meen, Arthur K.	P.C.	York East	95 Lord Seaton Rd., Willowdale
Morin, Jules	P.C.	Ottawa East	101 Wurtemberg, Ottawa
Morningstar, Ellis P.	P.C.	Welland	97 Alberta St., Welland
Morrow, Donald H.	P.C.	Ottawa West	The Park West, Apt. 508, 36 McEwen Ave., Ottawa
McKeough, Hon. W. Darcy	P.C.	Chatham-Kent	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
McNeil, R. K.	P.C.	Elgin	R.R. #2, Springfield
Newman, Bernard	L.	Windsor-Walkerville	1290 Ypres Blvd., Windsor
Newman, William	P.C.	Ontario South	Balsam P.O.
Nixon, Robert F.	L.	Brant	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Paterson, Donald A.	L.	Essex South	1 Georgia Ave., Leamington
Peacock, Hugh	N.D.	Windsor West	Room 322, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Pilkey, Clifford G.	N.D.	Oshawa	801 Regent Dr., Oshawa
Pitman, W. G.	N.D.	Peterborough	1364 Gordon Ave., Peterborough
Potter, Hon. Richard T.	P.C.	Quinte	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Price, Henry J.	P.C.	St. David	27 Bloor St. E., Toronto 5
Pritchard, Mrs. Ada	P.C.	Hamilton West	93 Bold St., Suite 904, Hamilton
Randall, Stanley J.	P.C.	Don Mills	Ontario Place, 1 St. Clair Ave. W., Toronto
Reid, T. Patrick	L.-Lab.	Rainy River	P.O. Box 187, Fort Frances
Reid, Tim	L.	Scarborough East	38 Guildcrest Dr., Scarborough
Reilly, Leonard M.	P.C.	Eglinton	639 Yonge St., Toronto 5

Member	Party	Constituency	Post Office Address
Renwick, James	N.D.	Riverdale	Room 322, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Renwick, Mrs. Margaret	N.D.	Scarborough Centre	Room 322, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Reuter, Allan E.	P.C.	Waterloo South	45 Main St., Galt
Robarts, Hon. John P.	P.C.	London North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Rollins, Clarke T.	P.C.	Hastings	R.R. #1, Bancroft
Root, John	P.C.	Wellington-Dufferin	Orton
Rowe, Russell D.	P.C.	Northumberland	546 Lakeshore Rd., Cobourg
Rowntree, H. Leslie	P.C.	York West	770 Don Mills Rd., Don Mills
Ruston, Richard F.	L.	Essex-Kent	Box 4, South Woodslee
Sargent, Eddie	L.	Grey-Bruce	868-2nd Ave. E., Owen Sound
Shulman, Dr. Morton	N.D.	High Park	378 Roncesvalles Ave., Toronto 3
Simonett, J. R.	P.C.	Frontenac-Addington	P.O. Box 100, Sharbot Lake
Singer, Vernon M.	L.	Downsview	Suite 405, 365 Bay St., Toronto
Smith, Gordon E.	P.C.	Simcoe East	P.O. Box 128, Orillia
Smith, John R.	P.C.	Hamilton Mountain	42 Sunninghill Ave., Hamilton
Smith, Richard S.	L.	Nipissing	676 McIntyre St. W., North Bay
Snow, Hon. James W.	P.C.	Halton East	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Sopha, Elmer W.	L.	Sudbury	Box 1206, Sudbury
Spence, John P.	L.	Kent	Muirkirk
Stewart, Hon. Wm. A.	P.C.	Middlesex North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Stokes, J. E.	N.D.	Thunder Bay	Box 62, Schreiber
Trotter, James B.	L.	Parkdale	227 Riverside Dr., Toronto 3
Villeneuve, Osie F.	P.C.	Glengarry	Box 27, Maxville
Welch, Hon. Robert	P.C.	Lincoln	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Wells, Hon. Thomas L.	P.C.	Scarborough North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
White, Hon. John	P.C.	London South	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Whitney, Norris	P.C.	Prince Edward-Lennox	R.R. #1, Consecon
Winkler, Hon. Eric A.	P.C.	Grey South	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Wishart, Hon. Arthur A.	P.C.	Sault Ste. Marie	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Worton, Harry	L.	Wellington South	15 Queen St., Guelph
Yakabuski, Paul J.	P.C.	Renfrew South	Box 219, Barrys Bay
Yaremko, Hon. John	P.C.	Bellwoods	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Young, Fred	N.D.	Yorkview	717 Woburn Ave., Toronto 12

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

HON. WILLIAM G. DAVIS, Q.C.	<i>Prime Minister and President of the Council</i>
HON. ALLAN F. LAWRENCE, Q.C.	<i>Minister of Justice and Attorney General</i>
HON. W. DARCY McKEOUGH	<i>Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics</i>
HON. ROBERT WELCH, Q.C.	<i>Minister of Education</i>
HON. BERT LAWRENCE, Q.C.	<i>Minister of Health</i>
HON. JOHN YAREMKO, Q.C.	<i>Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship</i>
HON. ALLAN GROSSMAN	<i>Minister of Trade and Development</i>
HON. WILLIAM A. STEWART	<i>Minister of Agriculture and Food</i>
HON. CHARLES S. MACNAUGHTON	<i>Minister of Highways and Transport</i>
HON. JAMES A. C. AULD	<i>Minister of Public Works</i>
HON. ARTHUR A. WISHART, Q.C.	<i>Minister of Financial & Commercial Affairs</i>
HON. RENÉ BRUNELLE	<i>Minister of Lands and Forests</i>
HON. DALTON A. BALES, Q.C.	<i>Minister of Municipal Affairs</i>
HON. THOMAS L. WELLS	<i>Minister of Social and Family Services</i>
HON. FERN GUINDON	<i>Minister of Tourism and Information</i>
HON. JOHN WHITE	<i>Minister of University Affairs</i>
HON. GEORGE A. KERR, Q.C.	<i>Minister of Energy and Resources Management</i>
HON. C. J. S. APPS	<i>Minister of Correctional Services</i>
HON. GORDON CARTON, Q.C.	<i>Minister of Labour</i>
HON. LEO BERNIER	<i>Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs</i>
HON. ERIC A. WINKLER	<i>Minister of Revenue</i>
HON. JAMES W. SNOW	<i>Minister without Portfolio</i>
HON. RICHARD T. POTTER, M.D.	<i>Minister without Portfolio</i>
HON. EDWARD DUNLOP	<i>Minister without Portfolio</i>

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Speech from the Throne, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor	3
Wills Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading	7
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Davis, agreed to	8
Appendix	9



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

**(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon as our guests, we have in the west gallery students from St. Leonard Separate School in Willowdale; and in both galleries students from Haliburton Highlands Secondary School in Haliburton. Later this afternoon we will have students from Westdale Public School in London and Central Park Senior School in Oshawa with us.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, each year at this time the Minister of Health has the great pleasure of welcoming to this House as a visitor, Timmy, the representative of the Ontario Society for Crippled Children, whose annual 1971 Easter Seal campaign is now under way.

Timmy symbolizes some 14,500 afflicted children in Ontario. In real life he is Denis Lapalme, the 11-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Orval Lapalme of 263 Kent Avenue in Timmins. Denis is a grade 7 student at St. Gerrard School in Timmins.

Some time ago in an accident Denis' legs were so badly injured that both had to be amputated below the knee. But his is a real success story for the society and the Easter Seal campaign which supports it. Timmy now skates again and plays hockey. In fact he plays centre for his school team in Timmins. He advises me that his favourite hockey team is Boston and his favourite hockey player Bobby Orr.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce 1971's Timmy, Denis Lapalme.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, as Timmy comes from my riding, whether I could join with the Minister of Health and the other members of the House in welcoming him to Queen's Park and in commending him for the very wonderful job he is doing as Timmy this year, as an example of a young person who has overcome a great handicap and, as the minister stated, as a valuable member of his own hockey team in Timmins.

Along with the minister, I would like to urge all in the province to support this worthy cause and to pay tribute to Timmy, Denis Lapalme from Timmins. Welcome.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

The Minister of Agriculture and Food has a statement?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Speech from the Throne, His Honour the Lieutenant Governor stated that the government of Ontario would be expanding the provisions of the capital grants programme for Ontario farmers. Today I wish to outline the more important aspects of these changes, which become effective tomorrow, April 1, 1971. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the capital grants programme was introduced by this government in 1967 as a 12-year programme to assist commercial farm operators in Ontario in financing the farm improvements necessary to lower their production costs and improve their income. This programme has served a very useful purpose. Thousands of Ontario farmers have benefited from the programme and we have gained valuable experience.

However, times and conditions change in agriculture as in other industries. We are moving to expand this programme to meet these new conditions.

The capital grants programme is available to all farmers in Ontario, including fur farmers, who are able to meet the minimum rule of eligibility, which is an annual gross income from his farm operation of \$3,000. If the farm is leased, the owner may apply for a grant if the tenant can demonstrate an annual gross farm income of \$3,000. Farmers who lease their land from ARDA are also eligible.

Grants have been made available for a number of capital works, such as farm structures, drainage, farm water supplies and field enlargements through fence row removals. Until today the maximum grant that any farmer could receive was \$2,500 for any project or combination of projects.

As of April 1, the maximum amount of the grants will be increased and the range of capital works eligible for assistance will be expanded. Specifically, the changes in the programme are as follows:

1. The maximum amount available to any one farmer under the programme has been increased from \$2,500 to \$3,000, and all grants paid to farmers since the programme was initiated in 1967 will be included in this calculation.

There is, however, one major chance respecting these maximum grants. We recognize that more and more farm families are consolidating their holdings, entering into partnerships and incorporated farm businesses. Therefore, when two or more persons form a partnership or incorporated farm business, and are each actively engaged in the operation of the farm, the partnership or corporation will now be eligible for double the grant available to a single individual, in other words \$6,000.

2. Whereas in the past capital grants have been based on varying percentages of the cost of the works provided, as of April 1, 1971, all grants will be based on 40 per cent of the cost.

3. The farmer himself decides whether he will use all of his capital grant allotment for a single project, or if he wishes to spread it out over the several classes of projects available for grant purposes. However, any individual is limited to \$1,500 on the projects assisted by ARDA; for example, field enlargement, farm water supply and orchard removal.

4. A number of additional items are included in the classification "Farm Drainage and Farm Structure" effective April 1, 1971. These include maple syrup structures; fixed equipment such as piping, plumbing, stabling, pumping equipment, bulk milk tanks, permanently installed livestock scales; fixed equipment that is part of a manure storage or waste disposal system; electrical wiring and natural gas installations other than for farm dwellings; bridges and culverts.

5. The "Field Enlargement and Water Supply" section of the programme which has been provided under ARDA has also been amended and expanded. The uniform 40 per cent cost figure will apply on all of these projects in the future. "Field Enlargement through Fence Row Removal" has been expanded to include the removal of old orchards, but it does not include land clearing.

The "Farm Pond" section of this programme has been expanded to include the cost of piping, plumbing and pumping equipment as an allowable expense.

The "Farm Wells" section has also been expanded to include as an allowable expense the provision of piping, plumbing, pumping equipment and where necessary electrical wiring to service such wells. Cisterns for farm use are also included in the expanded programme.

6. Two new classifications have been provided for eligibility as recipients of a capital grant for Ontario farmers. The first of these is "Farm Vacation Hosting." It has been demonstrated that many urban persons are anxious to spend vacations on farms. We see this as a potentially important source of new farm income.

In an effort to encourage and enable farm owners to engage in the farm vacations business, capital grants will be made available under ARDA for the provision of certain facilities necessary to bring the farm home up to a suitable standard for these purposes. These facilities, now eligible for capital grants, include plumbing installations, electrical wiring, structural renovations and the provision of fire exits.

It must be demonstrated that present facilities are inadequate. The husband-and-wife team must have attended a training course, or be considered capable of hosting vacationers, and have made a long-term commitment to the programme. The family must also agree to maintain accurate records from this venture.

Grants for this purpose shall be on the basis of 40 per cent of the cost of the facilities, to a maximum of \$1,500 per family. It should be pointed out here that this is a special research project of our ARDA branch.

The second of the new classifications is a programme to assist in the removal of diseased and dead elm trees. For some years Ontario has assisted municipalities in the work of removing trees suffering from dutch elm disease and we are currently involved in an extensive seasonal employment programme along our major traffic arteries. This extension of the programme will extend the same kind of aid to farmers.

Under this section of the programme farmers will receive \$5 per tree to a maximum grant of \$500 per farmer. To qualify, the farmer must apply to our department and have the affected trees marked. The wood must be disposed of or piled in a satisfactory manner. The grants made for diseased and dead elm tree removal are in addition to the maximum amounts available under the other sections of this programme.

The capital grants programme for Ontario farmers will continue to be administered by

The Department of Agriculture and Food. Application forms are available from our county and district offices and assistance will be rendered to the applicant by our staff. Our agricultural engineers will be available to advise on the best facilities and the proper installation procedures. When the work is completed and the necessary receipts and receipted invoices have been assembled, our staff in the county and district offices will proceed to inspect the work.

We urge that every farmer who seeks to participate in this capital grants programme consult with our extension staff and our engineers before the work is begun. In this way we can ensure that the greatest benefit to the farmer can accrue from the programme and the applications can be processed quickly and accurately.

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to distribute to each member of the House a copy of this statement so he will have an accurate description of the programme at hand.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to announce a new programme under the \$1-million tourist loan fund administered by the Ontario Development Corporation which will substantially increase financial—

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): From nothing!

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Peanuts!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —assistance to the tourist industry in Ontario.

The programme is in two parts:

(a) Performance loans—I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that performance loans are what have heretofore been known as forgivable loans and there is a good reason.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Why did the minister change the name? Would he like to explain it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would be glad to explain it to the hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: Stanley, is there any place you would rather be?

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Anywhere the hon. member wants to go, I will buy the ticket.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Let us have the statement.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious the opposition members presume this is going to be a good programme because it annoys them.

Mr. Lewis: The minister's perverse kind of logic!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I presume this is evidence of the opposition's interest in the tourist industry.

Mr. Pitman: Certainly!

Mr. Lewis: It is indeed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, why do they not sit and listen?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The new programme is in two parts:

(a) Performance loans will be provided for tourist attractions, such as ski hills, convention centres, snowmobile trails and other amenities which will attract and retain tourists in the off-season. By improving their annual occupancy rates, these central facilities will help area resort operators increase profitability. Applicants for performance loans must demonstrate that the project is viable and will be a benefit to existing tourist operations in the area.

(b) Recognizing that many tourist operators experience difficulty in financing needed improvements, interest rates and repayable loans for the tourist industry will be at the same rate as the government borrows long-term funds. Currently this rate is 7.75 per cent. The maximum loan under the tourist loan programme, which is presently \$50,000, will be increased to \$75,000.

These measures will go a long way to easing the financing problems of tourist operators and help create a stronger industry. Repayable loans for tourist operators are normally available to winterize, renovate and generally upgrade facilities. Loans are also available to tourist resort operators for antipollution measures.

The tourist industry has historically encountered difficulties in either obtaining loans or obtaining loans at reasonable rates of interest. This dual-purpose programme will do much to improve conditions in the tourist industry and make financing more easily available to the smaller operator.

Mr. Stokes: The minister's department has issued two in the last year.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Right!

Mr. Pitman: The government collects \$250 million through taxes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Whatever happened to Stanley Randall?

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

Mr. Ferrier: He had some flair.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): More flair than substance but now we have neither.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

PROPOSED CONFERENCE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier.

Can he report to the House when the proposed conference on foreign investment will be held and what the guest list is expected to be at this time?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure that the term "guest list" is quite appropriate. We propose to hold the conference during the latter part of May or the early part of June, and I shall be in a position to announce further details to the House in about two weeks.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: I wonder if the Premier is prepared to inform the House whether or not individual members or representatives of the three parties will have an opportunity to present their views at the conference?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure at this point whether the members of this House will have an opportunity to present their views. Certainly they will have an opportunity, shall we say, to join in or listen to the discussions. From my own personal standpoint I think it would be appropriate for members to make some contribution and we will endeavour to build this into the format.

COST OF ONTARIO PLACE

Mr. Nixon: I have another question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

Can he now report to the House on the expected completion cost of Ontario Place, to the opening of which he invited us all in six weeks?

Mr. Stokes: \$20 million.

Mr. Nixon: Is he aware that the costs have escalated already from \$13.5 million to \$19 million, and it is expected that they will end up at about \$25 million?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour to get the actual cost for the Leader of the Opposition, but I would suggest with respect—and I want to make this point right at the outset—that on those matters that are under the very direct responsibility of certain ministers, those questions might more appropriately be addressed to those ministers.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: However, Mr. Speaker, knowing the Leader of the Opposition's very real interest in this, not only from the cost standpoint but the very positive contribution Ontario Place will make to this province, I will endeavour to get those figures for him.

Mr. Stokes: It will be very useful to the people in the north.

Mr. Lewis: He has not changed at all.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Is it a supplementary?

Mr. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question on a matter over which, I would say, the Premier does have specific control. Is he now prepared to announce that the former Minister of Trade and Development will in fact be invited to operate Ontario Place? Or must he continue to wait for the Premier's call?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can only say to the Leader of the Opposition that I really appreciate his concern about the members on this side of the House. I am sure that there will be some very meaningful involvement, that the former minister will find some situation in the not too far distant future, and I will be delighted to let the hon. member know when that happens.

Mr. Nixon: Somebody has got to look out for him.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That same situation.

Mr. MacDonald: How long?

Mr. Lewis: Be careful of being too precise.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has a supplementary?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Is the report correct that the firm for Ontario Place is to cost some \$3.5 million, which is in excess of the cost of "Tora! Tora! Tora!?"

Mr. Lewis: And I hope it is significantly better.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): It might be better than "Tora! Tora! Tora!"

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have not seen "Tora! Tora! Tora!", nor do I know the exact cost of that particular production. I can assure the member that the cost has not quite reached \$3.5 million, and I shall get the exact figure for him. But once again, with respect, it might be more appropriately addressed to the minister responsible.

Mr. Singer: What does the Prime Minister know?

Hon. Mr. Davis: A great deal

FUNDING OF HOUSING PROGRAMME

Mr. Nixon: A further question—leading from yesterday's speech from his honour—that I would like to put to the Premier. Can he give us any further details on the funding of the housing programme that was announced again yesterday? In what specific ways does it differ from a similar programme that was announced by the former Minister of Trade and Development some months previous?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I propose to make a comprehensive statement with respect to the new housing programme tomorrow afternoon in statements from the Ministry.

Mr. Singer: Some day we will get the Premier to answer one question head on.

CLEAN-UP OF MERCURY POLLUTION

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Can the minister inform the House

more clearly as to what use would be made of the \$10 million that he would receive from Dow Chemical if he were successful in his suit against that corporation, in order to clean up the mercury pollution in the Great Lakes system; and particularly in the St. Clair River?

If I might just put an additional question along those lines. Does the minister now believe that technology does permit the clean-up of this type of pollution without any additional risk of distributing it further in the Great Lakes system?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Yes, Mr. Speaker, \$10 million is the estimated reclamation cost for the St. Clair River and the Lake St. Clair area.

We are satisfied with the scientific and technical evidence that we have had and which has been made available to the law offices of the Crown, that it is safe to take certain reclamation steps and use certain reclamation methods that we require under the statement of claim.

Mr. Nixon: In essence, would these methods simply be dredging; and can the minister assure us that if this money was spent on the clean-up, or the reclamation as he calls it, that the mercury pollution would be removed from the system?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, it involves a form of dredging with retention booming, and also a form of neutralization of the mercury in the bottom of the river.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Humber has a supplementary?

Mr. Ben: Yes, I had written a request to the minister outside this House: could we be supplied with details of the system that has been advocated to the minister for removing this mercury?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As I have indicated in my answer, Mr. Speaker, these are very scientific and technical methods that would be used by whatever body or agency would undertake reclamation methods, or that Dow, for example, if required to do so, would engage in. Any information given to the hon. member would have to be very broad, very general in its scope, but I think that type of information could be supplied to him.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Ben: It will be supplied then, will it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary of the minister.

Does the minister plan on taking any action or implementing any type of project concerning the dredging in the Detroit River as a result of mercury pollution on the part of the Wyandotte Chemical people?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: This is a possibility, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): But the government did not sue Wyandotte. How could it be a possibility? Be realistic!

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member can have the opportunity of a supplementary—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I have not heard what the hon. member has said.

Mr. Bullbrook: It is so ridiculous. It is difficult to contain yourself when you listen to this garbage. Did the government not sue Wyandotte?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, as it turns out, of course, the amount of the accumulation of mercury in the bottom of the Detroit River nowhere near compares with the accumulation in the St. Clair River.

Mr. B. Newman: How does the minister know?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We have tested that. We know by our sampling and testing that the greater accumulation in that part of Ontario is in fact in the St. Clair River.

Mr. B. Newman: Can the minister assure the people of that?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, we have that information. There is no question about that. I believe the federal government also has that information.

Now I have forgotten the member's question. Oh yes, he dealt with—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The minister's span of concentration is fantastic.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Really, unless there is an extraordinary accumulation of mercury in the river bed, it is doubtful if we will undertake reclamation processes or procedures.

I think we will concentrate on those areas, such as in the Dryden area and the St. Clair area; at least initially.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River has a supplementary?

Mr. T. P. Reid: The minister mentioned Wabigoon. May I ask by way of further supplementary if the government envisages also dredging the Wabigoon and English River system in northwestern Ontario and if this is feasible also?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It may be possible, Mr. Speaker, that we would undertake some form of reclamation this summer, in Clay Lake particularly, and in some parts of the Wabigoon River.

Mr. Lewis: At public expense?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It is very doubtful if we would be involved in the English River.

Mr. Lewis: At public expense?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Not necessarily.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary: Is the minister prepared to maintain his position, notwithstanding the statement by Mr. Justice Harlan of the Supreme Court of the United States, when he delivered, on March 23, the majority of the opinion of the Supreme Court of that country to the effect that there was no known system of ridding the Great Lakes, or any other water system, of mercury pollution?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that was *obiter dictum*.

Mr. Singer: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It was *obiter dictum*. It was not part of a decision.

Mr. Singer: But he said it.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It was not part of his decision.

Mr. Singer: No, the minister does not understand.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It really was something that he had been told. He is a judge, not a scientist, and the main part of that decision, of course, was to refer it back to the state court.

Mr. Singer: He is wrong and the minister is right.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary!

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, I think to this theme, Mr. Speaker, how did the minister arrive at the \$25 million figure?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, that was arrived at by the law officers of the Crown. I did not draft the statement of claim. That was an estimated amount drawn and concluded by the law officers of the Crown.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister say that I should direct my question to the Attorney General or to the Premier? To the plaintiff?

Mr. Sopha: To the plaintiff!

Mr. Lewis: To the plaintiff! All right, I will wait.

Mr. Speaker: Has the leader of the New Democratic Party questions?

THRONE SPEECH PROPOSALS

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I would like to first ask the Premier how it is that neither he nor his Minister of Trade and Development had particular details of the economic cornerstone of his Throne Speech yesterday; namely the employment and housing prospects.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I go back to my days in my former ministry when the member for Scarborough West—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Great days! —was always anxious to have any announcements of this kind related to the members of this House first. As I indicated just a few moments ago, it is my intention to relate these matters to the members of this House tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. MacDonald: Why did the Prime Minister hold a press conference to give the details then?

Hon. Mr. Davis: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, in that I assume that is a question, or perhaps a supplementary, from the member for York South who is usurping his leader's time, I am sure I did not convene a press conference. As a matter of fact, the press were given copies of the Throne Speech and I went to explain certain portions to them.

An hon. member: Explain? Not to explain!

Mr. MacDonald: The Prime Minister's verbal gymnastics have been dulled by the campaign.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, will the Prime Minister's answer tomorrow indicate the number of dollars from the private sector, the number of dollars from the government of Ontario, the number of dollars from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the number of new jobs to be created by this programme and how many housing units we will, therefore, have in total this year as compared with last year, and as compared with the government's current target figures? Will all those areas be covered with precision in the Premier's own way?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in my own way and with precision. When I say comprehensive, it will include all of those items.

Mr. MacDonald: He may live to rue those words tomorrow night.

Mr. Singer: Stan would at least pretend he had an answer.

Mr. Lewis: May I address a question to the Provincial Secretary? Is the Provincial Secretary here? I am sorry, I do not see him.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Second row.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I am sorry.

Mr. Sopha: He has been demoted also.

Mr. Lewis: To Provincial Secretary.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): I am starting the whole process a second time around.

Mr. Lewis: He certainly is.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what the Indians are afraid of.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: And with his finesse it will be a coup.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have outlasted five leaders of the opposition.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Why quarrel with success?

GRANTS TO INDIAN GROUPS

Mr. Lewis: Right. Might I ask the minister through you, Mr. Speaker, when will he be confirming the grants requested by the Indian Friendship Centre in Thunder Bay and the co-operative pulp and paper industry in Moosonee?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that all of our grants had been dispensed. I will take up those specific questions and get the answers for the hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, it was well before the end of the fiscal year that the minister assured the Indian Friendship Centre in Thunder Bay, or the department assured the Indian centre in Thunder Bay, that the grant was under serious consideration—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader might ask the question.

Mr. Lewis:—and the minister says that this is not now available?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am not sure. To which grant is the hon. member referring?

Mr. Lewis: The Indian Friendship Centre in Thunder Bay, which has made repeated requests from this government for grants.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: For what purpose?

Mr. Lewis: For the purpose of friendship.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

I would point out to the hon. members that the question period is their period and if it is used for other than asking and answering questions the members are the losers thereby. Therefore, I would request that we give a reasonable opportunity to the members to ask questions and the ministers to answer.

I would also request that there be, and I shall—

Mr. Singer: How do we know which ones they will answer?

Mr. Speaker: I think we should prevent this. There should not be an exchange across the floor unless a question is asked. Whether it be of the Prime Minister or the Provincial

Secretary, if the supplementary question is not asked properly, I shall call it out of order from now on. When the turn comes for a supplementary question you will ask it. You will not ask it across the floor of the House.

The hon. leader of the New Democratic Party has the floor for a continuation of his questions.

Mr. Stokes: A supplementary to the same minister: Did the minister not, in fact, meet with a delegation from the Indian Friendship Centre two weeks ago? Did he not have his picture taken with them powwowing in front of the building? Did they not ask him to match dollar for dollar the \$60,000 that they have for a building project that will cost in the neighbourhood of \$150,000? Does the minister not recall that less than two weeks ago those events took place?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, there is a member who knows the questions to ask.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the Thunder Bay Indian Friendship Centre was the second on the scene in Ontario, the first being in that great municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

The Thunder Bay Friendship Centre has through the years received, starting from my first ministry, substantial numbers of grants, which they have requested and received in full.

What the hon. member is referring to is that the Thunder Bay Indian Friendship Centre has plans—very ambitious, very commendable plans—for a large community centre. This department does not have the funds available to provide capital grants in that area. We have been meeting with that group; we have been trying to assist them in various means. In the discharge of one of our responsibilities of communicating, we have been in touch with The Department of Agriculture and Food to see whether the—

Mr. MacDonald: They just asked for equipment.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko:—community—some day I will outline for the hon. member the programme of the department so that he may become aware—I am now directing my answer to the person who questioned me.

We have tried to see if we can bring them under the general community programmes branch of the Province of Ontario. We have suggested to them that instead of trying to fund the total capital project in cash at one time, they seek ways and means of obtaining partial loans. I even offered to sign a guarantee on a mortgage for my particular share.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have suggested all of these avenues in order to assist them above and beyond the present responsibilities of this department.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, the reason I know so much about this particular Indian Friendship Centre is that I became the first honorary president of an Indian Friendship Centre of this organization during my last ministry.

REVISION OF OMA FEES

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker:

Inasmuch as the Ontario Medical Association's revised fee schedule comes into effect—I guess it is tomorrow, April 1—what is the government's decision on whether or not to meet the increased rates?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I will announce that decision when it is made.

Mr. Lewis: I am sorry—when it is made?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: When it is made.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, how is it that the minister has reversed the policy of his predecessor who promised us an answer well in advance of the fee schedule coming into effect?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I do not know what my predecessor promised—

Mr. Lewis: We had a guarantee from the government.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I can really add nothing more than to say that as soon as the decision is made I will announce it here.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, one final question of the Minister of—

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has a supplementary?

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary of the Minister of Health: What is the minister doing about the confusion that will develop tomorrow with the new fee schedule, inas-

much as it has not yet been printed and it is not available to doctors?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The fee schedule itself is an internal production of the Ontario Medical Association.

Mr. Shulman: They do not have any.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: That is not, as far as I understand it, my business.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South—a supplementary?

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Speaker, have negotiations been going on between the government and the OMA about this fee schedule?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Not negotiations; I would say discussions, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Any further supplementaries? Has the leader of the New Democratic Party concluded? The member for Simcoe East. The member for Simcoe East has a question?

TIME LIMIT ON UPGRADING FOR CAAT STUDENTS

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education.

Is the minister aware that some of the students of Georgian College in Orillia—and I assume that this same problem may apply to other students of colleges of applied arts and technology throughout the province—are forced to discontinue their educational upgrading due to the 52-week maximum time limit that is allowed for academic upgrading? If so, can the minister offer any suggestions as a solution to the problem?

Hon. R. S. Welch (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the programme referred to by the hon. member is one purchased by Canada Manpower and I understand one of the terms, and it is a fairly rigid term, is that it cannot exceed 52 weeks. I would suggest—and indeed this is something that is within the framework and the terms of the Act covering the Canada Manpower programme—I think this is something the hon. member might want to make representation about to the government of Canada to see whether there cannot be some flexibility introduced into this type of programme.

Mr. G. E. Smith: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would agree that perhaps the federal guidelines are a little too rigid; could they be a little more flexible?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I can just—

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Did the member and the minister have lunch together?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, in fact we did not. I think this just goes to underline my comment earlier, Mr. Speaker, that in negotiations or in discussions with the government of Canada there could perhaps be some flexibility introduced into this type of programme to take individual cases into account. I would think if the hon. member had the names of the students involved it might be wise to discuss them directly with the officer of Canada Manpower who was in the first place responsible for assigning the students to the college for the upgrading programme.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville had a supplementary?

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, a supplementary of the minister: Would the minister consider providing the services so that the student would be able to complete grades 9, 10, 11 and 12, within the 52 weeks rather than the 64 weeks as at present?

And a second alternative: would the minister consider combining the total amount of time to two years, both for upgrading and for skill training, so that the first portion, the upgrading, could take the 64 weeks and the skill training would only have to take the balance of the time, and they would still complete the programme within the two-year prescribed period?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat the fact that the qualification for this type of course rests in another jurisdiction, under another statute. We simply provide the training at the community college in the area where the qualified person lives.

I am now being asked a question as to whether or not, from an educational point of view, it is possible to compress the upgrading programme of four years into two. I would have to have some advice as to whether this was possible.

I can recall, during the period immediately following the Second World War, apparently it was possible to devise some type of a programme for the returned service men to accomplish this type of programme in a shorter period of time than it took in the normal route. It might be wise to investigate that. Certainly I can assure the hon. member that I would be very pleased to look into that particular matter.

Mr. B. Newman: A second supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister consider the second alternative that I mentioned? That is, in the upgrading programme where skilled training is involved the 52-week period also applies. But generally, the skill training programme is completed in a shorter period of time and where you combine the two, you would still have the two years or a 104-week period. But as it is today, after 52 weeks, the student can only get two weeks or four weeks of grade 11 and then is cut off benefits, and is not eligible for the skill training the next year.

Mr. Speaker: This should be a question.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would be glad to take that into consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Further supplementaries? If not, the member for Kent has the floor.

FARM TAX REBATE PAYMENTS

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): I have a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the minister aware that there is a considerable number of farmers who have not received their farm tax rebate yet? Could the minister inform us why and when they will receive these tax rebates?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that most of the cheques for the rebates went out at the end of last year, but there may be some that have not gone out. Certainly there have been letters that I have dealt with since I came to the department.

I think there is some problem at the moment as to whether lands were assessed for farm purposes or not. I am endeavouring to look at that particular problem to see if we can clear up the difficulty.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: How long will it take to change this from properties that have been assessed as residential instead of as farms?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, you have to measure the type of problem and the means at hand to change it, if it needs to be changed. I am dealing with it directly at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Spence: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? It will be the last one.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, what if a farm consists of 400 acres and is classed as residential?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The assessments from all of the areas of the province were brought into the department; they were using a different type of coding for different lands in different areas. The staff endeavoured to bring some uniformity out of the coding.

There may have been some that have been missed in that operation because it was done very quickly and we are trying to straighten it out.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Waterloo North has a supplementary?

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A supplementary: Would the minister now promise to act to amend the order-in-council which created this problem under the farm tax reduction programme? Where—

Mr. Speaker: All right. The hon. member has asked his question now and the minister will answer. If he has a supplementary, he may ask it.

Mr. Good: I have a supplementary. Will the minister amend the order-in-council under the farm tax reduction programme so that farms that have been erroneously assessed and have been admitted to having been assessed improperly by the area assessment commissioners, could benefit from this programme as do legitimate farmers?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that I will use the simplest way available to correct the problem.

Mr. Bullbrook: The hon. member cannot expect anything more.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary? The member from Essex has a supplementary.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Is the minister aware that correspondence is going out from his officials in charge of this programme demanding that the people sign a form to the effect that they have grossed more than \$2,000 income off the front portion of their farm, which may be in a defined water area and only 500 feet deep?

I think this is the whole crux of the matter. These people are honourable people and they cannot sign this form in good conscience, but they do feel that this is part of their

total farm and are entitled in fact to the government's programme.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the particular instance to which the hon. member is referring. Certainly, in reference to the \$2,000, it applies when it is under the 10 acres, but I will take note of that.

Mr. Good: This is the problem.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for Timiskaming has a supplementary? No? Then the member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker! Is the minister aware that the subsidies branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs is notifying farmers that, where they have been improperly coded, it is their responsibility to get in touch with the assessment department and make the correction? Does the minister think this is fair?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, this matter came to my attention just very recently and that is the reason there has been a review of it with the officials. They were looking at it. We are trying to straighten it out and I hope it will be done within a week or 10 days.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview. This will be the last supplementary on this question.

Mr. Singer: No. It is not a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Then the member for Timiskaming has the floor.

CLOSURE OF COBALT REFINERIES

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs.

In view of the fact that today is the last day that Cobalt refineries will accept ore, can the minister give the House some indication of the present status of negotiations between his department and Cobalt refineries and the various mines in the Cobalt area?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I will take this question as notice and report back.

Mr. MacDonald: It will be closed before then.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this company is going to close today, surely the minister must have something to communicate to the House?

Mr. Speaker: The minister has given his answer to the question as he is entitled to do. It is his responsibility. The member for Port Arthur has the floor.

NORTHERN TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Highways referring to a paragraph in His Honour's Throne Speech yesterday, which indicated that a review would be made of the cost of transporting goods between northern and southern Ontario.

Could the minister tell the House when this review will be made? How intensive it will be? Will it be the review to end all reviews? How much co-operation there will be with the federal government and to what extent the people most seriously affected, the people of northern Ontario will be involved in this review?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am not too sure whether the hon. member is quarreling with the purpose that was described in His Honour's speech yesterday. I think it is time this matter was reviewed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The government has had 25 reports on transportation.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: My hearing aid works very well. I heard His Honour yesterday just the same as the hon. member did. May I say to the hon. member that the review process has already begun.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I should hope so.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: It should have been.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Port Arthur a further supplementary?

Mr. Knight: May I ask the hon. minister to answer the other parts of that question? Will there be co-operation with the federal government? How intensive will it be? And will the people of that area indeed be involved in this review?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me see! It is about 24 hours since His Honour made his speech in this House yesterday.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is going to make a full statement tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Patience, patience, patience! I have already indicated that the review process has been undertaken. It will be intensive in character. It will be done in depth in the usual form and manner that we do things in this department. At the appropriate time, sir—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Is that the study for northeastern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton:—at the appropriate time, even in intermittent stages, we may well inform the House as to its progress.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: By way of supplementary, I would like to ask the Minister of Transport whether the review will include investigation into the conduct of a government which fixes and permits the discrimination in the price of beer?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I rather think that question should be appropriately directed to the minister who has the responsibility for those matters, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Rainy River a supplementary?

Mr. T. P. Reid: No, not off hand.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East has a question? A supplementary from the member for Thunder Bay?

Mr. Stokes: I would like to ask the minister: Is it not true that this has been a study that has been ongoing for several months and that the results of that study are now before cabinet for their consideration?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge. The study that was made reference to by His Honour yesterday is a study that will be part of the new department when the new departmental Act is introduced into this House and made law. It will be part of that, but we are anticipating that so we are starting now.

I cannot speak with respect to the senate to which the hon. member makes reference. I have no particular knowledge of it myself. I do say that I, plus the two departments as they presently exist and the new department when it is constituted, will progress this study with—

Mr. Sopha: With diligence?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: With diligence. That is a good word. Thank you very much. Due diligence, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for the word. The hon. member is quite correct—due diligence.

Well, it may not be a new idea but it is a new study as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Stokes: A further supplementary: Is it not a fact that the minister, when he was the Minister of Treasury and Economics, promised, when he unveiled the Design for Development in Thunder Bay, that a study had already been put under way to discuss the high cost of transportation in the north and that within very few months of that date that a report would be coming back? Is it true that the minister is denying any knowledge of that study?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, Mr. Speaker. This is being processed in rather unusual form. Of course I recall. The study was referred to when we presented the regional development programme for northwestern Ontario, but I am talking about a study that will be undertaken by the two departments as they presently exist and by the new department when it is constituted.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am talking about the study that was referred to in His Honour's speech.

Mr. Speaker: That is right. The supplementary questions are on that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It will be carried out by the two departments that are presently under my administration and in companion terms with any other studies that have been made. We recognize the importance of it. Since other associated elements have now been described and will be developed, certain other means will probably be at our disposal to pursue this matter. I simply suggest—and I hope the House will accept it—that it will be pursued, and I go back to my hon. friend and thank him for the words, with “due diligence.”

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East has the floor for a new question. We have had enough supplementaries on that.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. T. Reid: A question of the Minister of Education: Does the minister intend to support the unanimous report of the standing committee on education presented by the Conservative Party chairman from Hamilton Mountain (J. R. Smith) over a year ago, on May 15? I quote:

Your committee recommends that its terms of reference be extended to permit it to initiate studies in education and in the economics of education and to report thereon.

Does the minister intend to support the committee and its requirements?

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the hon. member that this is a matter of government policy, but the floor is the minister's to answer.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think the whole question of the role of the standing committee in terms of reference would be a subject to be dealt with by the Prime Minister in due course.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister prepared to have a body outside of his department investigate the costs of education in this province; and if so will he ask the standing committee to do it?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, do I understand the member to say “a body outside of the Legislature”?

Mr. T. Reid: A body outside of the minister's department, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Welch: What does the hon. member think his role is? I thought the people of his riding sent him here along with 116 others of us to examine the spending estimates of the department once a year?

Mr. T. Reid: I said a body outside of the minister's department of civil servants. Will the minister authorize and support the standing committee investigating the costs of education in this province?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to add to my answer. This is a matter which is subject to the scrutiny of this House once a year.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I might ask the Minister of Education whether he has as yet framed a reply to the secondary school teachers who were trying to get in contact with him last week?

Mr. Speaker: That is not supplementary to the original question. In due course the member can ask it. Are there further supplementaries to this question?

Mr. Pitman: Under the cost of education?

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary from Sudbury East?

Mr. Martel: No.

Mr. Speaker: Then the member for Peterborough may now ask his question, if he wishes, as a new question.

REPRESENTATIONS BY SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Education if he has had an opportunity yet to frame a reply to the secondary school teachers who were trying to get in touch with him last week?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I am glad this question has been asked because the Minister of Education met for an hour with the president and the executive of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers Federation on March 22, the day before the letter arrived, and at that point this particular matter was not discussed.

Mr. Pitman: Was or was not?

Hon. Mr. Welch: It was not. It was not discussed. I called the meeting to respond to another particular matter that was concerning them. The letter arrived on the Wednesday with some specific questions. In my absence the Deputy Minister replied, and I would be very happy to send the hon. member a copy of that particular reply.

It is my hope to have the opportunity to meet with the executive of the OSSTF to review the factual information that they require in order to assess the whole question of the ceilings and the spending levels for ordinary expenditures.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary. May I ask the minister to table the reply?

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I might ask a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, as to

whether the minister would be prepared to have the OSSTF come before the appropriate committee of this House in order that all members of the Legislature might be able to discuss this matter with them?

Hon. Mr. Welch: It is my intention to meet with the executive of the OSSTF to respond to the particular matters that they raised in the letter, and that is as far as I am prepared to make any comment today.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I could ask one further supplementary question? Could the minister indicate, in relation to the contents of that letter, whether any guidelines have been presented to the board along with those steps that would ensure the quality of education will not be affected by these steps in the areas such as special education, professional development and so on?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, this minister takes second place to no one in the province in his interest and his concern for quality education.

Mr. Pitman: That was not the question.

Hon. Mr. Welch: He is also quite satisfied that the school trustees of this province are very competent people, elected by the people in that area to manage education.

Mr. Speaker: Those are sufficient supplementaries from this member. Does the Leader of the Opposition wish to ask a supplementary?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, in response to an earlier question, I am tabling a copy of the reply.

Mr. Speaker: That is what the Leader of the Opposition was asking for?

Mr. Nixon: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It is the turn of the member for Grey-Bruce. If he defers, we can give it to the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That will be the day.

RAILWAY SERVICE IN BRUCE PENINSULA

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): A question of the Minister of— Why do you not hang some signs around their necks with their new jobs?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Would the minister advise what his plans are in his new Department of Highways and Transport to reactivate the railroads in my part of the country?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I have to say that it is a very interesting question. I think the hon. member is aware that every rail line abandonment that has been proposed by either the Canadian National or Canadian Pacific railways has been dealt with, as they appeared, by The Department of Transport before the committee of the Canadian Transport Commission.

Mr. Sargent: That is this government's stand now?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The decisions to abandon these rail lines are made, of course, by the railways with the concurrence of the Canadian Transport Commission, but I suppose I should remind you, sir, if that is necessary, that it is an emanation of the federal government. Interventions are made in each instance; briefs are submitted on behalf of the communities of this province wherever this occurs. But if it is decided, in the wisdom of the Canadian Transport Commission, to allow these abandonments, then there is very little this government can do about it. So we are going to pursue these matters again with increasing diligence.

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary: Is the minister aware of the new Railpax setup in the United States and is he going to pursue the weak-kneed policy of Irwin Haskett in this regard?

Mr. Speaker: The question period has now expired. I would point out that the debate would be much better if we referred to members by their official designations, not by their personal names.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave—

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member wait? The Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs has the floor first and he is entitled to present his report.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me pleasure and privilege on my first official act of this new Legislature as the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs to

table the department's annual review for 1970, copies of which have been placed at each member's desk.

An hon. member: The minister's picture is not there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, mineral production in 1970 shattered all previous records at \$1.63 billion.

Mr. Nixon: The minister was not supporting Lawrence, was he?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes.

According to history, the annual review is one of the first departmental yearly summations to roll off the press. It is written in two parts, the first dealing with the vast mining industry in the Province of Ontario and the second with an equally expanded Department of Mines and Northern Affairs.

Mr. Nixon: What a payoff!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not acknowledge that my predecessor, the hon. member for St. George (A. F. Lawrence) was responsible for much of the expansion in the department. I also wish to congratulate my entire staff for having produced such a report in such a short time.

Mr. Bullbrook: His predecessor is going to wish he was back in that department.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I am told that in the newspaper trade this is akin to stop press writing.

Mr. Singer: The minister was just saved by the Speaker today.

Mr. Bullbrook: We are going to find out how much law he really knows.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: All the material, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order; order!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would point out to the members, Mr. Speaker, that all the material here had to be garnered from December 1 on.

I think that you, Mr. Speaker, and all the other hon. members here today will concur that the review speaks for itself. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: And the Provincial Secretary's report?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following

reports. The 1969-1970 report of the Provincial Auditor for the Province of Ontario, the public accounts of the Province of Ontario for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1970, and the financial statements of the University of Western Ontario for the year ended June 30, 1970.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I beg leave to present the annual report of the Department of Energy and Resources Management for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1970.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if a monitor will check the PA system. It is not working at the members' desks. There was no report from the minister on our amplifying system.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): That is to our advantage.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves that Mr. Speaker be authorized to arrange for the printing of the reports of debates and speeches in the amount of 3,000 copies daily, copies of such printed reports to be supplied to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, to Mr. Speaker, to the Clerk of the legislative assembly, to the legislative library, to each member of the assembly, to the reference libraries of the province, to the press gallery, to the newspapers of the province as approved by you, Mr. Speaker; and the balance to be distributed by the Clerk of the assembly as directed by the Speaker.

Mr. T. Reid: Is the Prime Minister's picture going to be on them?

Mr. Sargent: Point of information: Would the Prime Minister advise why—

Mr. Speaker: There is no such thing as a point of information.

Mr. Sargent: Well, how do we talk about this?

Mr. Speaker: When the motion is presented then it may be debated.

Mr. Sargent: Okay.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Mr. Davis moves: That

Mr. Speaker be authorized to arrange for the printing of the reports of debates and speeches in the amount of 3,000 copies daily, copies of such printed reports to be supplied to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, to Mr. Speaker, to the Clerk of the legislative assembly, to the legislative library, to each member of the assembly, to the reference libraries of the province,

to the press gallery, to the newspapers of the province; as approved by Mr. Speaker; and the balance to be distributed by the Clerk of the assembly as directed by Mr. Speaker.

Now, if the hon. member wishes to speak to the motion by way of debate, he has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my point always has been that if *Hansard* could be available to the people of Ontario at large, it would be one of the 10 best sellers, if they could put this on the market.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is kidding.

Mr. Sargent: If in some way we could tell the people they can buy *Hansard*—buy some advertising space, Mr. Speaker—and say to the people, "you can buy *Hansard*". It would be a new venture in democracy for them to see what goes on in this place. They know only what these people in the press gallery tell them, that is all. Everything is censored up there.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): It is just as well the hon. member is censored.

Mr. Sargent: I do not mind, I do not mind. Somewhere along the line there should be more than 3,000 copies of *Hansard* printed.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate?

Mr. Sargent: Why not?

Mr. Speaker: Motion agreed to.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Mr. Carruthers moves the standing committees of the House for the present session be appointed as follows:

1. Procedural affairs committee, to which will be automatically referred the applications for private bills for report as to compliance with the standing orders governing such applications. This committee may, in the discretion of the House, also have referred to it any matter relating to standing orders and procedures in the House, or the committees thereof, and any matter relating to the privileges of the House and the members thereof, or of the election of such members.

2. Legal administration committee, to which may be referred in the discretion of the House any bills, estimates or other matters relating to the Departments of Financial and

Commercial Affairs, Justice, Labour, Municipal Affairs, Provincial Secretary and Citizenship. To this committee also will be automatically referred any boards and commissions which report through the ministers of those departments.

Committees 1 and 2 combined under the chairmanship of the chairman of the legal administration committee will function as the private bills committee.

3. Human resources committee, to which may be referred in the discretion of the House, any bills, estimates, or other matters relating to the Departments of Correctional Services, Education, Health, Social and Family Services and University Affairs and to which will also be automatically referred those boards and commissions which report through the ministers of those departments.

4. Natural and physical resources committee, to which may be referred in the discretion of the House, any bills, estimates, or other matters relating to the Departments of Agriculture and Food, Energy and Resources Management, Highways, Lands and Forests, Mines and Northern Affairs, Tourism and Information and Transport and to which will also be automatically referred any boards and commissions which report through the ministers of those departments.

5. Estimates committee.

6. Public accounts committee.

7. Regulations committee, as ordered by Revised Statutes of Ontario, chapter 110, 1968-1969.

Committees number 1 to 4 inclusive may have no conflict of membership with one another, nor may committees numbers 5, 6 and 7 have conflict of membership with one another.

Which said committees shall severally be empowered to examine and enquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereof, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Carruthers moves: That

Standing committees of this House for the present session be appointed as follows:

1. Procedural affairs committee, to which will be automatically referred the applications for private bills for report as to compliance with the standing orders governing such applications. This committee may, in the discretion of the House, also have referred to it any matter relating to

standing orders and procedures in the House, or the committees thereof, and any matter relating to the privileges of the House and the members thereof, or of the election of such members.

2. Legal administration committee, to which may be referred in the discretion of the House any bills, estimates or other matters relating to the Departments of Financial and Commercial Affairs, Justice, Labour, Municipal Affairs, Provincial Secretary and Citizenship. To this committee also will be automatically referred any boards and commissions which report to the ministers of those departments. Committees 1 and 2, combined under the chairmanship of a chairman of the legal administration committee, will function as a private bills committee.

3. A human resources committee, to which may be referred in the discretion of the House any bills, estimates or other matters relating to The Department of Correctional Services, Education, Health, Social and Family Services and University Affairs; and to which also will be automatically referred those boards and commissions which report to the ministers of those departments.

4. Natural and physical resources committee, to which may be referred in the discretion of the House any bills, estimates or other matters relating to The Department of Agriculture and Food, Energy and Resources Management, Highways, Lands and Forests, Mines and Northern Affairs, Tourism and Information, and Transport, and to which also will be automatically referred any boards and commissions which report to the ministers of those departments.

5. Estimates committee.

6. Public accounts committee.

7. Regulations committee, as ordered by Statutes of Ontario chapter 110 of 1968-1969.

Committees number 1 to 4 inclusive may have no conflict of membership with one another, nor may committees 5, 6 and 7 have conflict of membership with one another.

Which said committees shall severally be employed to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in many years that a substantial departure from the regular ordering of the business of the House has been put before us without previous consultation. Surely the construction or the reconstruction of these committees might very well have been a subject for discussion among the whips before the motion was put before us.

It is true that the motion that is put by the whip of the Progressive Conservative Party was taken from a report which, as I understand it, was prepared for the whips by the Clerk of the House some months ago—but there was no agreement at that time that this was going to be the basis of the restructuring.

It is only by virtue of the fact that my colleague, the member for Waterloo North, happened to have one of those papers available from previous discussions more than six months ago that we could even follow the resolution as it was put forward. I think it would have been useful if we had had an opportunity to discuss this matter before it came before the House as a resolution.

I really feel that it is an imposition for it to be put this way, Mr. Speaker, and I must say in all conscience to the whip of the Progressive Conservative Party that I personally feel that he is not serving the House properly in putting the resolution this way.

There may be an opportunity for him to respond to that a bit later, but I can tell you, just in listening to what he has had to say, that the constitution of the so-called committee number 1 deals with the applications for private bills for report, as to compliance with standing orders, but it does not appear to me to be a form in which a discussion of private bills and an approval can in fact take place.

If the Prime Minister would care to comment before I continue, it might be possible for us to adjourn this matter even until tomorrow if there is other business we could proceed with, until we at least get a copy of the resolution as it has been put forward on behalf of the government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, just to reply to this very briefly. I quite frankly did not take an active part in the discussion of the proceedings of the standing committees of this House in the past four or five years.

My recollection is that the representatives from the various parties, together with the Clerk of the House, prepared just the phraseology that is presently before us on this

occasion. This was known to the members opposite, and the procedures that are being set out here surely fall into line with many of the discussions we have had in this Legislature.

To me it is a very significant step forward; it means that committees can now function at the same time without any conflict of membership, and I would have thought the Leader of the Opposition would have welcomed this with a very substantial degree of enthusiasm.

Mr. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Davis: And I could go further with respect to the procedural affairs committee, which will be dealing with matters of private bills, that it would still continue this same function that the private bills committee did, that it would have the right to approve and report back here to this House.

Mr. Nixon: All right.

An hon. member: The Leader of the Opposition has got to talk to his whip.

Mr. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: May I just point out for a moment that this is a debate in the House and normally a member speaks but once in such a debate.

Mr. Nixon: I might draw to your attention, sir—

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked if the Prime Minister wished to reply, so perhaps the Leader of the Opposition will complete his remarks on this particular debate now.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, Thank you. In response to the comments—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Completely unprepared.

Mr. Nixon: In response to the comments made by the Premier I would simply point out to him, as I really already have, that I am aware the whips discussed this six months ago. But I would tell you sir, that there was no agreement that I am familiar with, nor that my whip is familiar with, and I simply feel that it would have been in the best interests of having a reasonable debate at this time if the whips, under the chairmanship of the government whip, had undertaken to discuss this and get the kind of agreement that might have been possible, and I am sure that it would have been possible.

Well now, sir, I want to continue, because I do agree that the committee system needed, and does need, reform. One of the complaints that has come from all sides has been that with the eight or nine or 10 separate standing committees it has been practically impossible for an individual member of the House with membership in several committees to meet his responsibilities as adequately as we would all like to do. So certainly this approach is acceptable. My point simply is that it should certainly have been a matter of consultation before it had been presented here in the House. I say again we still do not have a copy of the motion that has been presented by the Conservative whip and I say that we ought to have a copy of it.

Mr. Speaker, if I might continue—having entered that objection—proposals for committee reform have been substantial and the former Minister of Education, as he himself has said, has frequently not taken an active role in that, having been occupied with his heavy duties elsewhere. But now that he is leading the House it is a matter of prime concern, and I am very glad that he is giving it his attention. I would suggest to him that it might have been worked out a little more effectively to include us all in the final decision that might be made.

I would call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that there have been changes in the committee system over a number of years. The estimates committee itself was proposed by the Liberal Party since 1967, and finally this was acceded to by all parties. I do recall that with the amendment that we offered in 1967 and 1968, the NDP opposed it because they felt it would not lead to effective debate.

My point is this, that it has been necessary over a number of years to put the difficulties that we as private members have experienced with the committee system before the government, and there have been changes, and I feel that the committee system has in some respects improved because of it. I feel that if we can eliminate duplication of assignments—as this proposal I hope will do—then of course it will be in the best interests of all of us serving our responsibilities as we see them.

I should draw to your attention, sir, that over the last eight years the responsibilities of the committees have been substantially downgraded, and I feel that this is one of the serious shortcomings that is the responsibility of the immediate past Premier. I do not want to spend a long time on this, but since the Minister of University Affairs is in the House

I know that he would feel badly if I did not repeat again my comments about his great days when he was chairman of the education committee back in the early Sixties. In those days that standing committee met every week without fail. Also, in those days the Premier was also the Minister of Education and he was even prevailed upon to attend on some rare occasions. I well recall that the then chairman—

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): The member was more constructive then than now, I recall.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, I recall that the then chairman of the education committee, who is now the Minister of University Affairs—and the present Premier, as did his predecessor, has gone to great lengths to make room for that particular gentleman around the council table—but he used to use public funds to have a bus pulled up at the door and we as members of the education committee would travel around the province, sometimes on jaunts that were not very useful.

On the other hand we got so that we could call the chairman of the board of the University of Western Ontario at least by his first name and become acquainted with some of his broader political views.

The point surely is that the education committee, more than any other, should have the facilities available to its members to really become immediately acquainted with those leaders in the education system of the province, and certainly to obtain a better understanding of what these problems are.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be wise to recall to you, sir, that on May 15 last year a resolution came from the first meeting of the standing committee on education that was held during the whole session, calling upon the government to authorize the sum expenditure of that particular committee and giving it some authority to investigate costs of education and to call before it those people who had some expertise in that area.

My colleague, the member for Scarborough East, raised this just this afternoon, and my colleague from Sarnia raised it in the standing committee on education a year ago. But the government under the leadership of the former Premier (Mr. Robarts) did not see fit to respond with the funds and the initiative that would have permitted that sort of investigation to take place. I well recall that during the days when community colleges and the policies determining their development were under substantial discussion in

the community that the standing committee on education had no meetings whatsoever for five months.

It was almost as bad as last year when there were only two meetings of the standing committee on education—one to pass the resolution requesting funds and special support so that that committee could make its investigations effectively in this House and around the province; and the second meeting of that committee where the Conservative majority reversed itself and quashed the resolution as it had been previously passed. Those were the only two meetings of the standing committee on education that were held during the entire session last year, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. T. Reid: Twice that year.

Mr. Nixon: That is an indication of the level to which the standing committees have dropped under the leadership of the previous Premier. Now we can hope for better things under the present incumbent. But I am still critical of his approach even to this resolution today, which was entered into without the kind of consultation that certainly would have made the position more tenable.

But to trace the development of changes, at least in the standing committee system, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, last year that the standing committee on health did have some rather effective meetings in which it discussed the ramifications of certain government policies and the problems that were faced by the mental institutions particularly in this province. It was only because of the effectiveness of the deliberations in that standing committee that the government of the day saw fit to remove the present Minister without Portfolio and member for Quinte (Mr. Potter) from the chairmanship, replacing him with my hon. friend the member for Hamilton West (Mrs. Pritchard).

There was a great deal of criticism at that time, because it was, I think, properly said that the government was attempting to muzzle one of the standing committees, which is supposed to be an independent adjunct of this House, in its attempts to make free and useful hearings available, not only to educate the members but to educate the people of the province in some of the problems in that particular field of our responsibility.

The public accounts committee is another case in point. One of the improvements in recent years was the establishment of the public accounts committee and the agreement

on all sides that the chairman of that committee would be a representative from the opposition.

I notice from the scowls from my friend in the middle of the House here that the public accounts committee, I guess, was functioning before but it certainly was strengthened. I feel it was strengthened by the agreement on all sides that the chairman be someone representing an opposition party. But even that fell far short of the effectiveness that it might have achieved simply because there were no funds allocated for staffing that committee. The very lengthy and difficult regimen of work they undertook had to be carried out without the sort of, I will say, professional assistance that must be a part of any kind of discussion or an investigation of this type.

I was glad to hear, yesterday, His Honour saying that the government was going to have a new departure in policy and that the administration was going to listen to what people said and then act in response. I thought it was a bit trite; it sounded as if the new administration had the same speech writer as the old one had. I do not know whether that is a fact or not. It is always, of course, a good thing to say that the government is going to listen and respond to the views of the public.

But I would say that what we need substantially here is the means to make not only the government but the whole Legislature more responsive to the views expressed in the community. While the government has its own means of increasing its sensitivity, such as the Premier and his colleagues going on tour into the various parts of the province and listening to the complaints that are put to them and him, I feel that the standing committee system is one area in which the usefulness of the members of the Legislature can be substantially improved. For this reason, I would hope that these committees as they are constituted will not be hampered in their investigations by a restrictive attitude on the part of the Premier or the government through the ministers, which in fact will stultify and deaden any initiatives which might come forward from the committee itself.

I recall to your mind, Mr. Speaker, that last year there was an initiative from the standing committee on education which was knocked on the head. They were not given the powers nor the financing to undertake the investigation of education costs which surely were as important even then as they are now.

The second case in point was the removal of the chairman of the standing committee on health. Now that particular debt has been paid off and rectified by his appointment as a Minister without Portfolio. I feel that his price is a bit cheap but that is, of course, his decision and not ours. I am not sure what was put to the Premier to persuade him that the member for Quinte should be brought into the cabinet, but I have my own suspicions.

Nevertheless, I am recalling the fact that government policy last year once again put down any initiative from a standing committee even if it was forthcoming from the Conservative chairman of the committee itself. I feel that this is an occasion when we must give every support to the government in upgrading the committee system. If this approach is going to do it, then I say "Hear, hear" and we would support the basic motion.

I feel, of course, that it does not go far enough. The present Premier and the members of the administration have heard my views previously on some of these areas. But, for example, in the speech yesterday we were informed by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor that there is going to be a special committee designed to examine the matter of foreign control of our economy. This deals with foreign investment in our province—

Hon. Mr. Davis: A conference.

Mr. Nixon: A conference. All right. It is not a committee of this House and this is one of the points that I want to make, Mr. Speaker; because while it might in fact serve some purpose to have a conference of the type that the administration has had dealing with the pollution of the Great Lakes, or the tax difficulties with the municipalities, my experience with both of those previous conferences has been that they have been window dressing—that no specific action has followed from either of them or any of them. I am afraid that this conference is going to be the same.

My point is this, that surely the standing committee system of the Legislature should be flexible enough to give the members of the Legislature an opportunity to examine this—not just in debate in the House, even though that is very important, but on an occasion when we can call before us, by power of subpoena if necessary, those people whose views we should be seeking in getting the kinds of opinions and background which are going to be necessary in the debilitations on

new statutes and regulations in this very sensitive area.

The second area in this connection would be an examination of Ontario Hydro rates. I was most interested to see in press reports of the recent leadership race in the Progressive Conservative Party that the member for Ottawa South (Mr. Haskett) made it very explicit that he felt there was not sufficient information provided even to the cabinet to approve or disapprove of any rate changes on the part of Hydro. This, of course, was in direct contradiction of the statement made by the former Premier when the whole matter of Hydro rates was under discussion a year ago.

Frankly, I regret the fact that the standing committees of the House are not going to have the power, with the proper professional advice provided, to investigate this matter as fully as we would hope. Instead, the Speech from the Throne said that the productivity improvement programme—that committee that was set up under that title originally—is going to make a thorough examination of the whole basis of the decisions taken by Ontario Hydro.

I welcome the examination, believe me. I think that that is valuable, but I feel that the flexibility of the standing committee system of this House should be such that that sort of investigation can be undertaken in the public interest by the members of the House. It can only come about if the standing committees are provided with the kind of qualified and professional staff that undoubtedly the productivity improvement programme commission is going to have available to them.

As a third example of the sort of area of discussion which our standing committees must undertake, I would recall to your mind, Mr. Speaker, that it has been our contention that the whole area of medical fees should come under the scrutiny of the appropriate standing committee of the Legislature, with recommendations made to the whole House upon which the government can act under its responsibilities which are well known. This is not to be the case unless there is a referral of the OMA fee schedule made in the next few days by the Minister of Health to one of the appropriate standing committees which, undoubtedly, we will constitute this afternoon.

There is a whole area here—not only involving doctors' fees but, for the benefit of a good many of the members of the House,

the decisions taken unilaterally by the bar associations of the province in setting the legal tariffs. I think the same can be said in the decisions taken by the farm products marketing boards. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture and Food is here, and he knows that they have substantial powers to set fees for services, and, more importantly, costs of foodstuffs at the production level. I feel that those decisions should be reviewed by the appropriate standing committee of the House as well.

I can go on to say that in any area—in any area—where by statute or custom, a monopoly situation prevails, particularly in the setting of fees for service or for products, there should be a direct route by which an appropriate standing committee of the Legislature will have the right and the powers of subpoena to call before it those people responsible for making the decision and to review that decision. It would, on the one hand, give the power of review and recommendation to the government; and on the other hand, give the representatives of those particular disciplines and businesses a good forum to express the views that they have in the financing of their own business or profession.

Another case in point would obviously be the whole insurance industry—not just the automobile insurance industry but the insurance industry at large. In the automobile industry particularly, the rates have been substantially standardized and it is usually by agreement that increases of certain percentages are imposed without any recourse to public control. At least, the government has not seen fit to impose these controls although it does have the powers granted by this Legislature to undertake these controls.

I feel that these rate changes on behalf of the automobile insurance industry should be reviewed by a standing committee of this House. The whole situation associated with the wage situation and the profit situation in large industries in this province should come under its purview as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am simply saying that we support an amendment and, I should say, a change in the basic committee system. Certainly, it can be changed even during this session and amended in sessions to come to improve it; but we have tinkered with it for a good many years—I suppose for more than a century—and we are a long way from having a committee system that works effectively at the present time.

While these four special committees and the two extra committees may serve our purpose in a broad way to deal with the general business of this House, I feel that they are lacking substantially in giving the powers to the committee system to have a general oversight of the economics of the province. In specific terms, I am going to propose an amendment adding an additional committee on financial affairs—economic affairs, I should say—which would have the direction of this House to call before it the representation and the representatives of those areas in the business and the service industry of the province which have, in fact, monopoly powers to set rates and fees.

I feel that it should be in the power of that committee not only to provide a public forum for the representatives of those particular areas to justify their position, but also a forum in which the public interest, through the members of this House, can be represented and recommendations can be made to this House which should be regarded and followed by the government of the day. In the past, there has been an objection that this interferes with responsible government. I do not say that the committee should have the power to impose its decision, but simply to make public recommendations of the type that I have already described. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment to the resolution presented by the hon. member for Durham, as follows:

I move, seconded by the member for Downsview, that there be an additional standing committee appointed, called the economic affairs committee, empowered and instructed to investigate and hold public hearings related to significant cost changes in products or services affecting the cost of living in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, while the amendment is being put in your hands, I would say that it is essential that not only does this House have the basic and final responsibility of such review, and the power to make recommendation to the government, but that the same review of public endeavours has to be transferred to the standing committee system much more effectively than it ever has in the past. During the question period, certain matters were put to the Minister of Education concerning education costs. This is obviously a matter of prime concern and importance to us all.

In my view the standing committee on education must have—or the committee that is constituted by the resolution put before us

must have—an immediate instruction from this House to undertake the sort of review that was envisaged in the resolution that came from the standing committee on education last year. You recall, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution was supported by members on all sides and killed by the government. They were not prepared either to permit it or to finance it. But this is the sort of investigation that we must have.

Mr. T. Reid: The year of crisis—the minister did not even look at it.

Mr. Nixon: I draw to your attention, sir, the resolution on the order paper in the name of the member for Scarborough East, which called for substantial reactivation of the standing committee dealing with education affairs for this precise purpose. It calls for an interim report not later than April 30, 1971, and a final report not later than June 30, 1971. It also provides the instruction to the appropriate standing committee that representatives of the teachers' professional organizations and others be summoned before that committee to express their views in this matter of urgent concern; and that every means at our disposal be made to search out those areas in education where costs can be cut, and not necessarily with the meat-axe approach which interferes with the quality of education in the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, it is not usual for the government opposite to accept the recommendations of the opposition parties. I would, of course, ask them to consider this amendment with care and, hopefully, to support it. I would simply recall to them that while the wording of this resolution is practically identical with a similar one that I put before the House last year, it has been our experience that it will take three or four or five different debates and votes in this House until the government of the day will see that the committee system must be improved. It must be made relevant. It must and can make the government and the House more sensitive to the problems in the community and this is surely what we need, because democracy is a good long way from having achieved any kind of perfection. Perhaps I am prepared to say it would be a lot closer to it if we were over there and the government people were out in the country. That is something that we can settle in another forum and we are prepared to do it in the next few weeks or months.

But I am here to say that whether you are a New Democrat or an old democrat or any other kind of democrat, we must realize that

unless we improve the sensitivity of this Legislature and the government then our method of government is becoming substantially irrelevant. We are going to continue to have decisions by the government in response to crisis, that we as members of this Legislature have seen our positions downgraded during the last eight years and we want to serve notice on the present incumbent of the Prime Ministership that we will insist on having a more effective role to play with committees that are going to be meeting regularly and are going to have an effective role to play in the determination of policy.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, in perhaps more abbreviated form, I would like to deal with the government resolution. I begin by pointing out that in basic intent the resolution is acceptable to us.

My mind went back to the journals of the assembly; back, I guess, to Friday, November 6, 1970, when this committee's report was tabled in the Legislature. It was a report with which all members agreed, including the representatives of the Liberal Party, and a report which contains almost word for word the resolution which is before us today. Indeed, the only alterations are in the naming of two committees.

It seemed to us then, as it seems to us now, that that was worthy of support. We had participated in the decision ourselves and subsequent discussion reinforced that view.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, subject to certain caveats and to a subamendment I would like to move on behalf of this caucus, we think that the amendments to the committee system are salutary, that they are important, and that if they can be made to work much will be derived from them. I would prefer therefore to dwell rather more on the present than on the past.

One of the things which is lacking—and perhaps the Premier can reassure us on this score—is inclusion in the government's resolution of any reference to unrestricted substitution on the part of members, which was an original stipulation in the report tabled last November. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier and his aides will feel it legitimate that members of various parties in the Legislature, with due notice to the House can substitute people in an unrestricted fashion; not the permanent members of the committee but on a day-to-day basis such as is required in order to make the committees work.

With that introductory thought let me perhaps make three separate points:

1. There must, of course, be given to the committee system and preferably these standing committees as designated, the right to have public hearings, not only here at the Legislature but throughout the Province of Ontario; the right to call witnesses by subpoena or otherwise; the right to investigate certain public areas and contentious public issues at will. That right is of course, often supported in the context of a committee by government members as well as opposition members because the committee does not impose upon members the same kind of inhibitions that the Legislature tends to impose. The committee system—and I fully concur with the Leader of the Opposition—must therefore be permitted to examine with painstaking analysis and with the right to report and make recommendations to the Legislature, areas such as the cost of education; and be permitted to call in industrial polluters throughout, let us say, northern Ontario, to bring them to account; to examine a matter like the cutting in Quetico Provincial Park rather than assigning it to an advisory committee; to enter into a full analysis of automobile insurance, not merely the setting of premiums, but also in the settling of claims and the imposition of no fault. In other words, it would take a grip on the most contentious public issues, and confine its activities not purely to Metropolitan Toronto but have hearings throughout the province and allow all members of the Legislature to participate in that procedure as well as the public. In order to do so, the powers of the legislative committees will obviously have to be enhanced significantly.

2. Mr. Speaker, one of the things which this resolution does not ensure—although I would read into it good intentions—is that the most critical of the standing boards and commissions and tribunals of government will not necessarily appear before the standing committees in any order of priority or at a time and with the sufficient analysis to which every one of them should be subject.

I want to make three specific observations in this regard: First, of course, regarding Ontario Hydro coming before that committee which deals with natural and physical resources, let me add this thought, Mr. Speaker: we in this party think it is a mistake to have submitted Ontario Hydro to the analysis of the committee on government productivity. That committee was never designed to investigate a matter as important in terms of the setting of rates, in terms of the rates stabilization fund and in terms of develop-

mental policy, as Ontario Hydro. It is positively ludicrous that that committee should have the authority to investigate energy resource priorities in Ontario over the next several years.

We have an energy board in this province which one would have thought might have some concern in that area. But more important, Mr. Speaker, we have members of the Legislature before whom Hydro should be brought and called to account, giving us the right to summon every conceivable expert testimony to counter their massive, seductive public relations barrage which was characteristic of the last hearing and will be characteristic of every other.

We make a profound error, Mr. Speaker, in thinking that these boards and commissions are improved by analysis which is purely internal. It is unacceptable to us. The committee on government productivity just presented a little report to the members of this Legislature. Some of it was substantial, some of it was fairly trifling, but none of it suggested that this committee had in any sense the capacity to investigate an area of such exceptional public concern—which should be subject to public and open scrutiny, not to another cocktail party analysis behind the scenes. In terms of a public corporation, that does not sit very well with members in this party.

The second point, Mr. Speaker, involves the Workmen's Compensation Board, which must have priority in being called before the legal and administrative committee for precisely the same reason. The Workmen's Compensation Board is given to an essentially anti-democratic process of review. The entire review is internal; it is not subject to external analysis and scrutiny on the part of any body in a consistent fashion. And it is a matter of intense priority that the Workmen's Compensation Board be brought before the appropriate legislative committee, not for an hour and a half but for several sittings if necessary, giving us access to all the material which we require, allowing members to raise all those areas of contention—and God knows they are infinite where the Workmen's Compensation Board is concerned—and subject that board to a more rigorous grilling than it has ever received through the process of debate in this House.

Finally—although more by way of example than by way of a definitive outline—the Ontario Hospital Services Commission must have a similar priority before the committee which is entitled “human resources.” It must have

that priority, because in many parts of the province standard ward care now ranges from \$70 a day to over \$100 a day; the absence of chronic and convalescent care in Ontario is now notable, and the cost of hospital services, and the undue cost of the delivery services of the health system generally should be subject again to public appraisal. That can be achieved in a committee in a way in which it cannot be achieved in this House. It will satisfy both public and members that people are, in fact, called to account—again, not at the whim of government and of an occasional hour but as an absolute priority. The sub-amendment which we propose puts it as a priority as the Premier will shortly hear.

Three, Mr. Speaker, the last point I wanted to make, and it supports others who have made similar points, is that all of this is premised on an adequate staffing, reporting and functioning of the committee. The committee system must have a committee *Hansard*; the debate must be reported. It is not important that they be published in 3,000 copies—although perhaps that is desirable; they will be memorable graffiti at times here and there in the province—but certainly several hundred or 1,000 copies of the standing committees should be available to members and to the public.

The committee must have counsel, legal counsel. The committee should have, in fact must have, accountants; it must have financial people attached to it. The committee must have the right to call on research consultants; all these committees should have that right when we are dealing with a specific legislative area such as a commission, board or tribunal. Only if you give the committees that kind of staff and substance will they be other than the quieter of discontent.

I do not think I need embroider it further, Mr. Speaker. That makes the points centrally as we see them. Others in my caucus would wish to elaborate.

Mr. Premier, through the Speaker, we want to make the committee system work. We are frustrated and at times a little angered by the way in which members of the Legislature are excluded from the committee process. We understand the purposes of the past, the designs of the past, which prevented us from appropriately exploring hospital problems, costs of education, and related matters.

We assume that this redistribution of the committee system, based as it was on a proposal from all three parties, can be made to work. We are going to move heaven and earth to see that that is achieved and exploit

the committee in every conceivable sense over the next number of weeks or months should they ever meet, before the Premier decides to call an election while he wanders amiably about the province.

Mr. MacDonald: Diligent use of review.

Mr. Lewis: Diligent use of the committee system, precisely. We might even want to review the review of transportation costs in and out of northern Ontario at some point in time.

Let me, therefore, move, seconded by the member for Riverdale (Mr. J. Renwick), that the resolution be sub-amended by adding thereto the following clauses. It is hard to resist the proposition of price and wage review offered by the Liberal Party; that amendment can hardly be resisted. I think that my amendments would obviously have some substance. If the first part can be understood, if the legalese can be understood, the others will follow. The clauses:

Which said committees shall severally be empowered on their own initiative, when not otherwise engaged in matters and things referred to them by the House, to examine and inquire into further and other matters and things related to, or in any way touching within their competence, as they in their discretion may determine;

Which said committees shall be empowered to engage counsel and from time to time such other expert staff as may be necessary to enable the committees to discharge their responsibilities.

That the proceedings of the committees be reported by *Hansard*;

That the Workmen's Compensation Board be called first before the legal administration committee;

That the Ontario Hospital Services Commission be called first before the human resources committee;

And that the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario be called first before the natural and physical resources committee.

Mr. Speaker: If no member from the government side wishes to enter the debate at this time, the hon. member for Scarborough East had indicated his desire to speak previously.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I would defer to my deputy leader, thank you very much.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Mr. Speaker, as mover of this resolution, may I simply state that it was based on the report of the standing orders committee of last year. I think it was thoroughly debated; it was discussed by all members of that committee.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: In the House?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Is there a point of order?

Mr. Peacock: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I apologize for interrupting the hon. member, but may I have your ruling as to whether this closes the debate since the motion before us is in the name of the hon. member whom you now recognize?

Mr. Speaker: I think there is no limitation on the—

Mr. Peacock: I believe if the hon. member who was putting the motion—

Mr. Speaker: Unfortunately, I have sent the motion out to be photostated for one of the hon. members. I do not have it before me. I believe it was the hon. member who did introduce it. In that case, he does not have the right to enter the debate at this time. I must say that the hon. member for Scarborough East had indicated his desire to speak. If he wishes to defer to the hon. member for Downsview, that is perfectly all right.

Mr. T. Reid: Yes, I defer to the deputy leader.

Mr. Speaker: The hon member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I would think that the Premier has embarked in a most inauspicious manner to try to order the proceedings of this House.

Negligence probably is the best word for it, if it is not arrogance. We have a motion brought in today and, quite apart from any other practices or procedures, first of all there has been no consultation this afternoon or in the days that preceded the convening of this session as to the exact form of the motion.

Second of all, as of this moment the debate having gone on for some minutes, perhaps a half-hour already, there are still no additional copies of the resolution available. In fact, the Clerk has not got one; the

Speaker has sent out to have additional copies made. It makes it most impractical and almost impossible to intelligently debate a motion that is brought before this House when neither the Premier nor the government whip has had the courtesy to follow an established pattern in this House—to make copies available to all the members of the House or at least the leaders of the parties before the motion is, in fact, put.

Mr. Lewis: But we have copies.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Copies are here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I can hear the nattering here on my left which is par for the party on the left. They are nattering because they do not understand what I am about to say. If they will be patient, I will explain to them exactly what has happened.

What has happened was there was a committee, Mr. Speaker, that did consider, with representatives of all parties, certain recommendations.

Mr. MacDonald: We all know that.

Mr. Singer: Now that committee in due course reported to the House on November 6, and the report was received. It was never, in fact, adopted, nor is it part of the policy—

Mr. Lewis: The report came before our caucuses.

Mr. Singer: —Mr. Speaker, of this House. There are all sorts of reports that are tabled from time to time that do not, in fact, become part of the policy of this House. In fact, while I had a brief glance at the original form of the motion that was put, there are several substantial and important differences in the motion that was put and in the form of the report that was tabled by the committee last November 6. Names have been changed; details as to quorums have been changed; details as to interchangeability have been changed—all these things, Mr. Speaker, without either preliminary advice, without consultation, and without even the ability to present to the members of the opposition parties copies of the resolutions that are being debated.

Mr. Lewis: The hon. member should be pleased with this report; he agreed to it at the time.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry about the paucity of knowledge of the leader of

the NDP. He has not done his homework again; he is throwing a few more—has he thrown any pamphlets recently to the natives of eastern Ontario to explain his policy?

An hon. member: To the animals!

Mr. Singer: To the animals, yes; do that! Do that rather than heckle in an uninformed way.

Mr. Speaker, let me return to what I have been saying. I would think that if the government wanted to embark in a normal way to substantially change the committee systems of this House, it would have, yesterday or the day before, or even as late as this morning, sent a message to the opposition parties with a copy of the resolution it wanted to introduce. It is most unusual. Certainly when we are debating any bills or anything else, there are copies available. I note that my leader when he moved his amendment had copies available for you, Mr. Speaker, for the Clerk, for the Premier, and for the leader of the NDP.

Mr. Lewis: We were equally vigilant.

Mr. Singer: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that even the member for Scarborough West has a little virtue about him and followed the accepted procedure when he moved his amendment. That is the standard procedure that should have been known at least to the Premier and to his whip. That was not done.

Let me get down to what is really before us. There is a substantial change suggested, and I think that in order to make this committee system work there has to be a viability and an ability given to all of these committees to intelligently deal with the matters that concern the people of this province. No longer can we go on having committees meet only at the behest of the chairman who is a Tory—and the chairman's move is dictated by the government. It is all very well to say that the committees are the place where the work is done, but when the committees do not meet—and when they do not meet at government direction—and when their abilities to inquire are in fact limited or denied, then there is no real democracy in the Province of Ontario.

This is a new government, Mr. Speaker, or so they have been trying to tell us; this is a government that is trying desperately to present a new image. It is the same old Willie. Unfortunately, we had hoped there was going to be a new one. It is even more arrogant than the last government because it brings

in a matter for debate and it does not present copies of the resolution to us in order that we can intelligently discuss it.

Therefore I say that the amendment moved by my leader is of the utmost importance, and if this committee system is going to work in a way that will help the people of Ontario inquire into and get information about such things as legal fees, medical fees, insurance rates, hydro rates and all of those other things, then there has to be the kind of additional committee that my leader has put forward in the amendment that he has moved.

What could be more logical and sensible, Mr. Speaker, if this government is serious about amending the committee procedure, than to say that there be a committee—call it what you will, call it the economic affairs committee as we mentioned in our amendment—empowered to investigate and hold public hearings related to significant cost changes in products or services affecting the cost of living in Ontario.

The member for Scarborough West makes a very valid point in his subamendment that is implied certainly in our amendment, that the economic affairs committee be allowed to make these investigations. The member for Scarborough West spells it out in a little more detail, that it be able to do it on its own initiative, and this is the whole key. That certainly is implied in the amendment and if it needs to be spelled out any more carefully perhaps the wording used by the member for Scarborough West is pertinent.

But surely these committees, this committee and all the other committees, must be able to determine by themselves what they want to look into, and not have to come back from time to time to the House and not only be limited to examining into and inquiring about matters referred to them by the House. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that makes sense.

You can change the form of this, and you can surround the committee structure with the kind of restrictions that are talked about. We look at the original report, the one that the member for Scarborough West was guffawing about a little earlier. You will note that the original report has very strict limitations on substitutions. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that was left out of the resolution, apparently—I still have not got a copy of the resolution. Oh, it just came over, I just have it now. That apparently was left out.

Mr. Deans: Now the member knows what he is talking about.

Mr. Singer: Now if everybody knew what happened originally and had been agreed upon; then has this become a part, is the original report, a part of what is implied in the moving of this resolution? If it is, then it is wrong. It is very, very wrong. Because surely it does not make sense. It does not make sense to me that substitutions only be permitted where a member is unable to attend and has arranged for a substitute, or where a member has a particular interest and comes in and is able to find somebody to substitute for him.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, it must be the privilege of all members of the House to attend all committees of this House and to say as they deem proper what they think about a particular question that a committee is considering. Perhaps their right to vote should be limited, but surely we are not going to accept by implication the suggestion that it is part of the original report of the standing committee that the right to substitute be so limited and so restricted; apparently the right to attend was to be so limited and restricted! Surely that is not the intention, Mr. Speaker, and we should be told about that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Who was on the committee from the member's party?

Mr. Singer: That is not the point. The point is that you have made a mistake, you have made a serious mistake, because again you have not researched what you are talking about and you have not had the courtesy to detail to the House what you were going to bring before us.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that as a first move of the new Premier, if he intends to democratize the procedures of this House, he should begin to take the opposition into consultation on new moves of this type, he should spell out clearly what he has in mind and he should not try to drag the red herring across the trail as he did for so many years in The Department of Education. He has got a different job now, and he has not changed one whit when he proceeds to introduce this motion in the way he introduced it this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge that the House accept the amendment moved by my leader plus the PS added by the member for Scarborough West, which spells it out in a little more detail. It is a pity the member for Scarborough West has not a little more new thinking in his mind to bring up something new.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, if the Premier has not changed, we have certainly been reminded of the fact the hon. member for Downsview has not changed either over the winter.

Mr. Lewis: In fact he has deteriorated.

Mr. MacDonald: I am momentarily overwhelmed at the sense of hurt that has been inflicted upon the Liberal Party. This motion was one that I as a member of the committee, including representatives of the Liberal Party, discussed at very great length. The only point of any validity in this political skirmishing is to clarify to what extent, if any, some of the really substantive aspects of that original report may or may not have, inadvertently, been dropped, specifically this question of substitution. It seems to me that the flexibility in having four omnibus committees, plus the three special committees, is one of the merits of the new setup. But it becomes a merit and avoids becoming a strait-jacket, only if we get full right to substitution.

And I suggest to the Premier, or to the government whip who presumably is going to wind up this debate, that either there should be an amendment on their part to clarify that, or some unequivocal statement in the record to indicate that that aspect of the original report is going to be carried through into the resolution of today or at least into the operations of the committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make just two or three general points. The Leader of the Opposition suggested that the committee operations in this Legislature should reach out to cover the full spectrum of citizens' concerns from all across the Province of Ontario. In other words, the committee should be as sensitive and as involved in the discussion of everything as is the Legislature itself. I have no quarrel with that as an idealistic objective. But from my years of observation in this House, those are the stars for which we may ultimately reach.

We have got something very much closer to earth to contend with. And it is firstly to get from this government—and maybe we have it, I am not going to prejudge them—a serious approach to committees, because previous governments have not had a serious approach to committees. They have set them up, they have not met. They have been delayed through the obstructionist tactics of

chairmen who sometimes were put in, one was led to believe, for the specific purpose of stalling in the operations of that committee. Now if the government is moving with seriousness to try to use the new format of committees to come to grips with the work of the House, fine.

The second and even more important point is that the committees simply cannot be effective if the government is not going to respond to the obvious conclusion down through the years—the need for means to make them effective.

I need not remind the Legislature that some years ago one of my colleagues in this party, and I have forgotten which one it was, made a motion in one of the committees which was unanimously adopted by the committee—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): It was me.

Mr. MacDonald: Was it? It was the hon. member for Riverdale. I do not want to subtract anything of the historical record to which he is entitled.

The motion was that the government should take the necessary steps to provide the committees with staff and with *Hansard* records. We have moved to some degree with some of the committees having *Hansard* records, but we have never moved to the provision of adequate staff.

Mr. Speaker, it is ludicrous, absolutely ludicrous, that you should have, for example, Hydro come in and present an hour's report and give the members of the Legislature an opportunity to ask a few questions, and then to call that an analysis of the operation of the whole administration of one of the biggest businesses in the Province of Ontario. You simply cannot dig in and find out indeed what this government should know—and often I suspect does not know—as well as the members of the Legislature, if you do not have adequate staff to prepare the questions and to dig the facts out.

In short, we have got to have a serious approach by the government and we have to have a provision of the means to make the new committee structure operate before we can give any consideration, in my view, to the broader objective that the Leader of the Opposition has raised about committee concerns being extended to cover the full spectrum of concerns of citizens all across the Province of Ontario, the full spectrum of all of the matters that might normally come before this House.

However, Mr. Speaker, just so that the Leader of the Opposition will not feel that I am being unfriendly to him this afternoon, there was one—

Mr. Lewis: In fact, he has deteriorated.

Mr. Nixon: I never feel that way.

Mr. MacDonald:—one point which he might have mentioned as real rather than just political skirmishing against the government, of how careless and inadequate has been the government's approach to this whole procedure.

May I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that a full year ago we got within reaching distance of a commitment from this government to set up a committee on constitutional affairs. After the Prime Minister of that day dragged his feet for months, they finally set up the committee. Then, for four months we could not get the committee into operation because the chief government whip allegedly could not find out who the members of the committee were going to be. And then—the final affront—that committee was called by its chairman on the last day of the session. I hope he did not collect the \$1,000 pay going to the chairman of the committee—just as an aside.

Mr. Nixon: Maybe he was looking into it.

Mr. MacDonald: But it was called on the last day of the session for purposes of considering what we could do or what we should do in the future. I thought that finally when the committee was called, even on the last day of the session, that this meant that the government was serious, that the whole issue of constitutional affairs to which the last Prime Minister gave such high priority and which, according to the Throne Speech is still going to have a high priority, was not going to be shuffled off into the corner. Yet we have a new proposal from the government for the establishment of committees and once again the committee on constitutional affairs has become lost.

I do not know what the government is going to do about it, but if the government is going to prove that it is not playing games with all of the recommendations for an effective committee structure, as far as I am concerned, before we finish this debate there is going to be some sort of a suggestion from the Prime Minister or from the chief government whip as to what they are doing with regard to the committee on constitutional affairs. I, for one, after a full year's battling, am not going to see it get lost in the shuffle

as the government comes in with its new proposal and resolution today.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity, as this is the first time I have had to speak in the House, of congratulating the new Premier of the province on what looks like a much better attendance record than he has had the last three years. It is nice to see him in the House regularly.

An hon. member: It is only the second day of the session.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Two days in a row.

Mr. T. Reid: I know he will take his duties very seriously and will be in the House and an active member of it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I always have.

Mr. T. Reid: I only hope that his successor as Minister of Education will be here quite often to answer questions from this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the first item I would like to refer to in this discussion is that part of the government resolution which says that these committees which it is setting up will look into "bills, estimates or other matters referred to it by the House." I think I would like to underline that last phrase, "other matters referred to it," which, in effect, in my opinion means other matters referred to it by the responsible minister of the government. I think the committees must have the power to look into matters that they consider to be important and not simply matters that are referred to it by, in effect, the minister of the Crown responsible for those matters.

For example, Mr. Speaker, I refer to the standing committee on education last year which reported on May 15 that the committee recommended that "its terms of reference be extended to permit it to initiate studies in education and on the economics of education." I think that the committee on education last year should have had the right to initiate investigation into education costs in this province. It should not have had to come to the Legislature to request this permission which, in effect, was turned down at the subsequent meeting of that committee.

I think the new committee on human resources, which will include issues relating to education, must have the power to initiate studies into the cost of education, for ex-

ample, the fantastic increase in school construction costs which have soared from \$1,360 in 1959 to \$3,580 per student place. I think that the committee should have the right to investigate these cost increases without first, in effect, getting the permission of the Minister of Education to do so.

I would like to say that I was very disappointed with the response of the new Minister of Education to my question this afternoon urging him to refer to the standing committee on education—now the new committee on human resources—the question of educational costs. His reply will bear some examination when it is printed in *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker, because I suspect and sense a feeling of secretiveness in his replies, a feeling that he is going to protect the departmental officials and that he is not going to open up the debate on the cost of education to the members of this Legislature in the relevant standing committee. I must say I feel a great disappointment in this.

I think that when we examine his reply to my question we will see that he said he is going to meet with the representatives of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation and that they will meet with him only. The clear implication that I got from that was that he would be terribly unhappy, if not unwilling, to instruct and allow the Legislature to call before it representatives of the OSSTF and other groups to examine "other matters referred to it" by this Legislature.

So I think the proposal brought forward by the government is lacking in this respect. I think the committees must become less partisan. There must be a place where individual members can play a role in their private capacity much more than has been the case in the past. I think they should have the right to initiate such studies and that the studies, other than the estimates and so forth, should not simply be the studies that the relevant minister—in my case, the Minister of Education—will allow the committee to look into.

The second point which I feel is important in examining and criticizing, hopefully in a constructive way, the government's proposal, is this. I start, by way of example, Mr. Speaker, by noting that the standing committee on education and university affairs met only twice during the third session of this Parliament. It met only five times in the second session of this Parliament. I think it is imperative that this House instruct the committees or make it possible for the committees, to meet on a regular basis and not

simply on a sporadic basis, in effect, at the wish of the chairman—a government member—in cahoots with the relevant minister. I think this is bad. I think the committees must be instructed to meet regularly and that they must be instructed to report, not “from time to time,” but to report regularly to this House.

The third point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the committees ought not to be staffed by civil servants of the departments which may be being investigated by the committee. I refer to the experience I have had with the standing committee on education over the last couple of years. The secretary of that committee has been a senior civil servant in The Department of Education. I think this is bad. I think the committees must be staffed, sir, either by an independent body responsible to the Legislature as a whole or to yourself, sir, rather than by departments which might well be being investigated by the particular committee.

I have never seen any minutes of the standing committee on education. They have never been produced and I would be uneasy that if there were dissension as to the exact wording of a motion put before a committee, it would be impossible to verify because a committee has not had minutes which have been properly adopted at subsequent meetings of the committee.

I am not saying that in the past motions made by opposition members in the education committee, for example, have been altered by a departmental civil servant, but I am saying it is very difficult to understand what has been agreed to unless there has been a record. I think, sir, there should be a special secretariat to staff this committee and that special secretariat might well come under your jurisdiction, sir.

The fourth point I would like to make—and perhaps the government whip could clarify this point for me in his windup remarks—is that I do not fully understand the meaning of the legal phrase, “the power to send for persons.” Does this mean that the human resources committee, for example, could say to the president of McMaster University, “You come up to the human resources committee and explain why 13 of the 18 members of your department of political science are American citizens. Will you explain?” Will the committee have the power to say to someone such as a university president, “You must appear before this committee, and if you do not there will be legal proceedings against you.” I would like to have that point clarified.

Mr. J. Renwick: That is clear.

Mr. T. Reid: Well, I would like to know if that is what it means, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know what happens to a person who refuses to appear before a standing committee. What would happen to the president of McMaster University if he turned around and said, “That committee has no right to call me before it and I will not come.”

Mr. Sopha: Bread and water!

Mr. T. Reid: What are the legal proceedings?

Mr. MacDonald: Why does the hon. member not cross those bridges when he gets to them? It has never happened.

Mr. T. Reid: Because I would like to have the presidents of universities come before that committee and I would like to ask them questions about the de-Canadianization of the universities in this province.

Mr. Lewis: Well, if the hon. member asks them to come, they will come. Do not assume they will not.

Mr. T. Reid: And finally—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Do not make a political speech.

Mr. T. Reid: Did I hear something about politics over there?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Just a brief word.

Mr. T. Reid: Brief?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Very brief.

Mr. T. Reid: I cannot believe it.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I simply urge the members of this House to accept the amendment that has been put forward by my leader and I would hope that the government party would accept what I consider to be some constructive albeit critical proposals.

Mr. Sopha: I should like to join in the debate firstly by extending the last remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition when he made that very forceful and very trenchant plea that this Legislature become relevant to the life and times of the province.

I am one of those who has believed in recent years that there is a danger of decay in parliamentary institutions if we as legislators do not demonstrate a great deal more alertness and a much more sympathetic spirit toward the needs, the demands, the anxieties

and the frustrations of the people that we seek to serve.

I am fortified in that belief when I think of specific examples when that rapport between us and our constituents was, to use a modern argot, very meaningful. My mind goes back to the meetings of the labour committee of last year, which must have marked one of the most intense exchanges between the representatives of the very large group affected by the activities of this House that has occurred in the life of this Parliament. And I think of the many days of sittings that we spent in examining and arguing over the provisions of what I think was Bill 176.

As well, I recall to mind the tedium that characterized some meetings of the legal and municipal bills committee when, for example, we dealt with the very arcane and mysterious mystique—that is a good phrase—of bills like The Securities Act or The Business Corporations Act. Those of us who attended incurred a very vast boredom when having to consume a diet of a very boring subject. But they are revelatory of the establishment of those lines of communication with the public and give members of the public an opportunity to come here in the very precincts of Parliament and speak face to face and meet eyeball to eyeball with the people who have the sovereign power within the state, and to get off their chests those things that are bothering them.

In the same vein, Mr. Speaker, I think it perfectly ghastly, if not atrocious, the environment in which those committees meet. Last year, I raised this subject and obtained almost no progress. I think it reprehensible that legislators are forced to sit like errant school children in a cluster before the chairman of the committee, perhaps a cabinet minister—although they are a vanishing breed from committee work—and a number of the more prestigious members of the bureaucracy. There the committee members sit, like school children, without even the advantage of looking straight in the face of the members of the public who come there to make their complaints and representations.

Perhaps a little public money, a modest amount, could be expended in setting up a physical environment in committee room 1. It would be appropriate, as far as physical facilities go, to the science of “committeeology.” The legislators could be arranged around in a knot, perhaps on a little raised dais. Comfortable provision could be made for the member of the public to sit down while he is being questioned or making his

representation; perhaps microphones might be provided, in a word, to lend some dignity to the operations of Parliament and an important aspect of it.

I do not know if the wall between committee rooms 1 and 2 is a bearing wall but perhaps that wall could be removed and those two commodious rooms could be made into one that would accommodate the maximum number of committee members that might be assembled. I suppose that is on the private bills committee. Once again I make that plea.

I think there is an important trait to be sought in the promotion of the dignity of Parliament to give some prestige to the people who have the final and sovereign power within the state and to impart to members of the public, when they come here, that this is an important proceeding affecting their lives, their well-being, and those whom they represent. I do not think that is too much to ask.

A word about ministers: I think one of the disabilities of the committee system, of course, is that which flows from a government long in office. That feature of it is related to the fact that many of the ministers of the Crown have occupied the position of adviser to the Lieutenant Governor for too long a time and have become too long removed from contact with the committee system.

Perhaps there is ground for optimism there in that, as I look over the array and the paucity of attendance in the debate on this important subject, I see some who in very recent times played a very intimate role in the committee structure. That is, those almost out of sight from the Premier—the inner seven, the outer six. Perhaps in the cabinet councils they will remember the important role they themselves played and will promote the idea that it is time, within this system of British parliamentary democracy, that perhaps we might copy some of the more useful aspects of the American congressional system.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Be very careful; the member for Scarborough East is very sensitive.

Mr. Sopha: Well I am not that nationalistic. I am not against borrowing what is good—and the good in it is the close and intimate contact with the people for whom we are the stewards. That is the good in it.

Mr. Peacock: The lobbyists!

Mr. Sopha: I am not particularly attracted by some features of the amendment of our

friends to the left. I see no reason that we need hire a lawyer. They have enough to do with legal aid, nowadays. We do not need them as long as we have the member for Downsview and the member for—

Mr. MacDonald: That is why we do need them.

Mr. Sopha: —for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) and the member for Riverdale to assist us. We have enough lawyers to adequately staff the committee with legal talent.

Mr. Nixon: Too many, some say.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, there is some truth in that.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The member for Sudbury cannot always be there.

Mr. Sopha: The ministers of the Crown, of course, in the British system, have been traditionally and historically against an expansion of powers of committees because they see that as a vitiation of their own domains and their independence of initiative. They are suspicious of the committees because they feel that they will, in some way, diminish the powers that they command both individually and collectively in the cabinet council. It need not be so. The operation of the British system can be coextensive with separate initiative being exercised by ministers of the Crown and by intelligent and aggressive committees.

Lord knows, Mr. Speaker, I do not need to convince you that life in the technological, cybernetic nuclear age has become so terribly complex that it is difficult for Parliament to keep up with the changes. Parliament nowadays is in danger of the irrelevance that it just cannot keep pace with the changes that are going on outside its precincts, that it cannot continually be aware of the thoughts of those on the street corners of this province.

That is why I say unhesitatingly that perhaps the only vehicle that can save us from falling into decay is the projection and development of the committee system, and that is why I hope this debate will commend itself to the leader of the government and, as he comes to the office with, no doubt, a new zeal and zest for government, that he will find something of merit in the views that we promote over here and he will take the initiative and assume the final responsibility to develop the committee system in the way that we suggest.

I see nothing wrong, and very much that is good, in the thought that the president of the Ontario Medical Association, if that is what he is called, be called before the committee to explain the changes.

Mr. Nixon: He is a she.

Mr. Sopha: She, pardon me. The Treasurer of the Law Society would be, I am sure, a very willing and a very useful guest to have before the committee to explain the activities of lawyers and their charges, and I hastily say to my friend from Scarborough East that if neither one of them wants to answer the Queen's subpoena then we will put them on bread and water in the second subbasement down below, and there is no question about our power to do so.

Mr. MacDonald: Both of them together?

Mr. Sopha: And the new Minister of Justice will serve the subpoenas himself, no doubt.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Sure!

An hon. member: He would be delighted.

Mr. Sopha: Those are some of the developments that we would promote. I do not want to add anything to what the Leader of the Opposition said about the economic affairs committee. The arguments are so incontrovertible that this is a means of cultivating that necessary relevance to the economic life of this province, that I wonder if the leader of the government does not hastily adopt the idea.

I have engaged in and I have listened to 12 debates up to this second day of the opening of the session of the Legislature, and I am encouraged by my memory that it has progressed over the years. Always this government has been unwilling to indulge in innovation but as a result of constant prodding, protest, declamation, they have finally acceded to the suggestions for reform. Did I not read in the paper the other day that the Provincial Auditor's responsibilities were going to be greatly changed, that as a result of the declamations of the Liberal members of the public accounts committee—

Mr. Gaunt: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sopha: Well, that is a significant example. The Leader of the Opposition has pointed to others, but I must say as a member of the Legislature that I derive an intense enjoyment out of the work of committees, and I have said on many a platform that the

most democratic aspect of the work of this House is that of the private bills committee. It is far and away the greatest example of democracy that is practised here, where independence of thought and opinion is given the fullest sway, the maximum of participation is accorded to members of the public who come there to ask the sovereign body to execute a legislative act according to their wishes.

Now I am just a little disturbed. They say, finally, if I understand this motion, that we are to be deprived by its terms of participation in various areas of interest, that if you are in one section you cannot be in another, as I read it. You are to be prohibited by regulation from doing so, and that, of course, is not in accordance with the multiple responsibilities that we have where we must perform a variety of interests, we must be alive and alert to many aspects of the human condition that concern us as legislators. Perhaps, after that is tried for a while, then a more practical and more consummate form of participation will be found. I certainly hope so.

Those are my remarks in support of this resolution and amendment, and once again before I sit down, I plead for that physical change in the environment down on the first floor. Too many of these ministers have not been involved in it. The leader of the government himself will not think it is unfair criticism that there is probably not a member of the Executive Council who has had less contact with the committee structure than he has. Now, that is deserving of some criticism. He simply never called the committee for which he was responsible.

There have been other developments that I must mention before resuming my seat. It was taken for granted for many years, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Municipal Affairs would participate actively in the work of the private bills committee. A great majority of those bills, of course, relate to the matters under his jurisdiction and, very disturbingly, last year the then Minister of Municipal Affairs put a cessation on his attendance. Mr. Spooner used to be there religiously, but when the present Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) took over the portfolio almost by design it seemed that he was not going to attend. Notwithstanding the pleas of the committee who asked him to do so, he declined to attend.

Now I hope the new incumbent will resume the participation of that attendance. Because it boils down to this: Members of that committee must be told by the minister what the attitude of the department is to certain

specific bills before it. They do not know which way to vote, whether to accede to the request or whether to deny it, until they are acquainted with the government policy in that area. It is a vital participation and I hope we will not be further denied that guidance there that comes. But I am cheered, I am absolutely euphoric, that the time of this government is so short, that it is not so long until we will be over there running things and we will order the life of this province.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Carruthers: Same old thing.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, within the next few days the public accounts committee to be established by this resolution will have put before it accounts of some \$3.7 billion in gross expenditures in the completed fiscal year for which the auditor has reported to us. Once again that committee will meet with something like perhaps 10 to 11 members. Unless the Prime Minister himself gives his attention to the recommendation which the public accounts committee of the last session reported to the House, it will be meeting to cope with an expenditure of record proportions without the benefit of expert counsel and advice to guide it in its deliberations.

The public accounts committee is one of the historic committees of this House—I would say it is the senior committee, by virtue of the fact that until last session it has been the only one to exercise independent review of government expenditure of policy arising out of that expenditure by virtue of statutory authority not requiring specific reference from the House.

It needs, as recommended, counsel from The Department of the Treasury. It also needs, if the Prime Minister agrees with the recommendation, independent counsel such as accountants and others who can assist the committee members to probe behind the mass of figures that is put out in that statement of the public accounts of the province.

The case remains for staffing of all the other committees in a similar way, Mr. Speaker. But I have much less hope that the Prime Minister will agree to go to that extent.

I would like to raise with the chief government whip, the member for Durham, who has introduced this motion, four points:

Will he address himself to this question of substitution that is not part of the motion before us, but was part of the committee report of last session?

Would he explain what purpose or assignment the committee on estimates will have—one of the three specialist committees?

Would he tell the House the significance of the word "automatically" in the motion before us as it relates to the appearance of government boards and commissions before the various standing committees?

Finally, what will the numbers and quorums of the various standing committees be?

On the third point, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the Prime Minister and to the chief government whip—they may have come to this conclusion in consultation outside the House in the last few minutes—that a standing committee of such a general nature as one of the four now before us should not have any idle time on its hands throughout this session. If this House has not referred to it specifically an estimate or a piece of legislation, it should automatically—using the word of the motion—be empowered to undertake the examination or inquiry into the operations or policies of any Crown agency or board or commission. It should not have to wait upon instructions from the House, and I trust that that is what is meant by the use of the word "automatically".

Mr. Speaker, in this group we welcome the innovation. We look forward to the Prime Minister giving it substance and weight, because I remind him of the statement in the Speech from the Throne yesterday, that, as government grows, not only in terms of expenditure but as it grows more in terms of adopting to its own purposes modern management systems, it requires the counterweight of standing committees of this House as representative of the public of the province being in touch, and it is only through the increasing responsibility of such standing committees that that counterweight will be provided.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Sudbury was talking about the private bills committee. I have sat on that committee for many years, and I do like the way the private bills committee administers its affairs by very thoroughly investigating each bill and looking through the problem.

I am very concerned, and have been for many years, as I study the history of Hydro and the small connection that we have with them as a commission and as legislators. They can increase their rates as they see fit.

They can spend millions and millions of dollars as they see fit and we have an opportunity to question them for about an hour or one hour and a half.

In committee that was dealing with Hydro just last year, there were many of us wanting to ask questions of the chairman. I realize that they had a lot of work before them. They came to us with their drafts and charts and scales indicating to us that that was not the only raise that we would have in hydro—that Hydro would continue to raise their rates because power was needed in this province.

Industry after industry is leaving this Province of Ontario because they are going to other jurisdictions where hydro can be bought much cheaper. Not for a one-year term, Mr. Speaker, but for terms of 5 to 10 years at a lower rate. We are getting more unemployment in this province from day to day as industries leave us and go into other jurisdictions, while we cannot question a minister in this government on the issues that affect the people of this province so seriously.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Hydro was never meant to—

Mr. Bukator: Yes, as a matter of fact, Hydro was never meant to administer its own affairs in the manner that it does this day. As I study the history of Hydro it was meant to come to this Legislature to naturally speak of its stewardship and to tell us what it is doing for this province.

Perhaps this new method is going to be used by the whip of the government to give us an opportunity to question these people with experts on how they spend their money. Not because we cannot possibly do the job, but there are too many man-hours of work to be done at that time to get the experts to tell us why they administer the affairs of their particular commission as they do. I think we have a right to question their expenditures. I think we have a right to sit in that committee hour after hour, and day after day until we are satisfied that these rates are justified.

If the hon. member's resolution is going to bring this about and give us an opportunity to question not only that commission, but others as was mentioned earlier in this day, then I say, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is on the right track. But my leader's amendment to the resolution clearly indicates that we want to know what is going on in these commissions. We want to know why this money is being spent and we would like to be able to either agree or disagree with them.

So I say to you that the amendment is a just one, one that you all should support because we are all trying to do one thing, and that is to be proper stewards to the people of this province, to do our jobs and to do them well.

If the new Premier of this province would indicate to me—and he may—that he will go along with this amendment and give us an opportunity to question all spending bodies in this province before they have a right to impose on the people of this province increase after increase without any regard for the people that are on low income, or on pensions and cannot meet their obligations, then I would say to the Premier, he is starting to do his job in a proper manner at this time.

If he does not support this amendment and does not give us an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to discuss with these people the reasons for their administration and the way they go about spending the taxpayers' money as though it was going out of style then I do believe that we have fallen short of the job that we are put here to do.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I too want to mention Hydro; it seems to be on everyone's mind at the moment. I want first to state though, that I could support the motion of the government. The motion pretty well encompasses those things that we agreed upon last session.

I can support what the official opposition has said in adding another committee. Perhaps there is a need for it. I think that the subamendment that we offered, of course adds some substance to the whole procedure. It adds to the committee and gives the committee an opportunity to deal in depth with many of the problems that obviously have to come before these committees. I think the need for some expert guidance has been obvious, at least for the last 3½ years that I have been in this House and serving on the committees of this House.

What worries me is that the government yesterday indicated that they were going to have a complete review of Hydro by the committee on government productivity, which is a committee separate and apart from any committee that has on it members of the Legislature. I am worried about that because I am convinced, as I look at it, that it will mean that the appropriate committee that is being structured today will not have

the kind of opportunity to come to grips with Hydro in the way that we want it to.

Over the last two years, when we had Hydro appear before the government commissions committee we did manage to extract from them—no matter how painful it was—we extracted some rather interesting, sometimes disturbing aspects of their operation. The only thing that held us back from getting a more meaningful discussion with Hydro was that we did not have the expert advice that we needed in the committee to come to grips with the expert advice that they had brought with them—high-priced help brought from the Hydro offices.

What I am suggesting to the Premier is that if he makes available to the committees the opportunity to have legal counsel and engineering staff made available on a hire-as-you-need-them basis we will not have to have Hydro investigated by the commission on government productivity. The job will be done by the elected representatives, where it should be done. The people of Ontario will have an opportunity to hear the results of the kind of investigation that we want to conduct into not only the rates but into the entire operation and future operations of Ontario Hydro.

It seems a shame to zero in on Hydro alone because there are a lot of other areas, but I am afraid that what is going to happen is that when this is shunted off to this productivity committee we will then be faced with yet another year of just handshaking, listening to the very able chairman gleefully telling how wonderfully well Hydro is operating without us being able to come to grips with it.

It is not a matter of staffing these committees with full-time staff sitting around doing nothing while the committee is not meeting. It is simply a matter of making available to the committees the opportunity to hire—whether it be through the existing offices or whether it be from outside—the kind of help necessary to conduct a proper investigation in order that we can determine whether or not the policies of Hydro are adequate and, on top of that, whether or not the money that Hydro raises is being raised in the proper fashion.

For that reason I ask that the amendment—at least those parts of it that deal with the staffing—be given great consideration and that the government accept that proposal so that we can operate efficiently and effectively.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, as the prize attender on committees of this House—proved by newspaper articles—I feel that I have not only the right but almost the prerogative in this particular area at the moment. On these attendances that one made an almost 100 per cent record on, one would believe I was almost enamoured of committee work.

Nothing, Mr. Speaker, invigorates me more than the thought of attending the Wednesday matinee of the public accounts committee. A more vital, penetrating, zestful enterprise can hardly be imagined. Some Saturdays I go in on the scenario and it is like the last act from “The World Well Lost” or “Much Ado About Nothing.” On occasion it is even tragic. Lear comes to mind—the terrible things that happen in human life—and it is with that background and with that pertinacity that I express some misgivings.

We have agreed overwhelmingly that the government committee restructuring as it is presently ventured upon has some merit. I wish to express a little of my strictly personal suspicions about it. If the design of this committee—as it very well may be—is simply, basically to alleviate the government party of the embarrassment in failures to attend—and I suspect that in part, at least, it is precisely with that motivation that this committee was brought into being—then the committee system will not work. Because the number of sittings of any one of these committees is going to be as extensive, repetitive and drawn out as what they were as divided among the numerous committees. Though fewer members within the government party may be called upon to attend; and they can overlap, I would hope, and duplicate. At the same time, that is not the purpose in this restructuring.

Mr. Speaker, I want to put particular emphasis upon the business of the second paragraph in our sub-amendment having to do with the enforcing of the role of the committee by way of experts.

I have served on two select committees of this House. One was the Smith committee. On that committee we had high-powered—to say the least—legal counsel in Robert Macaulay, who drove the committee assiduously. We had economic counsel on that committee to help in the way of advice. We also had research. It seems to me that while these various committees ought not to have permanently attached to them, or directly at-

tached to them perforce, either legal counsel or other forms of expertise, they certainly should be able to avail themselves of them. From time to time, as the committee saw fit, they should be able to call into the sanctum various forms of advice—to make use of the role of universities, to have sociologists, to have economic experts, to have accountants.

As I see it, these committees are hog-tied and hamstrung at the present time for the simple reason that there is not available to them the wherewithal and the knowhow and the inside information which would make their work viable and of some set purpose.

This is ever so true, as has been mentioned, with respect to those self-enclosed institutions who are willing to give as little away as possible except what is self-serving, such as the government commissions of this province. In that way we would be able to appoint these men, have them report back to us, then to go into the work of interrogation, cross-examinations or what you will, of that board which appears before us. This is a prerequisite. I would think that financial help would be made to it. It is certainly one of the features of the American system which commends itself very, very much to us.

If it is a case of the government seeking to swaddle information then I think that the government itself has to agree that it is working directly contrary to the whole purpose of democratic institutions. We often get that very strong feeling that information is being suppressed and deliberately withheld, even on matters which would not cause them embarrassment and which would be of great validity and worth in the public grounds in the way of saving costs and what not, and in that particular way.

Finally, and as an extension of what I have been saying about having the necessary personnel to make the work of committees viable I want to enforce what the member for York South had to say about that constitutional committee. We heard a great deal about it. It was one of those pivotal, at least focal, things that the former Prime Minister put forward in the way of a gesture toward Canadian unity, apart from his conference which was here and gone, apart from what he did with respect to the languages in this House. I suspect—and you know, we are not constitutional lawyers—most of us, and even with those trained in the legal profession, have a scanty grasp of what the real problems that overshadow us in this country

at this time are. I envisage that this constitutional committee would be at work in education, that those people in the province—and they are readily available—who have considerable insight into the subject could bring in in a capsulated and distinct form the real problems of the constitution as to which revamping should take place as between the various articles, particularly 91 and 92. We would have a chance to get our teeth into that flesh in order that finally we would come to grips with what are major problems and which are being sloughed off by both levels of government at the present time. If that would come to pass, that committee would certainly need counsel—not necessarily legal but of some very high quality touching knowledge of our constitution so that initially at least he could spoon-feed us with respect to the very complex and very profound problems that are raised there.

I am very sorry that nowhere in this present resolution, as offered by the government, is this committee envisaged or handled or touched upon or reverted to. It could be said that it might fall into committee number 2, but I think that the Premier would probably agree that it could fall under any and all of the committees because it is an all-encompassing subject and I would ask that further thought be given to instituting that constitutional committee as a separate and distinct committee of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word about this resolution and its amendment as put forth. In my opinion, the opposition's motions or amendments to the motion have very little validity in our democratic society under the British parliamentary system. What these people are suggesting is a change to the republican system of the United States, not taking into consideration the one basic difference—and that is that here we have a cabinet responsible in Parliament and in the United States the congressional committee develops and drafts the bills and measures presented in the House. They would like to have the power conferred to the opposition that is presently conveyed by our system to the cabinet—and that is being responsible in this House to the Legislature and the people of our province.

Mr. Lawlor: Does the hon. member not agree we have a horse-and-buggy system?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: The horse-and-buggy system that the hon. member refers to happens to be the suggestions at the moment of the opposition.

Mr. Lawlor: That is really clever. It takes one's breath away.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I would like to say that the resolution proposed by my colleague from Durham has great merit. I am sorry that he did overlook the possibility of substitution but I can understand why. This resolution gives the maximum option of holding meetings in this House. It gives a minimum of conflict for members being on two or more committees and sitting at the same time. It gives a very workable committee structure in that we can have four committees sitting at any one time at any one committee period.

I am very concerned that we do not have adequate staff. However, in the past the suggestion was made in debate to provide more funds for research staffs in the opposition parties.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Why has the government not acted on it then?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: This has been done on several occasions in the increases and it was to offset the real basic problem of the opposition members creating and developing the really constructive questions in committee.

This proposal by my fellow member will allow us to develop a very good committee system, and the option of this House referring work to any one of those committees by motion at any time allows for great ability to change and to alter the work load of a committee. The possibility of having the constitutional committee directed to whichever committee workload is light, I think has merit. But in that case I would suggest there should be perhaps a change of members who are interested and would like to be on the constitutional committee when it is deliberating the opportunities there.

I do not consider it as substitution nearly as much as if we have four committees sitting, the opportunity for exchange will be greater than the substitution feature. This is, as I see it, because if we have a full workload in the committee structure in this House, we should find that all our members are occupied at the same time. This has not been possible in the past. I believe that our party should see that there is a full committee operation and there is no doubt in my mind there is subject matter for a full committee operation at all times.

I wonder, though, when I see people who consider a committee not functioning when they had a 100 per cent attendance at one meeting, as reported in the press, and myself with eight committees and unable to attend on one occasion because I was a member of three committees sitting at the same time and I had to make a choice. So I asked the government whip which one I should choose, and he said, "Well, whichever one is needing you at the moment."

That is a difficult decision to make on my behalf and on his behalf, so we put this proposal and the members of both opposition parties contributed to this proposal in the committee on rules and procedure last year. We did put it through on computers to see what our alternatives were and what the problems were and we found that the structure proposed here by the member for Durham is a workable one and I am sure that we will all find that it is the best that we have seen to date. Certainly it will take reviewing, as we have done in the past here in any change we have made in rules and procedures, and I am sure that we may even find we can devise a more workable method shortly within even this structure. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one brief reply in regard to a remark that the member for Victoria-Haliburton made. I think he is confusing the issue when he thinks that when we want more expert advice on the committee that we are bringing about a presidential form of government. I, for one, do not approve of a presidential form of government in this country, but I am certainly convinced that it is highly important that we do have expert staff on the various committees that are in this House.

When I was on the public accounts committee, it was more than obvious to me that we had to have people who are skilled in economics and who know something about government. It has been suggested by the leader of the NDP that we need more lawyers. Well, one can look around this House and I, as a lawyer, can tell that we do not need more lawyers. We have got all the lawyers we need.

We certainly do need people who are skilled in economics. We can take the volume of the public accounts and, with all the interest and goodwill in the world, we cannot get to the heart of the matter unless we have got people who are skilled in the field of public accounts. Of course, we get all the experts in the world on the public accounts committee, and unless we have a decent

audit system in this province, they will not do us any good either.

If we are going to have a proper public accounts committee, we are going to have to have a Provincial Auditor who has got some real power and some say. That is one of the most vital things we are going to need insofar as the public accounts committee is concerned.

There is one example we can follow south of the border and I can refer to the State of California. They have a staff on each committee for each of what they call the minority party and the majority party. I have really been impressed with the ability of those staffs and how it makes it possible for members of the committee to make a real contribution. The members are in most cases highly informed, and if they are not it is certainly their own fault.

It is true that California has more money and has a larger budget than the Province of Ontario, but still we are getting in that class because we must remember that the budget of this province I think, is now larger than the federal budget was before the Second World War. So it means a lot of money is involved, and we certainly are going to need more trained personnel; I do not mean large numbers of them, but personnel who are close to the particular group and are involved and trying to get to the problem.

One of the most successful committees I have ever been on was the committee that got into all the trouble—at least the chairman got in all the trouble—with the government party. That as the health committee that sat two years ago. That committee, just as the education committee of a few years back was under the present Minister of University Affairs, did a lot of prying into what was going on. The member for Quinte, as chairman of the health committee, made inquiries literally all over the province and sought leaders of thought in various health problems.

Mr. Nixon: The government knows how to quiet those fellows down.

Mr. Trotter: There was no question that if a lot of people appeared before that committee they would embarrass the government. But at the same time, I would say that in the long run there is no question that many of those ideas are adopted by government no matter what party they might be. So if members are going to earn their pay, and if they are going to be informed to serve the public, they are going to need committees that are aggressive and that do a good job,

not just meeting once or twice a year, but by meeting throughout the duration of parliament.

I do want to emphasize and support the amendment of my leader because there is one very important thing about a committee that looks into the economic affairs of the province and it is this; If they would deal with the bread and butter issues that face us today, and much as we must protect our right to vote and much as we must protect our freedom of speech, one of the biggest weaknesses in our society today is that we do not deal with the bread and butter issues as our people are being caught up in unemployment. Not only the unemployment, but it is the fear of being unemployed.

If you are in a large city today people fear the high rents that they must pay for their apartments. We do not deal with that at all in the various committees that sit, and yet despite that over half the people of the city of Toronto live in apartments, and we do not even discuss the rents. I want to emphasize and underline that this is one of the gut issues of our time. If you send out your questionnaires you will know that a shocking number of people in this province want price and wage controls. You will get surprising answers that you would not have expected five or 10 years ago. And yet we do not discuss those issues to any great length. This is the type of thing that a committee should discuss in detail. How far should we go with price controls and wage controls? All the way, part of the way, or should we stay away from them? But we simply do not know the answer at this time, and this is why a committee dealing with economic problems is extremely important. This is why I would ask the government, particularly the government who have got the members that will support the amendment as proposed by the Leader of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Prime Minister wish to intervene at this time in the debate? We have another speaker from the opposition.

Mr. Bullbrook: You have more than one.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but I asked him if he wished to intervene at this point. If he wished to speak now he could, but otherwise the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I think that no more important, timely subject can come before this whole House today than this amendment. It is basically asking

that the committees be empowered to investigate and hold public hearings related to significant cost changes in products and services affecting the cost of living in Ontario today.

We have in the life of this House watched the government try to smooth over this whole area insofar as things concerning people. We have been talking about a purchasing department for years. We have a \$100,000 budget for purchasing; you are going to save us \$5 million to \$10 million a year—this never happens. We have the farce in Hydro where we are launched on a \$1 billion fiasco, an economic disaster which will never work. We are told that by authority—and no one in the Hydro seems to know where they are going in this matter. And it is a fact that we should make our life here meaningful.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to a parallel in the United States, these investigative committees have counsel to give them power to do things properly and to let the public know exactly what is going on, and I submit that we have no parallel in our democratic system here to match that. Why do we not have it? Because the government has gone along on the policy that we can cover these things up, and I say that respectfully, it is enough that you have inherited this thing, but it is time you had a chance to do something intelligent, to do something that is a new departure, to take something good from the opposition and to make a new step in democratic procedure. We are not dummies on this side of the House, we are—

An hon. member: The member could have fooled me.

Mr. Sargent: Some day you fellows will have the opportunity to have the fun of being here.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, and I say very sincerely, that the Prime Minister could do very well, he could make a landmark, to start the Premiership off properly, to be intelligent and not go down the route that because an opposition bill comes it is no good. I think this is very intelligent, timely, and needed by the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Oshawa.

Mr. Pilkey: Mr. Speaker, let me say first of all that this resolution is rather timely in terms of restructuring the committee process that we have been accustomed to in this Legislature, but I believe that the restriction—and I took that from the member for Victoria-Haliburton that there was going to be a restriction on the exchanging of

members of the various committees, I took that from his remarks and no one has said yet that they are not going to restrict them, and let me—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We have not had much chance yet.

Mr. Pilkey: Okay. Let me remind the government that in the Throne Speech they indicated that they wanted to get the views of the people and if we get the views of the people then we ought to have a process for the means of communication back to the people. It just has to be a two-way street. It appears to me that through this committee structure and through the exchanging of the members we can have this means of communication back to the people.

It means also that we must have the expertise within the committees so that there can be a legitimate discussion in looking at every aspect of the various problems that will confront the committee. This means that I support the resolution that was presented by my leader when he said that the committee should be empowered to engage counsel and other expert staff if necessary; that the committee ought to have that opportunity. I sensed again from the member from Victoria that he was in opposition to that; he pointed out that we were given additional funds on this side of the House for research facilities. We agree with that; but by the same token it appears to me that we ought to be able to engage experts in various aspects that the committees may be discussing.

I just wanted to make those brief comments—that if we are really concerned about the views of the people we also ought to have the means of communication back to the people. It seems to me that this kind of structure could do that if it is properly operated and we have the expertise that is necessary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Samia.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few comments. I had been out of the House with a delegation so there might be some degree of reiteration.

This afternoon I thought it was extremely relevant, probably in anticipation of this debate, that the Minister of Education in reply to my colleague, the member for Scarborough East, said the 117 of us should be concerned with the question of educational costs. The fact of the matter is, sir, that the 117 of us, I trust, have been concerned.

We in this party tried to exemplify that concern about 12 to 14 months ago. Strange it was that every member of the standing committee on education and university affairs voted in favour of a resolution that I brought to that committee, asking the government to give us power and ability, resources and talent and expertise to look at at least one field of educational spending. It seems to be very popular now; it is a popular thing to talk about educational spending now.

Surely to goodness, there is not one person in this House who has not experienced the same trauma that I experienced when I see literally thousands of dollars being spent in Lambton College in my riding on a course in geology; in a college of applied arts and technology, in the most esoteric, impractical involvement that you could think of—almost in the field of academic learning. Geology—a course in that has really no practical application other than in the post-doctoral field and we are teaching that course in a community college. They are teaching a course out here in the occult sciences and the occult arts.

Certainly we were legitimate in our concern and we came here, as members, into the House, your honour, and we said: “All right, we will have an opportunity during the course of the debate on the estimates of the various departments.”

But the fact of the matter is, you do not have the opportunity, because, as one of my colleagues said before, we are not all experts. I do not hold myself out as an expert in the field of education, but I think I have the right to look to the council of presidents of the universities to come before our committee, your honour, and to tell us what they think about the application of, for example, the great structure that the federal government makes available again in postgraduate studies as compared to graduate studies.

We want to find out if it is properly distributed, or we want to find out if it is not perpetuating among some universities programmes designed not for the academic benefit of their students but to bring more money into the coffers of the treasury of the university. I want to be able to ask these questions. I want to be able to get the council of regents of the community colleges to come before us and say, as to the original philosophy that the government had in the conception of the community colleges themselves, is it coming forward? Is it doing what you wanted it to do?

But we have not had the opportunity. You cannot do that during the course of the debates on the estimate. I call upon the government to support the attitude that has been exemplified by my colleagues and was exemplified, your honour, by members of the government when they came and said unanimously to this chamber, "Please give us this opportunity." It does not satisfy us and it is not enough that the present Minister of Education says to us "The 117 of you should be concerned." We are concerned. It really does not satisfy, although I know the present Prime Minister does have tongue in cheek when he writes to me and says "You know we spent the money wisely and well, Jim." I cannot take his word; I cannot take his word for that.

I do have a responsibility. So I exhort all, I exhort all again as I exhorted them during the course of that meeting that we had to discuss that motion from this party, the Liberal Party, that they consider it again today. Give us the opportunity, Mr. Speaker—give us the opportunity to do the job so we can go back and I can say to the farmers in my riding who are not getting their rebate cheques that the municipal subsidies branch is doing a proper job. Give us the opportunity to investigate the practicality of these programmes that you bring forward. We might wish to respond and say they are wonderful programmes.

I tell you, I cannot respond in that fashion. I am prepared to give you my assurance as one member of this House, if you give me the opportunity of investigating adequately, it will not be any witch-hunt. You remember we talked about that, too, that it is going to be a witch-hunt. That, of course, is completely irrelevant; there will be no witch-hunt at all. What we will be doing, in effect, is our job. I exhort the Premier to reconsider his position. Give us this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this motion I cannot help recall some of the things I said two years ago, back in February, 1969, during, I think it was, the Throne debate. At that time I discussed the standing committees and pointed out how impossible it was for the committee on government commissions to look into even a fraction of the number of committees we had throughout the Province of Ontario. I made a long list of these committees, and I remember the present Minister of Health interject-

ing and asking me which of these boards I wanted abolished. I told him I could not tell which ones I wanted abolished since we put our research people on the subject and we could not even find out which of them were in existence and if they were, where they operated or from whence they got their money, or who the members were. The member at that time stated "They are all in existence now." I found out that a lot of them were not. There were a number of hundingers and perhaps when the Prime Minister gets up—and he is the Prime Minister, leader of the government—he could perhaps tell us when the commission for the investigation of cancer cures last made a report; or the cemeteries advisory board; or the board of directors for drugless therapy; or the artificial insemination board, to name just a few? Surely they must be making reports? They are, to the best of my knowledge, still in existence.

Mr. Sargent: Those are on-going deals.

Mr. Ben: They are on-going all right, but I will tell you—

Mr. Nixon: A Tory member has appointed every one of them.

Mr. Ben: I think the members of these committees I named are the ones that keep on writing letters hither and yonder, and reports, and signing them anonymously.

At any rate, I have one criticism of the subamendment submitted by the party to our left. That is where they specify which commissions shall be dealt with or called before the committees first. They mention the Workmen's Compensation Board in one instance before one committee; they mention the Ontario Hydro before another committee, and the Ontario Hospital Services Commission before still a third.

My quarrel with that particular subamendment is that if we do call these particular bodies to account, we never seem to get on to any other committees. Every year that I sat on the standing committee on government commissions we called before us the Workmen's Compensation Board; we called before us the Ontario Hydro and, I believe, we called before us the Ontario Northland Railway. Apart from those major ones, we never did get to any of the minor ones. We just did not seem to have either the time or the inclination to do so. Now and then we got a list of certain other commissions, but we never delved into them.

I am suggesting that if we continue to specify which commissions we should call before these standing committees, we are going to get into the rut that we deal with those and only those and overlook many of the others that are in existence, and in fact are carrying on the government of this province and not the people who sit to your right, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that the New Democratic Party leader give consideration to the leading requirement which would provide which commission shall be first called before the committee; for a number of reasons: One, we are going to spend too much time with that particular commission. Second, I think that there should be an element of surprise, that they should be open to inspection at any time and not know which one is going to be called before the standing committee.

Just to assist some of the members of the House, there are the Crop Insurance Commission, the Farm Products Marketing Board, Ontario Livestock Board, Milk Commission of Ontario, Ontario Telephone Services Commission, Ontario Research Foundation, Ontario Energy Board, Ontario Northland Transportation Commission, and about 20 or 30 others. As a matter of fact, there are about 115 boards and commissions and administrative tribunals. There is no way you are going to get them all, if you are going to spend so much time on the Workmen's Compensation Board, or on the Ontario Hydro, or on the Ontario Hospital Services Commission. We ought to be able to pick them at random so that every board and commission in the Province of Ontario can expect that unexpectedly it will be called upon to justify its existence and its operations to the members of this House. Aside from that, I will certainly support the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the contribution from the government side will be made by the government whip. I just want to make two or three very general observations, and I will try to do it in a non-provocative sense, but I really feel that there should be some indication of a reply to the Leader of the Opposition and to the member for Downsview.

The resolution that was introduced is based completely on a report that was prepared for the members of this House by a committee on which there were representatives from each party. The representatives from the Liberal Party included the member for Sudbury, the member for Rainy River,

and the member for, I believe, Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Farquhar). I recognize that when the Leader of the Opposition had not done his homework for the debate this afternoon—

Mr. Nixon: Nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Davis:—that the member for Downsview felt that his somewhat irrelevant rhetoric was necessary to attempt to bail him out.

Mr. Nixon: I had no notice of the government's resolution whatsoever, and that is a fact.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I indicated yesterday that one of the first orders of the House today would be the establishment of the standing committees.

Mr. Nixon: Why does the Premier not have a copy of the resolution?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We have always debated the establishment of the standing committees. There is no question that the members—

Mr. Nixon: The NDP tags along with the Premier all the time.

Hon. Mr. Davis:—opposite certainly, even those in the New Democratic Party, knew very clearly what was going to be discussed this afternoon.

Mr. Stokes: What does he mean "even"?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly, even.

Mr. MacDonald: We always know what they are going to do.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All I would say to the Leader of the Opposition and to the member for Downsview: there is no question but that the government is attempting—and in a very constructive way—to improve the committee process in this Legislature. To me, it is one of the very significant steps we have made. I assure the members opposite that it is my intent to involve them in some form of consultative process and change of the rules, or any other mechanism, but I think it was quite proper for the government and for the Prime Minister to assume, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite would have come somewhat better informed as to the content of this resolution. I would say—

Mr. MacDonald: Fair enough, fair enough!

Hon. Mr. Davis:—on the question of whether a person can be replaced or substituted or what have you, surely it is the proper

occasion or obligation for the striking committee, when it meets, to constitute the membership of the standing committees. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, this would be the appropriate time to deal with that particular problem.

Mr. Speaker, when this resolution, unamended, goes through this House, as it will very shortly—and I will tell the Leader of the Opposition now—I intend to pass a motion referring to the procedural affairs committee a motion to consider, by all members of that committee whether it would make sense to set aside Wednesdays—the complete day—for committee sittings, as we did once before. I feel, Mr. Speaker, if this is to be meaningful, if we are really going to get our teeth into some of these situations, that we cannot do it on the odd morning during the week. I am personally of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that at least consideration of setting the total day, Wednesday, for the standing committees makes some sense. I have not made any final decision on it. I will be doing this through the procedural affairs committee.

I might also point out, Mr. Speaker, that there are already staff attached to the department of the Clerk of the House that will form the secretariat of the standing committees themselves. They will not be members of any existing government department. I should also point out, Mr. Speaker, that I think one must recognize, as was pointed out in the Throne Speech, these matters must be evolutionary. There is a great deal of pioneering to be done to go ahead in this process. I speak for the government and my colleagues. We want to make the committee system meaningful. And when I say that, I also have had some experience with it and I know it is a great thing to talk about it here in the House. It is another thing to come to grips with it when the committees themselves are called. I do not intend to get into any debate on this occasion as it relates to the so-called resolution in the standing committee on education, except to recall to the member for Sarnia's mind there was a meeting scheduled for June 26—on that particular occasion the member for Peterborough attended, the member for Scarborough East could not attend—which meeting was scheduled to see if we could find some ways and means to move the education committee ahead with the analysis of some of the cost problems. That happens to be factually the case, but I will not dwell upon it on this particular occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I should also point out that I have checked these amendments very care-

fully. I see the amendment from the Leader of the Opposition, and I say to him, with respect, as I read the initial resolution there are very few of those matters, if any, that are not contained within the existing resolution, if at the direction of the House, these matters are to be done.

I would say to the member for Scarborough West—am I in the right geographic area, the member for Scarborough West—as I read the amendment from his particular group—I sense a desire to have the committee structure moved to the extent where there is no direction, per se, from the House itself, as it relates to certain matters. I have to go on record as saying, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important in the consideration of the committee structure that there be a recognition that it draws its power from the Legislature itself, and surely consideration as to the affairs, what should be directed, these are things we can debate here. These are things we can direct to the committee. There is nothing to preclude this in the initial resolution.

Mr. Sargent: No chance for a change here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Just a minute. There is a very substantial change here. I know it is difficult for it to sink through to the member for Grey-Bruce, but it is coming. I hope it is coming. I would say to him that the change is here and it is a very significant change and I hope he appreciates it.

I would say to the member for Scarborough West, there is nothing in the initial resolution that precludes, if the need arises, if it makes sense to do so, the acquisition of staff as it relates to specific situations. It is quite obvious as I read this that matters relating to the Hydro Electric Commission, matters relating to the Workmen's Compensation Board, the Hospital Services Commission, really are without any question inherent in this resolution itself, no doubt about it whatsoever.

And so, Mr. Speaker, in those very brief remarks, I have to say that really I cannot see any validity in accepting the advice from the members opposite as it relates to the amendment from the New Democratic Party or the amendment from the official opposition, because I think, with respect, Mr. Speaker, much of what they are attempting to say in their amendment, if they would read the initial resolution very carefully, they will find that it is covered.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Will the Prime Minister respond to my earlier query as to whether the constitutional committee has been shuffled out of existence, and secondly, would the Prime Minister—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, let me respond to one question at a time. In this way, perhaps it will be more meaningful. The constitutional committee: I, personally, am very anxious to see some consideration of the constitutional problems considered by a committee of this Legislature very shortly, prior to discussions that will take place in Victoria in June. And I would suggest, with respect, that not only are there the four committees here—and I think this is the best way to do it, because if we start fragmenting them further and breaking down membership, I think we will run into problems of attendance—there is no doubt that when you look at at least two or three of these, the constitutional situation can be considered in that committee; and I for one, Mr. Speaker, would support that kind of approach.

Second question?

Mr. MacDonald: My second question is, would the Prime Minister clarify exactly what he meant when he said that the striking committee would have the power to make a decision with regard to the right to substitution? For example, would the striking committee have the power, the majority of Conservatives on it, at this stage to say there can be no substitution and therefore reverse the recommendation of the original committee?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, my suggestion was that the striking committee consider the matter of substitution. If there is no agreement there then we can debate it further here in the House. I have no objection to that whatsoever, but it impressed upon me the logic of having the striking committee getting into the question of numbers, the question of substitution, it is far more relevant for them to do it than for us to get into this discussion at the moment here when perhaps it will not be necessary.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister permit a question from me?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Bullbrook: In relation to the comment that the Premier directed to myself relative to a meeting that he had with the member

for Peterborough and the member for Scarborough East, do I glean that the government anticipates doing something to give us members on the standing committee on education and university affairs the ability to look into the costs of education?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if memory serves me correctly, we had a further discussion in that committee. The second time that we met, there was no consensus on that occasion as to the structure.

I recall the member for Riverdale participated in it, and the member for Peterborough. I undertook on that occasion to meet with the member for Peterborough and the member for Scarborough East to develop some sort of mechanism that could be worthwhile as far as the standing committee on education and university affairs was concerned. The meeting was scheduled, I believe—

Mr. Bullbrook: What has Premier done?

Mr. Lewis: Take a breath; take a breath!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —for some time on June 26 and the member for Scarborough East did have a matter of pressing public concern—

Mr. Bullbrook: Is the Prime Minister undertaking that he is going to do something?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and he could not attend. As a result this matter was not finalized.

Mr. Bullbrook: Would the Premier advise the House whether he is giving us an undertaking that he is prepared to give us the power to do the things we want to do on that committee?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member for Sarnia is a very talented individual. He can read this resolution as well as anybody else and the question—

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and the question, as it relates to this specific resolution, there is no question within the terms of this, some of these things can be done.

Mr. Bullbrook: The answer is no.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No it is not.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, it is yes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No it is not.

An hon. member: It is not yes. It is not no.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Durham.

Mr. Carruthers: Mr. Speaker, in bringing this debate to a conclusion, may I just briefly say that, as has been stated, this motion was based on the report of the standing orders committee and is recorded in the journals of this House. Everyone has had an opportunity to study them. There was a consensus of opinion, as I understand, by the committee; it was approved by the committee last year, and today's debate to me has been a sort of a familiar filibuster and we have been talking politics more than we have common sense.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Carruthers: This motion, Mr. Speaker—the substance of it—is flexible, it is comprehensive, it solves most of the major problems that have faced the committees in this House. Every member knows the problems that we have had in forming committees, attendance. The work of the committees has been a—

An hon. member: Frustration.

Mr. Carruthers:—they have been overloaded with work. Now here is an opportunity for you, as members of the opposition, to do something about it. I urge everyone in this House to support the original motion and defeat the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Carruthers has moved:

That standing committees of this House for the present session be appointed as follows:

1. Procedural affairs committee, to which will be automatically referred the applications for private bills for report as to compliance with the standing orders governing such applications. This committee may, at the discretion of the House, also have referred to it any matter relating to standing orders and procedures in the House or the committees thereof, and any matter relating to the privileges of the House and the members thereof or of the election of such members.

2. Legal administration committee, to which may be referred in the discretion of the House, any bills, estimates or other matters relating to the Departments of Financial and Commercial Affairs, Justice, Labour, Municipal Affairs, Provincial Secretary and Citizenship. To this committee also will be automatically referred any boards and commissions which report through the ministers of those depart-

ments. Committees 1 and 2 combined, under the chairmanship of the chairman of the legal administration committee, will function as the private bills committee.

3. Human resources committee, to which may be referred in the discretion of the House, any bills, estimates, or other matters relating to the Departments of Correctional Services, Education, Health, Social and Family Services and University Affairs and to which also be automatically referred those boards and commissions which report through the ministers of those departments.

4. Natural and physical resources committee to which may be referred in the discretion of the House, any bills, estimates or other matters relating to the Departments of Agriculture and Food, Energy and Resources Management, Highways, Lands and Forests, Mines and Northern Affairs, Tourism and Information and Transport, and to which will also be automatically referred any boards and commissions which report through the ministers of those departments.

5. Estimates committee.

6. Public accounts committee.

7. Regulations committee, as ordered by Statutes of Ontario, Chapter 110, 1968-1969.

Committees number 1 to 4 inclusive may have no conflict of membership with one another, nor may committees number 5, 6 and 7 have conflict of membership with one another.

Which said committees shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

The amendment thereto Mr. Nixon has moved, seconded by Mr. Singer:

That there be an additional standing committee appointed called the economic affairs committee empowered and instructed to investigate and hold public hearings related to significant cost changes in the products or services affecting the cost of living in Ontario.

Then, as a subamendment, it was moved by Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. J. Renwick that the resolution be further amended or supplemented by adding thereto the following clauses:

Which said committees shall severally be empowered on their own initiative, when not otherwise engaged on matters and things referred to them by the House, to examine and inquire into such further and other matters and things related to or in any way touching upon matters and things within their confidence as they in their discretion may determine. Which said committees shall severally be empowered to engage counsel and from time to time such other expert staff as may be necessary to enable the committee to discharge their responsibility.

That the proceedings of the committees be reported by *Hansard*.

That the Workmen's Compensation Board be called, firstly, before the legal administration committee, the Ontario Hospital Services Commission be called, firstly, before the human resources committee and the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario be called, firstly, before the natural and physical resources committee.

The vote, of course, will be on the sub-amendment. I, therefore, put it to the House.

Those in favour of the subamendment moved by Mr. Lewis will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

The House divided on the subamendment, which was negatived on the following vote.

AYES	NAYS
Ben	Allan
Bolton	Apps
Braithwaite	Auld
Brown	Bales
Bukator	Belanger
Bullbrook	Bernier
Burr	Boyer
Davison	Brunelle
Deacon	Carruthers
Deans	Carton
De Monte	Connell
Farquhar	Davis
Ferrier	Demers
Gaunt	Downer
Gisborn	Dunlop
Good	Dymond
Haggerty	Evans
Innes	Gilbertson
Jackson	Grossman
Lawlor	Guindon
Lewis	Hamilton
MacDonald	Haskett

AYES	NAYS
Makarchuk	Henderson
Newman	Hodgson
(Windsor-Walkerville)	(Victoria-Haliburton)
Nixon	Hodgson
Paterson	(York North)
Peacock	Jessiman
Pilkey	Johnston
Reid	(Parry Sound)
(Rainy River)	Johnston
Reid	(Carleton)
(Scarborough East)	Kennedy
Renwick	Kerr
(Riverdale)	Lawrence
Ruston	(Carleton East)
Sargent	Lawrence
Shulman	(St. George)
Singer	MacNaughton
Smith	Meen
(Nipissing)	Morin
Sopha	Morningstar
Spence	Morrow
Stokes	McKeough
Trotter	McNeil
Worton	Newman
Young-42.	(Ontario South)

Potter
Price
Pritchard (Mrs.)
Randall
Reilly
Reuter
Robarts
Rollins
Root
Rowe
Rowntree
Simonett
Smith
(Simcoe East)
Smith
(Hamilton Mountain)
Snow
Stewart
Villeneuve
Welch
Wells
Whitney
Winkler
Wishart
Yakabuski
Yaremko-64.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 42, the "nays" 64.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the subamendment lost.

The vote will now be on the amendment moved by Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Nixon: We will accept the same vote.

Mr. Speaker: Same vote? Agreed?

I declare the amendment lost.

Now, the main motion, moved by Mr. Carruthers.

The same vote?

Mr. Singer: Oh no!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: All right. It is getting late, I just wanted to be sure.

The motion, then, upon which we will vote will be that made by Mr. Carruthers, and as many as are in favour will please say "aye".

As many as are opposed, will please say "nay".

Mr. Speaker: I declare the "ayes" have it.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that it is getting a little late and there are other

important matters that must be dealt with by this House, with the consent of the House I would be quite prepared to carry on with the next resolution or under the rules we can resume again at 8.

I am prepared to move ahead now with the consideration of the next resolution if we get common consent.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what resolution the Prime Minister has in mind, but I presume it is the interim supply resolution. We for our part are not prepared to give this just our perfunctory assent.

For that reason, I presume that for your convenience we would resume at 8.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, what I was saying was I assumed that perhaps there would not be enthusiastic response to this motion, but this does not preclude us from going ahead right now.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Introducing and welcoming Denis Lapalme as "Timmy", Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Ferrier	17
Capital grants programme for Ontario farmers, statement by Mr. Stewart	17
New programme under tourist loan fund by Ontario Development Corporation, statement by Mr. Grossman	19
Proposed conference on foreign investment, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	20
Expected completion cost of Ontario Place, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Shulman	20
Use of possible \$10 million from Dow Chemical to help clean up mercury pollution, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Ben, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Singer, Mr. Lewis	21
Throne speech re employment and housing prospects, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis ..	23
Grants requested by Indian groups, questions to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Stokes	24
Government's decision on revision of OMA fees, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Ferrier	25
52-week maximum time limit on upgrading for CAAT students, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. G. E. Smith, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. B. Newman	25
Farmers who have not received farm tax rebate payments, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Spence, Mr. Good, Mr. Paterson, Mr. Gaunt	26
Negotiations with Cobalt refineries and other mines in Cobalt area, question to Mr. Bernier, Mr. Jackson	27
Review of cost of transporting goods between northern and southern Ontario, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Knight, Mr. Sopha, Mr. Stokes	28
Report of standing committee on education, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. T. Reid	29
Reply to secondary school teachers, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Nixon	30
Reactivating railway service in Bruce Peninsula, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Sargent	30
Tabling annual review of Department of Mines and Northern Affairs, Mr. Bernier	31
Presenting reports of Provincial Auditor, Public Accounts and University of Western Ontario, Mr. Yaremko	31
Presenting report of Department of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Kerr	32
Motion to arrange for printing of reports of debates and speeches, Mr. Davis, agreed to ...	32
Motion re appointment of standing committees, Mr. Carruthers, agreed to	32
Recess, 6 o'clock	64



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, March 31, 1971
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1971

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

MOTION FOR INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, it is rather important that we conclude a certain piece of business, this being March 31, which is the end of our fiscal year.

A motion has been made, Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge—

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): It was not made.

Hon. Mr. McKeough:—each year since I have been in the House. I suppose if we go back far enough this motion was not made. That was in, perhaps, the happy days when—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Do you want to make the motion before you make the speech?

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Just be patient.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): When we had the dictatorship.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No. When the House sat, perhaps, for two months and the business of the House was concluded by March 31. At any rate, the motion was—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the minister would make the motion first.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am speaking on a motion. All right, I will be glad to do that, Mr. Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of University Affairs (Mr. White), that the Provincial Auditor—

An hon. member: Oh, the Treasurer found one.

Hon. Mr. McKeough:—be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil service and other necessary payments, pending the voting of supply for the fiscal year commencing April 1, 1971, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriations following the voting of supply.

Mr. Singer: Could we have a copy of that, or is that another secret?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes. Just as soon as we get it tabled.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Mr. McKeough moves, seconded by Hon. Mr. White:

That the Provincial Auditor be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil service and other necessary payments, pending the voting of supply for the fiscal year commencing April 1, 1971, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriations following the voting of supply.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might just continue with the explanation if that would be in order.

In the days gone by, the House of course completed the budget and, I suppose, rose by April 1. At any rate the budget was completed by April 1. Then a few years ago things started to stretch out and, as I have said each year that I have been here, this motion has been made. So I suppose really it will be some time in October or November before the supply motion is put to the House, and in that interval the auditor requires authority to pay the salaries of the civil service and other payments which this House will undoubtedly approve, as I have said, probably in October or November.

I suppose the procedure is somewhat different this year in one instance, that up until this year this motion has been made after the budget has been presented to the House and the estimates tabled in the House. It is no great secret of course that this year in the normal pattern of legislative events, in which the House might have met by the first of February and the budget would have been presented in March, this motion would still have been made on March 31. I am quite sure of that. But something unusual happened in this particular year which was of no great—which was of great moment—

Mr. Singer: Not great. The minister was right the first time.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Which was, I say, most unusual to those of us who sit on this

side of the House. We had a leadership convention which delayed— Now that would be no surprise over there, because they have had so many of them. But on this side of the House—

An hon. member: And due for another.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And due for another.

Mr. Singer: Raising your voice does not make the case any better.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: On this side of the House this was an unusual circumstance. However, Mr. Speaker, if I could assure the House, I would be glad to do so that this unusual circumstance undoubtedly will not happen again.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): He probably will not be there.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I do not want to break any great confidence—and I was not told this in the privacy of the cabinet chamber—but my leader (Mr. Davis) indicated to me that he fully expects to stay on for at least nine years as Prime Minister and leader of the government, and we will not have this problem.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We will not have this problem until at least 1980.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, what the Treasurer said is true only to the extent of his historical perspective. It is accepted in this particular chamber of course that once each year, as the province runs out of voted money; at the end of the fiscal year the Treasurer puts through what has become a pro forma motion authorizing the auditor to approve the regular expenditures.

But I think the time has come when we have to accept our important responsibilities under the democratic system and require that the government of the day account for the expenditures which they are undertaking and surely come before this House on a regular basis for something that is in most democratic houses referred to as interim supply and not just a pro forma motion.

In this case when this motion is approved—and I believe the Treasurer is right in expecting that it will be and surely not before too many hours have elapsed—he will be given a blank cheque for what amounts to, I would expect, \$4 billion this year. I confidently expect further that we will have an oppor-

tunity to put our case before the people as well as the members of this House before very much of it is spent.

That is why we on this side feel that it is something more than just a perfunctory motion that is put after 6 o'clock after an afternoon of debate in which members on all sides are supposed to say "Fine. That is all right Darcy," and nod and go about their business. Surely in this case—and the Treasurer has pointed out that it is special; we have only been in session for a few hours—if the Treasurer was going to take his responsibility seriously he would have arranged with his leader or the House leader, as the new House leader comes more and more into a position of ordering the business of this chamber, that his motion, which is obviously an important one—as a matter of fact it is essential to the conduct of the affairs of the province—would have been put at the time the Legislature was convened at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

I am not for a moment saying the debate this afternoon was not an important one, but it could as easily have been held tomorrow as this afternoon. While the Treasurer is prepared to imply that we are obstructing what is the orderly business of the province, he was the one who was surely attempting to put through under the guise of the pressure of time a resolution of tremendous importance indeed.

I would like to say something further. It has been pointed out in this House previously by the hon member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) that whenever supply is voted—and essentially that is what we are doing tonight—then every member of this House has an opportunity, which goes back very far in the history of our democratic institutions, to bring to the attention of the first minister, and certainly the Treasurer, problems that the people of the province are experiencing with government policy and particularly financial policy. It is not my intention to lead the Liberal Party into any attempt to break the province for a few minutes following the midnight hour.

Undoubtedly the money will be voted tonight, but surely, Mr. Speaker, you will recognize that it is the responsibility of this government and certainly of the opposition, to see to it that the attention of the people of the province is brought to the fact that this motion will authorize the auditor to approve the expenditure of what will probably amount this year to \$4 billion.

I was struck this afternoon by the use of a phrase by the new Premier that I have not

heard in this House during the eight years in which our affairs were led by his predecessor. He said he intended to put through a motion tomorrow dealing with certain matters.

Mr. Singer: He said: "I will pass a motion."

Mr. Nixon: "I will pass a motion" is what he said. Now, this is a man who never, never, makes any slips of the tongue. All of his phrases and his pronouncements are very carefully considered indeed and, if anything, he errs on the side of saying nothing if there is any chance that he might be misconstrued. But he said, "I will put this motion through the House."

It is a tendency, I think, on the part of the government that has been—

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): I said: "To the House."

Mr. Singer: No, the Prime Minister did not say "to".

Mr. Nixon: — in office for more than a quarter of a century—

Mr. Singer: He said, "I will." No, "I will pass."

An hon. member: That is right.

Mr. Nixon: —to feel—

Mr. Singer: You certainly did.

Mr. Nixon: —that the membership of this House is redundant—

An hon. member: \$100. You are on.

Mr. Nixon: —and that only the affairs of government have any importance.

I would say to you, sir, that we on this side of the House feel that a matter of the voting of these huge sums of money is of prime importance indeed. As soon as this motion passes it means that all of the discussions on the estimates are largely a charade. The decision to spend the money has, in fact, been taken and that the authority for the auditor to approve the expenditure is already on the books of this House and he has the authority to proceed.

It is interesting to note that in most jurisdictions the phraseology of the motion is somewhat different. In fact, a reference specifically to interim supply, I believe, should be a part of the resolution. I believe it is associated with the custom in this province to have a pre-audit of the expenditure and, as a matter of fact, it has been the

policy of the government for many years that the signature of the auditor or someone designated by him is essential before expenditure is undertaken. I am happy to see that the government has accepted the recommendations of the productivity improvement commission that this be abolished and that we get back to the tried and true system where the auditor, in fact, audits the expenditures after they have been completed. This, surely is something that we look forward to.

It is my view that if the government, as in this case is the fact, is prepared to spend an estimated \$4 billion on the strength of a motion simply authorizing the auditor to approve, that it should bow to the custom of Legislatures and Parliament everywhere and comes before the House on a regular basis—every 30 days I would suggest—to get the interim supply that is necessary to keep the functioning of the business of the province afloat.

There is no thought that we are going to cut off pay cheques to pensioners, or even members of the Legislature. We have, I suppose, cheques in our pockets now. If this supply motion does not carry they would bounce if we took them to the savings office tomorrow morning.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Just to correct the Leader of the Opposition's great lack of knowledge. That cheque, of course, is dated March 31. There is no possibility in the world that that cheque would bounce.

Mr. Singer: I thank the minister for telling us that. We were worried.

Mr. Nixon: I appreciate the advice of the Treasurer, but I should just tell him that one of his strongest supporters, sitting not too far from where he is sitting, said that he was glad to get out before the banks closed so that he could cash his before this debate came on.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that you recognize it was not the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr), if he wants his mind set at ease.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will recognize the rights of any member of this House to bring before you and the advisers to His Honour, matters of substantial concern related to finances or otherwise. I am delighted that the Premier has already instructed or put on the order paper—it amounts to an instruction—that the debate on Monday will deal with unemployment. I feel that we will

have ample opportunity to discuss that important matter at that time and I look forward to the occasion.

The Speech from the Throne will evidently begin tomorrow, assuming that this debate is completed in time to proceed with that, and there will be other opportunities in a general sense to discuss the business of the province. For those reasons I feel that we should deal with specific matters in this regard.

I have put before you, sir, the fact that I consider the resolution an important one. I believe that the government should amend its procedures so that they ask specifically for interim supply and do so on a regular basis. Having said that, I want to raise for your consideration, sir, and particularly for that of one of the ministers sitting opposite, a matter of substantial concern which I want to bring to your attention tonight, and I refer specifically to the farm economy.

We were treated this afternoon to a statement by the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), who is present tonight, about an extension—

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker. Order, order!

Mr. Nixon: Does the minister want to raise a point of order?

Mr. Peacock: He is in order.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. minister wishes to raise a point of order, he has the opportunity to do so.

Mr. Singer: Come on, get up. If he does not like it, that is not enough. Let him make his point.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, this is not a budget debate.

Mr. Singer: Oh, yes, it certainly is.

Mr. G. Demers (Nickel Belt): There is nothing else to say.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I say to you, sir, that I have two specific points beyond the ones that I have made. The first one deals with the farm economy and I will deal with it briefly, because although the Minister of Agriculture announced this afternoon that he is going to raise the limits on the grants that he is going to make available to farmers, the point is that he has done nothing and his programme does nothing to substantially improve the price of hogs, or the price of eggs.

He winces, but surely he knows that the primary producers in this province are in a position, Mr. Speaker, where they cannot meet their basic payments, that they are not being supported by this minister nor the programmes of this government in a way that gives them an opportunity to make any fair living or even keep up their payments on the substantial mortgages under which they labour. And if you want to talk about welfare inequities there are a good many farmers in this province with substantial investments behind their operation who are working many, many long hours day by day and are not nearly making the money that would be available to them if they threw up their hands and went on some form of welfare.

I do not want to belabour this point. I simply want to bring it to your attention, sir, and to that of the Minister of Agriculture who is present, that here is an area where the government has failed the people of this province, that they have allowed a large section of our industry, the agricultural industry, to go without leadership, without programmes, which will substantially give the farm community any opportunity to partake in the burgeoning opportunities in the Province of Ontario.

His grant programme this afternoon is welcome, but there is very little in it which is going to essentially improve the situation. I wanted to bring that to your attention, sir, as a specific area of grievance which is surely our right and our responsibility in this connection.

The second point that I want to raise is that in the short time that the present Treasurer has had his responsibility, he has substantially undermined the confidence of the people of the Province of Ontario, not only in his ability but in the ability of this administration to order its financial affairs. He had not accepted his position as what—third or fourth in precedence in the swearing-in ceremony. It is strange that he is sitting at the Premier's left hand, as a matter of fact. I do not know what the explanation for that is unless it is some small repayment for favours rendered in the past.

Mr. E. Sopha (Sudbury): No, the fateful walk—

An hon. member: It looked good on TV but does not look so good here.

Mr. Nixon: The laying on of hands.

Interjections by hon members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Point of order, Mr. Speaker: In that the Leader of the Opposition has asked me a question, I would just say that he is seated to my left because, unlike the members opposite, we relate certain things that agree with—

Mr. Nixon: Did I ask a question? If the Premier wants to rise on a point of order, fine, but I did not ask him a question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I thought the Leader of the Opposition asked me a question.

Mr. Nixon: No question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, I see.

Mr. Speaker: Then the hon. Leader of the Opposition will speak not to the seating of the House, but to the resolution before the House.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, right, sir, I intend to do that. I was talking, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that the Treasurer, in the few hours that he has had the responsibility of his high office, began his position, began the exercise of his responsibility by reviving the old threats that were first sown by the present Minister of University Affairs, the former Minister of Revenue and before that the chairman of the White committee, when it was suggested that Ontario have a separate income tax.

An hon. member: Were there no Liberals on that committee?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, this was the first rattling—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Was the Leader of the Opposition one of the Liberals on that committee?

An hon. member: There goes the minister, he is off again.

Mr. Nixon: —of the old MacNaughton sabre—

An hon. member: As Treasurer, the minister has to be sane and sober and quiet.

Mr. Nixon: —the first rattling of the old MacNaughton sabre to undertake the old political confrontations with the government of Canada. The people opposite simply cannot get over thinking of the government of Canada as “them Liberals” up in Ottawa. Now this is a matter of grave concern, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Davis: How do you think that?

Mr. Nixon: —which I think renders the usefulness, the continued usefulness of the Treasurer, substantially in question, because if he is not able to deal as a representative of the government of Ontario with a representative of the government of Canada, then I predict a continuation of the failures that were a part of the efforts of his predecessor and the former Premier in dealing with the federal administration. The very suggestion that we have a separate income tax collected by the province of Ontario is certainly completely unacceptable.

Mr. Demers: We have not said that.

Mr. Nixon: Completely unacceptable. It would lead, Mr. Speaker, to a chaotic balkanization of our tax system. This was pointed out by the report of the Smith committee and it is nothing more than the old-fashioned kind of political threats that have undermined the dealings between the two most important governments of Canada for so long.

Mr. J. R. Simonett (Frontenac-Addington): What is the member doing right now?

Mr. Nixon: I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Treasurer is simply carrying with him into his new office the same autocratic attitudes associated with one of the first families of Chatham that he had with him at the time when he had the responsibility of supervising the affairs of The Department of Municipal Affairs. It was a fortunate thing that he was moved out of there and the present Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) was brought in to sort of smooth that over.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the leader will come back to the resolution on hand.

Mr. Nixon: Right, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the voting of supply and the position in this matter taken by the new Treasurer of the Province of Ontario. I told you when I began my remarks that I was not going to speak at great length. I wanted to make two points, the first having to do with a specific area of our economy and the second having to do with the inadequacies of the present Treasurer himself. That he should begin his responsibilities by immediately threatening not only the government of Canada but the rest of the provinces of Canada with a separate approach to taxation is surely unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I think these matters are of great importance. I put them before you in prelude to an amendment to the motion that I feel is broad enough to allow any member of the House to take part in the debate, and I move, seconded by Mr. Singer, that this House regrets the failure of the government to order its financial affairs to adequately serve the interests of the taxpayers of Ontario.

Mr. Simonett: My right-hand man.

Mr. Nixon: And, Mr. Speaker, while that motion is being brought to you, sir, I would like to say that in—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Have we got a copy? The member made such a big fuss about this.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, there is a copy for the member if he will wait until the young man brings it to him.

Mr. Singer: Hold your breath; there it is, read it.

Mr. Nixon: In the moments before the Treasurer—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Prime Minister has not got one.

Mr. Singer: Anybody else?

Mr. Nixon: —made his remarks he said that he expected himself and his colleague immediately to his right to have the responsibility of advising his honour for something like nine years. Now he must be some kind of a clairvoyant, because as I understood the new Premier, as I heard him on television on an auspicious occasion a few weeks ago, he said that he expected that there would be another 40 years of Conservative rule.

Then I say that while the scattered applause from the half-empty benches on the government side may support his contention of 27 years of Conservative rule, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province feel that it is time for a change, and in this connection, just before you put the amendment, I would say to the Premier that if he does not think I am right, then let him advise His Honour to prorogue the House, issue the writs, and we will go to the people and see who is right.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Oh, here comes the second gun who sits on the Leader of the Opposition's right; the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent).

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): The fastest gun in Owen Sound.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They are really bringing up the big ammunition tonight. Hearken to the leadoff for the Grits.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Singer: Sane, sober and considered. He has not learned any of the lessons for being a Treasurer.

Mr. Sopha: He is quite a skater though.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Perhaps we might put the amendment and then we can get on with the debate.

Mr. Nixon moves, seconded by Mr. Singer:

That this House regrets the failure of the government to order its financial affairs to adequately serve the interests of the taxpayers of Ontario.

The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, I thought before the hon. Leader of the Opposition sat down he would have invited the new Prime Minister to recommend to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor that he resign his post and call on the Leader of the Opposition to form a government. I have not heard such a build-up to a motion of loss of confidence in this government in the last 3½ years that I have sat here, Mr. Speaker.

We were full of expectation at 6 o'clock, as I am sure the Prime Minister and his Treasurer were, that this evening we were to be witnesses to, if not participants in, a major confrontation between the Leader of the Opposition and the new Prime Minister.

Instead we have had a discussion of the price of eggs, the price of pork.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Peacock: Not only, Mr. Speaker, are we participating in this major confrontation over the price of eggs, we are doing so to an empty gallery, a gallery which is not there to report the motion of want of confidence which I am sure the Leader of the Opposition has looked forward to with such expectation in tomorrow morning's newspapers.

I doubt very much it will be there. We on our part for the time being are content to meet the Prime Minister on his ground Monday afternoon when we engage with him on what he regards, as well as we do, as the

prime economic crisis in the province—unemployment.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Peacock: Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Grey-Bruce, who rose immediately after the Leader of the Opposition subsided, brought colour back to the cheeks of the provincial Treasurer. When he sat in his place at 8 o'clock I thought he was aghast at the prospect that he had to face this evening. When he saw the member for Grey-Bruce rise, the colour immediately returned to his cheeks, his boyish good humour was restored, and I see him now full of courage at the rest of the evening that lies ahead of him.

Mr. Speaker: I trust the hon. member will come back to the resolution in front of him.

Mr. Peacock: Yes, Mr. Speaker. For a time I almost thought I saw the Prime Minister blanch, but he, too, has been revived by what he has seen before him this evening.

I will not prolong this, Mr. Speaker. I simply point out to the Treasurer that he can expect, no matter how long he sits, or who takes his place in elections to come, that this kind of motion will invariably be before the House on the eve of the new fiscal year, or some few days before it. It is accepted parliamentary practice, as the Leader of the Opposition reminded us—whether one calls it the votes on account at Westminster, or interim supply at Ottawa, or the no-name motion that we give to the way we treat it here—that a government must, before presentation of the estimates, at the time of the budget, before adoption of the estimates and the passage of The Appropriation Act, have a motion of the Legislature to pay for the public service and to carry on the programmes.

We do not quarrel with the government's desire to continue payments to teachers through legislative grants, Mr. Speaker, or payments for cutting down trees with dutch elm disease. We do not propose to block such programmes, Mr. Speaker. But I do say to the Treasurer he is wrong and it does indicate his freshness at the job that he should dismiss, as he has this evening in introducing the motion, the future need for such a similar motion.

Let me conclude by leaving this thought with you, Mr. Speaker, that it is typical of the official opposition, I am sure, in bringing this motion before you this evening—this amendment—that they have very much in

mind recent newspaper articles referring to this group as the actual, if not official, opposition.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Peacock: It is quite typical of them, in my brief experience in this House —

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): And responsible besides.

Mr. Peacock: — to do just what they have done this evening to blow their wad very early in the session and to do it in front of an empty gallery at that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, it was to be expected, I suppose, that we would be treated to that parade of trivia from a member who does not intend to seek re-election to this chamber, for one reason or another.

What is offensive is his lack of historical perspective. As long as Parliaments have existed, sir, and in the days when Parliament came into its own and became a very real force in the life of the British people, the right of the official opposition to grieve, to state their complaints before money was voted to the Crown was a very hard-fought-for and a very hard-won one.

I am not sure, I say early in my remarks, that the motion before the House is legal. I was under the impression—one wants to talk as a constitutional lawyer with a little knowledge of the subject—I was under the impression that the only way a Legislature could vote money to the government was upon a request to do so from Her Majesty. There was nothing in either the preliminary remarks of the Treasurer, nor in the body of the motion itself, which indicated that this request for the voting of supply has come from the Lieutenant Governor or over his hand. I have become accustomed to the pattern in this House for all members to stand in their place when the Prime Minister himself delivered the request over the Lieutenant Governor's own hand or that of the administrator, in the request for supply.

And all the more important is the constitutional form when we face the stark reality, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, that some \$4 billion is being asked for. That statement was not only not disputed by the Treasurer, but was buttressed when he said that finally we would get around to voting the final supply bill some time next October.

Mr. Singer: Or November.

Mr. Sopha: Happily, this Legislature will be, by that time, long gone.

Now, it was not necessary at all for the Leader of the Opposition to amend the motion. "May" discloses that we have a right—any member of the House has a right—to state any grievance, any complaint, to stress any anxiety or to make any representation to you, Mr. Speaker, before calling or being called upon, or giving acquiescence to the voting of a single penny to the government to carry on its operation.

Then, I hastily say to my friend from Windsor, that it was a major confrontation between the Leader of the Opposition and the new leader of the government. In his final words the Leader of the Opposition issued to him a clear and unmistakable call to go to the people—

Mr. Singer: Right, right.

Mr. Sopha: —to decide—

Mr. Singer: Do it now—today.

Mr. Sopha: —to decide who it is that should have the burdens of office in this province. It is not to exaggerate, it is not to distort language, to torture reality, to say to the new leader of the government or to ask him rhetorically—and I emphasize rhetorically, because I do not want him on his feet at this point—to say to him, "Where is your mandate? Where is the mandate you have to lead the government?"

Mr. Singer: No, no. Where is it?

Mr. Sopha: He was not elected as the leader of this—

Mr. Singer: Twenty-one votes over the absent Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence).

Mr. Sopha: —of this province. He was elected to that office—

Mr. Simonett: How many votes did the hon. member have?

Mr. Singer: I am prepared. Let us call the election and I will ask again for a mandate. Let the Premier do it. I am prepared; let us have the Premier do it.

Mr. Sopha: Not only does it sharpen the acuity of my enthusiasm, but it buttresses the feeling of assurance and validity of what I

say to have the support of my friend from Downsview.

I was asking the Prime Minister rhetorically, where is his mandate to lead this province? He was selected by a political party. Nor is it to exaggerate the accuracy or the reality of what occurred to say that he was selected by a group of 60 so-called delegates-at-large who represented in their persons, and in their positions, the financial, industrial and commercial establishment of this province—John Bassett, John David Eaton, Eddie Goodman, others of that ilk and kind. It was absolutely clear.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Point of order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think the member for Sudbury would want to be quite correct. My leader was not chosen by a political party; he was chosen by the political party of this province.

Mr. Nixon: He was chosen by the new Treasurer—a personal laying-on of hands.

Mr. Singer: The minister can do better than that. Maybe not much.

Mr. Nixon: Charlie could not do it, but Darcy did.

Mr. Sopha: Generations of political students, of course, will assess the efficacy of the fateful walk of false Sextus when he moved across Maple Leaf Gardens in the wake of the tidal wave created by his father-in-law, a very shrewd politician who knows the importance of political reality and where to put one's support.

Mr. Singer: And how to work a voting machine.

Mr. Sopha: It was also perfectly obvious, of course—and now, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking about the mandate of this government to ask for this money—it was obvious that the grass roots of the Conservative Party did not support this man as the leader of that party on that occasion. Their support was for the present Minister of Justice.

Mr. Singer: Two seats removed.

Mr. Sopha: Another indicative figure of course, a very revealing figure, is that according to my count, 44 of the members opposite supported the member for Peel North.

Mr. Speaker: Might I suggest that the hon. member would come back to the resolution?

Mr. Sopha: Let me just ask this question. If it took the 44 of you to elect him, who do you speak for? Whoever you speak for are not listening to you. So it is perfectly appropriate at this point in the life of Ontario for the Leader of the Opposition to say, in reference to this motion, let us go to the people at the earliest possible time and settle this, and —

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: — and determine who shall have the responsibility for dealing with those many anxious and frustrating problems that confront the people.

Where are the hospital beds?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: What date did the hon. member —

Mr. Sopha: Where are the hospital beds? Just at the point —

Mr. Singer: Thirty-seven days from now, May 7.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Just as the Minister of Health opened his mouth, I was saying, where are the hospital beds to treat the people who are ill in this province? Tragedy attends many a family when they have sick persons in their houses and on their hands and cannot find a hospital bed in order to make available to them, in the proper environment, the skills of medical science.

Unemployment, that we are going to deal with next Monday.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Forced upon us.

Mr. Sopha: The anxiety of people the length and breadth of this province —

Mr. Nixon: We will listen to that speech again.

Mr. Sopha: — about the environment; the danger that we face, that human life on this planet may be obliterated entirely within the lifetime of those now alive. The question of education costs. The general problem of taxation. The burden and the struggle with inflation. The price of rents. The price of food. In every aspect of our life in this province, the likelihood that everyone, the housewife, the worker, people on modest incomes, the pensioner, faces impending tragedy, anxiety and frustration.

Mr. H. L. Rowntree (York West): All against a deliberate policy of unemployment in the hands of Mr. Trudeau.

Mr. Sopha: But where in that document of yesterday were the aggressive and forward-looking policies?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Where were the policies that pointed the way to a betterment of the —

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): I will get more votes than you will down there, I will tell you that much.

An hon. member: That is what you said the last time.

Mr. Peacock: What major theme is he going to develop tonight?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce will have his turn shortly.

Mr. Singer: At least he is going to run again. He is not quitting.

An hon. member: Some people have more sense.

Mr. Sopha: I say that it is perfectly proper that at the earliest —

Mr. Singer: You should all quit now.

Mr. Sopha: — opportunity in this session, the Leader of the Opposition should call attention to the problems the people of Ontario face in speaking to this request of the government. That he has done. He really should not be victimized by the trivial argument of the last speaker with catchy phrases like "blowing our wad early," whatever that means if it does not impinge almost on the borderline of vulgarity.

But at the earliest time in the session, of course, we say to the Prime Minister either to give the people of this province the leadership to which they are entitled or go to the people to decide who should give it. We are comforted, and glad to have the opportunity to say at this very early time that we have every reason to be assured that there is a tremendous surge of support for this party.

Mr. Sargent: You know it.

Mr. Sopha: Thirteen hundred in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not on the resolution at all and I would ask that he come back or resume his seat.

An hon. member: They cannot even get a candidate in Grenville-Dundas.

Mr. Sopha: I will say that more quietly —

An hon. member: We are going to vote for his brother in Belleville, though.

Mr. Sopha: — 1,300 in Ottawa. Four people seeking the nomination. Fifteen hundred in Hamilton a short time ago.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Fifty cents a membership.

Mr. Speaker: This is a debate on the supply resolution and I will not allow the members to stray as far as this hon. member here strayed and I would ask that he come back to the resolution and we debate it.

Mr. Sopha: Well, the burthen of our remarks of course, very germane to the resolution, is that we are saying to the government, "let us go to the people." Instead of asking for this interim supply let us get out in the hustings and settle with the people of Ontario. Let them settle the issue of how this money should be spent.

An hon. member: It is perfectly legitimate that way.

Mr. Sopha: That is the issue: to determine according to their democratic ways of choice which group of people shall have the confidence of the Lieutenant Governor, and the gist of our remarks on this is to issue that challenge to the Prime Minister, to tell him that this party is ready.

An hon. member: It is eager to tell him.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, this party is ready. Did you hear those unctuous phrases uttered that we are the real opposition—from the party that last October went into full and final decline; that irretrievably lost the confidence of the people of this province and Canada generally? They cannot recover and will not recover.

At this point, well buttressed by precedent in May, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks by saying that we are entitled, that we have the obligation, again at the earliest time, to stand here and to say to the government, "You are unworthy to ask for this money because you have not got the policies that indicate that positive approach to the solution of the problems confronted by the people of this province." You deserve it. The only decent thing to do by the new leader who has not got a mandate is to go down the hall to

the Lieutenant Governor and to advise him to dissolve the House and let us have an election. We are ready for it.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, it is a worrisome thing that we talked about voting funds on the start of the \$4 billion budget. After having watched today the most disorganized front bench I have ever seen in my life—nothing is going according to plan —

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I do not know. We are in the opposition and we sit here and look at what is going on.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, we were talking about the financial brains of this Treasury Board. I recall that about 18 months ago when we were talking about the perils of the taxpayers under the guise of the provincial Treasurer at that time, he assured us that everything was hunky-dory in this province, everything was just the greatest, that we did not know what we were talking about. And one morning we woke up and he said we are facing a financial nightmare, it was coming immediately. Everything that he said was entirely wrong a month before. We knew what was coming and this is how in one month they can be so completely wrong.

I say it is a worrisome thing to see the scandals we have across there today to run the affairs of seven or eight million people when they do not know where we are going insofar as tomorrow in Ontario is concerned. The most glaring thing in voting supply for this government is the fact that we are launched upon a hunt for power in Hydro.

Stay right there and listen to me.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): I read the member's press release.

Mr. Sargent: We are launched on a \$1 billion nuclear programme—please listen; it is important that you should know something about it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We will send a wire to "Pierre."

Mr. Sargent: He is in trouble too but not as much as you are, I will tell you.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: We call the shots when we see them wrong, and if I am wrong I will

say so. I think this government is in terribly bad shape. I am only a small businessman but if I ever ran a business the way you fellows run it, I would be broke tomorrow, I tell you.

An hon. member: He does not run his own business this way either, I tell you.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Have you seen his Bobby Orr wrist watch?

Mr. Sargent: I will get you one; I will get you two or three.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Get me two or three.

Mr. Sargent: It is very important to be seriously launched. We are committed to a \$1-billion programme on nuclear power. That is our commitment through this fine minister's department. He has got too much to do. We are partially committed to a process that has never worked in 10 countries in Europe; it has never worked in Nova Scotia and—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It is working right here now.

Mr. Sargent: Just a moment. We are trying it in my area and you spent \$1 million last fall when you made a mistake, but you covered that one up pretty well. Let me tell the Premier the glaring thing he should know about this. In this total commitment to the nuclear hunt for power we have spent maybe \$400 million or \$500 million of the money of the taxpayers of Ontario through Hydro in this particular field and the authorities tell us—this is not a laughing matter; I am talking money—the combined production of all the nuclear programmes in Canada in 1971 and 1972 will amount to one-half of 1 per cent of the total load this year.

Having spent \$400 million or \$500 million, we have arrived at the point where we are 9½ per cent off the target. Do you wonder why I am concerned when I pay my hydro bill, when I pay my taxes in Ontario? This is not my word; it is the word of the authorities that the combined nuclear programme in America is only 1 per cent of the total load. And here we are, a province almost on the verge of financial nightmare, as he says over here; we are committed to spending \$1 billion on a programme we do not know will even work.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It is working now.

Mr. Sargent: It is not working now. The minister does not know what he is talking about; I know what I am talking about. I think it is disgraceful that Treasury Board can laugh and talk about an economic disaster like this particular thing. One per cent of the total load is nuclear power and we spent \$400 million or \$500 million.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We have not spent \$400 million or \$500 million.

Mr. Sargent: I would welcome to know how much we have spent.

Mr. Nixon: How much has the minister's department got committed to Pickering?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We have not spent \$400 million or \$500 million.

Mr. Nixon: How much has the minister got committed to Pickering?

Mr. Sargent: I do not know. I cannot find out. How much is it? Does the minister know?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I have not got it in my head.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the hon. minister to refrain from interrupting the speaker and cross-talking. If he wishes to engage in the debate, he may do so at the appropriate time, and the member will please address the government through the Chair.

Mr. Sargent: This is why I wish we had television. Look at this, laughing like a bunch of jackals. We have wasted a half a billion dollars for 1 per cent of the total load in Hydro and the government is laughing about it. If the taxpayers of Ontario could see this, it would be a great—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are not laughing about that.

Mr. Sargent: I do not know about that.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: The government has got a heavy water plant that does not work. That is all it has got. No one will ever know, Mr. Speaker, no one will ever know.

When the hon. Premier, then the Minister of Education, brought in his education consolidation programme to this House, the day he brought it in, he admitted he was \$50 million wrong. He asked us to vote him \$50 million that day. Now I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that no one in this province, no one in this House,

will ever know what school consolidation cost us, when areas to the south of us—every area that has tried school consolidation—has reverted back to the old programme.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Nonsense. Talk about something you know something about.

Mr. Sargent: Everything is nonsense to the Premier. But he will never know how much it has cost the taxpayers of Ontario through school consolidation. Now let him go to the people of Ontario and he will see what will happen to him on that one. That is a beauty.

He has a man sitting on his left there—the man who goes about the province selling regional government. Now regional government is going to be as bad for the government as education, so every time the Treasurer is up our way he and the Minister of Highways and Transport keep quiet. They do not bother me about regional government up our way because they know we won't stand for it. But you will never know and no one will ever know in this province how much he has cost us in the regional government programme.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton) is intelligent—

Mr. Sargent: I know, but he is a nice guy. He is not talking practical politics. It will never work. Ask the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Winkler). He and I were at a meeting to meet the members of the federation, and I told them that the government would have to keep regional government out of our affairs. We have got our own affairs up there. Great applause. Did the Minister of Revenue say anything? No, he kept very quiet. He did not say a word.

Mr. Nixon: He is in trouble. There is no doubt about it.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): May I rise on a question of privilege, there, Mr. Speaker? The fact of the matter is I told the member the first people I saw in Toronto were the very committee under the warden's chairmanship asking about the possibilities of regional government, and I said that.

Mr. Nixon: What is the minister going to do about the hospitals up there?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I have solved that too.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: The Leader of the Opposition burst on that one.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I have got to learn though. I have got to learn. I am not as smart as the Treasurer is.

An hon. member: The member will not learn from the Treasurer.

Mr. Sargent: No one will ever know what this minister has cost the Province of Ontario. So the two of them have cost us hundreds of millions of dollars through their egg-head bright ideas. If they had ever been in politics at grass-roots level they would not do crazy things like that.

An hon. member: The price of eggs is pretty low, too.

Mr. Nixon: And the Premier has got to get worried about it.

Mr. Sargent: I do not want to flog this thing, but we have the Ontario Hospital Services Commission, which is one of our biggest spending bodies and which is responsible to no one. The hon. Minister of Revenue says his enemies should not take advantage of his talking about closing the hospitals. Now if we cannot talk about it who can? And the government is still going to close the Chesley Hospital. We cannot get enough hospital beds but they are going to close it. But they are responsible to no one. The Minister of Health cannot stop them.

No one will ever know, Mr. Speaker, the land acquisition programme purchased by Bramalea Corporation. There have been no public hearings on this and multi-millions of dollars are involved here—all under the table. We do not know a thing about it. My leader today asked for public hearings with the power to call counsel and to investigate. No one will ever know the extent of the power of one Edwin Goodman. He was written up in the press a few weeks ago as a good-looking silver-haired guy who had untold power in this Province. The story went on to tell that by the flick of his wrist he could pick up the phone and do anything he wanted in Ontario by calling Queen's Park here.

Mr. Nixon: It is Eagleson that really bothers them over there.

Mr. Sargent: I think this is entirely wrong, when in the consortium of companies that he is alleged to be legal counsel for, and I guess the press is right—

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but perhaps—

Mr. Sargent: Yes, but this is—I am talking about spending money on housing. This man is a legal counsel for Cadillac Developments, one of the largest recipients of moneys from the Ontario Government in housing. They are building condominiums in the hundreds of millions of dollars. Mr. Goodman is their legal counsel. Now I do not suppose that he would help get these loans through like that. But there are untold millions of dollars that the people know nothing about, and I, as a taxpayer, am getting fed up with it. If they had come to us—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Why does the member not search the title?

Mr. Sargent: Come on. The minister is over 21. The government comes to us at five minutes to 6 and says, "Give us enough money to—"

An hon. member: Five after 6!

Mr. Sargent: Five after 6. "—to run the show." A million-dollar bridge that does not work.

I do not know about that one. It is a new one.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What is the member talking about?

Mr. Sargent: I did not get that one either.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That answers that question.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, a member goes back to his riding on the weekend and he is haunted with people calling him for work and for welfare. I know the calls the Minister of Revenue has in his place. I know the calls I have in my place. And thanks to the Minister of Highways and Transport I have got 30 men to work. He gave me 30 jobs for cutting trees down over the weekend, and I did appreciate it because I did not think I could get it. I was quite surprised.

Mr. Simonett: How many did Trudeau get the hon. member?

Mr. Sargent: I even got a blurb in the paper about that—in our local paper. But I was not after that. These fellows do not want welfare but they want to work. They want to work. And it is a sad thing when—

An hon. member: They want to get off their butts.

Mr. Sargent: They want to get off their butts.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Why does the member not phone Trudeau?

Mr. Sargent: The Premier has been so busy in the last six months aspiring to the job he has that he forgot there are people in Ontario who have not got jobs. And now he is starting at long last to look around and say, "Well, here is a hell of a good bait for an election."

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Order, order, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Sargent: This is my opinion. I am speaking my opinion, Mr. Speaker. The minister can have his chance in a few minutes. I want to tell you, sir, that during the war we could corral all the things we have in our society to put men to work to kill, but in times of peace we cannot give a man the dignity of having a job or a home.

I tell you something that we have in this province. In every city, we have millions of square feet of vacant plants crying to be used. We have money in our Ontario Housing Corporation. We are asking people to spend \$12,000, \$15,000, \$20,000, \$21,000 for a home. In the United States there is a modular housing programme on for housing costing less than \$10,000 that meets all standards down there. All we need here is a standard building code across this nation and we could corral all the money we needed to put every man in this province to work immediately, tomorrow morning, by taking these vacant plants and giving us modular housing, because if the housing business is good, everything is good. All the trades come into play and everything is great. That is the answer to unemployment situations. That is all you have got to do.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Fuddle-duddle!

Mr. Sargent: I have got more than that to tell him too. It is time we should move, because the dignity of a man having a job and his home is the most important thing in the whole world.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, I do not really understand this debate to any great extent. I hope the Premier will clarify a number of things for me. I cannot understand, for example, why the

House could not have come back a week earlier and we could have had a debate in the committee, say yesterday or the day before, and then the Premier or the Treasurer could have asked for interim supply about 3 o'clock this afternoon. We could have had a little discussion and they would have got their money. Why could we not have come back a couple of days earlier and done this thing? It is a rhetorical question, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What difference would two days make?

Mr. T. Reid: I cannot understand why you had to wait until the last minute, five after 6, to sort of try to shovel this through. That is a rhetorical question, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, once again—

Mr. T. Reid: I am sure the Prime Minister will have a chance to reply—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, do I understand correctly that if this debate happened by the merest chance to go beyond midnight that the Treasurer would legally not be allowed to write any more cheques? Is this how serious this issue is?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is right.

Mr. Singer: That is exactly what is at issue.

Mr. T. Reid: This seems to me like very incompetent planning. I sort of suspect that the Treasurer simply did not know he needed interim supply to write cheques after midnight.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. T. Reid: I have only been here 3½ years, Mr. Speaker, but do I understand that there is a tradition in this House over the last quarter of a century that the Treasurer or the Premier of the province simply comes before us and asks us for a blank cheque of \$2 billion or so?

This is just a fantastic procedure. I would have thought that some committee of this Legislature would have realized that this really is not quite the right thing to do. I could understand it if the government party had presented a budget to show where the money might be spent or had come forward and accounted for its expenditures in the past.

I am not a man of little faith. I have had the Premier opposite me, or I have been opposite him, for 3½ years. I think he is a man of integrity—as he goes out the door—so I really do not feel that I want to attack him personally in any sense. It is just that I feel that the people of this province feel that he has no valid mandate to come before the members of this House to ask for billions of dollars to spend in the way of a blank cheque.

It seems to me, if I recall correctly, some time in the last year he asked us for a blank cheque to bail out the school boards and he did not tell us at that time whether the amount of money he needed for that supplementary estimate was \$10 million or \$20 million or \$60 million. I think, as it turned out, it came to \$48 million. So I have a feeling that the people of the province question the ability of this government to figure out how much money it needs for specific programmes.

Now I would like to make a couple of points, Mr. Speaker, about why we are concerned about the ability of this government to spend so much money. I would like to refer, sir, to the auditor's report for 1969-1970 which was just made public today, I gather. In the Provincial Auditor's report there are a number of very disturbing statements which lead me to conclude that even under the former Premier (Mr. Robarts) this party had been in power too long and was failing to be the trustee of the taxpayers' funds that it ought to be.

Just let me give three examples from the auditor's report, which I understand was just released today, probably after 6:05.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, it was tabled at 3 o'clock if the member had been here.

Mr. T. Reid: Well, I have just received a copy. Thank you very much. It would have been nice, Mr. Speaker, if the members of the Legislature had been handed a copy in this place.

Mr. Sopha: The last day; we received four of them.

Mr. T. Reid: It would have been very nice to have had a copy of this report rather than having to go up to a member of the press and ask him if I might have the right, as a legislator in this place, to take a look at the Provincial Auditor's report.

Mr. Peacock: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. T. Reid: No, I will not.

Mr. Peacock: When was the member asked to prepare this speech?

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to put on the record of the House, Mr. Speaker, some statements from the auditor's report which have to do with the ability of the government party to be a trustee of the public's funds. And I feel very strongly that a government that is condemned in the three respects I am about to quote should not be entrusted with a blank cheque asked for at the very latest possible hour.

This is on page 18, and I quote directly:

The report on the audit of revenue of The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs dated July 3, 1970, and covering the period October 1, 1968, to March 31, 1970, indicates that it is still not possible to express an opinion that all revenues due and eligible have been collected or that all remittances received have been properly distributed in the accounts.

Mr. Singer: The minister has a big job ahead of him.

Mr. T. Reid: And yet this Treasurer has the gall to come before us, asking us for a blank cheque, when the Provincial Auditor says of that particular department that he cannot even audit its books properly and the auditor continues about The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Is it not ironic, Mr. Speaker, that The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, under the present Minister of Health, could not even keep its books properly and the auditor says this about the ability of this particular political party to keep its accounts:

The most disappointing discovery of this audit was that little development was discerned in the records and internal controls from the time of the previous examination.

So the Provincial Auditor has been saying this about this government party in the past, Mr. Speaker. He has been saying it, above all, about The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs which is entrusted with the financial affairs of the government to a great extent and they have not even got the confidence to keep their books in an orderly manner. They have not even got the competence to know where their revenues are coming from and they have not got records of their expenditures that satisfy a rather meek and mild Provincial Auditor. Yet this party comes before us again and asks us to give it a blank cheque. I find that ridiculous.

In another section of the report, again on page 18, the Provincial Auditor refers to the Ontario Housing Corporation—and remember this government is asking us for a blank cheque now to write cheques over to the Ontario Housing Corporation, albeit only 10 per cent of its funds.

This is what the Provincial Auditor said about this political party over there being able to manage the billions of dollars that it receives from the taxpayers of this province. He says about the Ontario Housing Corporation:

The audit and report thereon of the corporation for the year ended December 31, 1969, were not completed until November 4, 1970.

That to me is another example of the inability of this government to manage the financial affairs of this province.

A third example in the Provincial Auditor's report appears on page 20. Granted, it is perhaps slightly picayune but the point is that if this following situation is occurring in one part of this government, there are grounds for believing it is occurring elsewhere in the government. I quote directly; this is the Provincial Auditor speaking in his report released today:

A situation which I feel requires review and consideration is that of an executive officer in The Department of Trade and Development who is being reimbursed for living expenses while in Toronto and for travels to and from home.

The Provincial Auditor continues:

It would appear from an examination of expense account claims that attendance in Toronto is required on a full-time basis and therefore I respectfully recommend that consideration be given to establishing Toronto as this person's headquarters.

That is one of the worst types of tax evasion I have ever seen printed in any auditor's report, federal or provincial.

If that type of thing is happening in this government, if they cannot control the expense-account living, to quote the Carter report, what right has this government to come before us and ask us for a blank cheque so that this type of thing may go on? They have been in power much too long.

Another example, of course, is that the Owen Sound branch of the Province of Ontario Savings Office had a net loss of \$81,264 to a—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. Reid: It is in the auditor's report.

An hon. member: It is no longer confidential.

Mr. T. Reid: This is what the auditor says.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: It is not very nice. A fellow committed suicide. It is embarrassing to the family.

Mr. T. Reid: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: It is no longer a secret. It is in the auditor's report.

Mr. T. Reid: It is in the auditor's report for this year.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The then Minister of Revenue (Mr. White) took me into his confidence last year on this matter. It has been embarrassing to me and to a very fine family, and I wish that this were not in *Hansard* but this man involved committed suicide and his family does not know about it yet. That is the reason for it.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I continue with some other examples. My point is very simple. Here is the Provincial Auditor's report released today and it is ironic that with those examples about the incompetence of that party across there to spend money, to keep track of costs, on the same day they come before us and ask for a blank cheque.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to touch upon a few other examples, Mr. Speaker, on almost the arrogance of this government party coming before us, asking for a blank cheque.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. Reid: And to be able to quote a business organization, I would like to refer to what the Ontario Chamber of Commerce thinks about the ability of this government to spend 42 per cent of its budget; that is, the budget on education.

Back in May, 1970, the Ontario Chamber of Commerce made the following statements when they wanted an investigation into education costs. The Chamber of Commerce contended, Mr. Speaker, and I quote:

Each new school building represents the design without the benefit of uniformity,

consistency, unit construction and the advantage of two-storey design.

The second point the Ontario Chamber of Commerce made about the waste and efficiency of the taxpayers' money in the whole field of education is this:

There is insufficient effort to bring school plant into full productive service in community life.

The third level of condemnation is this:

There is unnecessary rivalry by county boards in setting teachers' salaries and benefits without regard to cost to the taxpayers.

The point again, Mr. Speaker, is simply this: The present Premier of this province, when he was Minister of Education and University Affairs, was responsible for spending 42 per cent of this budget and he fouled that up. Now he wants to have the whole budget available to do the same thing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. Reid: I would say that if he wants to have the confidence of this House, if he wants the confidence of the people of this province, he must get it on his own. In 1967, in my opinion, the government party ran on the coattails of a guy called Robarts and they got in. For the present Premier to try to ride on those coattails now when he has no mandate—he wants us to write him a blank cheque now just like he wanted us to write him a blank cheque in education—I say that is the height of irresponsibility.

If he wants the confidence of the people of this province, then he should have enough guts to say, all right, I was elected by a political party as leader of that party. I was not elected by the people of this province. We will take him seriously if he says, "Right, I challenge the opposition parties to an election. I want a mandate on my own and I am going to go to the people." And the sooner he does that the better.

We do not think that he has a right to ask us for a blank cheque to use the taxpayers' money in the same way he used it when he was Minister of Education and University Affairs. There was too much wastage there. He has not cut it. His predecessor would not even let us examine these costs in the standing committee. He would not even let us examine them in there.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by making this very simple point: that the people of this province—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Has the member talked to them all?

Mr. T. Reid:—find that man unacceptable until he goes to them to ask for a mandate. If he gets 42 per cent of the vote and 69 seats, then he has a right to ask for this type of blank cheque on the last day of the fiscal year.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Remember Robarts in 1961!

Mr. T. Reid: We want him to go to the polls now.

Mr. Randall: Remember Robarts in 1961!

Mr. T. Reid: If he wants to spend money, let him call an election.

Mr. Randall: Remember Robarts in 1961!

Mr. Sopha: Who did the member support?

Mr. Randall: Robarts!

Mr. Sopha: He picked the wrong man.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I am tempted at the outset to ask—and I will—who is it in this House who is going to oppose the passage of this resolution? I wonder seriously, if the Liberals had the opportunity at this time, with a much increased number of members, to defeat the government on this particular bill and thereby not pass this particular resolution—

Mr. D. M. DeMonte (Dovercourt): The member would oppose it for sure.

Mr. Deans:—whether they would or not.

Mr. Sopha: You have been saving that government in office.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Deans I do not really believe that if they stopped to think about the implications of not passing this particular bill, they would in fact be voting against it. But, all that aside, much of what they have said is true. Of course the government is incompetent.

Mr. Sopha: There is the source of their longevity in political life.

Mr. Deans: Of course the government is incompetent and we recognize that. That did not require the introduction of this resolution

to let us know that. We understand that they are floundering. We have understood that for 2½ years or more.

Mr. Singer: But let us not talk about it.

Mr. Deans: We recognize that every year.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on!

Mr. Deans: And the introduction of this resolution—

Mr. Singer: The NDP is unprepared again.

Mr. Deans:—has not altered that at all. Sure, it is another evidence of their inability to govern, but it certainly does not mean that we are going to deny—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Absentee leaders; the Lewis dynasty—

Mr. Deans: It does not mean that we are going to deny the people of the province the benefit of the many programmes that are presently underway and from which they derive their livelihood. I think that is a fair analysis of it. There is not going to be the defeat of this resolution. The only reason the official opposition is playing to the grandstand is simply to provide some kind of confrontation that does not exist.

Mr. Sopha: Does the member want an election?

Mr. Deans: I am surprised at them. I am surprised that they chose this particular vehicle to put forward the ideas that they have got.

This coming Monday we are going to debate unemployment, and during that debate we can deal with all of the matters pertaining to unemployment and we will.

Mr. Sargent: Who can?

Mr. Deans: We can, and the hon. member can if he is here.

Mr. Sopha: We do not need debating, we need policy.

Mr. Deans: There is ample opportunity within the next two weeks, after enumerating the many inadequacies of this government—

Mr. Sargent: Make your point!

Mr. Deans: I am going to; just hang on. There will be ample opportunity in the next

two weeks, after enumerating the inadequacies of this government, to vote a lack of confidence, because we have a lack of confidence. But what I want to ask, for the benefit of the member for Sudbury, is what gives the minister the right to introduce this resolution, taking into consideration the provisions of The British North America Act?

Mr. Sopha: Shaken by their waffling schism, lacking constructive thought!

An hon. member: This is better than the trade unions.

Mr. Deans: I want to ask the minister if he will bear with me and listen for a moment. I want to read something to him. I want to get his opinion on this, because there is the possibility that tonight we are being asked to vote on an illegal resolution. Let me read it.

Mr. Sopha: See, they had a justification in the thirties.

Mr. Trotter: The member for Sudbury has already told the member that.

Mr. Deans: It says in section 54 of The British North America Act,

That it shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue or of any tax or impost to any purpose that has not been first recommended to that House by message of the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or bill is proposed.

Mr. Sopha: That is what I said.

Mr. Deans: All of the things that have been said up to date by the members of the official opposition have been dealing with issues, and the issues are important, but the truth of the matter is that we must first decide whether it is legal to pass this resolution. Now the member may say to me that this applies to the House of Commons, but in actual fact it applies also to the Legislature because in section 90 it says,

That the following provisions of this Act, to wit the BNA Act, respecting the Parliament of Canada, namely the provisions relating to the appropriation and tax bills, the recommendation of money votes, the assent to bills and the disallowance of Acts and the signification of pleasure in the bills reserved shall extend and apply to the Legislatures of the several provinces.

Mr. Sopha: And the Treasurer shall be liable personally for everything he says.

Mr. Deans: Now I want to ask the Treasurer, because it is important, whether it is proper to pass this particular resolution in light of The British North America Act? Certainly you are inadequate, certainly your legislative programme does not meet the needs, but if it is not legal to pass this resolution then surely between now and 2½ hours from now you are going to have to do it in the proper fashion, in order that we can pass the necessary permission, in order that the people of the Province of Ontario can carry on, and so that the government can carry on if need be.

If the minister is listening, perhaps he would care to comment on it. Because that is really the only issue; that is really the only issue. The other issues, important though they may be, are issues of opinion. My opinion that the government is incompetent and that it ought not to have any more money; my opinion that the government has misspent the moneys that it has had; my opinion that it has not had proper priorities, our opinion of any number of things, may well be important.

But the truth is that to vote for the appropriation of these funds without that there be a message from the Lieutenant Governor, is in my view possibly out of order. I want the minister to deal with that particular issue before we go any further, because it is on that particular issue that the whole debate hangs. The member for Sudbury says he alluded to it—and perhaps he did, not very well. But we cannot vote to appropriate funds if it is illegal to do so in the manner that has been proposed. I ask for a ruling on that before we go any further.

Mr. Speaker: The member may very well ask for a ruling but he might complete his discussion of the matter.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I could say at that point that depending on the ruling the completion would be irrelevant. If the ruling were to be—

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): If the member has anything to say, get it over with.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): He has not said anything yet.

Mr. Deans: If the ruling were to be that this is perfectly proper and that this is the proper procedure in keeping with The British

North America Act, then of course the debate then becomes one of whether or not the government ought to be able to spend money. But if the ruling is that this is not in keeping with The British North America Act then I surely want to give them time to make the necessary changes.

Mr. Speaker: Then perhaps the hon. member would continue so that he may give Mr. Speaker the time to make the necessary investigations.

Mr. Deans: Fine, thank you. May I, sir, refer you to the proper sections in order that you can make the ruling? I referred to section 54 of The British North America Act, 1867, under "Money Votes and Royal Assent" as the heading.

Mr. Singer: Could the member read it please?

Mr. Deans: I already read it.

Mr. Singer: Could he read it again to refresh my memory?

Mr. Deans: I am sure the member knows what it says. I also referred to section 90—

Mr. Lawlor: What juvenile sarcasm.

Mr. Deans: I also referred to section 90, which brings it from the federal to the provincial jurisdiction. It is of vital importance to the completion of this particular request by the government that we determine the propriety of it, and it seems to me as we listened to the debate before, that that point should have been made and if it was, was made so obscurely that it was not recognized. It is all good and well to talk about the difficulty that farmers have in selling their eggs, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, and there is not one of us in the House who would deny it. It is all good and well to talk about the problem of the hog farmers.

Mr. Nixon: That damage has already been done but the member can work on it if he wants.

Mr. Deans: It may be fine to discuss the government's right to spend money on nuclear power stations.

Mr. T. Reid: How about the animals in eastern Ontario?

Mr. Deans: Did the member want to add to what he previously said?

Mr. T. Reid: I merely referred to the animals of eastern Ontario.

Mr. Deans: Fine. But if it is indeed not legal to ask for the appropriation of the funds in the first place, then all of that talk is talk wasted, and this is the crux of the whole matter.

Now one might say that the government has not got the confidence of the House, but I am sure that it would not be an earth-shattering statement to be heard in this House, it has been said so often. You could also say that there has not been much change in the government and therefore there is no reason to give it confidence or to have confidence in it, but those things are irrelevant, it does not really matter, and for that reason I am going to carry on no longer. All I say to you is that I believe that the government is wrong, I think that this resolution for which it has asked passage is wrongly done. I suggest that if it is going to be done by midnight they better hustle out and get somebody to draft it up properly.

Mr. Speaker: I must say that the hon. member's point is a very interesting point very ingeniously taken, and I think those of us who belong to the legal profession can appreciate it more than others of the members perhaps. During my period of time here—and I am advised by the Clerk, who has been here much longer—the tradition of this House has been to deal with these supply matters in this way. They have never been ruled unconstitutional and the matters of finance of the province have been operated in this manner for at least a quarter of a century.

I do not feel that at the moment I am in any position to rule that they have been unconstitutional during these years and therefore would not be at this time. Therefore I would say to the hon. member the ruling so far as I am concerned at this time, is that the procedure as adopted is quite in order, constitutional and otherwise, as far as this House is concerned.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Has the hon. member for Wentworth completed?

Mr. Deans: I have nothing more to say.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, I would like to use the introduction of this resolution for interim supply as the means of bringing attention to three areas of government spending, which I presume will be repeated again

this year and in which the muddling hand of the former Minister of Municipal Affairs was very evident. I speak of the old age tax assistance programme, the residential property tax reduction programme, and the farm tax reduction programme.

I think each of us here recognizes that there has been a great need within the province recently for tax reform. These three programmes were brought forth in the past number of years with the idea of being represented to the public as tax reform. Well, those of us in the Legislature who dealt with these three programmes know that they were in fact in no manner any means of tax reform, but just government handouts to accomplish a certain amount of political patronage to certain classes of people.

I will deal with them briefly and individually. The people themselves, at the time the programmes were introduced, in many instances were thrown into a great deal of consternation and confusion, first of all in the old age tax assistance programme. I think the provincial Treasurer is aware as well as I am of the great confusion that arose just before Christmas last year when this programme was introduced without any prior indication to the people. Suddenly people who were receiving the old age assistance cheque from Ottawa were on a list and received a \$50 cheque from this provincial government. Now, needed as this programme was—and the need for tax relief for elderly people was very much required at that time—many people did not know what the cheque was for and were very reluctant even to cash it.

The direct result of this was that the government had thrown the programme together very quickly. It did not provide any measure of relief for people in that particular situation, other than the \$50 cheque. It did not do anything to increase their regular old age benefit except on that one particular occasion. Many people were confused and tied this programme in with the municipal and education tax relief programme which then related as a lien against the property. That was why there was a reluctance on the part of many elderly people to cash their cheques.

My understanding is that the administration of these programmes required 200 additional employees at The Department of Municipal Affairs to administer it. The residential property tax reduction programme which has been in effect for several years was amended last year. Through that amendment

it brought hardship to many people who needed that reduction programme the most.

I am speaking of people who lived in low-cost and low-rental housing which did not generate sufficient assessment so that that property could receive the full rebate. I am sure many people at the end of the year called their members, as I was called, stating that they did not receive their whole residential property tax rebate. These people unfortunately in most cases were elderly people living in very low-cost or inferior type of housing. The housing, of course, was assessed at the lower rate and the people did not get what, in fact, was rightfully theirs, and what I feel the legislation intended they should have received.

The third programme, I think, is perhaps the one in which the greatest lack of proper planning showed up. That is the farm tax reduction programme.

The idea behind the farm tax reduction programme was debated in this Legislature last spring in a private member's bill. I think we agreed on all sides that something had to be done to relieve the farm of much of the education costs. The manner in which the programme was hurriedly thrown together was evident to all the farmers in the province; that they should receive one-quarter of their taxes back was all that was said. There was no legislation put forth and no opportunity given, other than in supplementary estimates last fall, whereby we could debate the intricacies of this bill.

Many questions were asked by myself and other members at the time of both the Minister of Agriculture and Food and the Minister of Municipal Affairs of how this would work, but no answers were forthcoming.

The order-in-council was drafted and drawn up on November 5 and the farmers were told their cheques would come out last year. As we know now, the cheques did not come out last year. They came out in January over a staggered process.

Now this programme is still a long way from being sorted out, simply because no thought was put into this programme other than to say to the farmers, "We are going to give you 25 per cent of your taxes back." Granted the farmers needed tax relief, but they certainly did not get it in the manner in which this government administered the programme.

The problems arising from this programme are coming to light every day. They were spoken of in the Legislature this afternoon.

No provision has been made for direct and permanent rulings on who should receive the rebate where rental agreements exist. Where a father-and-son agreement exists on a farm there is difficulty in ascertaining who is eligible for the rebate. Where land has been improperly coded by district assessment offices; in many cases farm buildings have been coded as residential, thus rendering the rebate programmes useless to that farmer because the legal department of The Department of Municipal Affairs will not pay the rebate unless the particular land has been coded as farm land.

The other side of the ridiculous picture is simply this, that much land in the province is designated as farm land and is coded as farm land and has never grown a nickel's worth of agriculture in the last 100 years. I have here a rebate cheque for a piece of land that was received by the owner and that land has never grown any agricultural produce.

This is the kind of government that hurriedly throws together a programme without giving it proper consideration or knowing what the final results will be. Now they ask that we should suddenly give them a free hand to spend any amount up to what would probably be the entire budget for this next year.

We just do not have confidence in the ability of the government to run the programme properly. These three short illustrations have definitely proved to me that there is certainly not the expertise there nor is there the ability to put the proper thought into a programme to do something for the people of Ontario. They hurriedly throw out something which looks good on the newspaper headlines and then they worry about the problems that it creates later.

These programmes have created problems with many people across the province. There is dissatisfaction among many people and consequently we certainly feel that this resolution of interim supply should not be granted without proper debate and the proper opportunity for grievance by the members here.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the casual and uncomplimentary remarks of the Treasurer, who has seen fit to absent himself from the House during the course of this debate—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): What does that prove?

Mr. Singer: I am glad the minister asked that question. It proves that the Treasurer, Mr. Speaker, has no real interest in the voting of supply. One would think, Mr. Speaker, that of all of the officials of this government who should have a real interest in the voting of supply, the provincial Treasurer should be the foremost one who should be here to see that the supply he has asked for is in fact voted.

I say it is either a sign of his ignorance or of his complete arrogance and the new arrogance that has visited itself upon this government, this newly constituted government, because in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, there has been no more serious a debate come before this Legislature, certainly in all the time I have been here.

Granted, sir, that this debate is a unique thing in the annals of the history of this House. But granted that, sir, the criticism that should be levelled at all members of the opposition is not that it has never been done before, but that it has never been done until tonight. I say, sir, that insofar as the criticism was directed in that way it is valid and deserving. But insofar as it is being done tonight, one would have thought that any opposition member would have been happy and eager to participate in this vote and challenge the right of the government to ask for supply.

I can recall, sir, sitting in the galleries in the House of Commons on many occasions when once every month the government has to come, in accordance with the rules of the House of Commons, through the House, and ask for supply every 30 days. Being somewhat of a student of these things, I have listened with very great interest to the speeches of such people as Mr. Diefenbaker, Tommy Douglas, David Lewis, and many others, whose best speeches, whose greatest contribution to the affairs of the government of Canada, have been in the speeches they have made on the debate in relation to the voting of supply.

So it is somewhat more than passing strange when we listen to the unusual and peculiar words of the member for Windsor West, the member emeritus from Windsor West, when he says that because it has never been done before it should not be done now. Or when we listen to the unusual words from the member for Hamilton. Is it Wentworth? Is he still here? He, having first derided the position that the official opposition has taken, suddenly has discovered that there is some

very substantial wisdom in the comments made by my colleague from Sudbury.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague from Sudbury said that it was his opinion that this kind of motion had to be preceded by an address from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor. Very correctly he said that; my friend from Sudbury, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, is probably the foremost constitutional scholar who sits in this House today.

Unfortunately it took the hon. member for Wentworth some considerable time to go to the statute books and discover exactly what the member for Sudbury was talking about. He came to it much later. But finally, sir, if I can bring any sense at all out of the leaderless group from the NDP who speak tonight, having again been caught flatfooted, having again been caught off guard, after second sober consideration they have come to the conclusion that the debate on supply is, in fact, warranted, and is, in fact, a proper debate to have.

I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that the Treasurer is now back with us, and I want to address my remarks now to the Treasurer and these are very simply this: The motion put forward by the government and moved by the provincial Treasurer, is to the effect that the auditor be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil service and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the fiscal year commencing April 1, until such payments be charged to the proper appropriations following the voting of supply.

This in fact means, Mr. Speaker, that the government is asking for a blank cheque to spend up to \$4 billion, perhaps \$4.5 billion, without any check, without any review, without any consultation, without any authorization. It is in keeping, sir, with what happened this afternoon when the Premier introduced a motion without giving us any advance notice, without any consultation, without even giving us a copy of it. It is in keeping, sir, with what the Premier said when he said, "I am going to pass a motion." It is in keeping with the new arrogance of the new government.

Mr. Peacock: Not even a royal "we."

Mr. Singer: Now, sir, I would think this: Many things have happened that have caused us to very seriously question the financial competence of this government; the ability to administer the affairs of this province. My colleague from Scarborough East has dealt

amply and well, as he usually does, with the comments made by the Provincial Auditor in the report that was tabled this afternoon. Unfortunately it was tabled so late that there has not been time to circulate that report to the other members of the House, so that we are denied the opportunity, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Point of order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Just so the record is clear I am informed that the auditor's report was placed in the members' boxes approximately five minutes after 3. I do not think that the auditor, nor this House, nor the officers of this House, should be held responsible for the fact that the member for Downsview does not look at his mail.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, that is probably as weak an effort as I have ever heard from an apparently responsible government minister.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Get your mail.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, surely there was only one group in this province that had control over the fact that the House did not reconvene until March 30. That group was motivated to a certain extent—and I do not condemn them for this—by political affairs which they had to set in order. The public in due course will determine how well they set them in order, but by reason of that kind of interference, the House convened on the eve of the expiry of the financial year.

After the House commenced this afternoon this report was, in fact, tabled. Some of us have been here in the House all afternoon, have been engaged over the supper hour, and the fact is that until this time this report has not been placed in the hands of the members of this House. So the pallid and feeble excuse put forward by the Treasurer just does not wash. If there is any inconvenience, or lack of information available to the members, it is the fault of this government again for badly ordering its affairs.

Now I commend my colleague from Scarborough East for having been able to obtain a copy of the report and to make very informed and intelligent remarks relating to it on this motion related to supply, and those remarks in fact speak for themselves.

There is one other thing that I think is a very important part of this story. During the course of the recess from November 13 until

March 30, a government committee, called the government committee on productivity, produced its interim report number one. That interim report, in fact, made three major recommendations. The first related to the role of the Provincial Auditor, and I am sorry he has been in and out all day and I wish he was here to hear me; he usually sits under the gallery.

The second relates to the central purchasing and the third relates to the appointment of parliamentary assistants to cabinet ministers. Fascinatingly enough, Mr. Speaker, the first two points that were made, the one about the ineffectiveness of the Provincial Auditor in the financial affairs of the province of Ontario, was accepted almost completely in line with the criticism that we have presented here for several years.

Fascinatingly enough, Mr. Speaker, the government announced it was prepared to accept the recommendations of the committee on government productivity.

Fascinatingly enough, Mr. Speaker, and I do not know whether the *Globe and Mail*—one of the Toronto papers—was in fact jumping the gun when it was commenting on this, but it began to talk about the new Provincial Auditor and how important it was to select a new gentleman to occupy that position who would properly carry out these recommendations.

One would have thought, sir, that we would have heard from the provincial Treasurer tonight why the criticisms we made in the past were passed over so lightly and why the recommendation now made by the committee on government productivity was not commented upon in this debate about the request for supply.

One would have thought, sir, that with a new government with the desire obviously to create a new image, we would have begun to hear about how in fact they were going to be financially accountable and how, in fact, they were going to explain, not in the words of the now Attorney General that we have no right to know, that we the people of Ontario have no right to know, one would have thought that they would begin to explain in the words of the committee on government productivity, that all the people of Ontario have a right to know the manner in which public moneys are being spent.

The second thing, sir, that is of equal importance, is the recommendation of the committee on government productivity in relation to central purchasing. There was never a greater sham or waste of money per-

petrated by the government on the people of Ontario than their so-called efforts at trying to set up a central purchasing system. They spent \$100,000 a year on administrative setup. They brought in a new and estimable gentleman out of Kodak who was going to work this for them. He got a good salary, worked for the government, he had a nice office.

His achievement was to set up his own private business and it was so successful that by the time he had floated a public issue on the market—which was a week after he left government employment—the stocks went on the market at \$1 and within a week they went up to \$4. He used his time well and he used it at government expense. But the former minister admitted in this House that central purchasing did not purchase anything for OPP, Eric Silk had told them to go and jump in the lake; that there had been no central purchasing in any other facet. In fact, the former minister was unable to indicate any single instance where central purchasing had been done by and on behalf of the government of Ontario.

Needless to say, sir, having brought these facts to government attention, the government ignored them, but the committee on government productivity brings back this recommendation and is very strong in its condemnation of government policy to this point and makes certain recommendations about a central purchasing system.

Between sessions, and without the House being able to talk about it, announcements come from the government benches: Yes, it is a good idea to give the auditor a new and important and meaningful role. Yes, it is important to have a system of central purchasing for the Province of Ontario.

These, and many others, are the reasons that our amendment has been moved by my leader. We cannot and we do not have any confidence in the government's approach to the handling of moneys on the part of the people of the Province of Ontario.

I think it is particularly cogent to listen to the words of the member for Windsor West, who said, "I expected a great confrontation, and all the Leader of the Opposition is able to talk about are eggs and pork." That is what he said, and in keeping with the words of his leader, "We are going to travel through eastern Ontario and throw pamphlets out to the animals." The NDP are not concerned at all about the people of Ontario. It is no wonder they do not like this debate.

Now, sir, I say this: I think that the only mistake that exists in the procedures of this House is that there is not an opportunity every 30 days until the budget in fact is finally passed for us to have the opportunity for this kind of a debate, when members can bring their legitimate grievances before the bar of this House and express them and hopefully get from the Treasurer, who does not want to listen, and the Premier, who is not here, and the whole new front bench of this new and startling government, some kind of explanation as to their carelessness and their negligence in the handling of public funds.

I urge all members of the House to join in the support of this amendment. If there is anything more appropriate to the affairs of the Province of Ontario, I do not know what it is.

And in the event that the government is not prepared to support the amendment, I would urge upon them—and I would ask that they take the message to their new leader—that we would like them to go to the people and ask the people of the Province of Ontario, 37 days from tonight, for their confidence, because that is the least that the Prime Minister and his colleagues can do.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to participate in this debate before the minister closes it? The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, simply to close the debate so far as we are concerned. It has been a wearisome one for us to have to sit through this evening.

Mr. Sopha: Nothing more boring.

Mr. J. Renwick: We in this party do not share the lack of confidence which the member for Downsview and his colleagues have in the Provincial Auditor, who is in substance a servant of this assembly.

Mr. Singer: The member had better ask his colleague from Windsor West about that. He had different views on the accounts committee.

Mr. J. Renwick: I just want to reiterate that the member for Downsview, last session—and he commences again this session—has stated categorically that not only does he not agree with the provisions of The Audit Act, but that he has no confidence in the Provincial Auditor of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Singer: Join with the member for Windsor West and many others.

Mr. J. Renwick: And we in this party take the position that since the Provincial Auditor is an officer—

Mr. Singer: Not the member for Windsor West or the member for Lakeshore either.

Mr. J. Renwick: —removable only on the address of this assembly—

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on.

Mr. J. Renwick: —If the member for Downsview had the courage to stop nattering about the Provincial Auditor, he would introduce a motion for the removal of the Provincial Auditor. We in this party happen to believe that the Provincial Auditor has, within the authority conferred on him by The Audit Act of the province, performed the service which he is required to perform as a servant of this assembly and not a servant of that government.

Mr. Singer: Why did his colleague sign the report?

Mr. Sargent: He has really climbed into bed.

Mr. J. Renwick: Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we in this party are quite prepared as the usual routine matter to grant the Provincial Auditor of the province the authority to pay the salaries of the civil service of this province and we are prepared to grant him the authority to make such other necessary payments as may be required for the on-going work of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Singer: Shame. Shame.

Mr. Sopha: They have kept—

Mr. J. Renwick: And, of course, Mr. Speaker, we are going to be placed this evening in the position of watching the Liberal Party vote for their amendment and then the Liberal Party is going to vote for the government motion—

Mr. Sopha: They will be wiped out.

Mr. J. Renwick: —that they have spent the last two hours complaining about. So they will try to be black on the one hand and white on the other hand and as usual they will fall right in the middle and they will continue to be discarded by the electorate of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Why do you not resume your seat?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, our position in this party is very simple. We will vote against the Liberal amendment and we will vote for the usual, routine, customary motion authorizing as an interim measure the Provincial Auditor to make the very necessary and essential payments which are required—

Mr. T. Reid: Is the member going to run again?

Mr. J. Renwick: —for the on-going work of this government. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Sopha: I see the validity of the Waffle group.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, I want to rise for a few moments in support of my leader's motion this evening, and I do so because something has happened in the last three weeks in the Province of Ontario that is unique and that has caused me great concern because it affects without reservation, and unequivocally, my riding and no other riding in the Province of Ontario, and the Minister of Energy and Resources Management has said that it will affect no other riding in the Province of Ontario; and that is the charade that the government is perpetrating now, connected with a corporate constituent of mine, Dow Chemical of Canada Limited.

I want to talk for a few moments because you are asking for money now. You are asking for money from the people of Ontario to continue that charade—not a charade motivated with a sincere desire to protect the public domain, not an action constituted as we requested in this party to protect the interest of the fisherman and the marina operators and those people who might well have been directly affected by the alleged pollution.

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bullbrook: Last June, Mr. Speaker, through you we said to the government, to the then Attorney General, we exhorted him and gave him our unequivocal commitment that we would support any legislation enabling him to take action on behalf of the citizens of Ontario who were adversely affected. And no one can take issue with that. It is in the record of this House. I stood, with the direction of my leader and my colleagues, to make that commitment to him because there was a technical question

as to whether action could be taken on behalf of those people. And during the court—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Retroactive legislation.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on.

Mr. Bullbrook: Not retroactive at all and it did not have to be retroactive and in point of fact, if it had to be retroactive, so what? So what? The minister and I and many others in this House sat when we were prepared to pass a piece of legislation—

An hon. member: The biggest bit you have ever been involved in.

Mr. Bullbrook: —and the member for Lambton will recall where we were prepared to pass a piece of legislation to be retroactive to do away with leases—to do away with leases involving oil and gas rights in Lambton county. Does he recall that? I ask my colleague to perhaps signify by a nod of his head that he recalls it. So retroactive legislation is not the question, but it is not that reprehensible from the point of view of governments.

Mr. Sopha: Wake him up and tell him that we are talking about politics.

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes. May I say to the member for Lambton that I am sure that I speak on his behalf too, because certainly his constituents are as concerned as mine.

In asking for the money to prosecute this lawsuit, we want to make something amply clear. We hold no brief, nor have we ever held any brief, on behalf of any industrial company, or any industrial polluter. We will not shirk our responsibility in taking action where action is necessary if it is a proper and appropriate action.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me show you one thing that they have done, one thing—one part of this fabulous action, about which the Prime Minister says to the people of Ontario, "This will show we mean business." One of the things he asks for is a mandatory injunction to stop Dow Chemical from carrying on the mercury cell process that allegedly pollutes the river.

I want to bring two things to the attention of Your Honour and my colleagues in this House. Thirteen months ago, Dow stopped the process; it is no longer carried on. He might make himself aware of this. The second thing is that he put them under ministerial order 13 months ago to stop the process.

You think that I perhaps exaggerate when

I call it a charade? It is really a ridiculous charade. It is a fraud being perpetrated by the Premier and that joker he has now appointed as Attorney General. The one thing we could always say about the office held by the Minister of Justice in this province was that it was done, not always properly, but it was done with temperance and reasonableness, as long as that office was held by the present Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Wishart). He sat on that lawsuit for a year and he did not issue the writ, but the present Attorney General did.

One other thing, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, if my friend from Sudbury will let me say this. I regard it as exemplary of the attitude of this government and more so exemplary of the Minister of Justice who carries forward this tremendously significant responsibility in connection with the courts assessing the responsibility for pollution. Now, let me point out one thing to you, Mr. Speaker, if I might.

When asked about the constitutional question as to the right of the province to take action in connection with the matter involving the bed of the navigable water, clearly a federal matter, the Minister of Justice said, "If they do not like it, let the fish sue us." Now, that is what he thinks. He thinks it is some sort of a game that is being carried on.

Mr. Sopha: Who said that?

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister, the Hon. Allan Lawrence, is reported in *The Globe and Mail* as having said, "Let the fish sue us."

Well, my colleague from Downsview, in speaking to me, has an appellation about that, "shooting from the mouth." That is what that Minister of Justice does, and I want to convey to the Prime Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, this: that the government will not fool the people of Ontario about its sincerity in connection with industrial pollution by suing for \$25 million of exemplary damages.

I invite the Minister of Energy and Resources Management and the Attorney General of this province to read the decision in the Supreme Court of the United States. Never mind the technical aspect of *obiter* or *ratio*, just talk about it. I do not want to give the government one more cent of money to continue with the charade and the fraud.

We say to the government, "Look, there is a problem in pollution. There is a prob-

lem up north. There is a problem with the Dryden Pulp and Paper Company." But that minister—and I invite him to contradict me—says, this afternoon, that they are going to do some reclamation work up north. Last week he was quoted as saying, "There will be no more lawsuits in the Province of Ontario."

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I never said any such thing. I was misquoted, and I assume it was a misquotation that came out of a speech at a meeting I had at Niagara Falls over the weekend.

I have been misquoted as saying there will be no other suits against any other industry. That is not correct.

Mr. Bullbrook: All right. Then at least you recognize the foundations from which—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We have strayed considerably from this amendment.

Mr. Bullbrook: We have not strayed at all, Mr. Speaker. We are not straying at all. The government are asking me, as a member, to support a motion to supply funds to carry on this particular type of insidious charade and that is exactly what it is. So I say it is right on.

But I am going to close now. I gave the minister the opportunity; I asked him to rise because he recognized the foundation for my understanding. The hon. minister was quoted in the press as saying there will be no more lawsuits. We are concerned on this side, if there is going to be reclamation—and I want to say collaterally to you right now, that information that I have of a scientific nature, and information that I have as to government activity, does not coincide with the information that you spoke of this afternoon in the House, in connection with the dredging of that river. The minister now must rest with this. I invite the Premier of this province, Mr. Speaker, to recognize what his minister has said this afternoon, because now he has put himself in a position for the courts to assess it. He has said he is prepared to take sufficient expertise to the courts to convince them that dredging of that river is not going to do more harm than good. The only salvation that he has is the fact that we will replace those over there in a year.

The court will not decide that case in that time. That case will not be ultimately decided for four years, and, of course, that is the final fraud of all. When you issue a writ with exemplary damages of \$25 million, you know

full well whoever wins in the court in the first instance, or loses, it will continue on to the court of appeal, and it will continue on to the Supreme Court of Canada. This government can sit on their collective—and do nothing in the meantime.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other members who wish to speak before the minister sums up? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be brief. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of various members opposite. I was particularly interested in the last remarks of the member for Sarnia. If this debate has served no purpose at all, we have at least had put on the record today the attitude of the member for the area and the attitude of the Liberal Party about doing something serious about pollution in this province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is just what the member said. I recall a debate, Mr. Speaker, we had on the subject some time ago—I suppose a year ago—when this problem first became evident, and they were talking a little different over there then.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Right.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But the mayor of Sarnia is a little worried about his little company of Dow and the member is just mouthing what the Liberal mayor of Sarnia has said—two Liberals who are interested in fighting pollution and getting on with the business of this province and making it a better place to live.

Mr. Bullbrook: Really, the minister does not understand.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Great stuff.

Mr. Bullbrook: He does not understand.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to comment on what other members have said, other than the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Leave your wild claims at home.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Leader of the Opposition introduced an amendment to what has been described as a routine motion, and it is a routine motion.

Mr. Singer: Four billion dollars worth of routine.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is a routine motion and the Leader of the Opposition felt constrained to make an amendment. He spoke about a charade that has been brought in. I thought it was rather interesting.

I thought the only charade that was perpetrated in this House today was how ill-prepared the Leader of the Opposition was for the debate this afternoon and how equally ill-prepared he is for this session of the Legislature. He should have obviously spent his time—instead of going to Myrtle Beach—finding out what this House decided last November about committees, and not wasted the time of the House this afternoon, not wasted—

Mr. Nixon: Why did the minister not take part in that debate?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —not wasted the time of the House this afternoon in a filibuster because he had nothing to say—nothing to say whatsoever.

All the Leader of the Opposition proved to us today was that he had not read a report of a joint committee of this House which was tabled in this House three months ago. The ignorance of the rules exhibited by the Leader of the Opposition is really rather abysmal and I only wish that he had spent that time, instead of in Myrtle Beach, just doing a little homework before the session opened.

An hon. member: Where is Myrtle Beach?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Carolina.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I make this final comment—

Mr. Nixon: I will set Eagleson on you. Eagleson does not like your looks.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Does anybody know who the president of the Liberal Party is? Do they really know? Does anybody know? At least our president is known.

An hon. member: Does the minister have one?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Do I have one?

An hon. member: They have not even got a party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I honestly do not know who the president of the Liberal Party is.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: In that event, perhaps the minister would go back to the resolution.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I just want to make one final comment, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition thought that he would raise two points of great significance. One had to do with agricultural policy and some criticism. This was interesting, of course, terribly interesting, obviously. The Leader of the Opposition was so overcome by the very excellent programme announced by my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture and Food, at 3 o'clock this afternoon, that it took him until 8 o'clock tonight to find a question or make a comment about it. Why did he not ask about it during questions?

It is a good programme. It is a better programme than I thought it was, but it took him—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —until 8 o'clock tonight.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And then, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Sudbury, the member for Downsview—

Mr. Singer: From third to sixth in just a few weeks.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —the member for Downsview talked about the supply motion and we had discussions, and we have had discussions about supply motions, I think it is—what, a year ago since the rules were changed, since the members opposite were granted free opportunities to bring in or to challenge the traditional supply motion—

Mr. Singer: The minister does not understand the rules of the House.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and what the Leader of the Opposition said is that 12 months after this House unanimously adopted new rules, he wants to change them again. He would like to change the rules as often as they change leaders and we cannot afford it.

Mr. Singer: One would have thought he would read the rules before he speaks.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But there is one thing that does not change.

Mr. Nixon: The minister would have made a great leader.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There is just one thing, Mr. Speaker, that does not change. There is just one thing in the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition which is constant again and again in his remarks. In his concluding remarks—

Mr. T. Reid: The minister should go back to Chatham.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —he took the occasion to defend his Liberal friends at Ottawa. He is not interested in our tax system. He wants to defend Mr. Benson again and again and again.

An hon. member: The minister owes me an apology.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, go to it. He apologizes for the federal Liberals sitting right there.

Mr. Nixon: The minister will sink with that separate income tax around his neck. Go and collect it now.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Leader of the Opposition will sink with Benson around his neck.

Interjections from hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Keep on embracing Benson and his white paper and we will be very happy. Just stick with Benson.

Mr. Speaker, this is a routine motion. I submit that the amendment should be turned down.

Mr. Sargent: That was a beautiful windup.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, I want to rise to place a point of order with you. I want you to rule on the validity of this motion in the light of the requirements of The British North America Act. I merely say this: The law speaks clearly that in order for this House to vote supply it must be on an address from the Queen or her representative. Now, I raise this because I say, as a private member of this Legislature, that I am delighted to see the disappearance of these monarchical trappings, and if that is the way we are going that we get rid of that abra-

cadabra, then it is fine with me. But I think you are called upon to rule whether this motion is, in fact, in order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He already has ruled. Where has the member been?

Mr. Speaker: Well, I would say to—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: He left when the member for Grey-Bruce was talking.

Mr. Speaker: —the hon. member that I already had determined the answer and made a ruling. Subsequent to that I was fortified in it by an hon. member of this House, who pointed it out, quite rightly I suppose, to me and I give it to you for what it is worth. I think it is an interesting comment that when the appropriations which are referred to do come in they will come in with a message from the Lieutenant Governor. But, in any event, I had already ruled on that particular point and the debate proceeded.

Mr. Sopha: All right. The Treasurer will have to pay it back personally.

Mr. Pilkey: He can do it too.

Mr. Sopha: He is the only member of the government who can do it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Let us place the motion and the amendment and have this part of the business proceeded and done with.

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves, seconded by **Hon. Mr. White:**

That the Provincial Auditor be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil service and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the fiscal year commencing April 1, 1971, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriations following the voting of supply.

Mr. Nixon, seconded by **Mr. Singer**, moved an amendment:

That this House regrets the failure of the government to order its financial affairs to adequately serve the interests of the taxpayers of Ontario.

The vote, of course, will be on the amendment by **Mr. Nixon**.

As many as are in favour of the amendment by **Mr. Nixon** will please say "aye."

As many as are opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

The House divided on the amendment moved by **Mr. Nixon** and seconded by **Mr. Singer**, which was negatived on the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Braithwaite	Allan
Bukator	Apps
Bullbrook	Bales
Deacon	Belanger
De Monte	Bernier
Farquhar	Bolton
Gaunt	Boyer
Good	Brown
Haggerty	Brunelle
Newman	Burr
(Windsor-Walkerville)	Carruthers
Nixon	Carton
Paterson	Connell
Reid	Davis
(Rainy River)	Deans
Reid	Demers
(Scarborough East)	Dunlop
Ruston	Evans
Sargent	Ferrier
Singer	Gilbertson
Smith	Gisborn
(Nipissing)	Grossman
Sopha	Guindon
Spence	Hamilton
Trotter	Haskett
Worton—22.	Henderson
	Hodgson
	(Victoria-Haliburton)
	Hodgson
	(York North)
	Jackson
	Jessiman
	Johnston
	(Parry Sound)
	Johnston
	(Carleton)
	Kennedy
	Kerr
	Lawlor
	Lawrence
	(Carleton East)
	Lewis
	MacNaughton
	Meen
	Morin
	Morningstar
	Morrow
	McKeough
	Newman
	(Ontario South)
	Peacock
	Pilkey

NAYS (continued)

Potter
 Price
 Randall
 Reilly
 Renwick
 (Riverdale)
 Reuter
 Robarts
 Rollins
 Root
 Rowe
 Rowntree
 Shulman
 Simonett
 Smith
 (Simcoe East)
 Smith
 (Hamilton Mountain)
 Snow
 Stewart
 Stokes
 Villeneuve
 Welch
 White
 Winkler
 Wishart
 Yakabuski
 Yaremko—71.

Mr. Nixon: Wrong side of that no confidence. We led you astray that time.

Mr. Singer: The NDP has confidence in the government. That is a good one.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): We discussed your position in that one.

Mr. Singer: Yes, we will even give it.

Mr. Sopha: That will be called the pork and eggs vote.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker the "ayes" are 22, the "nays" are 71.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost. The vote is now on the main motion by Hon. Mr. McKeough.

As many as are in favour will please say "aye."

As many as are opposed will please say "nay."

Mr. Stokes: Chickened out.

Mr. Lawlor: All that time wasted.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, after what has been obviously a very productive and constructive day, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:45 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Motion to authorize Provincial Auditor to make certain payments pending voting of supply, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, agreed to	69
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Davis, agreed to	98



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

**(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests in the gallery this afternoon, in the east gallery, are students from Royal Orchard Public School in Thornhill; in the west gallery, Olivet Day School, Islington, and Glenview Senior Public School, Toronto. Later today we will have people from the hospital management services branch, the mental health division of our own Department of Health with us.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) indicated to the Legislature a statement would be made on the initiatives this government proposed to undertake in housing.

To combat unemployment and help meet the housing needs of low- and middle-income wage earners in Ontario, the government has asked Ontario Housing Corporation to increase its participation in socially assisted housing and, at the same time, provide an increasing emphasis on programmes designed to assist families into home ownership.

The housing construction programme is expected to contribute to a record level of housing for the province as a whole of something in excess of 85,000 units. This compares to 76,600 starts last year under the Ontario guaranteed mortgage loan programme. Greater emphasis will be placed on the construction of senior-citizen accommodation in order to meet the requests of our municipalities.

Funds generated through a joint lending programme from the private sector and the governments of Canada and Ontario will inject into the economy of the province half a billion dollars. That portion of the funds directed to construction alone will establish the potential for 30,000 units of housing, providing shelter for an estimated 90,000 persons. This housing programme in turn creates the potential for 132,000 man-years of employment, both directly and indirectly.

In 1971, the funds available for geared-to-income family and senior-citizen housing,

including funds approved last year, for which starts will be made this year, will total about \$202 million. An additional \$15 million will be used for student housing in Ontario. OHC borrows 90 per cent of these funds from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and 10 per cent from the provincial Treasurer and repays both with interest.

To further stimulate home ownership the government of Ontario proposes to increase funds available as follows:

First, it will provide \$145 million to carry out the existing home ownership programme.

Second, under the new Ontario guaranteed mortgage loan programme, the government has received commitments from the chartered banks to provide at least \$100 million of first mortgage financing which will provide loans representing 75 per cent of the approved selling price. To this amount the province provides up to 20 per cent in secondary financing, with the balance of the selling price provided by the home purchasers as a down payment. A one-per-cent guarantee fee will be collected to establish a reserve fund against potential losses.

Of the total amount of \$265 million for ownership housing, the province is contributing \$165 million.

There is available to OHC for land acquisition and development in 1971 approximately \$50 million, of which \$14 million will be borrowed from CMHC and the balance will be provided by the province.

Mr. Speaker, the expenditure of all these funds, if required, should produce at least 30,000 units of which slightly over half will be for family, student and senior-citizen rental housing, with the balance for ownership.

Economists calculate that each housing unit creates 4.8 man-years of employment, both directly and indirectly. This includes on-site labour, factory labour of housing components, construction of roads and sewers and the creation of goods and services purchased by homeowners. Because of the mix of its housing portfolio, OHC uses a smaller multiplier of 4.4. This produces the estimate of 132,000 man-years of employment or one year's work for 132,000 persons.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The boys in the ivory tower have really been working.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It is actually 0.7 manual hours.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It must be good, Mr. Speaker. It is annoying the opposition.

Mr. MacDonald: That is a simplistic attitude.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As it is difficult to compute employment generated by the \$50 million land assembly and servicing programme, this is not included in the foregoing estimate. We were asked yesterday in the House to indicate the level of activity of OHC in 1970. During that calendar year, the corporation produced a record number of 9,586 family housing and senior-citizen starts. This represented nearly 12.5 per cent of all housing starts in the province. Not included in this calculation is the accommodation produced for 1,493 students.

In 1970, the corporation was Canada's largest lender for condominium home ownership, topping all banks, all trust companies and direct federal lending. A total of \$50 million was advanced, which resulted in some 5,100 condominium starts during the year.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): I wonder who got the biggest share of that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Relating this total activity to employment generated, the 16,000 units started—not counting starts on HOME lots—represented 70,000 man-years of employment directly and indirectly.

During the year 1,455 lots for lease were brought to market under the HOME land-lease programme and 7,525 social housing units were completed.

At the start of 1970, funds in the private sector were not readily available for mortgage loans. To bolster the home-ownership programme, as I mentioned earlier, the provincial government entered the first-mortgage field for the first time.

It is the government's hope that of the programme announced in the Throne Speech, at least 20,000 units will be started this calendar year. This indicates a 25-per-cent increase in the corporation's efforts over its 1970 record year.

However, Mr. Speaker, estimates must be considered, having regard for many factors

such as the availability of suitably serviced and zoned building sites, which have as much to do with starting a project as does the availability of funds.

Mr. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The minister is going to tell us about Malvern again.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the banks, the federal government and the Ontario government have all joined together to produce a massive programme of housing construction for the coming year. The fulfilment—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Don Mills.

Hon. Mr. Grossman:—of these objectives and the utilization of the funds being made available—

Mr. Singer: Riverdale.

Hon. Mr. Grossman:—depend upon private developers and builders joining with us. I particularly invite every member of the Legislature to encourage builders in their constituencies to take advantage of this extensive programme.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

FUNDING OF HOUSING PROGRAMME

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, further to the statement made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Development, can he make it clear to the House what the increase—the specific increase—in commitment of provincial dollars will be to substantially support this new initiative?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I thought I gave those figures.

Mr. Nixon: I am sorry, they were not given.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, perhaps the hon. Leader of the Opposition, when he gets a copy of the statement—

Mr. Nixon: Could the minister tell me what the amount is?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All of the money that I have mentioned that the provincial government is becoming involved in will be new money injected into the economy this year.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): How much?

Mr. MacDonald: How come?

Mr. Lewis: What does the minister mean, "new money"? That is an undertaking, not new money.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You cannot spend new money until you undertake to spend it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: If he has nothing to say, why does he not sit down?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As soon as they are quiet, I will speak.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. members wish an answer, they will give the minister an opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I will give all the details and hopefully this will answer the question.

The family and senior citizens' housing: there were 15,500 units which were committed in 1970 for 1971 starts, which produces a figure of \$57.8 million.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Is that federal money?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The federal money—CMHC—is for \$130 million. The total amount is \$202 million, of which the provincial contribution is \$20.2 million.

Mr. Sargent: It is a lot of money.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know. I mean, are we not supposed to take this money or do we just take Ontario's money and throw it down the drain, even if it is available from other sources?

Mr. Sargent: Take it and take credit for it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do the members opposite want houses built or do they not?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): Where did it come from in the first place?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, student housing: 2,200 units, for which \$14 million would come from CMHC and \$1 million pro-

vincial if all is done by the Ontario Students Housing Corporation. This is a total of \$15 million.

Home ownership: provincial contribution, \$165 million. If the hon. member wants his specific question answered, \$145 million has been available under the old commitments which have not yet been taken out.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): The minister spent more than that on Ontario Place.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Twenty million dollars of new money by the province. Private contribution by the commitment of the banks, which is new money: \$100 million.

Mr. Nixon: New money?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: New money.

Mr. Nixon: Not that figure.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Thirteen thousand, two hundred units, for a total of \$165 million.

Land and services: there has been a carry-over of \$9 million. CMHC is providing \$14 million; the government of Ontario, \$27 million—which totals \$50 million.

If the hon. member will add that up it amounts to \$532.2 million.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the minister further if the final total that he gave me in answer to my question is the total amount of the commitment announced in the Speech from the Throne as the half-billion-dollar new programme? Would he not agree that that comes from three sources—that still, in his description to the House, he has not made it clear what the commitment of this House or this government will be in addition—new commitment over what was committed last year? I would look forward to having an opportunity of going over his figures.

A second question if I may, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: If that was a question that the hon. leader asked, he should allow it to be answered. If it was a statement then of course it should not have been made.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I thought I made that perfectly clear. I was at great pains to point out, in case there was any impression that I was trying to create confusion here, I said that of the new money injected into this programme, of the provincial share \$145 million—

Mr. Lewis: That was a carryover.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —had already been committed by the provincial government which has not been taken up.

An hon. member: In 1970.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know what the hon. member is trying to prove—that we should add another \$145 million to make our programme look bigger? We would be prepared to do it.

Mr. Lewis: If the government did not use it last year, why should it use it this?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the member does not care about what happens to the taxpayers' money. It is there and it is to be injected into the economy this year and that is what the Throne Speech made reference to.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now we have \$15 million which has not been used in 1970 and we injected into the—

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Why was it not used?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is another matter. If the hon. member will ask that question—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: How can the minister guarantee that this money will be used?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that the number of housing starts last year was well in excess of that which was forecast by the government. So, if that was done I do not know why the hon. member opposite concerns himself as to whether we did not spend more money even than we did.

Mr. Lewis: The government should have, because it is away behind.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister is not answering the member for Scarborough West, he is answering the Leader of the Opposition. Would he please speak to that.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Of the \$100 million private funds which have been negotiated, could the minister make it clear what interest will be payable to those investments?

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Nine and one-half.

Mr. MacDonald: Another point he does not know.

Mr. Trotter: Nine?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Ask the former minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can assure the hon. member from the discussions I have had—

Mr. Singer: There will be no interest on mortgages.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —that it will be the interest charged currently in this field, and it will not be any higher. It could possibly be lower.

Mr. Singer: Which interest charged currently? There are about a dozen different ones.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: CMHC is going to be involved, so—

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary question if you will permit me. Now that a copy of the minister's statement is available it appears that, in fact, 9,000 new starts are the aim of the programme. Is that a correct interpretation of paragraph 3?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. The hon. member is reading from the starts which were made in 1970 under one particular programme.

Mr. Lewis: That is total starts. The question is accurate.

Mr. Nixon: It is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Total starts—

Mr. Nixon: It says 76,600, 85,000; 9,000, less than 9,000—

Interjection by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! As I have pointed out to the hon. members, this is their time and if they wish to use it this way that is up to them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The number of starts in 1970—family and senior-citizen units—was 5,568. The number of condominium units was 5,100. Student accommodation, 1,493 beds, for a total of—

Mr. Lewis: Not beds?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They call them beds for students. I have done a little more homework than the hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: Have you? Let us have some evidence of it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Student housing is referred to as beds because they are mostly for singles. At least, that is what they are supposed to be used for.

Mr. Lewis: I thought the minister was thinking of his old department.

Mr. Pitman: That is what makes it so dull.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: For a total, Mr. Speaker, of 16,161 starts in 1970 which is a damn good record.

Mr. Speaker: Has the leader a further supplementary?

Mr. Nixon: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister can provide an interpretation of this statistician's nightmare or public relations officer's daydream and tell the House and the people of Ontario at the next session precisely how many new provincial dollars will be injected into this programme, without simply reading this statement once more? Can the minister undertake to do that?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Tell the hon. member in the next session.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it is a sort of ambiguous question to begin with.

Mr. Nixon: That is an ambiguous answer.

Mr. Trotter: Does the minister not know what he is spending?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member wants me to do it some time in the next session. I will tell the hon. member right now, Mr. Speaker. As far as this government is concerned, if we can build all the units we projected for with even less money, we would be glad to do it. It is not the amount of money we spend; it is the amount of units we are going to build. That is a tremendous amount of money to inject into this economy and I know that makes all the hon. members over there unhappy.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West, a supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: A number of—

Mr. Singer: He has lost his confidence.

Mr. Lewis: —specific supplementaries, Mr. Speaker. The \$100 million from the private sector, how does that break down—from banks, insurance companies, trust and loan companies and other sources?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Five banks at \$20 million each.

Mr. Lewis: And that is the sum total of the banking area?

Secondly, where will the land come from? How much is on OHC land? How much is on CMHC land and how much is on private land?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have not got down to the detail of how much is on—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, oh!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are people—of course, it does, you know, take long—

Mr. Lewis: How do you build houses without land?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why does the hon. member not let me tell him? There are all kinds of builders and developers who have land, who want to build, who will be coming forward and who have already come forward to get approval from OHC to use these funds to build the housing units.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, am I to understand that the total additional provincial money on the basis of the minister's calculation is \$41.2 million for the year 1971?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is incorrect.

Mr. Lewis: That is exactly correct, and his own figures demonstrate it.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): How can the member be so wrong? It is incorrect.

Mr. Lewis: Let me ask another question. Is the minister aware, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: If it is supplementary, he may have another. The Leader of the Opposition had four.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: He bought it yesterday. This is going to be a repeat.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that the former Treasurer of the province (Mr. MacNaughton) indicated in his 1968 budget that we would require 90,000 units a year in Ontario—is the minister aware of that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member would have read, would have listened to my statement, listened to the Throne Speech; he has the speech in front of him.

Mr. MacDonald: We did.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are talking about precisely around those figures and the number of units. But that does not mean the government is going to build them all.

Mr. Lewis: Right, but not—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We only build, as a matter of fact, 12.5 per cent, as I read in my speech.

Mr. Lewis: The minister concedes 90,000 units. Does the minister realize that the executive director of his Ontario Housing Corporation in his department says that over and above the 90,000 units, we are now 65,000 short over the last several years? Is he aware of that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of it, but if that is correct then this is the way to catch up, by building 20,000 or 30,000 units.

Mr. MacDonald: No, the government is still going to give this year—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, we cannot build more units than it is possible to build with all the money in the world, with all the manpower available and with the land available. This is a damn good programme and why does the opposition not admit it?

Mr. Lewis: But the minister does not know what land is available.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West has one more supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister think that an additional 8,500 units in 1971, falling 5,000 units short of the Treasurer's level, and 70,000 units short of the provincial requirement, can be called a legitimate housing project?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I do and if it is possible to build more we will get the money to build more.

Mr. Lewis: It is not a new plan and they are not new jobs. They are old jobs.

An hon. member: They will probably have a two-month strike or something.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the opposition is complaining that our plans are grandiose when we talk about 85,000 or 90,000 units. Now the member says, "Why do you not add another 8,000 or 9,000 to it?"

Mr. Lewis: When will it start?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If we would have added another 8,000 or 9,000, he would have said "My God, you are up in the clouds."

Mr. Lewis: When will the building start?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It has started already.

Mr. Lewis: Where?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Parkdale has a supplementary and after that there will be no more supplementaries on this question.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. The units that are going to be allowed for private homes; is there going to be any maximum price under the HOME programme; what are those homes going to cost?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I cannot answer that question, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: No, that is one of the details like land and mortgages.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): Pie in the sky.

Mr. Trotter: One final question: If there is no limit on what the cost of a private home will be, how does the minister expect the average person to buy a house at the cost of houses now?

Hon. Mr. Snow: He did not say there was no limit.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not recall saying there was not going to be a limit. All I said was I did not have this information. I am not quite as brilliant as the hon. member for Downsview or the member for Scarborough West; it takes me a little time to learn this information at the moment.

Mr. Trotter: The minister does not know the interest or the cost of a house? Those are two things—

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition for a fresh question.

FEDERAL FUNDS FOR UNEMPLOYMENT PROGRAMME

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier.

Granting the grave concern that is felt on all sides of the House about the unemployment situation in this province, can the Premier explain to the House the three-month delay in taking up the \$17 million made available from the federal level for programmes to counteract unemployment in this province?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): The programme begins as of today.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. member perhaps had listened to the statement made by myself and others some four weeks ago at a press conference, it was very clearly indicated that the programme did not start, from the federal standpoint, until today. The regulations were not available until mid-January. There has been no loss of time as far as the province is concerned.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: The minister is aware that the announcement was made about the middle of December. Can he tell the House when the announcement was made about the provincial participation and why was there this three-month delay?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I tried to explain this to the Leader of the Opposition in, I thought, rather clear terms. The regulations did not become available from the federal authorities nor were the final commitments made with respect to funding; it does not start until today. There was no delay whatsoever on the part of the Province of Ontario; none.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Stop mouthing what Mr. Benson tells you to say. Did the member get that by wire or phone call from Ottawa?

An hon. member: When did you get out?

Another hon. member: There is Darcy again.

CONTROL OF DRUG PROBLEMS

Mr. Nixon: The minister is the millstone around the neck of government. There is no doubt the Premier should have put the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) to his left and put the Treasurer in the back.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Justice. Will he explain to the House what new steps he proposes to take—

Mr. Sargent: I read the Bible.

Mr. Nixon: —as the chief enforcer in the Province of Ontario to control the drug problems that are becoming more and more acute in the community?

Mr. Singer: Did the minister refer to himself as chief enforcer again?

An hon. member: Al, the enforcer.

Mr. Singer: The minister said that last night.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Did I?

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I see. Mr. Speaker, I assume the hon. Leader of the Opposition's comments are in reference to some informal remarks I was making last night at a completely non-political but very wonderful testimonial dinner for the hon. Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Wells).

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: During the question—

Mr. MacDonald: The government is going to need more than a testimonial to hold that seat.

Mr. Lewis: It will need more than a dinner to hold it.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Due to certain activities of about a month ago my voice still has not recovered and, therefore, I would appreciate it if members opposite could keep quiet for a little while while I am talking.

During the question period after the dinner, I was asked for some personal views in respect of the illicit drug trade in this province, and I indicated that one of the very few preconceived ideas I had on assuming this office was that there is certainly something very wrong, either with the laws or with the enforcement of those laws in respect of the drug racket in this country and in this province, and that I want to turn my attention to many aspects, and am turning my attention to many aspects of this drug trade in this province as—

Mr. Singer: The enforcer.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —I do not think I said chief law enforcer of the province, but as one who is charged with the responsibility in this province of seeing that the laws of this province, whether they are federal or provincial, are enforced.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary question: Following the statement by the chief of police of Toronto, when asked to comment on the Minister of Justice's statement, is he now prepared to accede that the enforcement is adequate and perhaps the laws are inadequate?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: As the hon. members know and I would hope the hon. member recognizes in any event, that if he is dealing with the question of the legalization or the lack of legalization of certain drugs, that that is outside the jurisdiction of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Singer: Does the minister have an opinion?

Mr. Bullbrook: What is legalization?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: In any event, in respect of the comments from Chief Adamson, as reported in one of the Toronto papers at noon today, I think one thing that was not covered in that press report was the fact that I went out of my way to indicate that I thought that the Metro Toronto police were doing the best they possibly could under the circumstances in respect of the men and the experience and the facilities that they have available to them. In no way was I casting aspersions, either on the RCMP and their activities or the Metro Toronto police force and their activities. As my hon. friend knows, or should know, the OPP, of course, are not very active in this particular field due to jurisdictional matters in respect of the drug trade.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West, first.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, on the minister's informal remarks: When a question was asked, "Does he have the power to control the OPP?" what did the minister mean by his reply, "That is debatable, too; I am finding out"?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Perhaps if the hon. member had been in the House in past years when the estimates of The Department of

the Attorney General were debated in this House, he would appreciate that the Minister of Justice in this province does not have control, does not have day-to-day control over the OPP.

Mr. Singer: Oh, that is nonsense.

Mr. Shulman: It is about time they did.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: This is a matter, however, quite frankly, that I am looking into.

Mr. Singer: Where was the minister the night the statute was amended?

Mr. MacDonald: He was going to cross the floor of the House or something.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The whole import of the Roach commission, if I remember rightly, was that there should be removal of political or civilian control over the police forces in this province.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: And this was one of the imports of that report.

Mr. Lewis: What is the minister talking about? He was here during that debate.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister of Justice is fumbling as badly as the Minister of Trade and Development.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am certainly appreciative of the fact that there are very many problems in respect of the control of the police forces in this province. If I did not indicate it last night, I am indicating it to the House right now that I am certainly taking a good, hard, close look at this whole aspect.

Mr. Lewis: What does that mean?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am taking a look at the question of control.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is going to exercise his rights under the legislation?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview has a supplementary?

Mr. Singer: Yes, would the Attorney General advise us if in his first answer to my leader's question he was implying a serious criticism of his predecessor in office when he said he feels that more has to be done about the administration of justice?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No.

Mr. Singer: No. Well what did the minister mean then?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Oh, come on.

Mr. Singer: Well, no, not "come on." If the minister thinks it is wrong, tell us what is wrong with it, and how the former Attorney General did not do his job. Tell us that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park has a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: A good thing there is an aisle between those ministers.

Mr. Shulman: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Is one of the steps that the Attorney General referred to in the answer to the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Attorney General, if I may.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I cannot hear the hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shulman: Is one of the steps that the Attorney General referred to, in answering the question of the Leader of the Opposition, to hold a public inquiry into the problems of organized crime as is recommended by the police commission?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is certainly consistent with his predecessor on that one.

Mr. Speaker: These are supplementaries.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: At this time.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, at this time.

Mr. Shulman: At this time?

Mr. MacDonald: Subject to change without notice.

Mr. Shulman: Was it at this time?

Mr. E. W. Sopa (Sudbury): Is the minister advocating here and now that there be a change or withdrawal of civilian control of the police forces of this province?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No.

Mr. Trotter: He insinuated that.

Mr. Singer: He is not aware that it exists now.

AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a final question, as far as I am concerned, of the Minister of Education.

In the light of the minister's statement last night to the separate school trustees that an answer to their request for extension of aid would be available shortly, can he inform the House what sort of review has been undertaken by the government or by The Department of Education in this connection, what does "shortly" mean, and is the review in fact simply a public opinion poll that will be available shortly to him?

Hon. R. S. Welch (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, in attending the meeting last night in the company of the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the member for Scarborough West, I included in my remarks a reiteration of what the Prime Minister himself said in Ottawa on March 18, in reply to a similar—

Mr. T. Reid: Was that Trudeau? What did Trudeau say about that? Was that the Prime Minister in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Has the hon. member for Scarborough East been here long, because the Prime Minister of Ontario is—

Mr. T. Reid: The minister said "the Prime Minister in Ottawa."

Hon. Mr. Welch: That is right. When the Prime Minister of Ontario was in Ottawa. I doubt whether there would be such a profound statement from the other Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister of Ontario, in response to a similar question, indicated that as a matter of government policy, the separate school trustees of this province would have a reply shortly to their brief. I cannot add anything further to that.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Can the minister indicate what sort of a review has been undertaken over these many months?

Hon. Mr. Welch: There has been a very careful review. The brief was prepared in May, 1969, and has reference to a good many legal and historical matters, and the government itself will respond to this particular brief shortly.

Mr. Pitman: A supplementary: I wonder if the minister can say who is making the review? Is it being made by individuals at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, or anybody outside the department or

is it being done by officials in the department? If so, what officials and what branch?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, it is a very complete review within government.

Mr. Pitman: Within government? Is it The Department of Education that is carrying on this review?

Mr. Speaker: We are still on supplementary questions. Has the member for Scarborough East a supplementary?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Which department?

Mr. Speaker: Has the Leader of the Opposition completed? The member for Scarborough West.

EXPORT OF ELECTRIC POWER

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management:

Can the minister indicate to the House the reasons for the government's reassessment of the export of hydro-electric power in north-western Ontario to Boise-Cascade?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a natural reassessment of a matter of this kind. It is now before the National Energy Board. There has been, as the hon. member knows, some objection to the idea of exporting power from Fort Frances to International Falls, and therefore we are reviewing the whole matter.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, I understand that the government initially supported Ontario Hydro in its willingness to export Ontario power to Boise-Cascade. Has the government's position now changed?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There has been no change. That is why there is a reassessment going on at this time.

Mr. Lewis: What does the minister mean? He has made his policy; why then the need for the reassessment? Why did the minister ask for a month's postponement at the hearings?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: So that there could be a reassessment.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River has a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is abandoning Ontario Hydro, is he?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No.

Mr. Lewis: Which is wise, in this instance.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Is the minister aware of the serious implication of the fact that Ontario Hydro and the Ontario government have, in fact, supported the application and that this will probably be the deciding factor in the decision of the National Energy Board?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I am aware of that, yes.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

SPADINA EXPRESSWAY DECISION

Mr. Lewis: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Premier if I may, or the Prime Minister, as one wishes.

When will the cabinet be reviewing the Spadina Expressway decision?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the cabinet is in the process of a review. I understand there is further information which Metropolitan Toronto wishes to present to cabinet and we will review it just as soon as we have the complete information.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, the member for High Park raised a matter of very urgent public importance in the question period yesterday and I undertook to get an answer to his question.

I think he indicated yesterday that the cost of the four films at Ontario Place was in the neighbourhood of \$3.5 million, which was comparable to the cost of a certain film, "Tora! Tora! Tora!"—which I have not seen but which I assume he has—of \$3.5 million.

My research indicates, Mr. Speaker, that that particular film cost in the neighbourhood of \$20 million, which I know he wanted me to find out for him. The four films at Ontario Place cost something less than \$700,000.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the Prime Minister that answers are only given at the appropriate time so that there may be an opportunity to—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! So that there may be an opportunity for supplementary questions.

At this particular juncture there is no opportunity for supplementary questions. There may be supplementary questions to the original question asked by the member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Nixon: But he undertook to get the cost of the building, too.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West has the floor for further questions.

Mr. Lewis: Can the Premier give us a date at which the review of Spadina will be complete, and to what extent is the cabinet divided on it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is that the way the hon. member would run a government?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, unlike the caucus of the New Democratic Party, the cabinet of this province is not divided on any issue.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think that was the question I was asked. I hope that was a very specific answer. Then, of course, the moment the review is undertaken, which will be very shortly, and as soon as we have the information, the result of that review will be announced to this Legislature.

CHANGES IN LEGISLATION ON AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs:

Will there be amendments to automobile insurance legislation this session?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): That will be a matter of government policy to be decided.

CLOSURE OF COBALT REFINERIES

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs:

Now that the Cobalt refineries are, in fact, scheduled to close, what is the government doing for that community and that plant?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, if I may, in answer to the question of the leader of the New Democratic Party, also answer the question that was directed to me yesterday by the—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister will confine himself to answering the question asked today. He will be given an opportunity later to answer the other question.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: If I may point out, Mr. Speaker, the refinery at Cobalt which closed yesterday has proved beyond a doubt to be an uneconomical operation and there is nothing that this government can do to keep the operation a viable unit.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, would the minister at any time table for the House or demonstrate publicly in what fashion the operation was uneconomic and why it was not possible for the government to rescue the Cobalt refinery?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, this is a private operation and I do not know if we have the authority.

Mr. Lewis: One final supplementary: The minister must have had some information on which to base his decision. What decision has been made about the jobs of the workers affected?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Everything possible, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, the pattern of layoffs and shutdowns is severe enough in Ontario without that.

What precisely has been done by way of relocation and retraining and re-employment for the 90 workers specifically affected, and the 200 others in the surrounding mines who may be affected?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the federal government, of course, has a manpower retraining operation and this department is studying the situation very thoroughly.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Dovercourt has a supplementary.

Mr. De Monte: Can the minister inform the House how many people have been forced on the welfare rolls by the shutdown?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I did not hear the question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member repeat the question? The minister did not hear it.

Mr. De Monte: Can the minister inform the House how many people will be forced on the welfare rolls by this after their unemployment insurance expires?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, there will not be any on the welfare rolls.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York East has a question?

SAFETY PROBLEM WITH "CLACKERS"

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. It is in two parts. It might help if I ask him both at one time.

Firstly, is the minister aware of the safety problem concerning a children's toy that has become very popular these days? It is known as a "clacker". Secondly, is his department—and this is presuming that he is aware of it, Mr. Speaker—is his department taking any steps now to investigate this safety problem and if, as a result of that, would they contemplate taking any steps in that regard?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, we have not had any formal notice of any injuries or damages caused to children. However, when the issue became obvious, and I heard personally of complaints, I set the wheels in motion in my own department and in relation to The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs and both of them are in touch with Mr. Basford's Department of Consumer Affairs in Ottawa.

Mr. Sargent: Give it to "Jack"—

Mr. Speaker: Are there supplementaries?

Mr. Meen: No, no supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. Trotter: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the minister can answer this question: Could they not take immediate action in regard to this? I have one parent here who has actually had a child's eye damaged. The principals in seven schools in Metro Toronto have banned them from the grounds. Surely the government should take action on that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: I would like to know how soon are they going to take these things off the market?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: As of this moment, Mr. Speaker, I cannot assure the hon. member whether it will be—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Removal of these from the market is a matter relating to the overlapping and combined jurisdiction of Mr. Basford's department, mine and to a degree The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Mr. Trotter: Is the minister sure he has got it back?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Let me put it this way, it is not as quickly answered as might be suggested because there are, I am told, at least half a dozen different types of these clackers and it is possible that some of them are completely safe while others are not.

Mr. Trotter: A supplementary: Is the minister aware that some chain stores are already taking them off the market? All we have to do with some of them is ask them to do it and they will, because they are causing so much harm. Is the minister not aware of this?

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Bowling balls are not allowed.

Mr. Speaker: Are there further supplementaries?

INTEREST-FREE FEDERAL LOAN

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier:

In his investigation into the housing needs, is he aware that last month Mr. Sharp loaned \$200 million to India on a 50-year loan at zero interest? Would the Prime Minister consider making application to Ottawa for similar loans to Ontario for housing and to aid unemployment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I assure you that I would beat a path to Ottawa's doorstep tomorrow if I felt that there was the remotest possibility of obtaining \$200 million at zero rate of interest for the taxpayers of Ontario, but I happen to be something of a realist and I do not really see this opportunity presenting itself to this government.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

ELIMINATION OF GRADE 13

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education: Has The Department of Education rejected the proposition that education be restructured in order to eliminate grade 13?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No. I have no comment to make on that today. There has been a study of the secondary school programme for a number of years and as the member will know, Mr. Speaker, there are many pupils in our school system who can complete the 13-year programme in 12 years through an accelerated programme, but I have no announcement to make with respect to grade 13 today.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister whether there may be an announcement in the near future in regard to this matter, since the city of Hamilton has indicated it is going to build, or make available, schools simply for the purpose of providing for grade 13 education and this adds considerably to the cost?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I know nothing about the building plans of the city of Hamilton. I have no plans to make an announcement on that particular subject at the moment.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister tell us who are the members of the committee investigating the feasibility of abolishing grade 13 in conjunction with officials from the community colleges, the universities and Ryerson?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would be glad to take that as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs has the answer to a question.

CLOSURE OF COBALT REFINERY

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I notice the member who asked the question, the member for Timiskaming (Mr. Jackson), is not in his seat. May I say that when he is back, I will answer the question at that time.

Mr. Speaker: Does the NDP leader wish that answer given now or to wait until the member for Timiskaming is back?

Mr. Lewis: I think we will take it now.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I think that is preferable.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out to the leader of the New Democratic Party, the refinery at Cobalt which closed yesterday was an uneconomical operation, and of course there was nothing the government could do in its power to keep it in operation. At the present time there are no other facilities in Canada that will accept the output from the silver producers in the Cobalt area because of a high arsenic content. The only company on the continent that will accept this ore is the American Smelting and Refining Company whose head office is in New York City.

The present mining operations are employing approximately 345 persons and it would be impractical for the government to grant exemptions under section 106 of The Mining Act. This exemption has been provided in order to permit the existing and potential producers to continue operations. The order-in-council provides for exemptions to any mine operation in the Cobalt-Noranda areas within the next three years but it also provides for the rescinding of the order-in-council if suitable facilities become available in Canada during the period of this exemption.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could inform the House why it has not been possible to process this silver at the mining laboratory in the area, as has been suggested by some of the municipal officials and others?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I understand, in speaking to my officials, that this is not possible, as I pointed out, because of the high arsenic content in the ore.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Durham has a question?

SENIOR CITIZENS' ALLOWANCE

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Social and Family Services.

In view of the fact that the federal guaranteed income supplement is being increased as of today, I would be pleased if he would advise the House whether any consideration has been given to increasing the comfort allowance for senior citizens in our homes for the aged?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): Well, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to tell the hon. member that changes in the regulations are in the works to increase the amount of the comfort allowance that will be retained by these needy old age pensioners in our homes. This will be increased from \$15 to \$25 and it will be effective today.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

CHARGES AGAINST OPP OFFICERS

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General.

Can he advise us at what stage are the disciplinary proceedings that are being taken against Wilson and Rodger and the third man mentioned by Mr. Justice Grant who were charged with having committed certain offences during the recent investigations into the Duke matter?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: My recollection is that it has been adjourned to some time very shortly but I will check into this and have an answer tomorrow.

Mr. Singer: Could the Attorney General advise us if these three men are still suspended from duty?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is correct, to the best of my knowledge. If it is not correct, I will inform the House and the member tomorrow morning.

Mr. Singer: Could the Attorney General advise us if these three men are still under full pay?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I believe a suspension merely is a suspension from active duty and not from pay.

Mr. Singer: Could the Attorney General advise us why such a long delay has in fact continued with which they are charged?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I will not today because I do not know. But I will find out.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has a supplementary?

Mr. Shulman: Please. Will the Attorney General inform us if the other matters that are exposed in the Duke inquiry, such as buying by the OPP, are being corrected or have been corrected?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: There are matters in that royal commission report which directly relate to government policy, and government

policy will be announced in this House in due course.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: This will be the last supplementary on this question.

Mr. Singer: Yes. Could the Attorney General advise us whether the disciplinary charges are going to be dealt with by a senior official of the OPP or by another person under the new regulations recently passed under The Police Act?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: These hearings are by a judge.

Mr. Singer: When was that decided?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: During the session last year.

Mr. Shulman: No, it was not.

Mr. Singer: No, it was not. Why does the minister not read what goes on and find out?

Mr. Shulman: It was to be heard by senior officers of the OPP.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside has the floor.

Mr. MacDonald: Takes a long time for the facts to penetrate.

Mr. Shulman: The new Premier should never have shuffled his cabinet. He is in big trouble.

Mr. MacDonald: Four to bat and four errors.

CADMIUM CONTAMINATION IN WATER AND AIR

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management concerning the cadmium levels in water and air.

Inasmuch as the Canada Centre for Inland Waters has found high levels of cadmium in the drinking water of the city of Guelph and vicinity—that is, 80 per cent in excess of the permissible levels—and has found that cadmium concentration levels in rain and snow in Ontario are surprisingly high, has the minister taken any steps to curtail or even discourage the use of cadmium in industrial processes in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the report emanating from the Centre for Inland Waters. It really did not surprise the officials in my department. As far as the cadmium levels in rain and snow are concerned, I am sure that the hon. member knows there are many other chemicals in these sources which were analyzed and which also concern us and which are in the atmosphere continuously. However, the findings regarding drinking supply in the Guelph area—I think the hon. member mentioned Guelph—are being looked into and are being analyzed. Further analysis is being made by the OWRC to verify these findings.

Mr Burr: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister asked the Minister of Health to alert the public, especially ice fishermen, that the drinking of rain water and snow water in these areas may be hazardous and should be discontinued, according to the advice of the officials of the Canada Centre for Inland Waters?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that the findings of the Centre for Inland Waters indicated that the level had been reached that would preclude the use of that as drinking water. I know there was an indication that it should not be used, that it should be avoided; I do not think there is really too much rain water or atmospheric water used as drinking supply today. I do not think the fishermen are drinking water from any of our lakes or rivers directly in too many cases.

The findings as far as Guelph were concerned, if my information is correct, were not really to a dangerous level that would preclude people from using that as a source of drinking water, although there was an indication that it could be dangerous if this buildup of cadmium increased.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has now expired.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed. On a point of information, I think that every minister should have a microphone at his desk. I am getting old and I have trouble hearing half the time. I do not see why every minister should not have a mike. Every member should have a mike. It is unfair to ask us to sit here and to strain to hear what is going on. With all the technology we have the sound is very bad. I think the House committee should look into it.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): We can hear the member all right.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): We can hear him.

Mr. MacDonald: We can hear him.

Mr. Sargent: And the answers are bad too.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That shirt is so loud we will not be able to hear the member anyway.

Mr. Sargent: Does the minister like it? The pot belly is mine.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure we can check on the acoustics again. Yesterday, I agree, they were not very good. But today they have been very good. One of the difficulties, of course is that all the members wish to talk at once and therefore it is very difficult to hear the answer or the question.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Welch presented the annual report of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education for the year ended June 30, 1969.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch presented the report of the Province of Ontario Council for the Arts for the year 1969-1970.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence presented the annual report of the Law Society of Upper Canada, Ontario Legal Aid branch, for 1970.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Arrangements have been made so that copies of this will be forthwith in the pigeon holes down in the post office for each of the members.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Mr. Carruthers moves that a select committee of 15 members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient dispatch a list of members to compose the standing committees ordered by the House, such committee to be composed as follows:

Mrs. Pritchard, chairman; Messrs. Demers, Farquhar, Gilbertson, Henderson, Kennedy, Newman (Ontario South), Peacock, Price, Reilly, Rollins, Smith (Hamilton Mountain), Smith (Nipissing), Stokes and Yakabuski.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): I have a question of clarification, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know, if I can, when we will get information with respect to a list of the numbers of people on these committees, or whether in fact that matter will be decided at the meetings?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the chief government whip might answer that.

Mr. Carruthers: The members will be decided when the striking committee meets and that will be Monday at 11 o'clock.

Mr. Stokes: Eleven-thirty.

Mr. Carruthers: Eleven-thirty.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE ACT, 1968

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Administration of Justice Act, 1968.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, this is one of a series of very routine housekeeping bills which I will be introducing this afternoon, designed to provide for the more expeditious handling of administrative procedures in the courts. The first part of this bill would make it possible to authorize the payment of the expenses of an accused person to attend the place of trial even though the offence charged is not indictable.

At the present time the Director of Public Prosecutions may authorize the payment of the expenses of the accused only in the case of an indictable offence, and there have been many cases where the offence may have been a summary conviction matter under provincial statute and it would have been appropriate to pay the expenses of the accused to come to the place of trial.

The second section of the bill, sir, relates not only to this bill but affects the following four bills that I am going to introduce here today. It permits the fees payable in the administration of justice to be fixed under this one statute rather than having a different fee being fixed under a dozen different statutes as is the case at the present time. This will consolidate the information in one place and will permit it to be dealt with on a uniform basis.

COUNTY JUDGES ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, this is one of these routine bills. Sections 1 and 2 of the bill will provide for an additional county court judge to be named to the county of Wentworth, and three additional judges of the county and district courts will have jurisdiction anywhere in Ontario. Section 3 relates to the fixing of fees for court reporters in the county and district courts by regulation under the bill that I just previously introduced.

CROWN WITNESSES ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Crown Witnesses Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, this merely permits the fees for Crown witnesses to be fixed by regulation under The Administration of Justice Act, 1968, rather than under this particular statute.

JURORS ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, this Act, like the others, will provide for the prescribing of the fees payable under regulations made pursuant to The Administration of Justice Act, 1968, rather than under The Jurors Act. The bill also adds drugless practitioners to those persons who are exempted from jury duty.

Mr. Singer: It is a real revolution that, changing the law this afternoon.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Justices of the Peace Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the main part of this bill relates to the uniform traffic ticket provision, to widen the traffic offences for which it may be used and to permit its extended use to offences other than traffic offences. There are also some procedural improvements that have been made so that it can be utilized within the confines of Metropolitan Toronto as well.

As well as the uniform traffic ticket provisions, this bill also authorizes the long-standing practice by which the accused may arrange for an adjournment at some mutually convenient time and not appear to the original summons.

COMMISSIONER TO INVESTIGATE ACTS OF OFFICIALS

Mr. Singer moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the Appointment of a Commissioner to Investigate Administrative Decisions and Acts of Officials of the Government of Ontario and its Agencies and to Define the Commissioner's Powers and Duties.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Bullbrook: A rather novel approach.

Mr. Speaker: I believe that this is not the first time I have seen this bill and I am going to ask the Clerk to ascertain that this does not entail expenditure of government money before it proceeds further in the House.

Mr. T. Reid: It will save money.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, for the seventh time in a row—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The bill must be read first.

Mr. Singer: Oh, I am sorry.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): After seven times one would think he would know.

Mr. Speaker: While the hon. member speaks to us he might relieve my mind by pointing out that there is no payment of government moneys either to a commissioner or otherwise included in this bill so that we would know.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, that is my opinion. The bill has been accepted six times already and put on the order paper and debated six times. One would presume that has been checked out.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Did the hon. member say it was not a money bill?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, for the seventh time in a row I introduce a bill which, if acted upon and accepted by the government, will allow the appointment of an ombudsman for the Province of Ontario who will be able to look after the problems the people have with nameless and faceless civil servants. This would add to the better administration of government in the province.

CONTROL AND REGULATION OF SNOWMOBILES

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to Provide for the Control and Regulation of Snowmobiles.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this is a model bill that was prepared by the Council of State Governments for submission to every jurisdiction in North America. The purpose of this bill is to control the various problems with snowmobiles, particularly excessive noise driving of game, and the large number of accidents and deaths due to alcoholism.

Mr. Sopha: Did the Waffle group approve that American intrusion?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, consideration of the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the hon. member for Lambton, that a humble address be presented to the Honourable W. Ross Macdonald, Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Ontario.

May it please your Honour:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the legislative assembly of the Province of Ontario now assembled, beg leave to thank your Honour for the gracious speech which your Honour has addressed to us.

It is a great privilege for me, Mr. Speaker, to be—

Mr. Speaker: Before the hon. member proceeds the motion must be put.

Mr. Reilly moves, seconded by Mr. Henderson, that a humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To the Honourable W. Ross Macdonald, PC, CD, QC, LL.D, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario;

May it please your Honour:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the legislative assembly of the Province of Ontario now assembled, beg leave to thank your Honour for the gracious speech which your Honour has addressed to us.

The hon. member for Eglinton.

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure for me to be called upon to move this address by his Honour the Lieutenant Governor. I am certain that all the members of this Legislature join with me in thanking his Honour for his words of confidence and inspiration that will surely guide us well in our deliberations, not only in the months ahead but deliberations which will, indeed, have a decided effect on all of us in future years. And those years, sir, promise to be among the most challenging we have ever known.

It is my privilege too, sir, to be among the first in this Legislature to offer most sincere congratulations to the new Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) and leader of our government. He is a man of quality, a man of great ability and immense experience both as a politician and as an administrator. But, Mr. Speaker, most of all he is a man of understanding and compassion—qualities without which no man could be a leader of others.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Do both the member and he have the same tailor now?

Mr. Reilly: I did not hear the comment from the hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Is John Bulloch outfitting both of you?

Mr. Reilly: No. Should he?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Looks like he has.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Intellectually.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): You realize that Al Lawrence is now leaving after that introduction.

Mr. Reilly: You know, Mr. Speaker, the qualities of our Prime Minister have been ably demonstrated throughout his parliamentary career. They are well illustrated in the make-up of his new cabinet.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Look at the size of the cabinet!

Mr. Reilly: At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the new members of this cabinet, the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Apps), the Minister of Labour (Mr. Carton), the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier), the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Winkler) and the three new Ministers without Portfolio (Messrs. Dunlop, Potter and Snow).

Without doubt, Mr. Speaker, one of the most pressing problems that our new government must face is that of unemployment. Severe unemployment is a legacy of economic mismanagement. And, in this case, it is mismanagement and the fiscal and monetary policies of the federal government which have accelerated this state of excessive inflation and unemployment.

Mr. Sargent: It is the very speech he made last year.

Mr. Reilly: We can take very little, if any, comfort from the federal government's latest figures which now show that unemployment in our country rose at a slower rate in February this year than in the previous years.

Mr. Sargent: Yet they give this government 90 per cent of its money and the hon. member still blames them. What does he want, 100 per cent?

Mr. Reilly: Today, there are some 675,000 Canadians without jobs, an increase of over 7,000 over the same period in the year before.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: I would have judged that my good friend and all members of the opposition would have been intensely interested in those people who have been deprived of the right to work. Even with this staggering unemployment rate the Trudeau government persists by suggesting that the latest statistics reflect an improvement in the unemployment picture, and that the signs for the future are promising.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Poor blind Liberals up there and down here, too.

Mr. Reilly: The callous disregard, Mr. Speaker, for the many thousands who have been forced from their jobs! Rather than meet the matter with compassionate urgency the federal government has chosen to treat it as a matter of statistics.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The hon. member gave that speech on Monday—

Mr. Reilly: The limp hope offered by Finance Minister Edgar Benson on several occasions in recent weeks that the worst may be over is hardly reassuring to those who cannot find work. Surely the government should not be falling back on statistical rationalization when close to 700,000 Canadians are jobless?

Mr. Sargent: What is the government doing about it here in Ontario?

Mr. Reilly: I will tell my hon. friend about that. That is why, Mr. Speaker, this government has made unemployment a top priority issue.

Mr. Sargent: When? When is the government starting?

Mr. Reilly: Members of the Legislature are aware that the Ontario cabinet approved a provincial-municipal programme to provide some 7,500 new jobs across the province. This is to be in the form of grants to municipalities, which my friend would know about, toward labour costs of those projects which are eligible. This move brings the total of Ontario's investment in such programmes so far to nearly \$17 million. A total of 12,000 new jobs will result.

In addition, this government, as was pointed out yesterday and again today, plans to bolster Ontario's economy with a dramatic \$500 million home construction programme, providing over 130,000 jobs over the next year.

Also, in addition to these jobs, as was pointed out in the Throne Speech, will be a substantial increase in summer employment for students in Ontario. Programmes have been created to enable students to demonstrate their personal initiative, respond to their concern about the environment, and acquire funds which will permit their education to be continued. Some 14,000 young people will be employed this summer by the Ontario public service.

Mr. Nixon: That is 3,000 more than last year.

Mr. Reilly: A substantial increase from previous years.

No doubt these and other programmes will be discussed, as the Leader of the Opposition said, next Monday during the special debate on unemployment, but members of this Legislature should be aware that this government not only cares about its unemployed citizens, it actually does something about it!

Let us turn for a moment to another subject—education.

Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have heard a great deal about the cost of education in Ontario. I have personally heard from many people in my own riding of Eglinton and from people outside my riding. It was—

Mr. Sopha: We hear the member was kind of shaky up there.

Mr. Reilly: Who was shaky, my friend?

Mr. Sopha: That is what we hear.

Mr. Reilly: The Leader of the Opposition told me not so long ago that they had improved the number of Liberals in Eglinton. They had moved up from the cupboard where they used to hold the conventions to the telephone booth.

Mr. Nixon: I wish the hon. member would get the unquote in the right place there.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): The member is incorrect there; he should say "end of quote."

Mr. Reilly: It was generally conceded by most of the people I spoke to that we must continue to have the best education for our young people—

Mr. Sargent: The member is better talking off the cuff; forget the notes.

Mr. Reilly: —as it is indeed one of the most important investments in the future of our province and indeed our country.

Mr. T. Reid: If it is wisely spent.

Mr. Reilly: Ontario's continued growth and development and improvement can be directly linked to the investment in education. I am sure the hon. member for Scarborough East would be the first to agree with me that it can truly be said "education pays dividends".

Mr. T. Reid: Provided there are jobs.

Mr. Reilly: Our education programmes, of course, do cost money. However, Ontario's spending on education is well in line with other provinces.

I am sure the hon. member for Peterborough, who has studied and who is interested and active in education, would agree with what has been done here as far as Ontario's education is concerned. We are still spending \$22 per person less than several other provinces in the country.

Mr. Pitman: It is hardly comparable.

Mr. Reilly: Our costs per pupil are comparable to what they call the "have" provinces of British Columbia and Alberta. I understand that according to some statistics here recently the pupil cost in Ontario for 1969 was considerably less than that of all the surrounding states. In the case of New York State, our cost per pupil was little more than half.

Mr. T. Reid: How about mainland China?

Mr. Reilly: Of course, if we want to be we can be ridiculous in connection with it, but as far as my good friend from Scarborough East is concerned, I expect more from him. If he really wants to hear something, he should listen to this.

In 1969 we kept a running score of some of the suggestions made in this Legislature by the hon. members sitting opposite for improving the educational services. The total cost of these suggestions added up to more than \$1 billion. I repeat, more than \$1 billion, or double the education budget of Ontario at that time.

Mr. Pitman: The member said that to the people in Maple Leaf Gardens and it is not true.

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Speaker, during the same session there was not one single utterance from my hon. friend from Peterborough, or any other member of the opposition, about cutting out any services in education; not one, not one suggestion.

Mr. Pitman: Yes, he will find many. The hon. member will have to start reading my speeches.

Mr. Reilly: However, at the end of this session the same people who demanded the vastly extended and expanded services will be demanding reductions once again.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, what I wish to establish here today is that the cost increases

in education in recent years have not been caused by reorganization of school boards, as the hon. member of the opposition would have everyone believe.

Mr. Ruston: Tell that down in Kent county. I dare the member to come down and challenge us down there.

Mr. Reilly: There are three major causes for the increases. One reason is an increase in the school population.

My good friend, the hon. member for Grey-Bruce—I am sorry that he has to leave the chamber because there are some things here that I am sure would interest him and be of particular interest to the constituents he represents. One reason, as I started to say, is an increase in the school population.

Since 1960 the elementary enrolment has increased by one-third; the secondary enrolment has more than doubled.

A second reason is a continued increase in the cost of construction of facilities. Even at that, we have maintained an extremely low level of cost when compared to other construction costs. For instance, on a square foot basis small hospitals cost somewhere from \$36 to \$40 to build, Mr. Speaker. Commercial banks cost between \$24 and \$31 per square foot. Commercial office buildings between \$21 and \$25 per square foot.

The secondary school structures cost between \$20 and \$24 per square foot. The elementary schools cost between \$16 and \$22 per square foot.

Mr. T. Reid: That is an increase by 200 per cent per student place since 1962.

Mr. Reilly: I am sure the hon. members for Scarborough East and for Peterborough agree that this presents a very favourable cost picture as far as construction costs are concerned.

Mr. Pitman: What is it all for?

Mr. Nixon: Compared with the Toronto Dominion Centre!

Mr. Reilly: The third major reason for cost increases in education is a tremendous rise in wages and salaries.

In 1960 the median salary for an elementary school teacher was \$3,716 as compared to \$6,549 in 1969. The median of the secondary school level was \$7,078 in 1960 in comparison with 1969 at \$9,149. As we are all aware—

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South) The member had better look at the members' salaries while he is doing that, too.

Mr. Reilly: I realize that this happens all across the board as one of the increased costs of education. No one will deny it.

As we are all aware, in 1969 the Ontario government placed ceilings on the maximum expenditure that a board could make for operating purposes. In addition the maximum tax increase for any municipality was one mill on the provincial equalized assessment. Any cost which might otherwise have caused a tax increase was covered by a special subsidy from The Department of Education.

This year saw a total limit to the amount of expenditure which a board may make. I am convinced that regardless of the limits, boards can and shall continue to provide a high standard of education at a reasonable cost, if they exercise care in their spending. In other words, I strongly concur with the statement made earlier this week by the Prime Minister indicating that the boards will continue to provide a high level of education to the people of our province within the established limits.

Mr. Pitman: Read the Carleton Board of Education report.

Mr. Reilly: I would like to turn for a moment to deal with yet another matter that concerns a great many of our people, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. T. Reid: I hope the hon. member says something better than he has so far.

An hon. member: That was good!

Mr. Reilly: I share with many concerned Canadians the conviction that we must take all necessary steps to maintain control not only of our own economy but of our own distinctively Canadian political, social and cultural life as well.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): That is not what the hon. Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman) said.

Mr. Reilly: I agree that the survival and development of Canada as an independent nation must be a top priority of all Canadians, and Ontario must play its full part in doing everything necessary to bring this about.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): At long last.

Mr. Reilly: We all know that our country was founded on values, institutions, ideologies and customs that are worth preserving. We must have the courage and the will to maintain them. As stated in the Throne Speech on Tuesday, we must and will ensure that essential control is maintained here.

Mr. Trotter: The member for London North (Mr. Robarts) says that is a phony issue.

Mr. Reilly: In this respect the government has already stated its intention to convene a conference on foreign investment. This government intends to take immediate steps to enhance opportunities for Canadians to participate in the development of Ontario.

Mr. T. Reid: Invite James Coyne!

Mr. Reilly: We intend to give preference to Canadian-owned businesses seeking grants and loans under the various incentive systems. To further encourage Canadian enterprise and ownership, a venture capital fund will be established to assist in the financing of small businesses which have exceptional potential but which involve greater risks than are acceptable to the conventional lending institutions. Additional assistance will be provided to small businesses to develop technology and products.

Existing regulations and standards of the Ontario Development Corporation and the Northern Ontario Development Corporation are being revised so that assistance will be more readily available to small Canadian-owned businesses and to certain segments of our service industries.

This in my opinion is overdue and indeed most welcome. At the present time however, it appears that our growth and development cannot be realized without financial backing, and this financial backing must come from somewhere. Money must be made available from some source so that we can invest it in the future of our province and guarantee the employment of our people.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Federal government—

Mr. Reilly: Many countries have depended on outside capital to develop their resources. As I recall it, the United States itself depended heavily on German, and particularly on British money, to carry out its own development.

The hon. leader of the New Democratic Party and some of his socialist followers insist

that the salvation of our nation is the nationalization of the energy resource industry, and federal co-operation to achieve public ownership of resources across Canada.

Mr. Lawlor: No, not in all phases.

Mr. Reilly: They would also wipe out incentive grants to foreign-owned corporations or their subsidiaries.

Mr. Lawlor: That is a good idea. Does the member not agree with that?

Mr. Reilly: With the unemployment situation already at a drastic level, in my view such policies would surely throw our nation into complete chaos.

During the past decade, the Ontario government has invested extensively in the promotion of economic growth and the expansion of exports. As a result, not only Ontario, but the rest of this country today enjoys a substantial trade surplus and a high standard of living.

Mr. Haggerty: All imported.

Mr. Reilly: Without continued expansion and without continued development of our economy it is doubtful that we could maintain our present standard of living.

We need to establish better incentives for Canadians to invest in their own country. Tax free dividends for Canadians, and government guaranteed bank loans to finance expansion and acquisitions by Canadian companies would be positive measures which would encourage and support Canadian investment.

The proposal of our government to establish the venture capital fund should open up an important new source of financing to Ontario's small businessmen. At the same time, we must appreciate that the great financial need for small business is for equity funds to finance inventories, accounts receivable and so forth. By increasing small business taxation from 21 per cent to 50 per cent the federal government would cut into the source of these equity funds so deeply that it is doubtful whether loans from a venture capital fund could ever be repaid. It is most important, therefore, that the government of Ontario continue to take a strong stand in opposition to any taxation which would further weaken the independent small business.

In the United States a great deal of time and talent has been devoted to the problem of small business taxation and to developing

policies under which small businesses can flourish. Comparable research, concern and policies have been singularly lacking in Canada.

For example—

Mr. Haggerty: And in Ontario.

Mr. Reilly:—as part of their permanent government structure in the United States there is a small business administration agency within the Department of Commerce, and at the political level the United States House of Representatives has had a select committee on business administration which has been very active in respect of both hearing submissions and recommendations since 1941.

As far as I know, back in 1941 they were still operating in the interest of small business. Just recently a presidential task force published a report entitled, "Improving the Prospects of Small Business", in which a large number of reasons were given for strengthening the small business sector in the United States.

The United States Treasury Department also is organized to look sympathetically at taxation as it affects the small businessman. In the recent United States tax reform legislation a lower rate of corporate tax was retained as an incentive to small business. It is hardly necessary for me, Mr. Speaker, to point out that the federal government in its original white paper on taxation proposed to eliminate the low rate of corporate tax in Canada without putting some effective incentives in its place.

It is only the strong representations by Ontario and other provinces and the small business community itself that gave rise to the reconsideration of this point. Mr. Benson has established a special body to inquire into the matter of tax incentives for small businesses. But as yet he has given no indication of the kind of incentives that will be incorporated into his reform legislation.

On the other hand, my good friend from Welland has asked me about the Ontario government. Our Ontario government, through The Department of the Treasury has developed a comprehensive new system for encouraging small business through the tax system. In place of the lower rate of corporate tax, Ontario recommends the introduction of income tax credits to owner-operators, for example, those who risk their money and employ their energies to start their own businesses. It is equal to 50 per

cent of increased investment in the small business concern. This tax credit system would have a maximum annual value of \$10,000 and a lifetime limit of \$100,000, which is approximately the same benefit now available on the lower corporate rate.

The new provision however, would be available only to Canadian residents and to active business investors. Large corporations, non-residents and passive investors would not qualify.

Mr. Lawlor: We have lots of them.

Mr. Reilly: Ontario has recommended that such a system be put into effect nationally.

Mr. Sopha: And here I am looking for somewhere to go.

Mr. Reilly: And if it were, it should prove to be an attractive and effective incentive to small business. The benefits of this new approach—I am sure the hon. member for Sudbury, and the leader of the New Democratic Party would be interested in some of the benefits of the new approach by the Ontario government through The Department of the Treasury.

Mr. Sopha: Did Eddie Goodman write this part?

Mr. Reilly: Oh, I researched this very carefully myself, hon. member for Sudbury. If there is something incorrect, I will accept the blame for it.

It would provide an outlet for the great talent and initiative of Canadians. I need only point out that many large and successful Canadian companies started out as struggling, small companies some 20 years ago.

Mr. Sopha: Like Eaton's, for example.

Mr. Reilly: Yes, it started out as a struggling, small company, very true. Let us not discount the amount of employment that has been given by these small companies that have grown and provided employment as time went on.

Mr. Sopha: Absolutely.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Reilly: It would offset the biases against small firms in the securing of capital financing within existing financial markets.

Mr. Sopha: Sure.

Mr. Reilly: You know the problem that the small businessman has when he goes to get extra finance.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. member used to be a small businessman.

Mr. Reilly: It would encourage invention and innovation. It would preserve small enterprises which play a vital role in the social and economic structure of Canadian society.

Mr. Sopha: John David Eaton was a delegate of ours.

Mr. Reilly: There is value in maintaining a balanced economic structure in which small enterprises, as well as large, can flourish.

Mr. T. Reid: Does that include book publishers?

Mr. Reilly: In short, in fostering a countervailing force in a world increasingly dominated by bigness—big governments, big unions, big business—

Mr. Sopha: Catchy phrases.

Mr. Reilly: Yes, right. The accelerated capital cost allowance proposed by Mr. Benson in his latest budget will do little for small businesses.

In the first place, it applies only to manufacturing and processing industries, not to retailing, service and commercial establishments where most of the small businessmen operate. Secondly, it applies only to machinery and equipment and will be in force only for one year, that is to March 31, 1972, which is too short a time to really stimulate increased investment. Finally, Benson's budget is expected to involve a revenue loss of only \$25 million for the country as a whole. It is hardly a bonanza in terms of Canada's need for investment, growth and development.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, some alternatives on a more generous basis are required if we are going to assist the small businessman, particularly in the retailing, service and commercial areas.

Mr. Lawlor: The government is going to have to set up its own personal income tax to do it, is it not?

An hon. member: Oh, do not be silly.

Mr. Reilly: Now, Mr. Speaker, from a viewpoint of labour, I sincerely believe that we here, in the Province of Ontario, have done more for the people of Ontario than any other

jurisdiction in Canada. Perhaps I should say that it may be than in any other jurisdiction in North America.

Let me remind this House that in 1970 alone, The Department of Labour made a number of improvements in its services to our labour forces, including—

Mr. Lawlor: The member knows what Edith Cavell said about sincerity does he not?

Mr. Reilly: —(a) Reorganization and expansion of the conciliation services.

(b) Improvements in the industrial training programmes.

(c) Addition of an energy branch to the department, and;

(d) The formation of a new uniform building standards branch.

Let me outline briefly the four points:

(a) The major reorganization and expansion of the conciliation services to provide additional mediation assistance has been hailed by both labour and management as an aid in helping the parties achieve settlements.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): How does the member for Lakeshore like that?

Mr. Reilly: (b) Revised and improved training programmes assist employees to upgrade their skills and open doors of opportunity for young people through on-the-job training.

Now, my good friend from Lakeshore, the hon. member there, will be glad to know that at the end of 1970 there were 18,500 apprentices enrolled in the various programmes provided by the industrial training branch.

Mr. Lawlor: Does the member know what Edith Cavell said about sincerity?

Mr. Reilly: It was the last refuge.

Mr. Lawlor: He is not going to shut me up.

Mr. Reilly: Another 5,000 will graduate this year from short term training programmes sponsored by The Department of Labour in partnership with the federal government and industry.

(c) Now, The Department of Labour assumed the responsibility for administering The Energy Act (1964) whose provisions relate to increased safety of persons and property in the petroleum industry.

(d) Uniform building standards branch has assumed the responsibility for the development and implementation of a uniform building standards code for Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many other favourable changes to the labour legislation.

By way of new legislation we have provided equal opportunity for women in our province with The Women's Equal Opportunity Act which became effective in December of last year.

Basically the Act prohibits discrimination based on sex or marital status in recruitment and hiring, training, promotion and dismissal. It also provides for maternity leave as one of its major provisions.

A number of Employment Standards Act amendments which became effective in January of this year directly benefit the working population of our province.

The major benefits of this legislation are that it will ease the tension created by anxiety over security of employment and also assist discharged workers to find new jobs by enabling them to take earlier advantage of various programmes provided by the federal and provincial governments.

Many members of this House were particularly interested in the amendments to The Labour Relations Act which were proclaimed February 15, 1971. They include some changes.

The Labour Relations Board has been given the right to issue cease and desist orders in illegal strikes or lockouts within the construction industry.

A major innovation will permit employer associations to be accredited as bargaining agents in the construction industry. Now, it is to be hoped that accreditation will achieve greater stability and improved collective bargaining relations in the construction industry.

As this new session commences, Mr. Speaker, we are conscious of the major labour negotiations now beginning in the construction industry.

In yesterday's *Globe and Mail*, Wilfred List reminds us of the serious situation confronting labour and management. He writes:

Construction employers in many key centres across Canada are preparing for negotiations with building trade unions. Major interest is focused on Ontario where the fate of a labour-management proposal for province-wide bargaining on a craft basis will be determined within the next month.

The collective bargaining scene in the industry has been a bleak one in recent years, as powerful and entrenched unions battled employers resisting unions' wage

demands. The result has been labour relations chaos from British Columbia to the Atlantic provinces.

In another article on the same page, Professor John Crispo, director of the University of Toronto's centre for industrial relations, and co-author of a major study of collective bargaining in the industry, states:

There is at present no greater challenge to the preservation of our over-all collective bargaining system than its chaotic state in the construction industry.

Both procedurally and substantively, the results of the collective bargaining process in that industry are intolerable.

Substantively, there are wage settlements so far out of line in relation to any reasonable criteria that there is no rhyme or reason to them, save and except for the excessive imbalance of power that plagues the industry.

The article concludes by saying I suppose, "things will have to get worse before they get better."

While commending the new co-operative understanding that has been recently achieved between construction management and the building trade unions, I urge that the government and all members of this House must follow the progress of these important negotiations with care and with concern. Any repetition of the excessive inflationary settlements made by the construction industry in 1969 would have grave consequences for the entire economy of this province.

Let us offer the construction industry our hopes for satisfactory and harmonious settlements in the current negotiations, but let us also remind both contractors and building trade unions of their responsibilities to the public and of the urgent need to exercise restraint in wage increases in order to avoid new inflation which will undermine our efforts to reduce unemployment and try to get our economy back into high gear once more.

Another immediate challenge facing this new Ontario government is the problems confronting all municipalities. Our urban growth and concentration have been dramatic in the past decade and we must realize that they will increase in the years ahead. According to statistics, the population of Ontario is expected to at least double by the end of this century; that would make it well over 15 million people. What is of even more concern is the fact that we can expect that 80 per cent of the people of Ontario will be concentrated in cities and towns.

With urbanization have come all of the problems of providing adequate and reasonably-priced housing, transportation, education, medical care, recreation and generally the quality of life which we so very much want for our families.

One of the significant aspects of the growing concentration of population living in our major cities is that we have the capacity to somewhat alter this trend.

Mr. Trotter: We need a better government. That is what is wrong.

Mr. Reilly: One of the best examples of urbanization is right here in Toronto, I say to the hon. member for Parkdale.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: Perhaps some of the members may have missed the article about Metro Toronto which appeared in *Maclean's* magazine last month. There are some interesting comments in the article. It said:

Metro Toronto is pushing toward a multi-ethnic population of 2.3 million. It mushrooms out from its lakefront roots at an annual growth of three per cent, or 5,000 new residents a month.

In Toronto each year about 50 major new buildings go up in the downtown core; some 23,500 apartment units and 8,300 houses are completed; 75,000 telephones are added to the city's 1.5-million-phone network,

and so on.

In concluding the article it pointed out that expansion has left Toronto facing crises in transportation, in urban renewal and in the fundamental decision-making machinery of municipal government.

One may ask, "What has the provincial government done to help?" Here are some things that the Province of Ontario has done to ease the load for the homeowner: It established a residential property tax reduction programme. It transferred the cost of the administration of justice to the province from the municipalities. It transferred the cost of assessment to the province from the municipalities. It increased the proportion of school expenses that are met from provincial grants. It has broadened the municipal tax base by allowing municipalities to partially tax university properties. It has permitted the assessment and the taxation of shelter in mining communities. It increased subsidies to cities and separated towns for road and street maintenance and construction. It has limited

the cost to the local taxpayer of establishing new water and sewage facilities.

The cost of these measures—I should tell the hon. member for Oshawa—the cost to reduce the property tax burden over the last two years has totalled more than \$400 million.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): How much does that reflect on each property owner?

Mr. Reilly: That is in addition to the normal increase in government support programmes to the municipalities and the school boards.

Many other improvements are contained in the Throne Speech which are worthy of comment, but let me conclude—

Mr. Pilkey: How come we have the highest property tax in any jurisdiction?

Mr. Reilly: Let me conclude by repeating what our new Prime Minister said on March 1, 1971.

The new government will emphasize a greater concern for the individual within our society. The government will provide leadership and direction, meeting specific problems with selective solutions and providing full opportunity for the people of Ontario to solve problems without undue government intervention into their private lives.

I have every confidence, Mr. Speaker, that this new government of Ontario will do just that—and more. As a result, our province shall continue to grow and develop as never before and we shall continue to maintain our leadership as one of the most progressive jurisdictions on this continent.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lambton.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to have this opportunity to second the motion of the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) for the adoption of the Speech from the Throne presented by the Honourable, the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario.

The people of this province are indeed grateful that His Honour the Lieutenant Governor has such a great interest and concern for their well-being. I am confident that the Speech from the Throne shall serve as a guide and inspiration to all of us in our deliberations in the many months ahead.

Some five years ago, the seconder of the Throne Speech, who was recently elevated to The Ministry of Labour (Mr. Carton)

referred to the Robarts government as the "Good Ship Robarts." This reference proved to be an actuality, for in the years that passed, the Robarts administration created much good in this province.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): It is about to sink, that ship.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): The new wave is washed out.

Mr. Pilkey: It is something like the Bona-venture.

Mr. Henderson: In retrospect, I like to think of our new administration as the "Davis Jet Age Government."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Henderson: This is the government that shall be called upon to deal with the great many complex and concerning issues in the most advanced age of our time. I am certain that the new cabinet, under the most capable and inspiring leadership of the honourable Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) shall continue to provide for this province in a most productive and beneficial manner.

I would particularly like to congratulate the new ministers of our government, the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Apps), the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier), the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Winkler), and the three ministers without portfolio (Messrs. Dunlop, Potter and Snow).

I was particularly pleased, Mr. Speaker, with the reference to pollution and the environment in the Speech from the Throne. It is imperative indeed that our present programmes to eliminate pollution are intensified and that new approaches are sought to reach this end.

This government has stated its determination to enforce its policy by court and other actions against those who would pollute our environment. We are the leader in our nation, indeed in North America, on pollution control and I for one wish to see this trend not only continue, but to intensify.

Ontario was the first North American jurisdiction to establish a water pollution control agency, The Ontario Water Resources Commission, which was established in 1956. The 1970 Waste Management Act is the most comprehensive waste management and disposal legislation in the entire country. Similarly, The Air Pollution Control Act is the most comprehensive air pollution control legislation in existence in this country.

We were the first to require motor vehicles to be equipped with pollution control devices, the first to ban general use of DDT and the first Canadian jurisdiction to host The International Conference on Water Pollution in International Waters.

Those are just some of the major steps we have taken in our efforts to fight pollution.

However, to achieve our objectives of even greater controls and more and newer ways of eliminating pollution, we are now about to set up an entirely new department—to be known as the Ontario Department of Environment. Key branches of the Ontario Water Resources Commission, together with specific functions of the environmental health services branch of The Department of Health will be integrated with the existing Department of Energy and Resources Management to achieve this new Department of Environment.

In addition to this government's proposal to introduce a comprehensive bill to deal with all matters related to environmental conservation, this is yet another fight in our fight against pollution. Among the many benefits which will result from the creation of this new department will be the ability to mount a stronger programme to preserve our recreational lakes and rivers so that we do not have to fear a repetition of the mercury pollution such as we had in the St. Clair River in my very own riding.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that the announced intention of the creation of a new Department of Transport and Communications will be welcomed with a great deal of enthusiasm by all the people of Ontario and particularly those in our vast northern portion of the province. An immediate function of this department will be to undertake a review of the costs of transporting goods into and out of northern Ontario. An extremely important matter to the people of our great north.

However, this new department, which is to be made up of the existing Department of Highways, the Department of Transport and the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission, will have responsibilities far beyond only those of Northern Ontario. It will be called upon to achieve a better balance between public transit, commuter services and motor vehicle traffic in general. It will take steps to integrate road, rail, air and water services throughout the province and it will continue to expand and improve our road system.

Most important to urban areas, this department will give special emphasis to the total

transportation system of the larger cities and their surrounding commuter areas by providing assistance to municipalities for the development of transit facilities. There is little need for me to elaborate on the extensive projects already initiated over and above those I have just mentioned which are designed to develop the rich northern sector of our province.

There is one other area, however, that I particularly wish to bring to the attention of this Legislature—for it is an area that has been treated with a great deal of criticism, although totally unfairly, by the opposition and the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Pilkey: Lots of promises but not much substance.

Mr. Henderson: The area I refer to is education, and particularly education in rural Ontario.

Over the past few years there has been mounting pressure on the government for more and more education services to the community. Farm organizations have constantly urged better education for farm youth. In 1963, the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, in its annual brief to the cabinet, deplored, and I quote, "the inequality of opportunity as between urban and rural residents." This was at a time when central high schools had already been established.

In 1964, the Ontario Farmers' Union brief to the cabinet stated in part: "High School Boards should be more directly responsible to ratepayers by being elected at the municipal level."

As late as 1967, the Ontario Farmers' Union brief included the following relevant statement:

If Canadian farms are to be well managed, an adequate level of education is of paramount importance. At the present time, educational levels in agriculture are low. In 1961, only 29 per cent of farm operators had more than elementary school education in comparison with 75 per cent of those engaged in managerial occupations elsewhere in the economy.

The farm youth continue to obtain less formal education than the city youth. Of the boys in the 15-19 age group living on farms in 1961, 52 per cent were attending school, as compared to 66 per cent in cities. This means that the coming generation of farmers, although more educated than the last, will also have less than average education.

In its 1967 brief, the Ontario Federation of Agriculture asked that services in rural school be upgraded to the level of the cities.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have accomplished what has been necessary. We have provided educational equality across this province to the greatest degree possible.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Bunk!

Mr. Henderson: And we have done it with the creation of larger boards so that every child possible would come under a board which would be able to provide the full range of specialized programmes and services which are necessary if children truly are to be given equal opportunity.

However, the hon. members who sit on the opposite side of this Legislature were somehow hoodwinked into believing that at long last they had something legitimate to belly-ache about. They accused us of ridiculous spending on education and they blamed it all on the formation of the larger boards.

I will not bore you with the details of how our costs of education increase came about. The hon. member for Eglinton has, in my opinion, more than adequately spelled out the reasons for the rise in education costs; and they were not the result of the formation of the larger boards, let there be no mistake about that.

While I am speaking of education, I cannot help but think about our education advantages available in Lambton county. I do wish to congratulate the county public and separate school boards on the work that they have put forth for the people of Lambton. In recent weeks there have been rumours that the Watford High School might be discontinued. I hope that the Watford High School can continue in its present capacity, serving the area around that community.

It would appear to me to be not a very wise move to discontinue this school and build onto other schools. Last summer, when the Minister of Education at that time visited the Watford High School, he assured the people of that area that any time the school board decided to renovate or build any addition, provincial grants would be available.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): It must be an election year.

Mr. Henderson: I am confident that that offer still stands.

Mr. Trotter: Election year!

Mr. Henderson: Not last year!

Let us turn for a moment to another matter—the matter of marketing boards.

Production is only one phase of the agricultural industry. Of equal importance is marketing. The present-day Ontario Farm Products Marketing Act had its beginning when the Ontario Legislature passed unanimously in 1937 The Ontario Farm Products Control Act. In 1946 this Act was amended and its name changed to The Ontario Farm Products Marketing Act. Although this Act has been amended from time to time to meet the changing needs of the industry, the objective of the legislation has remained unchanged: "To provide for the control and regulation in any or all respects of the marketing within Ontario of farm products."

The legislation provided for the appointment of a Farm Products Marketing Board to supervise the operations of commodity boards, to ensure that the marketing authority was not being abused, to mediate disagreements between principals and to ensure that producers have the benefit of a sound system of marketing.

Ontario's system of commodity marketing has not only been widely accepted by producers within the province, it has also been the model for similar legislation in other jurisdictions. At the close of the sixties, a total of 19 marketing boards were operating in the province involving the regulated marketing of 37 commodities. The total annual sales volume of these commodities is approximately \$500 million.

The Farm Products Marketing Board has encouraged the development of some rather sophisticated marketing machinery, including the teletype auction system used by the Ontario Hog Producers Marketing Board and the Dutch clock system that is used to determine prices of tobacco and cheese and also calves at the Ontario stockyards.

In 1963 The Farm Products Marketing Act was amended to allow for production control of tobacco. This is the only Ontario commodity subject to production controls. The turkey and chicken broiler plans, however, provide for the establishment of marketing quotas.

In 1968-1969 Ontario took another pioneering step with the introduction of the Ontario Apple Commission, which involves representatives of all aspects of the apple industry in the determination of price and other factors respecting apple marketing.

With respect to marketing, our government has indicated its support of the principle and general interest of Bill C-176, An Act to Establish a National Farm Products Marketing Council and to Authorize the Establishment of National Marketing Agencies for Farm Products.

It is our feeling that this legislation is essential if we are to prevent undue distress and unnecessary disruptions of production and marketing programmes that have been established by producers in many of the provinces, and to bring order and stability to the industry.

However, we are concerned over what would happen if one province or one area of production decided to opt out. This could destroy the efforts of the participating provinces. In my opinion the national board, in order to avoid harmful consequences of such an occurrence, should have the power to make such a province either dispose of its produce within its own borders or into export trade. Otherwise, they could dump their surplus into the other provinces and ruin the very climate of stability the national board is trying to establish.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Conservatives in Ottawa are holding that bill up. They are filibustering.

Mr. Henderson: It would be advantageous to have the right of appeal which exists in the Ontario marketing plan included in C-176, because this is a basic individual right. The hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) presented these views to the standing committee on agriculture of the House of Commons in its January 25, 1971, public hearing of this bill.

Mr. Nixon: He had better talk to his Tory friends if the member wants to make that bill law.

Mr. Henderson: The Lambton branch of the National Farm Union stand on this Bill C-176 suggests it should be amended in accordance with the following eight points:

1. We recommend Bill C-176 be amended in such a way as to make the operations of the proposed National Farm Products Marketing Council fully accountable to Parliament for its actions and activities.

2. We recommend the members appointed to the National Farm Products Marketing Council be made for a fixed period of not less than five years and not

more than 10 years, subject to review and renewal of a further period of service at the expiration of their appointed terms.

3. We recommend the powers to license or issue permits for food imports be vested in the council.

4. In the establishment of marketing agencies by the National Farm Products Marketing Council, we recommend no agency be organized before the wishes of the majority of the primary producers are clearly assessed.

5. We recommend the operating costs of the farm products marketing agencies appointed by the Governor-in-Council be totally financed by the federal treasury rather than out of the proceeds of the sales of farm products.

6. We recommend that a guaranteed price formula based on farm production targets and average costs of production be provided for each regulated product to be marketed under Bill C-176 and that the annual negotiation of production targets and price reviews take place between the National Farmers' Union and the respective marketing agencies.

7. We recommend the inclusion of cattle under Bill C-176.

8. We recommend Bill C-176 be so amended as to safeguard against production of a regulated product.

I would like to digress for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to deal with yet another most important matter.

More than 170,000 acres of submarginal agricultural lands have been acquired by ARDA and transferred to such other public uses as forestry, recreation, wildlife production and water conservation. ARDA provides for an additional one-third grant to municipalities for drainage works constructed under The Drainage Act of Ontario.

Total ARDA grants paid until March 31, 1970 amounted to \$6,934,873. One thousand two hundred and forty Ontario residents have sold to ARDA a total of 128,000 acres of marginal farm units and have either retired out of agriculture or moved into another area of employment. Much of the land so acquired has been attached to adjacent farms under our farm enlargement programme, and to date approximately 1,000 improved economic units have resulted.

Eight community pastures, consisting of 24,869 acres, have been established to serve adjacent farmers with extra grazing land at a

nominal fee. Two of these community pastures are located on Indian lands and they are operated by Indian people.

ARDA places high emphasis on water supplies and water conservation. One hundred and thirty-three dams for rural water supply have been built by municipalities or conservation authorities, which have received grants amounting to \$7,930,884. In addition, 3,486 farm wells and 1,151 farm ponds have been provided with ARDA financial assistance.

More than 7,000 Ontario farmers have received ARDA assistance to remove old fences, providing larger fields for more efficient use of farm machinery. A further 3,400 people, both farm and rural non-farm, have received direct benefits through increased income from ARDA development projects. These include expanded industrial milk processing plants, tourist industry developments, a revitalized maple syrup industry, expanded rural industries and improved livestock marketing facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the provision of the capital grants programme for Ontario farmers in the Speech from the Throne was indeed welcome news. Equally welcome was the statement made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food who outlined in detail the important aspects of these grants.

Those of us who come from rural areas are quite aware of the benefits to the thousands of Ontario farmers from the 12-year capital grants programme introduced in 1967 and we are also aware of the need to expand this programme to meet the changes in times and conditions in our agricultural community.

And these conditions have had a decided effect on the cost of farm improvements. Consequently, it is most gratifying that this government has undertaken to increase the maximum amount of the grant available to any one farmer from \$2,500 to \$3,000. It is also only logical that where a partnership of two farmers has been formed, and because that partnership in fact is a partnership of two farms, then the amount of the grant should be \$6,000 as announced by the hon. minister yesterday.

The basing of a capital grant on a straight 40 per cent of the cost is a logical and sensible amendment to the original procedure of varying percentages.

The third point made by the minister, that the farmer himself can now decide whether he will use all of his own capital

allotment for a single project, or if he wishes spread it around over several classes or projects, is equally logical and sensible.

I was pleased too, Mr. Speaker, that the government has included a number of additional items in the classifications of farm drainage and farm structure. Maple syrup structures; various piping, plumbing, stabling; pumping equipment; bulk milk tanks; fixed livestock scales; fixed wastage disposal systems; electrical wiring and natural gas installations other than farm dwellings; and bridges and culverts; are indeed very important to all farmers and should be included.

The removal of the old orchards and the inclusion of cost of piping, plumbing and pumping equipment for farm ponds and wells will help many farmers I personally know in upgrading their operations.

I will watch with great interest, Mr. Speaker, the two new classifications which have been established—farm vacation hosting and removal of diseased and dead elm trees. The recently demonstrated desire of urban dwellers to spend summer vacations on farms can prove to be indeed a very profitable business for the farm people. It is essential that moneys are available to farmers to improve their homes for proper housing of this new type of vacationer.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Henderson: I will get to that. I, for one, am extremely pleased about the provision for the removal of diseased and dead elm trees. Unfortunately, these once beautiful and stately trees are today marring the beauty of our province. Their removal cannot come too soon for me.

Mr. Speaker, in 1968 we introduced residential property tax reduction legislation to reduce the amount of municipal taxes levied on residential properties.

Any separately assessed residential property is eligible for a reduction in municipal taxes in an amount of \$30 plus 10 per cent of the average residential taxes in the municipality for the previous year. This reduction is not to exceed 50 per cent of the municipal and school taxes on the property.

In 1964 and 1965, Mr. Speaker, the Ontario government introduced the provincial ownership plan of providing for the construction and operation of water treatment plants and sewage treatment plants for municipalities with the costs being recovered on a usage basis. This extremely important programme is being administered by the

OWRC. The plants are operated entirely at cost and are the property of the province.

When the programme was initiated, municipalities were required to provide the trunk sewers and watermains necessary to connect the homes using the services. In June, 1967, the government announced an extension of this policy to allow for adequate water and sewerage facilities. Because the cost of sewer trunks and watermains proved to be a heavy burden in some of the smaller municipalities, the government indicated that it would now include these services as well, along with the treatment plants undertaken in this provincially-financed construction programme, to be operated at cost by the OWRC on behalf of the municipality.

On October 16, 1969, two further financial programmes to assist municipalities in projects related to sewerage and waterworks were announced by the government. Under this programme, provincial assistance is provided in an attempt to ensure that the cost of a water and sewerage works in a municipality will not exceed an average home charge of \$100 per year for water and \$120 per year for sewerage. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, for each and every town and village in Lambton county will benefit from this.

Mr. Nixon: Everybody's taxes will go up by \$220 a year each.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Plus frontage charge and connecting charge.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Just keep quiet! Pipe down!

Mr. Henderson: There are several other significant policies that I wish to bring to the attention of this House.

Expansion of farm management services: The emphasis in recent years has been on improved farm management technology. In 1969 a new management tool, Canfarm, which incorporated modern data processing techniques, was introduced to 70 farmers.

In 1970 more than 700 farmers will be enrolled and the plan is to expand it rapidly in the future. In 1969 approximately 50 farm management specialists were added to the departmental staff to expand the personal counselling service to farmers.

Veterinary services: The programme is being expanded in area and in amount of financial assistance, effective April. It will now cover the Bruce Peninsula and Renfrew county as well as northern Ontario and a large section of southeastern Ontario. Finan-

cial assistance is being raised from \$5,000 to \$8,000 per year and the mileage allowance for farm calls from five to seven cents per mile.

My riding of Lambton, Mr. Speaker, has many assets, some natural and some created.

First, Lambton county is situated at the southwestern corner of Ontario in a very rich cash crop area. The county is approximately 35 miles wide by 50 miles long. The total land area is 720,000 square acres, with approximately 600,000 square acres of this being occupied farmland.

On the north is Lake Huron and on the west River St. Clair, for a total of 80 miles lake and river frontage which is one of the best resort areas in the Province of Ontario. It has many other natural waterways which the local conservation authority are attempting to harness.

It also joined hands with the city of Sarnia some 15 years ago and constructed a modern county court house, jail and also county buildings, one of the first areas in Ontario to have these modern facilities. It also has the Lambton Twilight Haven, the county home for the aged, which was a joint effort between the city of Sarnia and the county of Lambton, situated on the westerly limits of Petrolia. Just last year they opened a second county rest home which is called the North Lambton Rest Home and is situated in the town of Forest.

These two homes have a total bed capacity of close to 300. It is also blessed with the CEE Hospital which is situated in the town of Petrolia. This came about from the generosity of some of Petrolia's early citizens.

Lambton has the finest network of county roads and provincial highways that there is any place in the province of Ontario. St. Clair Parkway was created by this government some five years ago, and they are now operating several parks plus a golf course. They are hoping to construct a marina this year. The West Lambton water line, which will serve Sarnia and all down-river municipalities, including the village of Brigden, is well underway.

Several urban municipalities have plans underway to construct sewerage disposal plants which will improve our local environment. As most people know, municipal drainage is a big item in the county of Lambton and they have received two-thirds of the cost of these drains from the senior governments. The government of Ontario has also assisted our farmers in their farm water supplies, also

in the capital improvements of farm buildings and tile drainage.

I did not mention earlier that Lambton is blessed with "Chemical Valley," which is situated immediately south of the city of Sarnia, and other major industries down-river that have supplied employment to a great number of Lambton citizens.

But it has brought problems at the same time. Most of the members of this House are acquainted with the problems of mercury in St. Clair River.

Of recent months we have been confronted with another problem—the disposal of by-products from chemical and other industries in the area. These have been disposed of in deep wells known as disposal wells. This has caused a great worry to the farmers of Lambton, and it is their contention that this could interfere with their farm water supply. I agree with the farmers' belief in this regard, and suggest that the government change this method of disposal, or guarantee to replace the farm water supply in the case that it should become polluted. I am sure the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) is in full agreement in this regard.

We have also many small businessmen serving Lambton, supplying employment for several citizens of the county. Due to the operation of our large chain stores, these businesses are in jeopardy. I would suggest that price wars such as we have witnessed here in Ontario within recent months are not for the good of the people but for the chain stores themselves, and in due course will put our small businessmen out of business and thereby remove the competition that now exists. Some form of government legislation should be introduced to prevent this happening.

The government is determined to assure the adequacy of our energy supplies for the future. It will ensure that the energy is used as efficiently as possible and that its use will not adversely affect the environment, health or life. The government will strive to maintain a choice between the various types of energy to match them with those uses for which they are best suited. To this end, the committee on government productivity has been asked to review the function, structure, operation, financing and objectives of the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario.

The committee has also been asked to advise the government with respect to the long-range energy requirements of the province.

Ontario Hydro acquired land some five years ago in Moore township in Lambton county for the right of way around the Lambton generating stations in September, 1969. Some of these property owners were contacted by Hydro regarding settlement. I contacted the chairman of Hydro on January 25, 1971. He again promised to contact them, but to this date he has made no contact.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): I have not heard either.

Mr. Henderson: I would suggest Hydro have their toe nails trimmed enough to cripple them up so they might realize the position they are placing the farmers in.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Hear, hear. That is the first intelligent thing the member has said.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): It needs more than its toe nails trimmed. Did the member write that himself? Maybe Hydro had better get its hair cut too. That is a terrifying threat for Hydro, to have its toe nails trimmed. How about manicuring them at the same time?

Mr. Henderson: That is right. Does the member want me to repeat it? I would suggest that Hydro have their toe nails trimmed enough to cripple them up so they might realize the position they are placing the farmers in.

The Department of Highways has also served several farmers in Plympton township with expropriation intentions, without any guarantee regarding farm drainage. I am sure every member of this House realizes that drainage is a must in Lambton. It is my belief that expropriation authorities should have to show their complete intention before starting proceedings.

Three quarters of our soil is very heavy clay, most of which requires artificial drainage. Our expected frost-free days are approximately 140. We have an annual rainfall on an average of 28 inches, of which approximately five inches is snow.

According to the 1966 census we have 4,000 farms, of which 2,775 were listed as commercial farms; in other words, farms with over a balance of \$25,000.

The population of the county, including the villages and towns, is approximately 50,000. In 1966, the agricultural income of the county was estimated at \$54,095,000, of which \$29 million was from field crops and vegetable production, and \$25 million from livestock and livestock production.

In that same year, from the *Canada Year Book*, we note that the agricultural production of Prince Edward Island was \$36 million; Nova Scotia, \$55 million; New Brunswick, \$53 million; and Ontario had \$1,232,275,000. The total for Canada was \$4,233,230,000. Ontario had 25 per cent of all Canada.

The riding of Lambton is also blessed with two Indian reserves: Kettlepoint in the north, situated on Lake Huron, with some of the best fishing and summer resort area in Ontario off its shores; Walpole Island Indian Reserve is an island in River St. Clair, connected to the mainland by a modern bridge which was officially opened last May 4 by the then Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme).

Walpole Island was also the first Indian reserve in Ontario to have self-government, due to their own initiative and their geographic location. Both of these reserves have a great future.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other matter that I wish to bring before this House. It is a matter of extreme importance to the members and to this Legislature. It is a matter which has more than often resulted in a great deal of doubt and confusion.

I make reference to the members of the two parties in the opposition to this government. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest difficulties is that certain—

Mr. Lawlor: Do not be inflammatory now. We are listening with anticipation.

Mr. Henderson: Now just listen!

Perhaps one of the biggest difficulties is that certain hon. members of the opposition are not too well informed on the rules. There is a saying that a biased critic will always find something to try to sharpen the edge of his tongue on, and especially so when he is ill-informed.

Mr. Nixon: That is what the member is doing, eh?

Mr. Henderson: It has been said many times that a good government requires good opposition. In this respect, Mr. Speaker, it is fortunate that our government has learned over the years to provide its own sort of opposition.

Mr. Nixon: Like the member.

Mr. Henderson: It would have been disastrous to have relied solely on the existing opposition parties.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The member means liabilities; not opposition, just liabilities.

Mr. Henderson: In the years that I have sat here and listened, I have heard some—

Mr. Lawlor: It was only 44 votes was it not?

Mr. Henderson: In the years that I have sat here and listened—

Mr. Nixon: I hear the member lost a lot of Tory support because he insisted all the delegates support the Premier.

Mr. Henderson: Do not worry. We are very happy. I have heard the member's party say they wish they had him for a leader.

In the years that I have sat here and listened, I have heard some of the most ill-conceived and ill-prepared opposition material imaginable. I sometimes wonder if even they are fully aware of their intentions and objectives. I think not.

I suggest to the hon. members who are in opposition to this government that perhaps they should first of all bone-up on the fundamentals of basic opposing and get down to doing the job they are being paid to do. Perhaps then, sir, this fourth session of the 28th Parliament will prove more fruitful and beneficial to the people of this great province.

Mr. Nixon moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, we will carry on with the Throne debate tomorrow and we will all be waiting in eager anticipation for the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Nixon) hearty and enthusiastic support of that great speech.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at 4:35 o'clock p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Government proposals re housing in Ontario, statement by Mr. Grossman	101
Specific increase in provincial dollars to support new housing initiative, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Nixon, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Singer, Mr. Trotter	102
Three-month delay in taking up federal \$17 million to counteract unemployment, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	107
New steps to control drug problems, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Sopha	107
Government review re extension of aid to separate schools, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Nixon, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Pitman	109
Reassessment of export of hydro-electric power to Boise-Cascade, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Lewis, Mr. T. P. Reid	110
Cabinet reviewing Spadina Expressway decision, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis	110
Possible amendments to automobile insurance legislation, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Lewis	111
Closure of refinery at Cobalt, questions to Mr. Bernier, Mr. Lewis, Mr. De Monte	111
Safety problem with children's toy "Clacker", questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Meen, Mr. Trotter	112
Interest free Ottawa loans to Ontario for housing and unemployment, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Sargent	112
Rejection of proposition to eliminate grade 13, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Deans, Mr. T. Reid	113
Closure of refineries at Cobalt, questions to Mr. Bernier, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Ferrier	113
Increase in comfort allowance for senior citizens in homes for aged, question to Mr. Wells, Mr. Carruthers	113
Disciplinary proceedings against OPP officers re Duke case, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Singer, Mr. Shulman	114
Cadmium levels in water and air, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Burr	114
Presenting reports of OISE and Ontario Arts Council, Mr. Welch	115
Presenting report of Law Society legal aid branch, Mr. A. F. Lawrence	115
Motion re select committee on report on standing committees, Mr. Carruthers, agreed to ..	115
Administration of Justice Act, 1968, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, first reading	116
County Judges Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, first reading	116
Crown Witnesses Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, first reading	116
Jurors Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, first reading	116
Justices of the Peace Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, first reading	116
Summary Convictions Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, first reading	117
Appointment of a commissioner to investigate administrative decisions and acts of officials of the government of Ontario and its agencies and to define the commissioner's powers and duties, bill to provide for, Mr. Singer, first reading	117
Control and regulation of snowmobiles, bill to provide for, Mr. Shulman, first reading	117
Throne speech debate, Mr. Reilly, Mr. Henderson	117
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Nixon, agreed to	133
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Davis, agreed to	133



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, April 2, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

**(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 2, 1971

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This morning, our early morning visitors are students, in the west gallery, from Nelles School in Grimsby, and later we are to be joined by students, in both galleries, who come from Eastwood Collegiate Institute in Kitchener.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce this morning that my department has produced a new and much-needed publication called "Fishermen", about mercury and fish. This 12-page booklet, which will be distributed to the members, provides concise and non-technical answers to frequently asked questions about this very important subject.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Can the minister tell us what he is going to do with the \$25 million?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: For assisting us in this publication I would like to extend my thanks to The Department of Health, Energy and Resources Management, and Tourism and Information.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce the continuation of financial assistance in the form of interest-free demand loans under The Fisheries Loan Act, 1970, for the current year. Loans were made last year to fishermen on Lake St. Clair and in the Wabigoon River area as well as a few in southern Lake Huron, western Lake Erie and the lower Ottawa and St. Lawrence Rivers, where mercury contamination had required the closing of the commercial fishing seasons on important species of fish.

Loans will be made in accordance with a revised formula to be announced. Eligibility for loans will depend on the applicability of the Act during the current year and will be related to the availability of other forms of assistance. The continuation of The Fisheries Loan Act programme will mainly assist those seriously affected fishermen planning legal action against polluters.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.
Oral questions.

MERCURY CONTAMINATION OF LAKES AND RIVERS

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, further to the statement of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, can he explain why no assistance to those game fishermen in northwestern Ontario was a part of his report? Does he have a special programme similar to the one that assists fishermen in the Great Lakes that would apply to those people who make their living either through fishing or sport fishing in northwestern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, if I understand the question of the Leader of the Opposition he is referring to loans to fishing camps, in that correct?

Mr. Nixon: Yes, people who have lost their business because of the mercury pollution.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Last year loans were given to camp operators where the sports fishing was closed, and the only area where sports fishing was closed last year was on Lake St. Clair for a period of about five to six weeks. Today no area in this province is closed to sports fishing. Those areas that are closed are closed to commercial fishing; some of the areas cover all species and some only certain species. Also, as the hon. leader knows, an announcement was made by my colleague the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman) whereby fishing camp operators and other related businesses will receive loans. This was made, I believe, about two days ago.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Would it not be true to say, however, that in the sport fishing camps in northwestern Ontario, even though there is no designation that restricts fishing, the business has completely disappeared since the fishing-for-fun programme has been inaugurated, in which anybody who catches a fish up there is not supposed to eat it? Is it not true that many of the outfitters have completely gone out of business and in fact will not open this spring?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the statement of the hon. minister.

Mr. Singer: Which minister do you disagree with?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It was quite true last year there were certain camp operators in northwestern Ontario who did have less business than the previous year. It was not entirely all due to the question of mercury. There was, of course, a certain amount due to mercury.

Mr. Nixon: The minister has talked to Mr. Lamb about this.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: However, I would like to say to the hon. member that at the Sportsmen's Show this year—and the hon. Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs, the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier) attended the Sportsmen's Show, and some of the Sportsmen's Shows in Chicago and other areas—the interest was very great and they are looking forward to a good tourist year.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: May I ask the minister if he or his department has considered buying out those tourist camps that are in these fishing-for-fun areas—buying them out at a reasonable price so that they may relocate in other areas where the mercury contamination is not to be found at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to send to the hon. member a statement made by the Minister of Trade and Development a few days ago whereby assistance will be given to fishing-camp operators.

Mr. Nixon: Inadequate like the housing policy.

Mr. T. P. Reid: That is not going to solve anything.

PROVINCIAL AUDITOR'S REPORT

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question, of the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Following the report from the auditor that he is not satisfied with the accounting of the disposition of funds during the last year in The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, can the minister tell me what steps he is taking to correct this situation?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker. That report of the auditor, I believe, was for a period of several months ago—the end of

1969, I believe—and was published last year. I have spoken to the auditor since I received the report and noted that, and I am checking with my own staff to see what steps have been taken to correct the situation.

I think the auditor was good enough to point out in his report that the department was a growing one—developing—and that some of the procedures were not as complete as they should be. We are taking steps to see that they are corrected. I trust his next report will confirm that.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Am I then to understand the reason for the inadequacy of the control of the expenditure is simply that the department was new?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not altogether certain, because the report was only made available a very few days ago. I think that is the reason. I think the auditor made some comment to that effect, but I have not yet completed my inquiry and got all the facts I should like to have. I know I shall have it soon and I am certainly of the attitude that if there were some failures in procedures in accounting, they shall be corrected.

REVISION OF OMA FEES

Mr. Nixon: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Health.

In his negotiations, either directly or through his advisers, with the Ontario Medical Association, has there been some discussion of the possibility of agreeing on a plan similar to the one negotiated with the medical profession in the Province of Newfoundland by the government of that province in which in certain instances, where payments to individual practitioners reach very large levels, there would in fact be a sliding scale reducing those payments?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary. Would the minister undertake to consider introducing that topic at the discussions that are presently under way on the establishment of a new medical rate?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Was there any discussion or negotiation with the medical profession in accordance with the obligations of The Health Services Insurance

Act prior to the new schedule of fees going into effect?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I am so advised by the previous minister, Mr. Speaker. I take care to use the word "discussions" rather than "negotiations".

Mr. MacDonald: Would the minister inform the House as to the nature or the result of those discussions?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, the nature of the result was an assessment as to the basis of the new free schedule, the general policy purposes behind its amendments and an assessment of why different rates were being shifted and different fee burdens or different fee payments were being downgraded and others upgraded. As I say, their discussions were not negotiations as if it were a collective agreement.

Mr. MacDonald: A further supplementary: Was the department satisfied with the explanations that it got from the OMA?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I cannot answer that in detail, Mr. Speaker, but the new fee schedule, as I understand it, has some very good principles behind it. Namely, I am advised that there is an effort to shift the remunerations received through fees by doctors toward the family practice and general practitioners, at the same time allowing the fees of certain specialists not to reach the levels they have previously reached.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Two supplementaries, if I may: First, could the minister give an example of one of the specialties where the fees are not going to be as high? Just one?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, I cannot this morning. I have heard them mentioned but my vocabulary as of this point in the field of medicine is inadequate.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps the minister would let us know.

The second supplementary, if I may: Does the government intend to pay the full schedule of fees beginning May 1?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, that will be an announcement of government policy to be made in due course.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

PICKERING NUCLEAR STATION

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management:

Can he give the House a further report on the development at Pickering? The critical point of the reactor has been reached; when can we expect first power, since it is already substantially behind the projected date when the project was announced?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, if the commissioning tests proceed normally, with only the usual number of problems encountered, we should have power in July.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Might I ask when the minister says "the usual number of problems," does he mean the usual number comparable to the type that we found at Douglas Point, or with a standard generator?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Some of these problems were encountered at Douglas Point; they are mainly mechanical problems. We hope to have full rated output at that plant in July.

Mr. Speaker: Has the Leader of the Opposition completed? The member for York South.

POTENTIAL EMPLOYMENT IN HOUSING PROGRAMME

Mr. MacDonald: In the absence of the Minister of Trade and Development, may I address a question to the provincial Treasurer?

How many more new jobs—new jobs—are going to be created by the government's housing programme?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): I think that is a question that should wait for the Minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, since this is part of the whole economic development of the province and an integral part of The Department of Treasury and Economics, which is now my major preoccupation—and I look forward to it with some pleasure—I suggest to the minister that he, as the major spokesman for the government—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South—

Mr. MacDonald: —is not in a position to state how many more new jobs are going to be created.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South may raise it as a point of order or some point, if he wishes, but not by way of statement, because the minister may answer or not answer as he sees fit.

Mr. MacDonald: May I ask a further question? Can the minister explain the discrepancy between this government's contention that each new housing unit has a multiplier effect of 4.8 jobs, whereas the federal government, with jurisdiction over housing across the whole country, says that the multiplier effect is 0.7?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I read that statement in the paper this morning, Mr. Speaker. I would just make this comment, that those particular figures are quoted from remarks by the leader of the New Democratic Party and I would think that one would want to examine that particular quotation with some care before one commented on it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the provincial Treasurer whether he is denying the fact that Mr. Andras contends that the multiplier effect is 0.7?

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of University Affairs): On a different base.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I deny nothing, Mr. Speaker. I simply point out that those of us on this side of the House have tended not always to accept what the leader of the New Democratic Party, past or present, says is true.

Mr. MacDonald: A further question of the provincial Treasurer: Can the provincial Treasurer indicate when the tenders will be let for the private development in the government's housing programme and, secondly, when the new building construction will start?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is a question which should probably be asked of the Minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. MacDonald: I thought this was government policy.

HYDRO RATE INCREASES

Mr. MacDonald: I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. MacDonald: In view of the rumours with regard to the possible increase in hydro rates, can the minister assure the House that there will be a moratorium on the increases in hydro rates until the newly announced government study has been completed, with regard to Hydro, by the productivity improvement committee?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, the rumours to which the hon. member refers are the result of some remarks that were made at a recent Hydro convention to the effect that there would be an annual increase.

I would assume that the annual increase would be announced some time in the late fall of each year so I would assume that this committee, to which the hon. member refers, will consider hydro rates and all the ramifications of Hydro as indicated in the Throne Speech, before there is any announced rate increase.

Mr. MacDonald: Do I conclude from what the minister has stated that we can expect at least the initial report of the new review of Hydro and energy production and rates prior to next fall?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I do not want to tie down any dates or time when a report will come as a result of a review of Hydro. I would think that before any future hydro rate increases are put into effect, as mentioned at this particular meeting, that certainly the productivity committee will meet to consider all the ramifications of Hydro.

Mr. MacDonald: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will the government at least—and preferably the House as well as the government—be made acquainted with the information that the committee gets prior to Hydro's announcing a rate increase or are we all going to have to come into the picture after the facts of the new increase?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I would assume that, prior to any new rate increases being put into effect, this committee—and I am only guessing really because this is government policy and timetables are certainly not final as yet—I would think that consideration by this committee and the steps that are to be taken as indicated in the Throne Speech, will have commenced. Therefore, I would assume that any hydro rate increases planned would be postponed, certainly, until that committee reports.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, that is a very interesting statement. We will bear it in mind.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview has a supplementary?

Mr. Singer: No, a new question.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for York South completed his questions? If so, the Attorney General and Minister of Justice has the answer to a question asked yesterday.

CHARGES AGAINST OPP OFFICERS

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received several questions from the hon. member for Downsview respecting certain charges that have been laid against two officers of the Ontario Provincial Police. While I did answer several of the questions—

Mr. Shulman: Incorrectly.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —there were particular areas where I think I undertook to provide further information and I wish to provide that information now.

First of all, I think the hon. member mentioned three officers. Charges under The Police Act have been laid against only two. I would assume the third officer the hon. member might be referring to was one, Wilkinson, in which there was—

Mr. Singer: Perhaps I could assist the minister. The third officer I was referring to was the one mentioned by Mr. Justice Grant in his report.

Mr. Shulman: Wilkinson.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, I looked at that very carefully, as obviously my predecessor did, and I could see, at this time anyway, no grounds for a charge under The Police Act in respect of that particular individual. There was some question as to the belief by the commissioner, I believe, of what that particular officer had indicated and, apparently, there was no way under The Police Act that we could find that a charge could be laid against him.

But charges have been laid against Superintendent Wilson and Staff Superintendent Rodgers pursuant to The Police Act. The charge against Rodgers is to be heard on April 6 and that against Wilson on May 3. As I indicated yesterday, these two men are still suspended from active duty but they are being paid during the suspension and until the disposition of the charges.

The delay in the bringing of these matters to trial arises primarily from the fact that the former government did not feel that it would be appropriate to proceed with these charges until after the completion of the inquiry and the publication of the report of the commissioner, the hon. Mr. Justice Campbell Grant. If my hon. friend remembers, the publication of that report took place, I believe, just before Christmas—around the middle of December anyway.

Mr. Shulman: This is April now.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am sure that it will be apparent to the hon. member that the laying of such charges during that inquiry would not seem to be in the interests of the fair trial of those charges or the proper disposition of the inquiry either. After the charges had been laid and the matter had already proceeded toward trial, adjournments were sought by the two men themselves, through their own counsel, and the government of the day did not oppose those adjournments.

The former government and this government have not actively sought any of the adjournments, but we have not seen fit to oppose those which were requested by the accused themselves. As I indicated—

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): What is the difference between the two governments?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: There are quite a few differences between the former government and this government. As I indicated in my answer yesterday, the charges will be heard before a county court judge pursuant to the regulations made under The Police Act. The question as to what charges should be laid against which persons and by whom such charges should be heard was first considered by my predecessor immediately following the disposition of the departmental estimates before the standing committee during the last session. But with the establishment of the inquiry, all of the decisions respecting these matters were postponed until the completion of that inquiry, for the reasons which I have just indicated.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister in light of his answer: Is it not true that charges were laid under The Police Act immediately after the conclusion of the hearing of the estimates of The Department of Justice, sometime last June?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am informed that the charges were laid before the inquiry but after the hearing of the estimates.

Mr. Singer: That is "yes". The minister answers "yes" to the question. Well then, if the minister will backtrack, why has it been necessary for the government to delay four months beyond the tabling of Mr. Justice Grant's report in dealing with these matters?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I thought I had just indicated that adjournments arose after the matter had proceeded to court trial; adjournments were requested by the accused's counsel themselves.

Mr. Singer: I see. Is it not true that the government passed the new regulations allowing the hearing of these charges by a judge of the county court only some time within the last six or eight weeks?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I will have to find out the actual date of the regulations for the hon. member. I have not got this information.

Mr. Singer: Is it not true that when the charges were originally laid they would normally have been heard, and could only have been heard, by senior officials of the OPP?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: At the time the charges were laid? Yes, that is true. It was considered, quite frankly, that senior officials of the Ontario Provincial Police should not be sitting in judgment upon senior officials of the Ontario Provincial Police.

Mr. Shulman: When did the minister get that change of heart?

Mr. Singer: Yes, there is no question about that. Could the minister advise us to whether or not these hearings scheduled to start on April 6 will be open to the public?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I will take that as notice. I have not considered that matter at all. My assumption had been that they would be open, or are to be open, but I had better check on that.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I think that is very important.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The innuendo there is that the hon. member thinks they should be open?

Mr. Singer: Indeed it is. Indeed it is. Is it fair to conclude, Mr. Speaker, from the remarks of the Attorney General—

Mr. MacDonald: The little man is having a big day.

Mr. Singer: —that the government has chosen to ignore the recommendations of Mr. Justice Campbell Grant insofar as charging a third senior officer of the Ontario Provincial Police?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No. That is a totally wrong assumption.

Mr. Speaker: I think another supplementary on this from this member will be sufficient.

Mr. Singer: All right. This will be the last one. Is it fair to conclude that since the disciplinary proceedings are governed by a limitation period of six months, the government let that period slip by and now is unable to take action against the third senior police officer?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has a supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: One question: Does the government intend to lay a charge of perjury against Mr. Wilkinson?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am considering a number of things arising from that report of the royal commissioner and decisions along this line will be announced in due course.

Mr. Nixon: Is that a threat?

Mr. Shulman: One more question in light of that comment: Does the government intend to lay any charges against any member of this Legislature?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: There are a few I would very dearly love to, but that is another matter that is under very active consideration.

Mr. MacDonald: That feeling is mutual.

Mr. Singer: The minister probably missed the limitation period again.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

DREDGING OF ST. CLAIR RIVER

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Can the minister guarantee this Legislature that the information picked up by his officials in their visit to Sweden indicated that the dredging of rivers to clean up a mercury situation is both feasible and safe?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I indicated a few days ago to the Legislature that I would give this hon. member or the hon. member for Humber (Mr. Ben), a summary of the information we have regarding reclamation methods. Certainly, I do not intend at this time to give a personal guarantee to the hon. member that such projects or reclamation processes will be effective. This still has an ingredient of experiment in it—it has never been tried before—therefore a guarantee at this time is certainly an unreasonable request.

Mr. T. P. Reid: May I ask by way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the dredging of the St. Clair River by the Ontario government part of a programme in which it is participating with the federal government to dredge that area, not for mercury but for transportation reasons?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the Ontario government at this point working with the federal government in dredging in the St. Clair River—specifically in the St. Clair River—but I could tell the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that any dredging we do involving mercury will involve the federal government.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

PLANS TO OFFER DENTAL CARE

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health.

Will he explain what action his department proposes to take on the recommendations of the ad hoc committee on dental auxiliaries by the federal government that dental care in its broadest sense be offered to all Canadians incorporating the same principles of quality control and financing as medical care as soon as feasible; and more specifically, will they start this year with younger children and encompass new age groups on an annual basis until school-leaving-age children have all been included, and at which time they could include the whole population?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I think, Mr. Speaker, the government can accept the first principle completely, the key words being “when feasible.”

In the department at the moment there is under very active consideration acceptance of the second point made by the hon. member with regard to a beginning to be made with smaller children.

Mr. Ferrier: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I could ask the minister if they propose to amend The Dental Technicians Act so that certain functions could be performed by the auxiliaries in the dental care field and if consideration is being given to the training of these auxiliaries?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, consideration is being given to these recommendations and also, of course, to the recommendations that have not been implemented in the report of the Committee on the Healing Arts.

At the moment the problem is to sort out how to control, and what bodies should control, the assessing of the particular medical-dental disciplines. So that is very much on the table. Consideration is being given not only to this question in relation to this particular discipline, but also to the whole spectrum of medical-dental disciplines.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question of the minister, I wonder if he is contemplating changes in the regulations governing The Health Services Insurance Act to ensure that dental disorders brought about by medical problems are governed by the Act?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The word “considering” is the key one here, Mr. Speaker. I think broadly that certainly we are considering the whole integration of dental care in a total health programme, and I come back to the beginning that the key words here relate to feasibility.

Mr. Deans: May I ask another supplementary question? Will the minister undertake to make a statement to the House during this session as to what specific proposals are likely to be undertaken in regard to ensuring that dental disorders as a result of medical problems are covered by the Act?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, I think I can undertake that.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

FUNDING OF HOUSING PROGRAMME

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the hon. Minister of Trade and Development.

Can the minister respond now to the question I asked him yesterday setting out specifically the new initiatives of dollars and starts in the housing programme announced in the Speech from the Throne?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, I do not deny at all that one could have said I was slightly confused by the figures.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I saw the handsome face of the Leader of the Opposition on television last night and he said it was a statistician's nightmare—and I agree. That is why I read the figures; obviously they are very difficult to follow.

I asked, if possible, for my staff to get me a set of figures that was more easily readable by those of us who are not as brilliant as some of those across the way.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When I checked them this morning, Mr. Speaker, I found those figures are actually in the statement, but perhaps this will help clear it up a little more.

The amount of new housing money from the banks is \$100 million.

Mr. Nixon: We heard that. The minister has read it before.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Certainly the member heard it; it is in the statement.

From CMHC—\$210 million, which is in the statement.

From OHC—\$222 million, which is in the statement.

The total amount is \$532 million.

The opposition keeps asking if it is new money. It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that what they are trying to elicit from me is whether the \$145 million, which is a hold-over from commitments made last year, can be considered new money.

If the Leader of the Opposition will read *Hansard*, he will find out that I told him at that time, in answer to his question, that \$145 million is a holdover from commitments made the previous year. There is no secret about that. The fact still remains that half a billion dollars is going to be injected into the economy.

Mr. Speaker, if it gives the opposition any great satisfaction or if it will help them sleep better tonight that I say there is \$145 million less—that it is not \$532 million, it is \$400 million—all right, let them say that. It suits us, so long as the job gets done.

Further, I wish we could pour \$400 million or \$500 million into the economy without using any of the Ontario taxpayers' dollars.

This business of trying to prove that we are doing a job merely by spending millions and billions does not give us any great satisfaction at all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I hope that answers the question of the hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. To further clarify, then, from the information that the minister was able to give outside the House to the press yesterday afternoon, we are to understand that the new initiative of the department which he heads will result in 4,030 new starts not during the coming year, but during the period over which this programme will apply.

Does that mean, Mr. Speaker, if I might ask the minister, that the initiative that the Speech from the Throne referred to as a half-billion-dollar initiative creating 132,000 jobs, is in fact, on the part of this government, simply the establishment of a projected 4,030 new starts and the number of jobs associated with that would be very small indeed?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is entirely wrong, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, even if the hon. member had read the press reports a little more carefully—and I do not have them in front of me—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Even if he had read the press reports correctly, he would have found that there are 4,000 and something new additional starts over the number of starts made last year. That is 4,000-and-something more starts this year than was made last year, which was a record.

Mr. Nixon: The minister did not expand it—he just put half a million dollars in it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that is just like saying you did \$100,000 of business last year and if you planned on doing \$150,000 this year you say to a business associate "we are only going to do \$50,000 worth of business this year." That is ridiculous, and that is why you are over there and we are over here.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question: In view of the minister's statement quoted in the morning *Globe and Mail* that

there would not necessarily be 132,000 new jobs, may I ask the minister how many new jobs there will be as a result of this housing programme?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did make that statement. Of course that is correct. No one said there were going to be 132,000 new jobs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister certainly gave that impression.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Read it.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): We read it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I will quote from the Throne Speech. Perhaps too many of the opposition were trying to read the French version and did not understand it.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister does not understand the English version, that is the trouble.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, using funds this will establish a potential for 132,000 jobs during the year.

Mr. Nixon: That is what I said. What about new jobs?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It does not say "new jobs."

Mr. Singer: That is writing—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It does not say "new jobs" at all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: In spite of Ottawa we are trying to save jobs.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me answer the question. I want to answer the question for the hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is deliberately misleading on the new housing programme.

Mr. Pilkey: The Attorney General would never have been caught by that one.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, the minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, first, for the benefit—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: First, for the benefit of the leader—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: We are trying to save jobs, so that Ottawa is put out.

Mr. MacDonald: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, nobody knows how many of the 132,000 jobs will be new ones. That is impossible to tell. Of course it is impossible. We do not know, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: So we are calling them 132,000 old jobs. What is the difference?

Mr. Singer: Why does the minister not read the first sentence?

An hon. member: Ottawa has eliminated jobs day by day. We are trying to save them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, nobody knows whether the person who is going to be employed next month on the new programme has been out of work for three weeks, four weeks, or one month. Nobody knows that.

An hon. member: Who put them out of work?

Mr. Singer: Come on. Phooey, phooey.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Nobody knows it at all. And for the benefit of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the apologist for the Liberal Party in Ottawa, these are precisely the terms—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —used by the federal Minister of Housing. May I read them, Mr. Speaker?

The hon. Robert Andars, federal minister responsible for housing, speaking in the House of Commons on February 10, 1971, indicated the federal government expected the national housing starts to increase from 190,000 to 220,000 in 1971.

In reference to this increase, he said in all, the new jobs—

and he used the words “new jobs”

—created directly and indirectly simply by the increase in residential building activity added up to about 140,000 to 150,000 man-years. That is a very substantial part of the unemployment role.

That is the end of the quote.

Mr. Trotter: That is man-hours.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Mr. Andras was even using the word “new,” which I did not use because I did not think it was advisable.

Mr. MacDonald: They were new.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Those were additional jobs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, the hon. member for Scarborough West yesterday said that they used a multiplier factor of 0.07. The NDP had better fire its research man.

Mr. Singer: Fraud! Bunch of phonies.

An hon. member: Under the two programmes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The 0.07 is part of the 4.8 per cent which is used by Central Mortgage and Housing—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, why does the hon. member not listen? He asked the question. If he is interested in housing, he should listen.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He might learn something.

Mr. MacDonald: We are interested in the minister's questions on the issue.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have been learning something about it.

Mr. Deans: The minister knew nothing on Tuesday.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The 0.07 per cent is part of the 4.8 per cent which is used by the federal minister and represents only the actual on-site labour of the house construction component. That means windows and

prefab stuff which is not made and produced on site.

An hon. member: Prefab stuff, is it 3.9 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, it is not even that. What the member is talking about is 0.07.

Mr. Pilkey: The Treasurer should keep out of it and not put him in deeper.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister of Trade and Development had better take over as provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Singer: Please stand back.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in this—

An hon. member: The members are awful noisy boys.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —very serious matter of housing and unemployment, the hon. members may claim I am trying to cover my ignorance by learning, but I am certainly not trying to cover it by laughing as they are.

An hon. member: The hon. minister has a lot to question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is very serious. I am waiting for the member for Scarborough West to get up and apologize for saying we were wrong in using the factor of 4.4. The factor of 4.8 is used by the federal government.

An hon. member: Apologize, oh, come on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We use 4.4 because of the mix of the kind of housing in OHC and 0.07 is, as I say, only that part of it represented by only the actual on-site construction.

Mr. Lewis: I would be glad to get up but not to apologize.

An hon. member: Because it is Ontario welfare.

Mr. Lewis: The minister applied the 4.4 to 30,000 homes, which was a dishonest thing to do.

Mr. Speaker: This is sufficient for this debate because it is getting out of hand. I will accept no further supplementaries on this matter.

The member for Ontario South has a question.

ABUSE OF WELFARE SYSTEM

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services.

What steps is he planning to take to stop the abuse of our welfare system by some of our young people?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, this, of course, is a matter that has been in the press of late. Certainly it is a matter on which I have received much correspondence.

I would like to tell the members that I plan to meet with controller Paul Godfrey and John Anderson of Metro Toronto early next week to discuss this matter.

My thinking now is that some element of discretion should be added to the present legislation. Apparently, for good and just reasons, changes were made a year ago, but it appears that this had led to other abuses in the system and we are certainly considering changes.

I can assure the House that in any consideration of changes, the important principle will, of course, be preserved that anyone in need—in true need—will not be overlooked in any of our legislation.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): A supplementary question: Will the minister be able to answer my question 7 on the notice paper sometime fairly soon, so at least we can have the facts on the situation before we go into a crusade against 16- and 17-year-old kids in this province?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It will be answered in due course, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has a supplementary?

Mr. Shulman: Does the minister intend to make any change which will prevent young people who are no longer living at home from going to school and still receiving welfare payments?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that to answer that I would say that some discretionary powers should be restored to the municipal welfare people so that they can have some discretion in this matter. You cannot just make a blanket statement that everyone over 16 still going to school and not living at home should receive welfare. I do not think that the people of this province want that kind of legislation.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Timiskaming.

CLOSURE OF COBALT REFINERY

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour.

In what way was his department involved in the talks and discussions concerning the closing of the Cobalt Refinery?

Hon. G. Carton (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I was afraid I was going to be ignored over here.

Insofar as that particular matter is concerned, I will get the information for the hon. member. I am not personally aware of that particular matter at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kent.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker. How it is possible, even with the changes in the cabinet appointments, that an issue that has been festering in the northeast for several months—and the plant has now closed down—

Mr. Speaker: That is not a proper supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: Well, how is it possible that the minister—

Mr. Speaker: It is not a proper supplementary question. I rule it out of order. The member for Kent.

SHIPMENT OF QUEBEC BROILER FOWL IN ONTARIO

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Is it likely that the Quebec broiler producers will be shipping broilers into the Province of Ontario to be placed on our markets?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I share the concern expressed by the member for Kent. I have heard rumours that this may happen. In fact, the regulations that are now in effect by the Ontario Broiler Producers Marketing Board simply provide for the sale of broilers within Ontario under marketing permits.

The rumours that I have heard, and which I assume may have reached the ears of my friend from Kent, are that there are certain producers in Quebec who may challenge that regulation and ship them in without the marketing permit.

There are other provinces in Canada that have been faced with the same problem. Their marketing legislation provides for seizure of the product within the province where they are to be sold.

In view of the fact that we do not have such legislation at present, I propose to introduce an amendment to The Farm Products Marketing Act which will make that provision. I propose to introduce the amendment immediately.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has now expired. It has been a very lively morning.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Development wishes the floor for a moment?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and pleasure to introduce and welcome to this House two very distinguished visitors who are in the Speaker's gallery: the Japanese Ambassador to Canada, His Excellency Ambassador Shinyichi Kondo, and the Japanese Consul General Itaru Tsuge, of the Japanese consulate in Toronto who are in the Speaker's gallery. I am sure the hon. members would like to give them a welcome.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle presented the legislative assembly for the Province of Ontario report under subsection 2 of section 2 of The Fisheries Loan Act 1970 for the period commencing October 1, 1970 and ending March 31, 1971.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves, seconded by Mr. Nixon, that Mr. Reuter, member for the electoral district of Waterloo South, and Mr. Rowe, member for the electoral district of Northumberland, be appointed chairman and deputy chairman respectively of the Committee of the Whole House for the present session.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: I may say Mr. Speaker is exceedingly pleased, Mr. Prime Minister and Mr. Nixon, with this motion.

Mr. Nixon: In speaking to the motion I am just a moment late; I say even though I was not consulted in this I am delighted to accede to the Premier's motion and say that I wholeheartedly second it and it is a very wise choice indeed.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: House in Committee of the Whole; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Before I assume the Chair I would like to say to all hon. members that I deem it a very great honour indeed to accept the responsibility of being your chairman once again for the fourth consecutive session.

I want to thank the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Leader of the Opposition for introducing the motion which has put me in this particular position, and indeed I want to thank all hon. members of the House for supporting the motion. I can only say that it has always provided me with a great deal of pleasure to serve as your chairman at the table during committee.

I know that in the past I have perhaps made a lot of rulings which were not too popular and perhaps which were inaccurate on many occasions. I can only say to the members that I will endeavour to improve the quality.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves the committee of the Whole House rise and report and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I cannot say "report progress" at this point, but I am sure I can very shortly.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in reference to the Speech from the Throne, I want to say at the outset that I had hoped with the new Premier (Mr. Davis) our procedures might have been changed, modernized, so that he in fact would have taken upon himself personally the responsibility of putting before this House the programme and the goals of the government that he should be responsible for during the coming session. Instead we stuck with the time-honoured procedure in which the words were put in the mouth of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

I would say to you, sir, without detracting in any way from the honour and dignity of the gentleman or his office, I would hope at the next session of the Legislature that His Honour will come into this chamber with us all standing, perhaps with someone else accompanying him, and with the responsibility and the advice from his first minister, that he simply welcome the members and charge us with the responsibility of conducting the business, with the responsibility of raising the funds to pay for the business, and then with his usual cordiality and hospitality, leave the chamber, and leave it for the Premier to put forward the programme of the government of the day.

It is a small point, but I feel that the administration opposite is more entrenched in the appearances of tradition than the understanding of the real tradition, which is that democracy does move forward and that our method of government has, I believe, improved, become more efficient and must become more sensitive to the people.

I am prepared to recognize and to bolster and continue the concept of our government that the power resides with the Crown and the Crown's representative in this province. But the approach that has been taken in recent years which more and more emphasizes the tradition and perhaps empty pomp of the office of the Lieutenant Governor is one which I personally would like to see reversed.

Naturally the Lieutenant Governor of the day would have his own preferences, and these must be honoured. But my own recollection extends to an occasion when I sat somewhere up under the clock on an opening day when His Honour came in in a business suit; it happened to be the late Louis Breithaupt. All of us who from time to time attend in the Lieutenant Governor's quarters should examine the portraits—and they are excellent

ones—hanging on the walls of each of the rooms of that fine apartment. There is one—I think an outstanding one—of Louis Breithaupt sitting in a business suit. In no way is there any dignity removed because he does not have a cocked hat with ersatz eagle feathers running down the back and the gold braid that is associated with the traditions of the royal prerogatives that were established here 175 years ago.

This is a personal preference, perhaps a prejudice, Mr. Speaker, and I wanted to put it before you.

There is the concept of loading the honourable gentlemen into an open landau and bringing him from the Royal York—I do not know how it got such status, he does not live there—up University Avenue in a freezing wind. There are no cheering crowds there; lots of OPP, I suppose, as is fitting. He comes up here, the cannon boom. I suppose there is nothing wrong with that, but surely, Mr. Speaker, the time has come when real dignity and real recognition of the position of His Honour would grant him perhaps a broader choice in the way procedures are undertaken.

I have the understanding, with the emphasis more and more on the traditions associated with these prerogatives, that one of the next steps will be the restoration of knighthoods in this particular jurisdiction. I was not thinking of "Sir Robert of Brant" so much as maybe "Sir Bob of Muskoka." I do not know; it has not got much of a ring to it—not the same ring as "Sir Darcy of Kent."

An hon. member: The duke.

Mr. Nixon: I have felt for a good long time, Mr. Speaker—perhaps that is not something that can be charged to the new Premier, but certainly to his new chief adviser, the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough)—that his main philosophical and political inspiration, if it did not come from his father-in-law, and undoubtedly much of it does, it really came from R. B. Bennett and Lord Thompson. I think that it reflects more and more the attitudes of this administration than the previous one.

This was made clear by the Minister of Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) a few minutes ago in drawing the line of demarcation between the old guard and the new way. The attitude is really a reactionary one. I do not think that a Progressive Conservative need be reactionary and surely the Premier would agree with this, even though the Minister of Justice might not.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to say that the lessons of history are not important and I would tell you, sir, that I have a great respect and understanding of where we have come in the democratic process—that I think that these traditions are essential and that sometimes history repeats itself.

I do not know whether you aware, sir, that it was just a century ago that an established, well-financed, deeply rooted political party, oddly known as the Liberal Conservative Party in those days, was defeated at the polls by the precursors of the present Liberal Party in an election which was essentially similar to the ones which we may face in 1971. The issues really were that a family compact had been re-established and that the will of the people had been overlooked because the government of the day felt that it had some divine right to order the affairs of this province.

A young man, Edward Blake, much younger than myself and much younger even than the boy Premier who sits opposite, was the leader of the Liberal Party in those days, the reform party, and stumped the province with great success. He had at his right hand as well a gentleman who went on to become Prime Minister of Canada—as a matter of fact he was briefly the Treasurer of the province—Alexander Mackenzie, and I urge upon you, sir, to examine, as I know that you frequently do, the portrait in the rotunda of this chamber and you will see that that Premier, Mr. Blake, the hon. Mr. Blake, thought so highly of his chief lieutenant that he had his visage included in the official portrait which was taken, or at least which was painted, with the background of these very desks.

It is interesting to note, however, that a century ago the problems of the province were similar, as far as politics are concerned, with the entrenchment of a well-heeled establishment party, a party that felt that it could do no wrong and that when it looked around at their political opponents it could see no one who could measure up to its high standards.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Liberal-Conservative establishment.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): What about the Liberal establishment?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, this is the sort of blindness that comes with being too long in office and this is the sort of blindness—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: —that affects even the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman) who, even though he does not understand the responsibilities of his department, is prepared to come into the House, sit in the front row, and defend what is really the indefensible.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Surely the point is that there are those who are prepared to say in support of the Conservative Party that even though the Conservatives are in trouble and that the new Premier had a substantial difficulty in grasping the powers of his office, still it looks as if they will be able to carry it over through these difficult times.

Another lesson that has come to my attention more recently, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the politics in other Canadian jurisdictions under these circumstances. The taxpayers in this province have been good enough to send me as an observer to a number of federal-provincial conferences over the number of years that I have been leader of this party, beginning in 1967. And during the last occasion—not the most recent which was supposed to be a closed conference but the one about a year before that—I well recall sitting in the galleries with others from across Canada who were there in the same capacity. On my right was an amiable young man named Gerry Regan and on my left an equally amiable and able young man named Dick Hatfield, and we were in the “peanut” gallery watching the movers and shakers of the nation sitting around the horseshoe table with their advisers nearby.

Mind you, it was a very educational process indeed but at the end of the first day, I remember, all of these men that hold the power of our nation in their hands, rising upon the motion for adjournment, and going out to have dinner with His Excellency the Governor-General, and Regan, Nixon and Hatfield went out around the corner to some greasy spoon and they talked politics while they sipped a cup of coffee or two and discussed the problems—

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Coffee or two?

Mr. Nixon: Yes, he was a Maritimer. That is right. They still drink a little coffee down there. We discussed the same kind of political problems that must have been imposed on Edward Blake as he looked at John S. Macdonald—the heavy financing, the entrenchment, the feel that these people cannot

be beaten short of some revolution—and still we now know that within a few months Gerry Regan is now the hon. Gerald Regan, having turfed out the entrenched Tories in Nova Scotia; Dick Hatfield is now the hon. Richard Hatfield, having turfed out the entrenched Liberals in New Brunswick. The point is that there is a wind of change, similar to the one that blew through this province a century ago and it is going to blow that minister opposite out of his department—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: —and it will blow this government out of office and result in the election of a Liberal administration in this province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: There will be very few of the present ministers back to sit in opposition and the hon. Minister of Trade and Development will not be one of them.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): You want to bet on that one? There was not much applause on that one.

Mr. Nixon: The minister did not seem to be in favour.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): There were a few in the government back benches. The member for Don Mills (Mr. Randall).

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the whole subject of reform must surely capture not only our attention but our commitment, and as we examine the contents of the speech there is no doubt that reforms have been predicted in that speech and I expect they will be entered into.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): I am told we stole the member's platform.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Grand larceny.

Mr. Nixon: I am not prepared, Mr. Speaker, to be in any way critical of the hon. gentleman opposite who persists in interjecting. It seems difficult to get him stopped.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He will find it even more difficult if I keep on.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Why does the Premier not write another housing statement?

Mr. Nixon: It is 10 after 11. It is almost time for you to retire.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Are you not having a conference on tides at 11:15?

Mr. Nixon: The hon. Minister of Trade and Development is fixing me with his glittering eye because both he and I know that the hon. Premier is going to go and meet our esteemed guests who are still sitting under the clock entranced by what they are hearing. But I do want to refer to the contents of the speech—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Unentranced.

Mr. Nixon: —and while the Premier seems to be sensitive to the charge that he stole good ideas from elsewhere, I say fine, that he can take all the ideas we have—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it is tremendous.

Mr. Nixon: —because they are all good.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nixon: He has undertaken the establishment of a department, The Department of the Environment, one that has been accepted by many other jurisdictions in Canada and been pressed upon the government by this party for a good long time. I welcome that. He has seen fit to allow the wheel to come full circle and put The Department of Transport, which never did amount to anything, back in with The Department of Highways. The reason for this supposed reform is that it will give the government, for once, a modern instrument by which urban transportation policy can meet the needs of the times.

But it is interesting, it is still under the direction of the seed merchant from Huron county, an estimable man but probably not as committed to the development of public transit as some others would be. He took over, of course, from his predecessor in The Department of Highways, who was a lumber merchant from Lanark county, an estimable man once again although I have not seen him in the House since it opened; he has been relegated to the rump of the Conservative Party, sitting over here with some of those who seem not to be in favour with the government. My point, Mr. Speaker—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, I noticed that almost all of the members for eastern Ontario have been put over there, except for the new Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence).

But, Mr. Speaker, this approach to cabinet reform is inadequate. Regarding The Department of the Environment, certainly I welcome the idea that the whole approach to the improvement of our environment is going to be put in one department. But this is an old story; we just wonder why it was not done five years ago. The formation of a Department of Transportation and Communications involving highways is simply putting the administration back to where it was before the development of a separate Department of Transport many years ago.

The only other reform that is mentioned—and it is here, really, where there may be some improvements—is a commitment in His Honour's words that the government is going to start using committees at the cabinet level. We have heard of these before. I can remember the former Premier (Mr. Robarts) talking about his control of the Design for Development and that a committee chaired by the Premier himself was going to co-ordinate this approach.

One of the most serious failures during the last eight years has been the inability of the former Premier to whip his cabinet underlings into line so that in fact they could and would co-operate on such matters as planning, which the public relations officers translated into Design for Development.

I think that the substantial indication of the new Premier's approach to cabinet reform was the fact that he was able to get rid of four of the old ministers but felt constrained to replace them with seven new ones. I do not know whether that is a commentary on the efficiency of those who were dismissed or whether it was a commentary on the political requirements to bring certain people into the cabinet who had no other justification for such high office as far as many objective observers, including the *Toronto Globe and Mail* could see. I am not an objective observer but the reasons for replacing the four with seven new ones certainly remains a mystery.

Stepping further into the whole area of cabinet reform, I see that the former Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) has not quite left the chamber, and while I do not particularly want to single him out, I must say on my part that I have been delighted he has been given the responsibility of House leader. His well-known and undoubted reputation for fairness and understanding, and also perhaps his new position as sort of—I hesitate to say—a senior member of the cabinet is accepted on all sides.

Mr. Lewis: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nixon: I remember—I should not really dredge this up again but it is part of the public record—*The Globe and Mail* once warned the former Premier that he had a cuckoo in the nest. I do not know whether the former Attorney General remembers that or not, but he seems to have lived down that criticism.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): A cuckoo in the clock.

Mr. Nixon: I think it is very fitting indeed that he did so. This leaves me also to recall that more recently *The Globe and Mail* attacked—in a most vicious and personal manner, I thought—the former Minister of Health (Mr. Wells), who is now presently the Minister of welfare, and said that he was “a clueless reactionary.” Frankly, I have a stronger feeling of agreement with that than I have about their former statement. But I suppose that more than anything else it meant the minister had to be at least removed from his responsibility in The Department of Health.

I am talking about cabinet reform as the government opposite has attempted to bring it about. Surely, it is sensitive to the feeling that is expressed not only in Ontario but in Canada and many other jurisdictions that it is essential that cabinets not be allowed simply to proliferate in their numbers without some plan and organization.

I noticed the picture of the new cabinet that was printed in most of the newspapers, and as I saw the men sitting around that long, long table I was struck by the fact that one end was so far away they seemed to sort of fade off into the fog. It was necessary for most of the newspapers to print a plan with the outlines of the heads of each man and a number in each, so that in fact we could identify the huge throng of people, having achieved this ultimate position, gathered around with fixed smiles pasted upon their faces—very similar to one that the Minister of Energy and Resources Management has fixed on his face now.

I felt that the new Premier, supposedly making new waves, had failed dismally; that there was no cabinet reform, that it was the same old game. And it is evident in the difficulties they have had in recent days in simply expressing the positions and policies of their departments. Perhaps one of the more important policy decisions taken by the new government leader was that there would be a big game of musical chairs and that people would have new responsibilities.

Only the Minister for Energy and Resources Management was able to have any continuity with policies that he had introduced, and I have felt that even he is having some problem legitimatizing the suit against Dow Chemical, and that is something that will be discussed a bit later in this debate.

The real reform, Mr. Speaker, must be predicated upon the reduction in the size of the cabinet itself: that there are obviously too many departments, there is a tangle in the lines of responsibility and the focus of the responsibility for administration. This is clear, not only in this House but to the people of the province who must deal on a day-to-day basis with this bureaucratic nightmare. Steps must be taken by this Premier or his successor to impose efficiency and a clear responsiveness in the cabinet of the province.

There is a second advantage in a reduction in the size of the cabinet. It is only a relatively small cabinet that can effectively decide priorities for the province; each minister in this proposed small group should be able and willing to comment effectively on the policies of his colleagues. We must get away from the present order of government, whereby each minister simply defends his own growing empire and agrees, for self-protection, never to interfere with those of his colleagues with similar responsibilities. This kind of free exchange essential to the hammering out of basic decisions on the direction of policy is necessary if modern government is going to be responsive.

Instead, under present circumstances it appears that the cabinet becomes bogged down in trivia, that ministers are concerned only with the expansion of their own direct area of government. This expansion has resulted in a public service of close to 60,000 employees, not counting the additional 23,000 employed by Ontario Hydro. We feel that an approach to a committee system is an important one, but I will be dealing with this from our point of view, by way of Liberal policy, a bit later in my remarks.

One of the recommendations put forward by the productivity improvement committee of the government was that legislative assistants should be bought forward to assist those ministers who have fairly extensive and large departments to work with.

This was one of the recommendations that was not accepted by the government opposite, and I think the reason is obvious. Because, as I counted, there are only nine private members of the Progressive Conservative Party elected to this House who do not al-

ready have separate and extra responsibilities and emoluments under this government. It would not be possible to find enough back-bench members to appoint any of these special officials.

Many of these who are not part of the administration have been granted important positions, like the former Minister of Energy and Resources Management, the present member for Frontenac-Addington (Mr. Simonett), who just last week was appointed as second vice-chairman of the Ontario Northland Railway. If the Premier is going to continue with an extension of the old patronage policies that were so much a part of the previous Conservative administrations, then obviously cabinet reform is completely beyond his abilities.

I want to say something a bit more about The Department of the Environment since the minister has seen fit to remain in the House. While he has not received this appointment as yet, it is generally understood, and in fact hoped, that he will be designated as the minister of the new department, and that when it comes to matters involving mercury pollution we will not have to listen both to the Minister of the Environment as well as to the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) and some others, when we get information about this area of the infringement of our environment.

We welcome the appointment of this department. I do, however, want to talk about what should be his main thrust as he takes over the new duties.

Mr. Speaker, you may perhaps recall, and I believe attended, the conference on Great Lakes pollution called last fall, in which representatives of most of the jurisdictions around the Great Lakes attended at the Science Centre in Toronto in an effort to co-ordinate our approach to improving the environment in the Great Lakes basin.

I have described on other occasions the expense that came from the public purse in order to make this an important conference. There were banners from floor to ceiling with the crests of Ontario and other jurisdictions. One felt that he was attending the Sportsplatz of Nuremberg because of the grandiose approach to the conference itself. Everything that money could buy by way of meat and drink was provided, but unfortunately the approach to policy was completely inadequate.

There were two people in attendance at that conference who, I felt, were significantly

aware of the crisis that we face in the environment in the Great Lakes basin. The one was Governor Milligan of Michigan, who went back and was re-elected, and the other was our own Minister of Energy and Resources Management, soon to become the Minister of the Environment. It was from those two gentlemen alone there came any grasp in their own remarks that this conference could, in fact, respond to the crisis situation in the pollution of the Great Lakes and take some action.

As a matter of fact, Milligan got up and objected to the communique which had been passed around among the heads of governments, or their representatives, and said—I can only paraphrase his remarks, Mr. Speaker—that it was essentially meaningless and did not reflect the crisis situation which we must face in the Great Lakes basin.

To his credit, the present Minister of Energy and Resources Management, in his remarks and in one of the papers that was provided for his use, indicated clearly that we could accomplish nothing unless some of our own provincial powers—call it sovereignty if you will; the word does not apply properly to the province—was handed over to some impartial and international body which, in fact, would become a legal tribunal, able to enforce its judgments and having application in the Great Lakes basin. His proposal was shot down by the former Premier of the province. He said, in his own statement, that there would be no thought of anything but co-operation, which was simply one way of saying that we were not prepared to accept the jurisdiction of an international body in this regard.

I felt that the former Premier substantially failed not only the people of this province but the people in the whole area of the Great Lakes. It was on his initiative, responding to the urgings of myself as Leader of the Opposition, accepted by the present Minister of Energy and Resources Management, which called for the conference in the first place, and it was his lack of leadership which degraded that conference into simply political window dressing for himself and other politicians from other jurisdictions.

It was a shame and a crime that from that conference did not flow some kind of an international organization, such as the International Joint Commission, which would have powers to act as a legal tribunal and enforce their findings on those jurisdictions which come under their control.

I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that unless we do this we may very well lose the quality of life that we have in the Great Lakes basin and, in fact, we are not serving the citizens and the taxpayers in our own province. If you think of the basin, it can be relatively easily set off with specific geographic markings; it would involve all of the land which is drained into the Great Lakes system. It has one of the highest populations and one of the most rapid population growths of any area in North America, in fact in the world.

I would predict that it will become the richest area in the world within the next 20 years. It is the area in which we live, and unless some specific action is taken other than what has been done in recent years, then even the development of a Department of the Environment will be nothing but a wasted window dressing in preparation for just another election campaign.

I am prepared to grant, Mr. Speaker, that the minister who will take on this responsibility is probably the one man in the Conservative ranks who can take this leadership. He was shot down by his former chief, the present member for London North. It remains to be seen whether the new Premier will support this sort of initiative or, in fact, treat pollution and the environment as just another political issue which maybe does not seem to be as important as it was last year. I would say to you, sir, that this is the issue, political or otherwise, which we must face between now and the end of the century, and probably from now as long as man infests the earth.

We still have no legislation allowing or requiring the Attorney General to sue polluters on behalf of groups of people whose livelihood has been adversely affected. There is this famous \$35 million suit against Dow but we must be clear that this government's suit is not on behalf of affected fishermen and the fishermen have no legal right to the proceeds from that law suit. It was made clear by the minister whom I have been praising in recent words, that those fishermen have the right to sue Dow Chemical themselves, and it was made clear by the present Attorney General that the real effect is against the fish in the Great Lakes system and maybe the fish ought to sue, or some irresponsible light remark like that—which I am afraid is indicative of the attitude that the front bench of the government have been exhibiting with the possible exception that I have brought to your attention.

Mr. Speaker, we also urgently require legislation allowing class actions for environmental pollution. There has been no indication that the government is prepared to extend technical assistance to individuals suing polluting companies and agencies, to ensure a proper balance of competing interests. You are aware, sir, and I believe you visited the premises with me some years ago, of Barney Lamb's Ball Lake Lodge, you perhaps recall that? Here is a man who has spent many thousands of dollars—\$200,000 I am told—of his own funds in preparing a suit against the mercury polluters in northwestern Ontario. There has been no action on the part of the government; no assistance on the part of the government.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, visiting that particular location about 1965, I believe—I am not sure of the year—when we saw the setup that he had in one of the most beautiful remote lakes in northwestern Ontario, Ball Lake. It was a huge tourist outfitters establishment. He maintained a fleet of about 25 aircraft so that from that particular point he could fly those people who could pay for his services into the recreational areas of the great north of the province.

It appears that Mr. Lamb will be out of business because there are signs all through the area, euphemistically saying, "fish for fun." What it means is that these lakes in one of the most remote areas of this huge province have been polluted—I would say irreversibly—by mercury and that, in fact, these people are not prepared to go up there simply to fish for fun, pull out the trout, the whitefish and so on and simply to take them off the hook, realize they are riddled with mercury pollution and throw them back in. Those people are out of business and the government has done nothing to assist them.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the head of this new department is going to have to take many more specific actions. I recall him almost splitting the top of his desk about 18 months ago when he said "the polluters must pay" in reference to Dow Chemical, which company was then in the headlines associated with mercury pollution. He now says the polluter must pay and they have entered into a \$35 million lawsuit. Without any special legislation associated with this everyone predicts that it will be somewhere between two and 10 years before any judgement is entered into.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is the best thing that has come to the legal community since legal aid. All we are going

to have is suits at every level of court, and without the initiative associated with upgrading some international tribunal we are never going to come to grips with this huge and growing problem.

We are informed that the government has given many industries deadlines for the installation of antipollution equipment. As a matter of fact, I well recall the minister getting up in this House and saying that he had placed his personal order on Dow Chemical that they should lose no more mercury from their processes. And yet, in an interjection here yesterday, he informed the House that mercury was still being lost from the Dow Chemical plant in Sarnia and polluting the Great Lakes system and, specifically, the St. Clair River. I find this unbelievable, incredible—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Very little.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, very little? Oh, well.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It is down from 40 pounds a day to less than one pound.

Mr. Nixon: Less than one pound? Well, Mr. Speaker, 40 pounds a day to some people might have been considered very little pollution. Certainly it was considered as no pollution by this minister until it was discovered that in fact mercury, a stable metal, does not simply sink to the bottom of the water and stay there and that we can forget it, but that it methylated and polluted the whole of this important waterway.

The minister's activities in this regard have been obscure, difficult to understand, particularly when he says pollution is continuing, that he is suing for an extra \$10 million in order that the government might clean up the pollution but that he himself, surely, cannot be sure that any means exists to safely clean up the pollution by mercury.

We should immediately provide tax incentives to industry to recycle products such as used automobiles, appliances and paper where the technology already exists, and intensify research efforts where technology is not yet available. We ought to build immediately a prototype municipal waste reclamation unit. I have heard Alderman O'Donohue in Toronto talking about this, arguing with others on the city council that it cannot be done.

It might be difficult for Toronto city council to do it, but the Minister of the Environment should have, as one of his

projects, the establishing, at provincial expense, of a prototype unit to show municipalities what can be done not only to effectively get rid of these solid wastes but to recycle them so that those useful components will not be lost and so that the energy associated with the burning can be put to useful purposes.

We had a pollution conference. It was staged, with great expense and fanfare. Nothing came out of it. Nothing at all came out of it that was useful. If the minister thinks that his appointment can be directed back to that, then let him say so. But all that has happened is that it is expected the conference will continue in the jurisdiction of Michigan in a few weeks.

I, frankly, have more confidence in the Governor of Michigan in making this thing meaningful than I have in the former Premier or the present Premier of this province. I hope that I will have an opportunity to attend that conference when it is called. But this is not the only conference, of course. This government has had a tendency, over the years, to use a highly stylized, expensive, public approach to take the heat off it when the public demands action.

We had a municipal conference in which the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) called representatives from the municipalities across Ontario into the same great hall at the Ontario Science Centre. Once again, no expense was spared. The minister's and the Premier's speeches were well scripted, if not well prepared, and a minimum of 10,000 copies printed with the crest of the province embossed on the front of the speech and handed out to anyone who could be persuaded to grab hold of one.

But still, aside from one catch-phrase from that conference, nothing was accomplished. The phrase was "a new partnership." There is a tendency for even the most jaded politician who hears these public relations approaches to policies so often, to say, "Oh, the public relations boys have been at it again." Yet I sense that this phrase, "a new partnership," somehow came as a natural emanation from what everybody knew must be the cornerstone of the approach that this government in this Legislature must take to the municipalities of the province. "A new partnership"—I like it. I think it is something that we must strive for. A new partnership that emphasizes the autonomy of our municipalities.

In The Department of Municipal Affairs—and I regret that the present minister and

even the previous minister are not here—there are some substantial problems. The present Treasurer, the member for the Chatham area, had had that ministry for, I believe, about three years. Somehow or other everything he touches in politics seems to disintegrate under his hands. During his short tenure he decided to centralize assessment, and it is his responsibility as the Minister of Municipal Affairs, not of the elected politicians in the municipality, to set the assessment on the properties of our community. This has developed untold difficulties. It has increased the expense by a factor of 10.

There are many small towns and bigger jurisdictions in the province that had their assessment in order in years gone by, but now find that there is property left off the rolls, that the assessment is late and they are losing tax funds because of it. It is obviously a serious problem to all concerned.

It was a mistake on the part of the former minister. He also undertook a reassessment with the broad approach that everybody would be paying a fair and equitable contribution to the cost of local government. This has developed into a nightmare; so much so, that because of the experiments in reassessment in about five municipalities the former minister had to get up in his place and say that he was postponing reassessment until sometime in 1973.

Of course, all this means is that as a political issue it was a killer and he had to put it on ice until he hopefully would have a chance to return after an election and go ahead with what is certainly a job that is not in the best interests of the taxpayers.

The same minister has been responsible for in-tr-a-cabinet warfare in the planning field of the type that is completely incomprehensible. I have already referred to the fact that the former Premier could not keep his three chief planning ministers in harness and that the Treasurer and the Minister of Municipal Affairs were arguing about these planning responsibilities under the cover of cabinet solidarity. We could see the steam coming out from under the cover and the fists coming up through the cover from time to time, and it was generally accepted in the public service that there would have to be a showdown between the Treasurer and the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Well, the showdown eventually came when the cabinet was reshuffled. The former Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), with a tired look on his face, has decided to stay on for the time being. He has been moved con-

siderably away from his new chief whom he, more than anybody else, I would say, was responsible for placing in office. It looks to me as if the former Treasurer lost that battle.

It is interesting that the former Minister of Municipal Affairs is now the Treasurer and he has taken over that other arm of the planning responsibility; he must see it now from the other side of the coin. It would be interesting indeed to hear his frank assessment of just what the other side of the planning coin looks like.

But I am trying to point out to you, sir, that in The Department of Municipal Affairs over the last three years we have got into an unholy mess and that the responsibility lies entirely with the present Treasurer, who seems to have a knack for disrupting everything he touches, whether it is politics or a government department. I refer to centralized assessment and reassessment, the warfare over planning and last, and probably most important, the chaos in the province resulting from his imposition of regional government.

I want to say something about this because I think that now the problems are coming home to roost. This morning in *The Globe and Mail* the headline is "Niagara Regional Government is Called a Failure." It has been going one year. Yesterday in *The St. Catharines Standard*: "Regional Government Review Urged to Halt Further Deterioration." I read the first paragraph from this article:

St. Catharines aldermen are hoping that a well-prepared 50-page brief will spark provincial government action on the inequities of Niagara regional government.

Another clipping from *The St. Catharines Standard* dated March 23, 1971. The headline: "St. Catharines Defers Bid to Secede From Niagara Region." The first paragraph:

Niagara region received another reprieve last night as city council rejected a bid to secede from it in favour of a personal audience with Premier William Davis.

I well recall the debate in this House when the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Bukator) got up and pleaded with the government opposite to postpone the imposition of regional government. He is a former warden of the county and his experiences were such that he said this programme would not work; he pointed out that it would elevate costs; that the government's approach to changing the fiscal basis for regional government was inadequate; that there was no

provision for proper policing, and he predicted at the time that the bill would give rise to a regional government which would not work as planned.

He asked for a postponement of a year or six months. We voted to hoist it for six months until such time as further research could be done upon it. The government, with the support of the NDP, bulled the bill through and now the problems are coming home to roost.

We have seen similar articles referring in detail to the problems of the Lakehead amalgamation. It is not really a regional government, it is an amalgamation. Ottawa-Carleton has municipalities which have been in the courts over the last months to determine what responsibility a small rural municipality has to contribute funds to build sewers and waterworks in another municipality far removed from themselves. This is the sort of chaos that has been introduced into municipal government by the present Treasurer, the former Minister of Municipal Affairs.

It is based on the kind of approach which is associated with another layer of government, resulting in high costs. It is also based on the political philosophy of the administration opposite, which is surely that centralized decision is the best and that the imposition of these reforms is the only way that they can be accomplished.

This, we as Liberals totally reject. We predict to you, sir, that the chaos that is presently visible in the regional governments and some other governments at the municipal level, is just the beginning unless this government moves in an entirely different direction, and this I trust will be the aim of the new Minister of Municipal Affairs. I think that the minister has taken over an unholy mess—

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): That is right.

Mr. Nixon: —that the former minister was like a child in the kitchen, grabbing at everything and throwing it around in some puerile effort to "leave his mark on the face of Ontario." I guess essentially that he is going to do that, but it is going to take a Liberal government to get municipal affairs back in order.

We have heard many speeches, Mr. Speaker, on the advantages of regional government. Believe me, they are very difficult to determine now that regional government is in operation in at least five areas of the province. One of the advantages is supposed to be to consolidate and strengthen

the borrowing powers of the municipalities. In my view, Mr. Speaker, it should be the function of the government of Ontario to undertake the borrowings of the municipalities, in which case it is not necessary to regionalize it.

We have heard it said that unless planning is put on a regional basis it cannot be meaningful. In my view, there should be a broad plan for the whole of Ontario arrived at by the government with the advice of the membership of this Legislature and with communication and consultation with the people of the province. Into this broad plan can be fitted the official approved plans of the municipalities at the smaller levels, or at the county level, or at the regional level, in the regions which are now established, and in this way we can accomplish the purpose much more effectively and with a much closer association with the people who are concerned.

The third thing is that unless there is regional government you will have the inequities associated with the distribution of assessment. One municipality may have many manufacturing plants or businesses and the tax return from that large assessment would accrue only to that municipality; therefore regional government must be imposed so that all can share in the distribution of this largesse. In my view, the distribution of funds is important only in paying for education costs.

The Liberal answer is to transfer the cost of education, at least to the extent of 80 per cent, to the tax base of the whole province and this obviously will negate the argument for regional government on the basis of assessment. I believe our experience is that the advantages of regional government are very few and are overcome by the disadvantage of high cost and confusion, which has been the experience of regional governments already established. The imposition of another layer of government is not working well. Certainly this province, this government, the government of this province, has to provide leadership and initiative in the improvement of municipal government.

I would call to your attention, sir, the experience of a group of municipalities in my own constituency, known as the county of Brant. It is a small county, admittedly. It has the city of Brantford with a population of about 70,000 right in its centre. But through the kind of co-operation and public spirit that politicians at the municipal level seem to be able to exhibit, we now have in that county, county-wide welfare, county-

wide planning, county-wide police and fire protection, a county roads committee and it was county-wide assessment before it was centralized by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Surely this approach, emphasizing the counties or the counties with additions and subtractions of certain municipalities, if that appears to be in the best interest of the citizens concerned, is the approach, rather than the imposition of a rigid formula of the type that the former Minister of Municipal Affairs has handed on to his successor.

Certainly groups of municipalities will always want to undertake studies to improve the efficiency of their own local government, and the government of Ontario must stand ready to finance those studies.

The city of Brantford and the county of Brant have requested for many months that The Department of Municipal Affairs assist in the payment for such a study. It was not until about three months ago that they finally got the approval to go ahead with a study in their own right to solve their own problems in a manner which was not imposed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): It is the same in Oxford.

Mr. Nixon: My hon. friend says it is the same in Oxford. My hon. friend, the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good) knows that in his particular area, which is the next regional government experiment, there have been many millions of dollars spent on studies in an attempt by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and his predecessor to consult with the local people. I hesitate to raise this again, but you know that even though these millions of dollars were being spent the minister responsible for housing was still prepared to go in there 24 months ago and carve out of that community 7,000 acres—which is going to be a new town—without consulting with anybody.

Surely this shows that the government opposite does not understand the spirit of consultation, nor do they understand what a new partnership with the municipal government must be. They have failed the municipalities and they know as well as I that this is going to be an important primary political issue in the election which we face, and from a political standpoint I can thank the present Treasurer for making this a political issue. Not only has he created chaos in the municipalities, but he has done the same thing in his own political party. I believe it was the pres-

ent House leader, one of the few members of the cabinet here listening to my remarks, who got up in his own constituency and said "Yes"—and I paraphrase him when I say this—said, "Yes, we are going to have to cool Darcy down. There is not going to be much more regional government."

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): And he nods "yes".

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): I would only wish to say that was a very extravagant paraphrase.

Mr. Nixon: But essentially the truth. And I would say to you, sir, that not only has he created chaos in the municipalities, but that the new Premier, when he came in, made haste to change him out of that department and get him in the role of the Treasurer so that perhaps some repairs can be made before we go to the polls. I have a premonition, however, that the new Treasurer will carry on with his inimitable personality in the same way in his new capacity as he has in his old one, that he is already rattling the sabres of a separate tax system when he goes up to Ottawa to speak to those people who are usually referred to as "my good friends".

He rattles the sabre of a separate tax for income; he says that perhaps we should cut up the provincial tax base and allow the municipalities to levy sales taxes, separate gas taxes, separate income taxes even. It looks to me that the great innovator is going to create chaos in the fiscal basis of our province just as he did in the municipal basis and just as he has in the Tory party.

An hon. member: The great destroyer.

Mr. Nixon: The great destroyer? Not that. He is certainly a political millstone and it is one of the unfortunate aspects of the recent leadership convention that because of his Uriah Heep opportunism that when he was finally counted out by the delegates to the convention, instead of doing what his colleague, the member for Lincoln (Mr. Welch), did and saying, "My delegates are free to do as they choose," he went over and placed his arms around the former Minister of Education and said, "That is my man".

For a person watching that on television it really was shattering. I thought we had got away from that years ago.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Great move. The Liberals never do that.

Mr. Nixon: Right. We do not do it. The member is right. Certainly it was old-fashioned politics of the type that the former Minister of Municipal Affairs understands.

Mr. MacDonald: The Liberals do do it.

Mr. Nixon: The interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is that with all of the fanfare associated with that, the delegates—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: The members opposite are making a lot of noise since there are only about six of them there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: The interesting thing is that the delegates themselves were offended at this approach and it almost was a failure. As a matter of fact, it would be interesting to note if we had some sort of a magic time machine and could push a button for an instant replay, and this time let the former minister let his delegates vote the way they wanted. I think the new Premier would have had more votes than he got. He would have won by 50 votes instead of 44.

Mr. W. Hodgson: I would not worry about that.

Mr. Nixon: The member has got a lot to worry about; he has some real worries. I say he particularly had better worry because the new Premier is not going to be accepted in the member's constituency.

Mr. W. Hodgson: He sure will—and the cabinet too.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): As a matter of fact the member will not be, since he took his stand on regional government.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Want to bet on that?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I know that you are anxious that I proceed with a commentary on the reform of the cabinet, which was referred to in the Speech from the Throne and which I think is of some substantial importance.

A third priority, as far as the Liberal party is concerned, would be the establishment of a new department combining at least two of the old ones, known as The Department of Social and Community Services. It would combine the existing Departments of Health and Social and Family Services, and probably the area of the Provincial Secretary dealing with citizenship.

Only with responsibility for the full range of health and social services centred in one organizational structure can we deal effectively with the enormous administrative and management problems that we now have with those programmes. How can we have a comprehensive policy for health care in Ontario that maximizes the efficient use of our scarce resources when homes for the aged are the responsibility of The Department of Social and Family Services, nursing homes are licensed by The Department of Health and hospitals are the responsibility of a quasi-independent body, the Ontario Hospital Services Commission?

The answer that has been suggested by some is the interdepartmental committee. But the history of these committees, particularly as controlled by the present administration, which now has abandoned the Legislature entirely—not one of them is in his place—is a bad one.

I want to deal with this in some detail, because I feel that The Department of Health has been foisted upon the new administration in just as bad a mess as The Department of Municipal Affairs. I ask you to think about this, Mr. Speaker. The problems in co-ordinating OHSIP and hospital services are obvious to everyone.

It was announced many months ago by the then Provincial Secretary that they were going to be integrated in a new approach to efficiency. Of course, nothing has been done. As a matter of fact, even then his timetable put a time of about two years on the final integration and rationalization of this complex series of operations.

Anyone who sends their premiums in directly and personally for hospital and medical insurance knows what a fiasco this is. We are billed four times a year for each one; that is eight separate billings. The bills arrive in separate envelopes; they are correlated by separate computers. We, as citizens and taxpayers, have to sign our cheques to pay for the premiums very carefully and make them out carefully, because one is payable to the Treasurer of Ontario and the other to something called HIRB, the Health Insurance Registration Board. Heaven help you if you were to include both cheques in the same envelope, because the computers would simply break down and you would probably lose your coverage for one or the other, or both, until your member of the Legislature phoned somebody and had it set right. This is obviously a mess. It is an important matter, but it is not a matter of

high policy because it has already been accepted by the government opposite; they do nothing about it.

The second problem is the shortage of hospital beds. I come from a community where there is no shortage. The planning by the local municipality and the local hospital board has been excellent over the years and we are well provided with the most modern facilities. But one certainly cannot say that for anybody living in the metropolitan area of Toronto. For an emergency situation there is a waiting period of three weeks, and for elective surgery one might as well come up to Brantford and have it done because the situation is that bad. We used to read about those problems back in the years right after the war—before 1950—but, if anything, it is worse now than it was then.

Little or nothing has been done to use government funds and initiative to establish a clinic approach to the practice of medicine. We have seen doctors moving out of small communities—and why should they not—and going into the larger centres to practice individually or in co-operation with some of their colleagues. After all, it is much easier because they can actually arrange for some time off; they can take a month off in the winter and go south or take a month off in the summer and have a holiday. I have no objection to that; after all, why should they not? They are among the highest-paid people in the province. Surely they should have an opportunity to enjoy their gains.

But this government should have some programme so that this clinic approach can be established in the rural areas as well, because we have to have more effective leadership.

There is a third problem, that of double billing. The government has not yet come to grips with this, and I personally am fortunate in having available the professional services of doctors who do not double bill. For example, I have a daughter who gets regular injections because she is allergic to bee stings. She goes up every two weeks and I never get a bill. And that is the way it should be. I pay high premiums.

I am not asking for services that we do not require, but there are many doctors—and, Mr. Speaker, you know this—who make a fetish of charging some additional small fee, maybe 10 per cent—maybe it is not so small—and they either get the money directly from the government or insist that their patients be billed separately for it. And I call it a fetish because I think it is meaningless. It

is associated with the ridiculous argument which surely was laid to rest about 1963, that it would interfere with the doctor-patient relationship.

I will tell you what interferes with the doctor-patient relationship, and that is when you get a separate bill for services of a normal, regular, routine variety. This double billing is something the government is going to have to deal with.

The high cost of doctors is another. I am not concerned that doctors are overpaid. I simply want this government to realize its responsibilities when our own law, our own statute, says that we must pay whatever the Ontario Medical Association decides. We must have some means not just to discuss but to negotiate with the doctors' professional organization.

I am here to say that I believe the doctors and the medical profession would welcome this. An example is what has been established in Newfoundland. They do not often set an example for us, and yet I read from a headline in the *Toronto Star* of four days ago: "Newfoundland Doctors Agree To Limit Income."

There is nothing startling about this other than that the government of the province has met with the professional people and worked out a rational programme, accepted on both sides, so that the public service is going to be maintained and the costs are going to be held at a proper level.

We must recognize that the doctors are perhaps, I would say, our most important professional people in the community. This has got to be recognized in every way, as well as in their remuneration; but surely this government cannot lie down like a young pup with its belly up and be walked over by every professional group within this province. I think it is essential that we do this.

The high premiums themselves are, I guess I am up to five, the fifth serious problem in The Department of Health. You have heard the litany of the fact that we in this province pay the highest Medicare premiums of any jurisdiction in Canada, and you have heard frequently from our side that even the funds payable by the government of Canada are not properly applied to our Medicare programme in a reduction of direct costs.

Our approach is that these costs go on a phase basis, and I use that phrase—you may call it a weasel phrase if you want, but it cannot be done all at once—and that these costs be transferred to the tax base of the

province. After all the premiums I pay, it amounts to, eight times a year, a very inconvenient tax and a very high tax indeed. We feel that we should accept the approach that it is a service that is paid for through taxes and those people that have the money pay more than those people who do not have the money.

I am supported in this by the member for Quinte (Mr. Potter), the former chairman of the health committee and the present Minister without Portfolio. I hope to goodness that his conviction in this matter has not been destroyed simply because for some reason not clearly understood he has been taken into the cabinet as a Minister without Portfolio.

I would say further that my conviction and contention is supported by the Minister of Health himself, because he recently said that in his view such a transfer should take place. I quote from the *Toronto Daily Star*—I really should mix up my sources a little more than this—but the *Toronto Daily Star* of March 19, 1971 in the body of the article I read as follows, and I quote:

Davis put a damper on Bert Lawrence's recent proposal to finance Ontario Health Insurance schemes from income tax revenues rather than premiums. Lawrence said earlier this week he hoped the government would drop the premium method of financing within a year or two.

So there is support on all sides. The NDP do not support that contention. I am sure that when the opportunity comes for their spokesman, they will want to stick with premium financing.

Mr. Singer: They want to support the government. They have confidence in the government.

Mr. Nixon: Well, they can do that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Very weak!

Mr. Nixon: It may be weak, Mr. Speaker, but it is not as weak as the position put forward by the NDP.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: This might be a reasonable occasion, when the member for Oshawa (Mr. Pilkey) is here, to say something about this because I have said publicly, and just a few days ago in the presence of the hon. leader of the NDP himself, that I felt his elevation

to the leadership of the NDP was as important politically for me and for the Liberal Party, as the selection of the Premier to head the Conservative Party.

I say this, we do not often talk politics here, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: No, no. The whip does not like it.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Rather rare.

Mr. Nixon: —but with the range that you give us, sir, I just want to say something about that. I think it is a matter of substantial importance. I have been asked what do I think is so good about it, and I can simply point to the fact that objective polls have shown the bottom is dropping out of NDP support. Back prior to 1967 they had 27 per cent of the support—at least it dropped to 19 at that point—now they say it is down to 14 per cent; and I attribute this to a number of things.

Mr. Trotter: Eleven per cent!

Mr. Nixon: Certainly one of them is the leadership they now have.

Mr. Speaker, it is in bad taste to indulge in personalities, but I must on this occasion because I would say to you that I have the highest regard for the leader of the NDP, both in his ability and as a person, so do not say I am attacking that man. I am simply saying to you, sir, that the people—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just sounds like it.

Mr. Nixon: —of the province are not interested in either encouraging or supporting an alternative which they see—

Mr. Pilkey: The Leader of the Opposition made a better speech last year.

Mr. Nixon: —which they see as a radical alternative. The leader has a number of problems. I read from the *Toronto Daily Star* of February 24: "Waffle Candidate Says NDP Stephen Lewis Interfering with the Party". I read from the *Toronto Daily Star* January 21, 1971: "NDP Win This Year Would Surprise Morton Shulman."

I read further from an article in the *Toronto Daily Star* January 13, 1971, written by Sally Barnes. I quote two paragraphs:

Asked by a member of the audience what chance NDP leader Stephen Lewis would have defeating Davis at the polls, Shulman said "pretty small". Reminded by reporters after the meeting that he had

predicted at last October's provincial NDP convention that the party would win the next election, Shulman said that opinion was based on the premise that Walter Pitman, not Lewis, would win the leadership.

I quote from Ron Haggart's column of January 22:

The question was put to Mr. Shulman: "What would your reaction be if the NDP won the next election?"

Answer by Mr. Shulman, "Surprised".

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: I read also from the *Toronto Daily Star* of March 17 and the headline is: NDP POLICY BOOKLET CALLED DISHONEST

A policy booklet outlining the NDP's platform for the next provincial election was denounced as a dishonest betrayal of socialism.

A second paragraph.

At that convention Penner said the party took a decided turn to the left.

Mr. Lewis: Who are Steven Penner and Morty Shulman anyway?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the NDP said who is Steven Penner; he is the man they have been attempting to nominate in Dovercourt.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: They have had two abortive nominating conventions, the last of them ending in fisticuffs, sir, and even—

Mr. Lewis: And there is a third scheduled; imagine the possibilities.

Mr. Nixon: If there is a third scheduled, or whatever the word is, Mr. Speaker, it looks as if the leadership of the NDP is trying to nominate Steven Penner who considers the NDP policy booklet a dishonest betrayal.

Mr. Pilkey: The Leader of the Opposition did a much better job last year.

Mr. Nixon: The reason the member for Oshawa has not been here for the last day or two is that he has been down in Detroit picketing the headquarters of the UAW.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: One of the most interesting newsclips I have seen for a long time on television was the tense, drawn face of Gordon Woodcock—Leonard Woodcock—the international president of the UAW and the member

for Oshawa's boss, as his picture was taken as he drove his limousine through the picket lines into the headquarters of the UAW office.

Mr. Pilkey: Very responsible, very responsible man.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): What a disgrace.

Mr. Nixon: Well, it is a fact, is it not. And
Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Pilkey: One of the leaders in American—

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Woodcock, like the management man he is, and just like I have seen managers of plants and the presidents of plants who say: "Well, we must go into our premises in order to carry on the business, you know", and so as he went through one of his employees went up to the rear end of the car and pasted on a sticker that said "scab." You know that word.

I must say that I did have just a few of these press clippings gathered together. I thought they might be of use, and I have not got too many of them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have a few too.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I would not say he was well prepared but—

Mr. Nixon: But you see, I have said that the member for Scarborough West's election as leader and the policy stands taken by the NDP were just as politically valuable to me as the election of the new leader of the Conservative Party—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member is home free.

Mr. Nixon: —because it really means that the Liberal Party is going to win the next election.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have heard people say the leader of the NDP is not a radical—and perhaps he is not, but certainly his party has a radical stance—that the section which he controls does not control the party, that there is a group—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Ask him if he is a radical?

Mr. Lewis: I think so.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There you go.

Mr. Nixon: There is a group called the Waffle group which imposed the policies of nationalization of resource industries, and nationalization of the automobile insurance industry.

Mr. Lewis: I am never sure.

Mr. Nixon: I have a quote from the *Toronto Daily Star* once again, March 17: "NDP would take over gas firms." I am just here to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I think this is appropriate, that the NDP have the right leader. Their policies are correct for a third party. Why have a third party which is not offering this sort of an alternative? They are now led back where the old CCF was back in the days of the Forties when they almost won an election.

The member for York South, of course, was endeavouring to bring the party into the centre of the road where there was some opportunity of political viability and success. He advised the delegates to that convention, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, not to vote for anyone who was either a radical or had a radical image or for policies which would move the NDP beyond any possible chance of getting the support at the polls. Unfortunately the party did not follow his advice. And for that reason I would say that the NDP support has dropped the way I have indicated in the polls that I have expressed to the House.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): What about how the Liberal support dropped from 1967 to 1970?

Mr. Nixon: I do not know; you rely on the leadership of the UAW. Certainly if I were to dig out that column about the member for High Park—maybe I should.

In that same column, January 27—

Mr. Lewis: The government is over there.

Mr. Nixon: —the question "What is your view of the influence of the labour movement in the NDP?" was answered by the member for High Park. "Of course the labour movement is the backbone financially and member-wise." So you see, you have got a fairly restricted base. But I should depart from—

Hon. Mr. Davis: A restricted financial base?

Mr. Lewis: Very.

Mr. Pilkey: Very restricted.

Mr. Nixon: Restricted to labour support. However, we will no doubt have that discussion. Now the Premier is back; of course he has his own problems. The leader of the NDP has to contend with the Waffle group and the interesting thing is, of course, in the NDP the Waffle group is the biggest section of the party.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on.

Mr. Nixon: The member for Brantford (Mr. Makarchuk) supports the Waffle group—

Mr. Lewis: He does not. Now do not attack his integrity when he is not here.

Mr. Nixon:—and it is a very, very difficult problem that he has. But you know, the Premier of Ontario, the leader of the Conservative Party, has to cope with the Lawrence-ites. We well recall that in the days immediately following that great evening, and believe me, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Morning.

Mr. Singer: That was the night the machines would not work.

Mr. Nixon: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was morning. I was there. I can tell you.

Mr. Nixon: There was a tremendous interest and concentration, and we would see the people representing the television, thrusting their microphones into the face of some charming little lady and saying, "How do you feel now that your husband has lost?" I had the great sympathy, and perhaps I was sensitized as much as anybody to the crass approach that some of the newsmen took, and had the greatest admiration for those charming ladies who would give an answer probably worthy of or better than the answer that their politician husbands came up with.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): How did you feel the time you lost?

Mr. Nixon: I know. That is why I say I am as sensitive to this as any of you might be. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the former Treasurer once or twice felt that he would like to have been a candidate himself because he could really show them how to do it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Never.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: It did not even cross his mind.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He probably could have—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Very good candidate.

Mr. Nixon: After the decision was taken there was a small lull over the weekend and then in the front page of the *Toronto Daily Star* there was the second man standing on snowshoes looking out with his glittering eyes, and the cleft in his chin saying: "Bill Davis better clean out the deadwood or the Tory party is going to be beaten." Was that not his quote?

An hon. member: Yes, yes.

Mr. Nixon: The deadwood is still there. There is a certain amount of rearrangement. However, the new Premier, the new leader, certainly wanted to paper over these problems as quickly as possible and I was here sitting almost in my place during the swearing-in ceremonies—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Two rows back.

Mr. Nixon:—in which the present Attorney General was brought forward as the Premier's chief lieutenant, the man who was going to have position second to none in the new administration.

Mr. Nixon: Well, second to one, in the new administration. And I thought, well that is politically required and a good decision.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You have a whole lumber yard back there.

Mr. Nixon: Then we come in here, Mr. Speaker, for the opening of the House and we see that really the Treasurer's decision has paid off; that while the House leader is sitting on the Premier's right as is proper—

Hon. Mr. Davis: As a matter of fact, it is on my left.

Mr. Nixon:—his chief adviser is Childe Darcy, the man who has wreaked chaos in at least two departments and is really the main destructive force in the Conservative Party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was over there, the House leader was here last time.

Mr. Nixon: All right, I am just pointing out to you, Mr. Speaker, the way it appears from here, the way it must appear in the province and most important the way it must appear to that large number of people at the convention who did not vote in support of the present incumbent.

Mr. H. L. Rowntree (York West): You see through a glass darkly.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Take whatever comfort you can.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, there are one or two things I wanted to refer to. I think it is very doubtful I will finish these remarks today. But I did want to say something about the other leadership candidates. Not specifically here, but it is as good a time as any.

The present Minister of Health is not in his seat, but I had a great deal of respect for him as a candidate, because he was one of the few people who was prepared to open up with the Tories and with the people of the province and talk about the problems of modern government. He pointed out, for example, that there had to be a review of Ontario Hydro policy, which has been accepted by the government, by the Premier, and this we applaud. But in his rationale for his statement, he as a candidate said there was not enough information available to the members of the cabinet to justify the rate changes that were imposed by Ontario Hydro.

Now forgive me for seeming to quote him. I simply give my understanding of the essence of his remarks, and this was in direct contrast to what had been put to this House many times by the former leader of the government, supported by the present leader of the government, that in fact they were in continuous consultation, that they were prepared to substantially bolster this policy. I felt that his contribution was an important one to modern democracy, that he was not prepared simply to walk around each issue time after time, never grasping a hold of any of them—he was prepared to say something of a meaningful nature.

I should not leave these remarks without just referring to the present Minister of Education. I was particularly interested in what he was doing as a candidate. He took the other extreme and refused to talk policy at all. That is all right. Probably he had assessed his own chances and knew what they were. There was a chance that he could win, particularly if there was a substantial hangup, as there really was, in which they might look for an alternative.

But the interesting thing really was that a good many of the people employed in the government and by the politicians over there thought of him as their candidate because they knew that he would be around long after the dust had settled, to fight again—and I think that is fine, and they want to be

around to fight again too. Their insurance policy was the Minister of Education and he served a tremendously useful purpose.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That does not make sense.

Mr. Nixon: Yes it does. It makes eminent sense. But as a result of this, the change that we have is something less than a new way. Up until last year, we had the former Premier and Treasurer sitting in those two chairs. On occasion I would call them white-lipped and trembling, because the Treasurer would get up and tremble when he talked about his dealings with the government of Canada, and it seemed so appropriate.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Enough to make anybody tremble.

Mr. Nixon: We are going to have to now, as we take part in the debate—it is great when there are other people here—but frankly, the former Treasurer has been moved a little bit far out of the main rank. We are looking here at the Premier obviously and his left-hand man, the Treasurer now. Once again, there is a certain similarity that you may not be able to see over there but we can see it here. I do not want to refer to it other than to say that Alan Eagleson has noticed some of these—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: But there is a great similarity and there is a great difference. I wish he were here now—I truly wish that he were here—because the members would all be able to see it. On the one face there is a smile, a friendly smile of sweet reasonableness and, on the face that is absent, there is that scowl that has become associated with the political personality of the Treasurer and which has been so destructive in the Conservative Party, in The Department of Municipal Affairs, in planning in this province and now I predict in our relationships, fiscal and otherwise, with the government of Canada.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I was discussing my views of cabinet reorganization as an introduction to my remarks.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Was that accepted at the member's policy convention? I know your educational policy was not.

Mr. Worton: What position does the Premier hold on that?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I think that once again the Premier is substantially misinformed.

Mr. Trotter: Very much so.

Mr. Nixon: There may be another occasion when we can debate the Liberal Party pronouncements and I would welcome it. But I do want to move on, hopefully, to complete my remarks in only one sitting, although I cannot guarantee that, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Single school system.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier has interjected "the separate school system."

Hon. Mr. Davis: I said "single."

Mr. Nixon: I want simply to say to you, sir, that our position has remained unchanged and will remain unchanged. We believe in the extension of public support to the separate school system and we await with interest any statements or comments that the Premier might make when he says, time and again, that we have never given an official response to the separate school trustees. We will wait for that, because we know that the Premier has the matter under careful study and as soon as Mr. Goldfarb tells the government what to do, it will do it.

I want to refer to at least one other area of cabinet reform and I intend to refer to this again in the unemployment debate that is scheduled for Monday. That is the need for the establishment of a department which I would choose to call "Construction and Supply". It in fact would build the roads. It would therefore have about \$600 million to deal with in building and maintaining each year.

It would also have the responsibility for the erection of all public buildings and, depending upon the year, this would amount to another \$200 million.

It would also have the responsibility for purchasing for all government departments—and I say all government departments. Frankly, I would extend its services so that we could centralize a good many of the purchases in The Department of Education and The Department of Health as it affects the facilities out across the province.

I feel that such a department, while it would not itself make policy, would for the first time give the government a fiscal instrument in which they could apply this kind of

leverage to the economic cycles in the province. I am going to refer to this on Monday.

I am not just sure of the schedule of that debate. If I only have 10 minutes, I will have to do it more hurriedly than I am now, but I think that is extremely important.

I did want on this occasion, however, to refer once again to the problems of centralized purchasing that have been experienced by the government offices. The Treasurer was the author of the programme. In my years of experience, I have heard him rise in his place as Treasurer and say that the idea had no merit and reject it out of hand. I heard him rise 18 months later and say that it was a good idea and would save us \$10 million the way he was prepared to administer it.

I have heard his statement on the acquisition of staff and I notice that he was not the one who made the statement when the top echelon of that staff was either dismissed or was severed from the government service under rather strange circumstances just a few months ago.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Will the member show me those statements some day?

Mr. Nixon: Yes, I will do that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Send them over.

Mr. Nixon: Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote briefly from an article in *The Financial Post* of February 27, 1971, by Philip Mathias. Mr. Speaker, I quote about four paragraphs and the first one is this:

By its own admission, the government could save at least \$10 million of taxpayers' money through centralized purchasing, which is used at least to some degree by most provinces, states of the United States and big cities. The main obstacles to centralization are fiefdoms, such as the Ontario Provincial Police, which stubbornly refuse to come under the central purchase and supply umbrella.

Purchase of vehicles has been centralized under The Department of Highways. However, both the OPP, the largest single purchaser of passenger cars in the government, and The Department of Correctional Services refuse to buy through Highways, believing their own car purchasing system to be superior.

Purchase of drugs has been partly centralized under The Department of Health. Correctional Services, however, does not buy through Health when a doctor prefers

to prescribe brand name drugs for his inmates.

The Department of Education under Minister William Davis, which is one of the biggest printing buyers—

I think he means the department—

—is particularly notorious for going its own way with printing purchases—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are really some errors in that statement.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, the minister will have an opportunity to enter the debate. But, Mr. Speaker, a final quote from *The Financial Post*:

Financial Post asked one deputy minister why such chaotic purchasing could be tolerated in Ontario. "Poorer provinces such as Saskatchewan need the economies of centralized purchasing," he said. "We are a little wealthier in Ontario."

Mr. T. P. Reid: What is \$10 million?

Mr. Nixon: This is the kind of policy, as Winston Churchill would have said, up with which we will not put. Now if the Premier wants to make a new wave—and he is yet to do so—it is in areas such as this where, beyond talking about economy and efficiency, he can effect economy and efficiency.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to refer next to The Department of Education. I do not intend to change its name but I will broaden its scope to include University Affairs and Correctional Services. I feel that until we begin looking at correctional services as an emanation of our education responsibility, that they will not be fulfilled properly.

We believe that such a large department would not be unwieldy as long as the minister did not feel it was his responsibility to interfere with the direct day to day administration of any of the organizations or facilities that came under his direction. The government can say what it likes about that. When we get to discussion of the estimates of The Department of University Affairs, if we ever do, we can talk about ministerial interference.

We are concerned with cost cutting. I mentioned just a moment ago centralized purchasing which, I believe, would save \$15 million if applied by a Liberal administration. It will not save anything until you people take it up seriously.

In this area the present government, led by the Premier when he was Minister of Education, has taken a meat axe approach to the control of the cutting of education costs.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member does not support that?

Mr. Nixon: All right, let me finish my remarks please. I feel very, very strongly about this.

Before I got this job I used to be a classroom teacher. I say that now with some hesitancy because this is an area of some sensitivity since the leader of the government opposite is trying to provoke a confrontation with those people.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not at all.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, no?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Leader of the Opposition would like to.

Mr. Nixon: Right, but I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in my experience I have had to conduct classes in chemistry and physics with 46 young people there trying to do experiments. This is the sort of thing we are heading for if the government continues to apply a meataxe approach to the cutting of education costs.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Nonsense.

Mr. Nixon: Now I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we can make substantial cuts and if they have to involve a change in the pupil-teacher ratio I will support it. I think we can cut costs in other areas, even our commitment to OISE—and frankly I do not feel that we can do away with educational research. I have a certain degree of a difference of opinion with people very close to me in this connection. But I think it is essential that we maintain a degree of responsible and reasonable research, not the commitment that has been made over the years with those people working in that \$60-million building on Bloor Street—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the member want a larger commitment?

Mr. Nixon: —and is wasting millions of dollars. Surely this is something that we can improve on.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Nonsense.

Mr. Nixon: But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, in the areas of administration, construction and support that are directly under the control of the Minister of Education, and therefore under the control of the Premier, we can accomplish real savings without downgrading the quality of education as it occurs in the classrooms.

The teachers have a heavy responsibility, not only as citizens but as people on the scene in education. Not everyone knows what that is like. They have to see that in their professional and personal capacities they bring every pressure to bear on the government so that the quality of education is not infringed. But I would say to you, sir, that the threat on the part of the secondary school teachers to walk out of their teaching responsibilities on May 3 is totally irresponsible and has nothing to do with putting the kind of responsible pressure on the government of the day that is required.

Surely we do not have to embark on some sort of government by confrontation in this regard; we, as members of the Legislature, can direct the pressures from the community on the government opposite so that in the words of one of the editorialists, "the fight to reduce school costs is a fight that the people are not going to lose, on matter what the pressures." That was well stated.

Mr. Deans: Was that the *Toronto Daily Star*?

Mr. Nixon: That was *The Globe and Mail*. But, Mr. Speaker, the pressures of abandoning the kids in the classroom surely is one that does not fit responsibly in this situation.

I have referred to a number of changes in the makeup of the cabinet of the province; I have indicated previously that I feel rather than the 21 departments with—what, up to 25 ministers now, or 23?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Twenty-three.

Mr. Nixon: Twenty-three. In order to direct the affairs of this province we should reduce the ministry to about 12. There are many over there who will say, "The body of work simply could not be done." But I accept, and have stated it previously, the contention of the committee for government productivity which said that a minister with a large department can have the assistance of someone elected in support of his party as a parliamentary assistant, or whatever the name would be.

I have pointed out already, I think in the Premier's absence, that the reason he cannot do it is that all of his members already have jobs. There are only nine over there who do not have some special—perhaps not responsibilities, but certainly emoluments which are the direct gift of the politician sitting opposite.

Mr. Lewis: No, they should not have.

Mr. Nixon: That is why the new Premier cannot undertake the kind of reform I am talking about. I want to talk about The Department of Energy and Resources Management. I have already spoken about the environment. Perhaps I would leave that area for another day because there is one area that I do want to deal with before concluding my remarks. That has to do with the Premier's department itself.

I think he is interested in "pulling a Trudeau," if you want to say that, and making the Premier's department the nerve centre of government, which I believe it should be. I think we are not here to debate the merits of the previous administration or particularly the outstanding abilities and some shortcomings of the previous Premier, but I believe one of his failings was that he gave too much freedom to the cabinet ministers who should have come more directly under him. I have already referred to the problems that the province has suffered in the whole field of planning.

For this reason I believe that the planning function and secretariat must be centralized in the Premier's department. It cannot be left to the Minister of Municipal Affairs just because he has got the community planning branch. It cannot be left with the Treasurer even though, in his estimates a few months ago, he called himself "the chief planner of the province." It cannot be left with him.

On the other hand, it simply cannot be coordinated by a simple committee with the Premier himself as its chairman. We have tried that. It does not work. The planning secretariat and the functions must be directly responsible to the Premier and no one else. Here is an area where I would second a member supporting me as a legislative minister, if you want to call it that, not as a minister of planning, but who would have specific responsibilities in this area.

This area of planning is tremendously important. I will not refer too extensively to it at this time. I have already said that one of the reasons for imposing regional government—that it would give a broad planning area—we can reject as long as the government of this province is prepared to accept its responsibility in two ways: First, to have a broad plan for the whole Province of Ontario, similar, I would say, to the Toronto-centred region plan—I reserve the right to be very critical of that in a moment—but similar to that, extending over the province. If one

wants to regionalize it in three or four areas, I would not mind.

The second responsibility is that when a municipality or a county or a region does satisfy itself that it has a plan which it wants to have classified as official—and many of them pay many hundreds of thousands of dollars for these plans—then the government of the day must recognize it, once it is approved, as official and not require centralized approval for all of the decisions that are associated with these plans in the municipalities around the province.

In other words, there can be a broad plan into which the municipalities' official plans will fit. And at that point whoever is responsible for planning at the centre has "hands off" and the locally elected officials—the mayor, the reeve, the corporation or the planning board which they appoint—have the power to make local decisions as long as the government is informed. They do not have to wait until the government sees fit to pick up that particular piece of paper six months later and start discussing it.

In this broad plan for the province, it is my feeling that more than anything else we have to designate growth areas which, in fact, will decentralize the growth in Ontario away from this particular area.

The biggest criticism of the Toronto-centred region—and it has been brought forward very successfully by the leader of the NDP—is that it contends not only that this area will continue to grow but that it will grow at a greater rate both in population and industrial concentration than any other area.

I think we must reject that. We must set up growth points around the province that in fact will decentralize this sort of growth.

I remember very well a statement made at a Liberal policy meeting held in Ottawa by John Reid, MP for Kenora, brother to another very effective and knowledgeable politician we all know.

Hon. Mr. Crossman: Who would that be?

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): What is his name?

Mr. Nixon: His statement was that we in northwestern Ontario cannot accept the complaints of you people down in Toronto that the Americans are dominating our industrial expansion and our business responsibility simply because we are not prepared to forego the influx of capital from any source in northwestern Ontario." He said there is only one way that can be made meaningful and it

is if the government of the province undertakes a policy and a programme of real decentralization. Then we can say, "Let us have stringent regulations, review boards and development boards which will in fact encourage the Canadian aspect of our business and the management of our business."

Mr. Pilkey: How would the Liberals carry out decentralization?

Mr. Nixon: I will tell the hon. member.

Mr. Pilkey: All right.

Mr. Nixon: He made a point which I think has great validity in this continuing debate, because in this broad plan of the Province of Ontario we Liberals will enact there will be the designation of growth points which in my view should be the centres of electrical and gas power in this province. That means that at Nanticoke on the shores of Lake Erie, which is now farmland—I have visited the place; many people have visited the place—there is one of the largest electrical installations of fossil fuel in the world under construction. It is going to cost a minimum of \$800 million when it is completed.

Now that area is obviously a prime point to be designated for industrial growth. The government, under Ontario Hydro is building large dockage facilities and unloading facilities. There will be sewage disposal, there will be water facilities, there will be rail sidings, highways must be built; and there will be a plan for the development of new communities, although that is not so essential. But surely, if you think of that; and think of our commitment in the Bruce Peninsula; not only at Douglas Point, which is miniscule compared with the Bruce power station which is going to be the third largest atomic plant in the world when and if it is completed.

It is going to have major dockage facilities right on the Great Lakes. It will have to be equipped with the same sewage disposal, water facilities, rail sidings, everything that a growing industrial community must have.

Think of Lennox, down near Kingston. The minister from Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Apps) is not here. I would like his views on this. Here is a major oil-fired installation in the eastern part of the province, and there are at least two locations in the north to which these remarks also apply.

Now these should be the centres of industrial growth. Our party policy would not permit us, and I would not lead it into this

sort of a policy, to say to any industry that wants to expand or locate here: "You must locate at A or B; at Nanticoke or Lennox, or Lambton."

Mr. Pilkey: How would the Leader of the Opposition decentralize it?

Mr. Nixon: All right; but public funds, with our initiative, and using the development scope of Hydro, which is going to be borrowing \$1 billion a year at that rate, starting in 1975, can set out these facilities which can be so attractive they cannot be rejected by growth industries.

That is the way it can be done, that is the way the Liberals will do it.

Now the spokesman for the NDP says it cannot be done.

Mr. Pilkey: I did not say that it could not be done. I just wondered how they would do it.

Mr. Nixon: He is either prepared to throw up his hands or to take the socialist approach and say industry must be directed. Well, that is it.

Mr. Lewis: That is what the Tories have been doing for 10 years. There is no difference.

Mr. Nixon: So, Mr. Speaker, this is the form of plan that we must accept, and a Liberal government will accept.

Mr. Lewis: There is no difference.

Mr. Nixon: The member says there is no difference. He will have to vote for it! Actually, he does not have to vote for us.

Mr. Lewis: Okay; I will not.

Mr. Nixon: Very good; there is one vote lost.

Mr. Deans: It is not lost.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the other area which I think deserves expansion in the Premier's office itself is the whole area of foreign influence on our economy and culture. This is a substantial issue. I feel the present Premier has made it an issue and has in fact rejected those of his colleagues who were prepared to argue with him. I can remember well the story in the newspapers, and I wish I had the appropriate clipping, referring to the member sitting up in the back row there, the former Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall); I do not

know what the headline was, but the paraphrase was these candidates for leadership are going to have to come down to earth when the campaign is over. In other words they are going to have to reject all that political promise stuff. The result was that they were elected and now that minister is sitting up there; in a place where he would rather be, I guess.

Mr. Trotter: The greatest thing since sliced bread.

Mr. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: Whatever happened to their education programme?

Mr. Nixon: I think it would be unwise if the instruments of the implementation of the Conservative policy in this regard, when they get one, were to be left to the tender mercies of any minister, but I would say least of all the present Minister of Trade and Development. He has been making speeches recently. It sounded to me as if he was using his predecessor's speech writer. His jokes are not quite as good yet, but the approach is much the same.

In this area, Mr. Speaker, I believe the control must be at that centre of responsibility, the Premier's office. There may come a day when we will be complaining the Premier is spending too much money and building too big an office, but I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, that one of the criticisms of the previous administration was that there was not this kind of control, that he was prepared to say to the Minister of Trade and Development: "Whatever you say, Stan, is right"; to the Minister of Municipal Affairs: "You go ahead, I really am too tired to worry about that."

Well we cannot have that any more. If there is going to be any water in the new wave, it has to be in the emphasis in the position and responsibility of the Premier.

Mr. Randall: Has the member been listening to Trudeau's speeches lately?

Mr. Nixon: As a matter of fact, Mr. Trudeau is in Brantford right now and there is a place I would rather be than here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member means he would rather be at home than here?

Mr. Randall: With Mr. Trudeau?

An hon. member: I would rather be there than listening to the hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: All right, Mr. Speaker. That is devastating.

Mr. Speaker, the final area which I think must be concentrated in the Premier's office is the federal-provincial-affairs secretariat. I, for one, would be horrified if he left it with the Treasury and particularly with this Treasurer. I am displaying my prejudice for the abilities that have been exemplified. He is a sabre rattler, even worse than his predecessor.

I believe that federal-provincial affairs must come under the Premier's leadership and not the Treasurer's. I think the time has come when we must deal with the government of Canada as the government of Ontario, and get away from the ridiculous political confrontation which has been characteristic of this government's predecessors, white-lipped and trembling.

The government can immediately say we are selling out to our Liberal friends in Ottawa. We will put up with that and it will cut ice with no one except the government's enthusiastic supporters sitting in the back row.

The future of Confederation is co-operation—and I mean real co-operation, not the old-fashioned backwoods Tory political confrontation that is characteristic of the Minister of Highways and Transport and of the Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is a two-way street, as I understand it.

Mr. Nixon: That is fine. All right. The Premier can insist on co-operation and he is the best judge as to whether he is getting it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I always have.

Mr. Nixon: Is the Premier saying he is not getting co-operation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have not been here long enough.

Mr. Nixon: All right, so he waffles on that too.

Mr. Speaker, while my remarks have been based on my view, and the official view of our party, on the re-organization of the cabinet—where the problems are and what the legitimate answers would be—the real thrust of my presentation has been to emphasize reform in the cabinet, reform in policy, and to reform the tax base of the province. There will be other opportunities to talk about taxation and our dealings with the government of Canada, and I intend to

do that. The second thrust is on decentralization. The policies of this government have been centralist. One of the weirdest things about the recent leadership campaign was to hear the Treasurer, talk about more autonomy for the municipalities. He is the greatest centralizer that we have had here in 100 years and he has been supported in this area by the others.

Now, decentralizing—giving autonomy to the municipalities, decentralizing the business of government so that the Minister of Lands and Forests has his headquarters in the north, and the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) does not have his headquarters at the corner of Bay and Bloor, in that brand new building, but he is somewhere in some good agricultural area like Brant county and the decentralization also of growth.

I have told the hon. members of our plans as a party and as a government this year—

Hon. Mr. Davis: And all in 20 minutes.

Mr. Nixon: —to establish a plan for the province which will decentralize this growth.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, the thrust is on democracy and democratizing this House—

An hon. member: Hear, hear. That is right.

Mr. Nixon: —and the responsibilities of government.

All right, all right. The Premier is nodding. Perhaps he is the one who wrote the section in the speech delivered by His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor a few days ago, that the government was going to listen to the people and act accordingly. We would have thought that they would have been doing that up until now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We have.

Mr. Nixon: Yes. So once again the Premier's words were meaningless.

The second criticism that I would have of the last Premier is that he downgraded the effectiveness of this House. That is the most serious thing, in my view, that I can say.

An hon. member: Shame.

Mr. Nixon: Over those years, we know that the time for debate in estimates has expanded to incredible proportions. In that sense maybe he lost control of the House. But the role of the private member, the role of the standing and select committees, has essentially been reduced under his leadership and certainly we are looking for a reversal of that trend under the new administration.

I believe that there is nothing new over there. The Attorney General said that they had to get rid of the deadwood and they have not done so. It is going to take an election to get rid of the deadwood and replace the Tories with a Liberal government.

We have come a long way since Governor Simcoe had all the powers in his own hands. You can see his portrait downstairs. He looks like a fellow who can wield them. With great respect to the present government, and the dignity of his office, the only thing he can say to us without advice is "Pray be seated." Everything else must be written and put before him by his advisers, and that is responsible government.

So we have come this far, but surely we do not believe that democracy has achieved perfection. We must take the steps that I have outlined at the governmental level, to reform government, to decentralize it and to democratize it. We feel that this administration and this Conservative Party has lost its initiative. The commitments that the present leader had to make in order to achieve his present high office have bound his hands and, in fact, covered his eyes. Because of this, he leads nothing but a caretaker government. The province needs new leadership. We on this side, are ready for an election. It is an election that we confidently expect to win.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was wondering when that matter was going to be brought up.

Mr. Randall: Sit down while you are ahead.

An hon. member: You blew it.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): I think there was a tack in that seat.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: I have a substantial amendment for the consideration of the House, Mr. Speaker, and I move, seconded by Mr. Singer, that the following words be added to the motion:

This House regrets:

1. The failure of the government to come to grips with the grave problems of unemployment and inflation.

2. The failure of the government to propose and implement realistic measures of economy toward spiralling education costs consistent with the high quality of education and training required by our young people to fit them to compete in the nuclear age.

3. The failure of the government to adopt the appropriate policies and to implement the necessary action to ensure to those of our people engaged in agriculture a fair return for the contribution they make to the economy of Ontario.

4. The failure of the government to provide adequate hospital, nursing home and convalescent facilities to those of our people suffering from illness.

5. The failure of the government to extend financial aid to separate education through grades 11 to 13.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is an interesting wording. Did you check that carefully?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Politics.

Mr. Nixon: To continue:

6. The failure of the government to provide leadership to those engaged in local government to recognize the disabilities they face in dealing with the high cost of administration, and to inaugurate policies which would bring to reality a new partnership with the municipalities to replace the present autocratic approach and encourage local initiatives in autonomy.

7. The failure of the government to move toward decentralization of government services in order to bring those services into a closer contact with the people of Ontario.

8. The failure of the government to adopt consistent and realistic policies to control pollution, arrest the deterioration of the environment and to restore the benefits of clean air and pure water as the rightful heritage of the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Nixon moves, seconded by Mr. Singer:

That the following words be added to the motion:

This House regrets:

1. The failure of the government to come to grips with the grave problems of unemployment and inflation.

2. The failure of the government to propose and implement realistic measures of economy toward spiralling education costs consistent with the high quality of education and training required by our young people to fit them to compete in the nuclear age.

3. The failure of the government to adopt the appropriate policies and to implement the necessary action to ensure to

those of our people engaged in agriculture a fair return for the contribution they make to the economy of Ontario.

4. The failure of the government to provide adequate hospital, nursing home and convalescent facilities to those of our people suffering from illness.

5. The failure of the government to extend financial aid to separate education through grades 11 to 13.

6. The failure of the government to provide leadership to those engaged in local government, to recognize the disabilities they face in dealing with the high cost of administration and to inaugurate policies which would bring to reality a new partnership with the municipalities to replace the present autocratic approach and encourage local initiative and autonomy.

7. The failure of the government to move toward decentralization of government services in order to bring those services into a closer contact with the people of Ontario.

8. The failure of the government to adopt consistent and realistic policies to control pollution, arrest the deterioration of the environment and to restore the benefits of clean air and pure water as the rightful heritage of the people of Ontario.

Mr. Singer: Is the motion carried?

Mr. Lewis moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Randall: So ends the 28th reading of the Liberal Party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, just before the adjournment, are we to understand there is no particular time limit in the special debate?

Mr. Speaker: There is normally a private members' hour on Monday. Has it been determined whether that—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the whips can meet on this. From our standpoint, we would be prepared to forsake the private members' hour for this rather important debate on Monday, if there is consent. I would never suggest it without consent.

Mr. Lewis: The Prime Minister does not preempt the rights of the House, of course.

Mr. Speaker, since it is such an important debate, and if there are not time limits, some of the speeches may go 20 or 25 minutes; could the debate then continue beyond 6 o'clock on Monday? Could it therefore be done in one continuity rather than an interruption, that is, pick up again on Tuesday?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to carry on until Tuesday. We will see how the debate is going on on Monday and will make some determination Monday afternoon.

Mr. Singer: No evening sessions unless there is an emergency?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. Unless there is an emergency.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 2, 1971

Lands and Forests booklet "Fishermen" about mercury and fish, statement by Mr. Brunelle	137
Assistance to sport fishermen and camps in northwestern Ontario, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Nixon, Mr. T. P. Reid	137
Accounting of disposition of funds in Financial and Commercial Affairs Department, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Nixon	138
Revision of OMA fees similar to Newfoundland agreement, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Shulman	138
Progress report on developments at Pickering nuclear station, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Nixon	139
Potential number of new jobs created by housing programme, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. MacDonald	139
Moratorium on increases in hydro rates by productivity improvement committee, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. MacDonald	140
Charges laid against two officers of Ontario Provincial Police, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Singer, Mr. Trotter, Mr. Shulman	141
Information from Sweden re dredging of rivers to clean up mercury pollution, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. T. P. Reid	142
Offering of dental care under same principles as medical care, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Ferrier, Mr. Deans	143
Provincial government initiatives re housing in terms of dollars and starts, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald	143
Stopping abuse of welfare system by certain young people, questions to Mr. Wells, Mr. W. Newman, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Shulman	147
Labour Department involvement in closing of Cobalt Refinery, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Lewis	147
Quebec broiler producers shipping broilers for Ontario markets, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Spence	147
Introducing Japanese Ambassador to Canada and Japanese Consul General, Mr. Grossman	148
Presenting Report, Fisheries Loan Act 1970, Mr. Brunelle	148
Motion to appoint Mr. Reuter and Mr. Rowe as chairman and deputy chairman, Mr. Davis, agreed to	148
Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. Nixon	149
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Lewis agreed to	173
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Davis, agreed to	173



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, April 5, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 5, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon we have as our guests in the east gallery students from Hillside Public School in Clarkson, and in the west gallery from Burlington Central High School in Burlington, Oak Park Junior High School in East York and King Edward Public School in Toronto. Later this afternoon we will have the First Queensway Rangers hosting Girl Scouts from Lansing in Michigan.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

LAKE OF THE WOODS HOSPITAL ADMITTANCE PROCEDURES

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker while we wait for the rest of the ministry to arrive, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Health.

Is he aware of the reported undue hardships suffered by the people living in the Lake of the Woods hospital administrative area because of the admittance policy established by that hospital board, which has resulted in the resignation of Dr. W. A. Baker?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the problem there. The details, or my judgement on it, I do not have at the moment, because I am just that—"aware."

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Might I ask the minister if he would report to the House when further information is available?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

OSSTF NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Nixon: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Education: Can he tell the House what steps he is taking to negotiate further with the representatives of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation regarding the May 3 deadline?

Hon. R. S. Welch (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I am in the process now of drafting a letter to be sent to the executive members of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation, inviting them to my office so that we might review the guidelines and all of the facts used as a basis of this year's guidelines. I hope that that will be a very productive meeting.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Does the minister know when his committee on negotiating procedures might give an interim report?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that by date, but I understand their public hearings start around May 5. Do not hold me to that date, but certainly early in May they plan to hold public meetings following up the briefs that have already been submitted. I have no idea when the committee may be ready, either with an interim report or its full report.

Mr. Nixon: But it will probably not be this year.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, since the minister has been drafting this letter of invitation to the teachers for some considerable time, does he have a date in mind, particularly in advance of May 3, when he will be meeting with them?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, I think I am suggesting in the letter—although I would rather the letter itself be read by the teachers—that right after the Easter break I am hoping we might get together.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: Can he report what plans he and his confrère from Quebec made over the weekend in their plan of approach to the federal-provincial negotiations, or the next federal-provincial conference to be held in June?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I met with the Premier of the Province of Quebec late Friday afternoon and Friday evening. It was really an opportunity to meet him in my capacity as Prime Minister of this province to discuss a number of those matters that will be raised at the federal-provincial conference. We exchanged a few thoughts that we had and I really have nothing beyond that to report to the House.

SWEEP PROGRAMME

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of policy, I wonder if the Premier can report to the House what steps are going to be taken in the immediate future to implement the programme known in the Speech from the Throne as SWEEP, which has something to do with student unemployment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, a point of order!

Mr. Speaker: Point of order!

Mr. Bullbrook: I did not realize my leader was going to ask a new question. May I ask a supplementary in connection with the meeting with the Premier of Quebec?

Mr. Speaker: No. Unfortunately, no. The hon. member was in the House and if he wished a supplementary he should have risen to his feet and indicated such and Mr. Speaker would have—

Mr. Bullbrook: May I invite your consideration that what you are asking of this hon. member is to read the mind of my leader?

Mr. Lewis: And that is difficult.

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of University Affairs): That is not easy!

Mr. Bullbrook: I cannot tell whether the Leader of the Opposition is rising to ask a new question or a supplementary question. I afford him the courtesy of asking a supplementary if he wishes to—

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member wishes to ask a supplementary question in the future he should rise to his feet, and if the person asking the question, whether he be the leader or not, does not have a supplementary then the member will be given that opportunity.

Hon. Mr. White: I have news for the member, his leader is not very pleased at

what he is doing. I wish the member could see his face.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, recognizing that I cannot object unduly to your ruling, I ask you to consider the fact that my leader rose, and I could not tell whether it was to ask a supplementary or a new question.

Mr. Speaker: I do not know what would prevent the hon. member for Sarnia rising also.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Now that the hon. member has heard him does he still not know?

Mr. Bullbrook: I rise now, therefore, and ask Mr. Speaker if I might direct a supplementary to the Premier?

Mr. Speaker: The answer is no; the time for that supplementary has been passed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

SWEEP PROGRAMME

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order just raised, I draw to your attention, sir, that we have not seen the Minister of University Affairs for some days since the House convened. It is nice to have him back.

Now I would like to return to my questions until such time as my hon. colleague from Sarnia can ask his own further question about the negotiations with the Prime Minister of Quebec. Is the Premier going to tell us something about his programme on student unemployment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I expect that during the discussions going on this afternoon, and I assume again tomorrow, there will be a specific reference to this particular programme.

Mr. Nixon: So that we can have the information available for the debate this afternoon, can the minister confirm that the student unemployment rate in this province is expected to rise to 18 per cent within the next month?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I find that very difficult to confirm as far as the student unemployment rate is concerned, because the bulk of the students are still in the school environment I do not know how I can confirm that to the hon. members. There

will be suggested figures as to the numbers over the summer months, but certainly to confirm an 18-per-cent figure today, when the universities and the post-secondary institutions are still operative, would be very difficult for me to do.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): A supplementary question: Is the minister aware that the youth unemployment rate, by which is meant the 14 to 19-year-olds, in this province is at present 18 per cent? Does he have a specific programme dealing with youths who are out of school to get them back into the productive labour force?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I see the member for Scarborough East has been able to update his leader's knowledge of this matter.

Mr. Nixon: Certainly far in advance of the Premier's.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): He is just jealous.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is a very real distinction between student unemployment, when the students are still within the school system, and young people who are not in the school system and seeking employment. There is a very real distinction, Mr. Speaker. I am aware that the rate is high, far higher than we would like it to be.

Mr. T. Reid: What is the government doing about it?

TRAFFICKING IN DRUGS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General: Can he explain to the House why, evidently, the reporter writing in *The Globe and Mail* this morning was able to determine that illegal trafficking in drugs is extensive in almost every community of Ontario, and yet the police forces under his direction seem to have great difficulty in determining this?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I did not hear that the question was directed to me.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, it is directed toward the Attorney General.

Can he explain to the House why a reporter for *The Globe and Mail*, writing in this morning's edition, was able to point out,

specifically, in a number of communities in Ontario, where the illicit sale of drugs is going on? Why is it that the law enforcement officers cannot determine this and do something about it?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I was out of the city on the weekend. I have not yet read the morning *Globe and Mail*. Before answering the member, I would much rather take a look at that story.

Mr. Nixon: A further question, Mr. Speaker; it follows so directly on the rather outraged comments that the Attorney General made—off the cuff, he said—last week that I thought he would be deeply concerned with this matter.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The enforcer, the enforcer!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

NURSING HOME COVERAGE IN HOSPITAL INSURANCE PROGRAMME

Mr. Nixon: I urge him to examine it.

If I might ask a further question of the Minister of Health: Can he tell the House whether negotiations are continuing with the government of Canada toward the covering of nursing home facilities in our hospital insurance programme in this province?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I have not had an opportunity of meeting with Mr. Munro as yet, but it is on the agenda for discussions.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Can the minister tell the House whether this is a matter of some priority in the government opposite or whether it is something that has been downgraded since it was discussed in the Conservative leadership campaign?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I would consider it of the highest priority.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): A supplementary question: If the federal government does not agree to make the necessary adjustments will the Ontario government proceed on its own to cover nursing home care under the hospital plan?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): What a question.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): That is a good question. It puts the ball right in that court.

Mr. Lewis: That is an excellent question.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I would think, Mr. Speaker, that my position would not be improved by answering that question.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): The answer must be no in that case.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE TEACHERS' BARGAINING RIGHTS

Mr. Lewis: To gladden his day, Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of University Affairs.

What will happen to the collective bargaining rights and status of community college teachers when the new Department of Universities and Colleges is formed?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, this is not in my department now. I think perhaps the question might go to the Minister of Education, although it must be self-evident to the members of the Legislature that these government policy announcements will be made in due course.

Mr. Lewis: Well then, a question for the Minister of Education—whatever that meant:

When the new Department of Universities and Colleges is formed and the community college teachers are thereby transferred, what would be their collective bargaining rights? What would be their jurisdiction? Would Bill 217, which was withdrawn last session, still apply; or would they have a status different from that?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I think it is reasonable to assume the status of the particular professional group to which the member alludes would be determined at such time as the government either reintroduces the respective bargaining bill or makes any further statement with respect to that particular policy matter.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, in view of the fact that the community college teachers have now taken a vote and the results of that will be announced, is there nothing the government might now say to them by way of its plans in view of the major change in their status?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, what is the major change in their status as of this afternoon?

Mr. Lewis: I read the Throne Speech—some of it, I felt, might be substantial. There was a part of it which implied a new department of universities and colleges which would affect their status fundamentally. Is the minister saying that part of the Throne Speech has also no relevance to this?

Hon. Mr. Welch: If the hon. member had listened to my comment on the question, Mr. Speaker, I understood he was making reference to their status by virtue of a vote which had been taken. I cannot understand why there would be any change in that particular matter at this time. After all, they follow certain procedures to make a certain determination; why would it be any different this afternoon?

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary; when the government changes their status as announced in the Speech from the Throne, what then is their jurisdiction? How then will they have the right to bargain collectively or otherwise?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Government policy in that matter will be announced in due course.

MOOSONEE HOSPITAL

Mr. Lewis: Might I ask a question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker?

Has the minister had an opportunity—I realize his assumption is recent—to look into the problems of building another hospital in Moosonee and the apparent conflict for the citizens of that area with Moose Factory; as well as the effects it might have for the whole area?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have.

Mr. Lewis: Has the minister a considered opinion as to whether or not the hospital will be built? If so, what size; and what will be the effects on employment opportunities for those in the federal hospital in Moose Factory, should it close down?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I cannot know what the federal government will do with regard to its hospital, but I am advised that good sense supports the province building its hospital on the mainland and not using the island. What impact this would have on unemployment or on employment itself I cannot

measure, but there is no immediate need, as I understand it, for the federal government to close its hospital merely because the province goes ahead with the mainland hospital.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask one final supplementary?

Has the minister an assurance from the federal government that the hospital in Moose Factory will continue to remain open and provide services and employment at the present level?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, I have not, Mr. Speaker. There is a direct conflict of opinion here between my department and the federal department and that has not been resolved; so I have not any such undertaking.

Mr. Speaker: A further supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: I have a final supplementary then.

Since the whole economy of the region would be dislocated, totally, were the federal government to close down the hospital, as they have implied they might, why is the provincial government moving ahead with its smaller hospital without considering all the community groups and individuals involved in the area? I gather they have not yet been consulted?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: We are considering all these facets of the problem; but fundamentally, I am told the hospital on the mainland makes sense and supporting a hospital on the island does not make sense.

The federal government would like to see more attention paid to its hospital and we would like to proceed with ours. This has not been resolved but I hope it will be soon.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Humber has a supplementary?

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Is the minister aware that half of the wards in the federal hospital at the present time are unoccupied for lack of patients?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, but I am also aware that this particular hospital, which is on an island, is not as efficient, not as useful—certainly not during parts of the year because of ice and water conditions—and therefore that ultimately a hospital on the mainland makes good sense.

Mr. Ben: If I can follow that up: if water and ice conditions are going to interfere with the transportation of patients to the island hospital, will not the reverse hold if

you put one up on the mainland and the one on the island is closed down? That is the people on the island are going to be isolated from hospital and medical services?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: They have been told—let me put it this way, I have no word from the federal Minister of Health to suggest that he is going to close the island hospital.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. MacKenzie) a supplementary? No. The member for Scarborough West?

AMENDMENT OF BILL 96

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour.

Will the Minister of Labour be amending Bill 96 regarding length of notice of termination or layoffs to conform with federal legislation, which is rather more generous in the terms? Will the minister introduce, for the House, his amendment?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Labour): I will take it under consideration.

AMENDMENT OF BILL 83

Mr. Lewis: Another question of the same minister, Mr. Speaker.

Would the minister consider amending Bill 83, which provides certain rights and security to women in the work force, to conform with federal legislation which will allow maternity leave of 15 weeks, rather in excess of provincial legislation?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Again, I will take it under consideration.

CLOSURE OF COBALT REFINERY

Mr. Lewis: Well fine!

One last question of that minister, Mr. Speaker, and I shall relinquish my time. Has the minister yet ascertained what his department has done to provide alternative employment for the 90 or more employees who lost their jobs by virtue of the termination of the Cobalt refinery?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This particular problem arose before our termination legislation became effective in January. As a matter of fact, my understanding is it started some time last summer. At that time

there was the involvement, as I understand it, of The Department of Mines in connection with whether or not this particular plant could or could not stay open. It apparently was uneconomic and could not stay open. To answer the question specifically, my department has had absolutely no contacts with the people up there. Neither have the Manpower consultant centre people. I phoned the Manpower centre at New Liskeard this morning and my understanding is that there are 20 people registered at Manpower centre, and there would be employment for most of that 20 if they would relocate, say in Timmins, or Kirkland Lake. There is employment, but apparently they do not want to move.

I have had no requests. I am advised there is nothing in my file in connection with any requests from anyone in connection with that particular matter.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. Jackson: Would the minister tell us exactly where in Kirkland Lake and in Timmins these men are going to find employment, when as a matter of fact Timmins and Kirkland Lake both have one of the highest unemployment rates in Ontario?

Mr. Lewis: What is the use of registering at Manpower?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I am advised by the Manpower centre that there were 20 jobs available some time last month and only four wanted to move.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peel South.

CAPITAL FUND TO ASSIST SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Trade and Development. Would he advise just when the capital fund which will be established to assist small business might be in operation; and may applications be submitted to the department, in anticipation of approval?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It is a matter of government—

Mr. Singer: It just happens I have a four page statement.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, it just happens that I do not have a four page answer.

Mr. Nixon: The Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) has his speech ready.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The details, Mr. Speaker, will be announced to this Legislature before release; I should have an announcement ready in a few days.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sarnia.

DOW CHEMICAL LAWSUIT

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General and Minister of Justice. Could the Attorney General advise whether he was properly quoted in a recent column in the *Globe and Mail*, relative to the government action against Dow Chemical and the constitutional questions involved, in saying "Let the fish sue us"? Secondly, is that representative of the attitude of the government in connection with this lawsuit? Third—and most important—was there any liaison between this government and the government of Canada in connection with them joining in the action to avoid any constitutional obscurity?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Permit me to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wellington South.

GRAND RIVER GRANT

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Is the minister in a position to inform the House as to when he is going to make an announcement in regard to the giving of moneys to the Grand River Conservation Authority in regard to various dam projects?

Hon. A. G. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, anything on the grant structure for the Grand and other authorities will be made some time this month.

Mr. Worton: This month?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

OMA FEE SCHEDULE

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker: Has the minister made a proposal to the Ontario Medical Association that beginning May 1 they accept somewhat less than 90 per cent of the fee schedule, specifically 80-odd per cent; and what was the response of the OMA?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not made such a proposal, but it was among a group of alternatives that I asked them to consider and they are still considering those alternatives.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has a supplementary?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Is this not in contradiction to the minister's statement the other day that the intention of a new fee schedule was to get more money in the hands of the general practitioners and less in the hands of the specialists?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I do not think there is any conflict, Mr. Speaker. There were half a dozen different permutations and combinations discussed in relation to whether it be 100 per cent, 90 per cent, 90 per cent without extra billing, 87 per cent—as the member can see, there are four or five different alternatives available and they were all put on the table and left there for consideration.

Mr. Shulman: A final supplementary, if I may. Would the minister not agree with me that if the OMA were to accept this proposal this would result in a larger amount of extra billing to the public?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I suppose that is correct. I cannot say how the medical profession will react but it would seem to be possible that this is the way they would react.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: I have two supplementaries. Is the minister then saying that the request of the OMA to accept 87.5 per cent was not contingent on that being full payment?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I never made a request to the OMA to accept any particular amount, 90 per cent or 87 per cent. My answer is categorically that this is one of many alternatives discussed. I have made no request to them specifically to accept any particular figure.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a final supplementary for myself, Mr. Speaker, why does the minister not share this kind of discussion and policy proposal with the House inasmuch as it involves a major outlay of public funds?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has asked his question.

Mr. Lewis: Well before the minister negotiates, as it were behind the scenes, why can it not be shared with the Legislature?

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): It is discussed in our caucus.

Mr. Lewis: Well, why should it not be shared?

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): If the NDP gets elected, the member can make the decisions.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

PLASTIC CONTAINERS FOR ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I should like to ask the Provincial Secretary if my understanding is correct that the Liquor Control Board is actually studying the feasibility of dispensing alcoholic beverages in plastic containers in order to decrease the pollution potential of the landscape by the bottles they presently use?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): It may well be, Mr. Speaker. I will look into that and bring the answer back for the hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: At an early time?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Immediately.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

CITY OF TORONTO PLAN

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Can the minister indicate whether he will accede to the request of the Chinese community in Toronto that the recent amendment to the city of Toronto plan extending the area for residential development west of McCaul Street might be referred by him to the Ontario Municipal Board?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, that request has not

come to me, but when it does I will give it consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa Centre.

TREATMENT FACILITIES FOR CRIPPLED CHILDREN

Mr. H. MacKenzie (Ottawa Centre): A question of the Minister of Health regarding crippled children in Ottawa; does the minister believe that before this year is over he can give complete clearance for the construction of adequate facilities for treatment of crippled children in the Ottawa area?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think so. And it will be a part, I hope, of the general facility involving the new Ottawa children's hospital.

Mr. MacKenzie: A supplementary: Do I understand the minister to say that the facilities will be available for crippled children in the ensuing year in Ottawa?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, I cannot commit myself to that, Mr. Speaker. All I can say is that in conjunction with the development of the Ottawa area children's hospital we will come to a position in relation to the facility for crippled children, and it will be done at one time.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

TESTING OF NEW NON-PHOSPHATE DETERGENTS

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management regarding non-phosphate detergents.

Are new non-phosphate detergents being tested and approved by the minister's department before being allowed on the market?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. I believe that as far as the safety aspect of detergents or any soap product is concerned, this is checked to see that there is not any detrimental effect resulting from the use of that particular product, but we just test it from the point of view of the effect on the environment.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is the minister aware that some of the new detergents consist of 45 per cent mere table salt; and if so would this not be detrimental eventually to the rivers?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, Mr. Speaker. We are satisfied that although some of these detergents are not effective cleansing products, as they are not really doing a good cleansing job, they are not a menace or a detriment from the point of view submitted by the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Parkdale, a supplementary.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the minister's department has any guidelines to warn the general public if a product replacing a phosphate is actually worse than the phosphate, or in the alternative completely useless for the purpose for which it is advertised?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, to answer the last part of the hon. member's question first, which was similar to the previous question, we have not advised the consuming public that a certain detergent without phosphate is useless or is not effective. We certainly are concerned about any substitute for phosphates and detergents. One of the best substitutes that we thought would be on the market—that is NTA—apparently has the same bad effects and possibly even worse effects, according to the U.S. Surgeon General, as phosphates. Of course, we would make sure that any substitute—that is the catalytic substitute—for phosphate does not do any damage to our water or lakes and we would impose the same control as we do now for phosphates.

Mr. Trotter: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: When the department finds a product is useless and does not warn the public, does it warn the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, this is, I suppose, more along his line.

Mr. Trotter: But he would not know whereas the minister does!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We are not really concerned in my department whether or not a product will do the job it is advertised to do, as long as it does not harm the environment. Now I suppose there could be communication between myself and another department—

Mr. Trotter: Oh, surely the minister's department would be concerned?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —but this is not really within the realm of my responsibility.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Sandwich-Riverside a further supplementary?

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, do I understand the minister to say that NTA is not allowed now?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, Mr. Speaker. There are some soap companies, some detergent manufacturers, contemplating using NTA as a substitute for phosphate. Just recently the U.S. Surgeon General indicated that NTA may be just as harmful in the receiving waters as phosphate, but there is no conclusion or no final decision on that particular product.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, whose decision is it?

Mr. Speaker: There have been sufficient supplementaries on this question. If the member wishes more information he can get in touch direct with the minister.

The member for Renfrew South.

RAILWAYS SETTLEMENT

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour in four parts. First, does he have for the House the terms of the settlement arrived at shortly before 8 o'clock this morning between the operating engineers and the two major railways?

Mr. Singer: If not, why not?

Mr. Lawlor: Just happen to have it.

Mr. Yakabuski: Second, was that settlement along the lines of the Pearson formula, namely a 30 per cent increase? Third, what effect does he feel the settlement will have on the already exorbitant freight rates? Fourth, what disastrous effects will this have on the residents of rural, northern Ontario and other parts of Canada?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Glad you asked that.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): There is a loaded question.

Hon. Mr. Carton: The answer to the first part is, no. As to the other parts, I will take them under notice.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is going to have a full desk of advisories pretty soon.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

OFF-TRACK BETTING

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Could the Attorney General tell us, in view of the statement by his predecessor that Ontario wants to assert some form of control over off-track betting, what representations, if any, either he or his predecessor have made to date to the Minister of Justice in Ottawa?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The Minister of Justice in Ottawa has been here in Toronto, in this building, speaking to me about the matter.

Mr. Bullbrook: Shows the relative importance of the thing.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: As far as the government policy is concerned in this matter, it has not yet been fully determined.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, can I imply from the Attorney General's statement that he repudiates the previous policy statement made by his predecessor some time after November 13, and prior to his ascension to this prominent office?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, a question of privilege!

The hon. member for Downsview puts words in my mouth which are not correct. I did not assert that Ontario wanted to assert control over off-track betting. Our position was that when the federal government saw fit to pass legislation placing off-track betting within the jurisdiction of the provinces, as they have done with lotteries, we would be prepared to carry out our obligation in that regard.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of a further supplementary question to the Attorney General; could he advise us if and ever the Ontario government is going to have a policy about off-track betting?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes; sometime, if and ever.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East.

SUDBURY HOSPITALS

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): A question of the Minister of Health: In view of the fact that the province has made funds available to alleviate the long-term crisis

facing patients in the Sudbury area, what assistance can be anticipated to alleviate the short-term problem confronting patients of at least a month waiting period to get a bed?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I will see what can be done, Mr. Speaker, and report to the hon. member.

Mr. Martel: Could I ask the minister one more supplementary question that he might consider? Would the government consider making available funds to the hospital board wherein they could rent portable classrooms, and with a little remodelling make these into convalescent areas adjacent to the hospital, and thus make the active treatment beds available for active patients?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I shall have the department assess the proposal, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Waterloo North.

THE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs: Would the minister look into the actions of Scottish and York Insurance Company to see if their present policy contravenes any section of The Insurance Act, whereby they give special car insurance rates to anyone who is an employee of Peel county Board of Education or Bell Telephone Company?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, we have a committee looking at the whole question of insurance, particularly car insurance; the matter of claims, the matter of how they are handled, the question of delays, the time taken, the treatment generally with respect to this matter. Each individual complaint that comes to our attention is immediately investigated thoroughly and reported to the plaintiff.

Mr. Good: A supplementary question: Is the minister aware that, in my interpretation of The Insurance Act, no special rate may be given to any group of people in car insurance; and I am asking him whether he would look into this and see if that section of The Insurance Act is being violated?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are looking at this type of thing. If this is a particular complaint, certainly we are looking at it; and if we have not got it, if the hon. member will be good enough to let

us have it, we will deal with it and I will give him a reply.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron Bruce.

DEAD ELM REMOVAL PROGRAMME

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): I have a question of the Minister of Highways and Transport.

Why did the government buy German chain saws under the dead elm removal programme on Highways 400 and 401? Second, since the programme had the purpose of creating employment here in the province, does the minister not find that there is a contradiction in buying equipment outside the province, thereby creating jobs outside the country?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Mr. Speaker, if indeed he does, he was not aware of the fact that German chainsaws had been purchased. The best I can say is that I will look into it.

Mr. Gaunt: Would the minister give the undertaking to report back to the House on the matter?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would be delighted to report back to the House.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Citizenship and Provincial Secretary has the answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Scarborough West.

GRANTS TO INDIAN GROUPS

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Scarborough West had asked on March 31 about the confirmation of a grant to the Nisku Corporation Co-operative in pulp and paper. That grant has been announced in a press release on March 5. It was one of six at that time and the parties had been notified prior to the announcement in the press.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary: Does the minister have the size of that grant? I am sorry, it did not come to my attention.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It was not only the \$8,000 for the pulpwood operation, but an additional \$4,000 to establish a handicrafts industry in Moosonee.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cochrane South.

TRAINING OF DOCTORS

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health.

What plans has the minister under consideration so that a great many more Ontario young people will be able to study medicine in Ontario, and thus we shall be able to provide more of our own doctors for the province?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I think that "plans" would be too strong a word. The discussion relates to improving the flow of students which I understand is hung up by inadequate clinical facilities at the hospitals for teaching.

I am told that the academic support, the buildings and the scientific support is there and is adequate, but the phase in relation to clinical training has fallen behind. As soon as that bottleneck can be removed, I would think the percentage of Ontario trained doctors and those attending medical school can increase substantially.

Mr. Ferrier: As a supplementary: Is the minister considering the construction of any more medical schools *per se* within the province?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, Mr. Speaker. There is one I have heard discussed and I cannot even remember the details of that.

Basically, as I understand it, it is a question of reorganizing the teaching system so that the students within the reach of the hospital itself have adequate facilities for training under the doctors on the spot.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Has the minister then completely rejected the recommendation of the Ontario committee on the healing arts for the establishment of one new additional medical school in the province of Ontario?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, I have not rejected this—and this is probably the point that I have in my mind, that I know there is a discussion of another one being made available.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Humber.

TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT OF HOURLY-RATED EMPLOYEES

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Public Works tell us how many hourly-rated employees have had their employment

terminated during the last year, and how many of that number during the last six months?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the actual number. I can give the hon. member the figure in a day or two.

I can tell him that those hourly-rated employees who had left the department since the beginning of the year are in the process of being reinstated. The policy of letting go our hourly-rated people, which was announced last year, is being held in abeyance for the time being in view of the general employment situation.

Mr. Ben: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is this reinstatement only going to go back to January 1, 1971, or, if I may finish my question, is there some seniority system that you have in effect which would bring back into a state of employment those that had so many years seniority?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take a great deal of the time of the House at the moment to explain the situation. As I understand it, a number of the people who had been hourly-rated tradesmen with this department for varying terms of from two weeks to 10 years were offered, in most cases, the opportunity of joining the permanent staff instead of being permanent casuals, in line with Judge Little's recommendation and submission to the civil service association.

I cannot give the member the figure of those who transferred to permanent staff as opposed to those who left the department and worked elsewhere, but I will attempt to get the breakdown and either table it in the House or send it to the hon. member, whichever he prefers.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Dovercourt has a supplementary.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): In some of these job reclassifications the department has actually reduced the hourly rate, has it not; and when they reapply for their own position, they have to take it at a lower rate of pay?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, the situation was that the hourly-rated employees who were so-called casuals, who were at the going rate for the trade in the area, did not have the same benefits as the permanent staff civil servant, where there was a lower rate with some additional benefits.

Mr. De Monte: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, am I not correct in assuming that some hourly rates have been decreased by at least half, and that when they reapply they must reapply at the half rate?

Hon. Mr. Auld: What I attempted to say, Mr. Speaker, is that the civil service permanent staff rates for certain classifications are less than the so-called casual rate, or the going rate in the area, but there are other factors to take into consideration regarding civil service benefits, which would tend to narrow the difference between the rates.

Mr. Speaker: One final supplementary.

Mr. De Monte: Then may I assume that the civil service benefits are worth 50 per cent of a man's hourly rate?

Mr. Speaker: That is sufficient, the hon. member is getting into a debate. He can get this information from the Minister if he gives him specific instances.

Has the hon. member for High Park a supplementary?

Mr. Shulman: No, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Justice and Attorney General has the answer to a question.

CHARGES AGAINST OPP OFFICERS

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker on Friday last the hon. member for Downsview left with me two unanswered questions relating to the inquiry into the conduct of certain OPP officers.

The first was the date of the regulation appointing Judge Steen. I am informed that the regulation was filed in the office of the Registrar of Regulations on January 12, 1971.

Second, whether there had been any instructions from this government to Judge Steen as to whether it would be an open or a closed inquiry. I indicated that it was our assumption that it was to be an open inquiry, but that these matters are left entirely to the discretion of the presiding officer or the presiding judge.

In this case I would assume that it would be open, but in the event that argument or evidence was presented to the judge that it should be closed, then certainly we would want to leave entirely to him that option as to whether it would be open or closed.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary: Could the Attorney General advise us whether the regulations that he

refers to particularly dealt with the appointment of Judge Steen or gave power to appoint a judge instead of the senior police officer?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I have not seen the regulation. I will take that under notice.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, and perhaps to clarify that question. It is my understanding that the regulation to which the Attorney General refers was a general regulation. What I was asking was when it was decided that Judge Steen would be appointed in accordance with the terms of that regulation, and that was in fact my question.

The second supplementary that I have, Mr. Speaker, is what criteria will Judge Steen apply in determining whether or not there should be an open or closed hearing? Will the criteria be such as that presently set out in the Criminal Code, or does he just establish his own criteria out of the blue?

Mr. Speaker: The question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Bales presented The Department of Municipal Affairs 1969 summary of financial reports for the municipalities.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation, the amendments of the Act simply provide for the seizure and detention of a regulated product and prescribes the powers and the duties that will be given to a local board by the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Board.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1947

Mr. Ben moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The University of Toronto Act, 1947.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is two-fold. It is intended to entrench the provisions of The Ontario Human Rights Code, 1961-1962 in the Act and to begin carrying out the recommendations of the commission on the government of the University of Toronto, 1970.

The bill is an interim measure designed to more positively involve students in a university community and to preserve Canadian cultural values.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Young moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): This bill stipulates that every passenger motor vehicle sold in Ontario or manufactured therein after January 1, 1973, shall have bumpers, front and rear, which can sustain a crash at the tremendous speed of five miles an hour without damage either to the motor vehicle or to the occupants; and that after January 1, 1975, the crash shall be 10 miles an hour with the same results.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: The government notice of motion No. 1, by Hon. Mr. McKeough,

RESOLVED,

That this House express its grave concern over the serious unemployment prevailing in Ontario and throughout Canada.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to lead off in this debate. I think all members of the House have certain views on what can only be regarded as a most serious condition both in the economy of Canada and of Ontario in particular.

Others of my colleagues will be more specific on their particular aspects of the problem. I propose, in the course of the next 20 minutes or so, to range over the broad field and to make certain recommendations for action which the government believes will be helpful to solve the present unemployment crisis.

I should like to comment first on the current economic situation in Ontario and

Canada. This winter there has been an intolerable degree of unemployment in every part of Canada. Not only does this cost the country and each province enormous sums of money in additional welfare payments, but also the value of lost output is almost incalculable.

In addition to these costs are the even more significant ones: The fears and distresses of the individuals and their families who, through no fault of their own; are now unemployed. Our citizens have every right to be angry at this turn of events.

The restrictive monetary and fiscal policies pursued by the federal government in 1969 and most of 1970 not only produced intolerable levels of unemployment, but havoc in all other sectors of the economy as well.

Economic growth as measured by the gross national product rose by 7.5 per cent, but the real increase was only 3.3 per cent, and in per capita terms was less than 1.5 per cent. An illustration of the seriousness of the problem facing the community is reflected in consumer sales. The value of retail sales during 1970 increased by only 1.7 per cent while prices rose by 3.2 per cent. Thus the physical volume of retail trade actually fell during the year.

The business community in Ontario, as elsewhere, was hit badly by high interest costs and declining incomes. This has been a particular concern to us because of its impact on investment decisions by businesses, and incidentally because of the provincial revenue losses. For example, in the 1970-1971 budget we expected Ontario provincial corporation taxes to yield some \$457 million during the last fiscal year. In fact, by the end of February, the severe upset in business earnings had progressively reduced our expectations to some \$410 million, down \$47 million or 10 per cent from the forecast.

We are not talking about something new in the concern of the government of Ontario. At the federal-provincial conference over a year ago, in February, 1970, the then Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) warned the government of Canada that unemployment would soon be our problem. He suggested that the federal government should carefully review its policies and give serious consideration to measures to counter the unemployment that would undoubtedly appear. Regrettably, this advice was large ignored. Once again, in the Ontario government budget presented to this House in March, 1970, by my predecessor, the now Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton), these warnings were repeated.

The government's position at that time was stated as follows:

The Ontario government recognizes that the control of inflation has a high priority among economic policies. However, it does not agree that the objectives and methods of current fiscal and monetary policy are irrefutable. If the federal and provincial governments continue to retard economic growth, Canada would experience both higher unemployment and inflation as in the mid and late 1950's.

The basic strategy of price containment through tight monetary and fiscal policy measures has a number of disadvantages:

It is economically wasteful because it puts people out of work and limits the nation's growth capacity; the less-developed regions suffer most; it hits industries indiscriminately and regardless of their direct influence on prices; it hurts small businesses and raises the cost of doing business; it restricts the supply and raises the cost of housing; it is accompanied by rising unemployment, hitting hardest at low-income earners and unorganized labour; it results in slower growth, lowers capacity utilization and productivity, and raises the unit cost of production. And finally, even if inflation is cured, the problem of the eroded purchasing power of the fixed income groups remains unless compensation is provided.

I am still quoting from the 1970 budget.

Ontario, with a rapidly growing population and labour force, needs a continuous stream of private and public investment to create new jobs and raise living standards. Any attempt to cure inflation by creating unemployment runs counter to the Ontario government's objective of keeping unemployment at no more than 3 per cent of the labour force. This is a reasonable economic objective, and it is imperative that a more sophisticated strategy than induced unemployment is found to cure inflation.

The Ontario government is not willing to accept the view that unemployment is a just and effective way of solving the problem. The effects will fall on the lowest income groups in the community. It is inconsistent to propose economic goals of tax equity to help these citizens while contributing to their loss of livelihood as a price of solving inflation.

Those were the words of my predecessor one year ago; words which regrettably were not heeded by the government in Ottawa. After the passage of a year, the current employment situation is graver than our most pessimistic predictions at that time.

The Ontario economy now has the highest level of unemployment experienced since 1961. It is a fair comment to point out that the current high unemployment situation was created by deliberate federal policies designed to offset the pressures of the economy, which 18 months ago—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): It has been this way for 18 months. Why start now?

Hon. Mr. McKeough:—were generating an inflationary spiral. At that time, the federal government initiated policies aimed at curbing the rate of growth of both public and private sector demand. The philosophy of

this approach was that with less public sector demand, the pressure for price increases would be less severe.

The capacity of provincial and municipal governments to involve themselves in economic stabilization policies is considerably more restricted than that of the federal government. We simply do not have the same massive access to income tax fields and credit facilities. We have, however, tried to keep in step with federal objectives and policies and there was some tightening of the belt by the provincial-municipal sector across the country.

The major instruments of slowdown were tight money and a massive federal government budgetary surplus. These policies began to take hold in the early part of 1970, and until quite recently, aggregate demand declined progressively. There has been some improvement in economic growth in recent months, but it is still fragile and in the initial stages of recovery.

The federal government has over the last few months introduced new measures and relaxed older policies in order to bring about such a recovery, since inflationary pressures have become much less severe. The private sector is now slowly beginning to show some signs of renewed growth, having been through a period of severe profit declines and cost-cutting.

However, the recent relaxation of the anti-inflationary monetary and fiscal policies pursued by the federal government has not immediately improved the situation in the labour market. The rising trend in unemployment, which started in the last quarter of 1969, continued throughout 1970 and into the beginning of 1971. The unemployment rate in Ontario increased from 3.2 per cent in 1969 to 4.3 per cent in 1970, and in February, 1971, was 5.2 per cent on a seasonally adjusted basis and 6.5 per cent in actual terms.

The number of new jobs created decreased sharply in 1970. Employment increased by only two per cent as compared with a 3.7 per cent increase in 1969 and an average annual rate of growth of about 2.8 per cent for the period of 1957-1970.

While on the average we had 134,000 persons unemployed in the province in 1970, this winter unemployment increased to over 200,000. This compares unfavourably with an average of 134,000 unemployed in the first quarter of 1970. Bad weather, the prolonged General Motors strike, and the recent rather sharp rise in the female labour force

participation rates can be offered as partial explanations. However, increased interest in employment opportunities shown by females comes partially as an effect of difficult labour market conditions rather than as a cause. As the family breadwinners are laid off, it is a sad fact of life that many housewives are forced to seek work in order to maintain the family income.

There has also been a most disturbing increase in the number of older persons losing their jobs. It is difficult to believe that these people, with many years of service to the community, will find it easy to regain entry to the job market when the economy recovers.

The problem is not just one of numbers of unemployed but is also one of the duration of unemployment. The long-term unemployed, that is those on the unemployment insurance claims registered for 27 weeks or more, increased from an average of approximately 13,000 in 1969 to over 30,000 in 1970 in Ontario. These are people who have been in the labour market for some time.

The rate of economic growth late in 1970 accelerated slightly, but this growth can be maintained only if continuous stimulus is applied. The Bank of Canada is pushing an expansionary policy—short-term interest rates are dropping rapidly and the money supply is growing at a record pace. Monetary policy itself, however, is not enough. Vigorous fiscal measures are needed to secure the necessary expansion in real demand to absorb the normal growth in the labour force.

We have a right to expect the federal government to adopt the required policies, and now. A reduction in taxes could bring and maintain the required stimulus to keep the Ontario unemployment rate to the 4.3 per cent level of 1970. I should like also to emphasize that a general slowdown in the economy cannot be tackled properly by concentrating only on regional measures designed for areas of highest unemployment. There should be a concern for maximizing growth everywhere in economic and fiscal policy packages.

It should be stressed here that young people in the 14 to 24 year age bracket have been hit most severely by the rise in unemployment. There were almost twice as many people in the 14 to 24 year age group unemployed in the first two months of this year than there were in January and February, 1970. There may be 60,000 young people in this age group unemployed in 1971 on

average, or about 40 per cent of all the unemployed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say, sir, this picture is bleak and it is likely to remain so if there are no substantive changes in the present federal economic policy in the next few months. The unemployment rate could easily average 4.9 per cent of the labour force, which means that we would have an average of 157,000 people out of work in Ontario.

The implementation of appropriate fiscal and monetary policies could bring a higher rate of growth to the Ontario gross provincial product in 1971 and considerably improve conditions elsewhere in Canada. Much of this growth would be an increase in the output of goods and services with moderate price increases.

There is an immediate need for increases in consumer spending and investment to bring the provincial economy back to a full-employment level of three per cent. To do this we shall need at least 150,000 new jobs this year. To put that in perspective: Normally we have been creating in the neighbourhood of 100,000 jobs a year; 100,000 jobs this year would reduce the rate of unemployment to 4.3 per cent. To get back to three per cent unemployment we need to create at least 150,000 jobs this year.

The province, as I have pointed out, has been aware of these problems for some time and we have repeatedly pointed out to the federal government that we are prepared to co-operate to reinforce any measures which it implements to support the economy.

The time is now appropriate for the federal government to enact further measures to reinforce the early recovery of the economy. Steps must be taken which are resolute and positive. Action must be prompt and must be such that it will have an immediate impact on the economy as a whole. For this purpose we strongly recommend the elimination of the federal surtaxes on personal and corporate incomes—

Mr. Sargent: What is this government going to do? Forget about them?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This would allow increased consumer spending and provide business with an incentive to invest.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): The minister should be sitting beside Stanfield.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Without such fiscal measures the recovery of investment expenditures may be long delayed. In addition to

a tax cut, monetary policy should be mutually reinforcing. By forcing interest rates down and lowering the exchange value of the Canadian dollar, a powerful stimulus would be given to our export industries—automotive parts, pulp and paper and small manufacturers. Consumer purchases of durables and housing—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Is the Treasurer pronouncing a tax cut today?

Mr. Sargent: He has said this before.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Pay attention to this. This is good.

Mr. Sargent: Did the minister read the editorials?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Consumer purchases of durables and housing would also expand.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Take the tax off production machinery then.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: At the present level of economic activity inadequate demand is undoubtedly an important factor in the low rate of investment. There is, however, another factor which has a great influence. The factor to which I am referring is the uncertainty engendered by the lack of decisiveness in a number of federal economic policies. The discussion of the federal white paper on taxation was a valuable exercise in participatory democracy.

Mr. T. Reid: His speech is bombing like the government's housing project.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: However, it did have the disadvantage that it was difficult for those who were about to make business investments to assess the conditions under which they would have to operate. We look for some mechanism whereby a full examination of taxation measures can be achieved without creating the public uncertainty that we have faced during the last two years.

Mr. Sargent: And people will still be unemployed.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But the tax policy is not the only area of uncertainty to which I must allude. Another major area of uncertainty in federal policies is Canada's position concerning foreign investment. We consider a discussion of these issues to be vital and, as you know, we plan to have a full public examination of these matters in the near future.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): The former Premier said that was a phony issue.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is our hope that the conference announced in the Speech from the Throne will bring many issues into the open and allow sound government decisions to be made.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): They have been in the open for years.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I have dwelt at some length on the measures that we expect and hope the federal government will implement during the next months. We feel that the situation is very serious, and have taken cognizance of this in formulating our own policies. May I first draw your attention to a number of policies that we have already announced. As you know, we plan to participate in a \$500-million housing programme over the next few months.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): He is back on that one. What a phony.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He did not know anything about this programme when I asked him a question on Friday.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will do it in spite of you fellows. You fellows would hate to see it, would you not?

Mr. J. Renwick: This should be a great psychological help to the unemployed.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In addition, we have provided jobs for approximately 12,000 persons through a variety of programmes during the present wintertime crisis. We also plan, as announced, to provide 14,000 jobs for students during the summer months.

Beyond this, the province is dedicated to policies—

Mr. Sargent: So this is the government's programme.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —that eliminate all unnecessary government expenditures—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Yes, yes.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and, at the same time, stimulate the private sector of the economy.

Mr. Singer: Why not start with the ONR; that is a good one.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Does the member want to speak, Mr. Speaker? Has he a question?

Mr. Singer: Later.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and, at the same time stimulate the private sector of the economy where there is sufficient flexibility in the provincial budget to allow us to do so. I must remind members of the House, through you, sir, that the amount of discretionary fiscal policy that the provincial government can normally undertake is very limited, representing no more than a few per cent of the total budget.

Mr. Sargent: Did the minister ever hear of fixing the building code?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We are, however, actively reviewing tax measures that will serve, as we explained in our discussion of federal government policies, to stimulate the economy further. It is not possible for me to proceed further on this matter until my budget speech on April 26, but let me assure you, sir, and the members of the House, that we will take all measures that we can conscientiously countenance to relieve the present deplorable situation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we join with the government in expressing our grave concern of the serious unemployment prevailing in Ontario and throughout Canada. I listened to the Treasurer with a great deal of interest, particularly when he was talking about steps which should be taken not only by the government of Canada but which could reasonably be adopted by this government.

For that reason we shall pay some very careful attention indeed to his announcement in the provincial budget, expected on April 26. Certainly his comments regarding tax reduction would lead us to believe that he has come as close as is humanly possible to an announcement, before the fact, of budgetary tax reduction and we look forward to seeing just what form that will take.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nixon: I feel that this debate is a useful one. If we were simply to leave it to the Throne debate itself it would of course be diluted in a good many other important matters that must be discussed which are strictly federal matters. Therefore, setting aside this day, or whatever period of time is necessary, to give the members of the Legislature an opportunity to express their views is certainly welcome on this side.

I think it is essential, however, that we stress—certainly from this side of the House

—what steps the government of Ontario might have taken in the past and should take in the future to improve this situation. I had the impression that the speech delivered by the Treasurer, completed a few moments ago, might well have been delivered by his federal leader. There seems to be a certain weakness in the opposition at the federal level and perhaps the Treasurer of Ontario is attempting to fill that gap.

In answer to my questions asked on the second day of the session, the Premier of Ontario stated that the reason the federal funds to assist in measures combating unemployment were not taken up more quickly by his government and that of his predecessor was that the effective date of the regulations was April 1 and Ontario was ready with plans for that date—at least it met that deadline by about eight or nine days.

I feel that his comments were essentially misleading. He knows as well as I, and all other members of the House, that \$17 million has been available to the province and it was necessary—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): What does the hon. member mean by “available”?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I can explain to the Provincial Secretary, who as usual is labouring under a heavy load of misapprehensions, that other more progressive governments were able to bring forward specific programmes, have them approved and spend the money.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No. Just tell us what he means by “available”.

Mr. Nixon: That money has already been put into circulation; for example in the Province of Quebec, and I give the House these specific pieces of information.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Borrow money, borrow money!

Mr. Nixon: The federal announcement was on December 9, 1970, and the federal government made available to the Province of Ontario the right to \$17 million to counteract unemployment in this province. Obviously that is not enough money, but it is a specific programme and I want to refer to it.

The Premier's statement with reference to the deadline of April 1 was seriously misleading. As early as February 15, in this year, Quebec had signed an agreement with the federal government for \$16 million of capital projects and as of April 1, \$10 million

of that fund had actually been disbursed to fund specific projects in that province.

Mr. Bullbrook: It is amateur hour over there again.

Mr. Nixon: Again, by April 1, out of a total federal programme of \$160 million—and again I would say it is inadequate, but it happens to be the federal programme for this year—

Mr. MacDonald: A Liberal programme.

Mr. Nixon:—a total of \$115 million worth of provincial projects had already been approved—none of these in the Province of Ontario, because this government did not follow the federal initiative.

The reasons for the delay are obscure. Obviously the government opposite, under the present Premier and his predecessor, had its mind on other matters. But surely in those calm days, when the former Premier of Ontario was beginning to relax and put his feet up and look at the plans and specifications for sailing ships and other things, he might very well have taken the advantage to use these federal funds. Instead of that, he passed it over to his successor who, I must say, in the few days immediately following his appointment, saw to it that at least the announcement was made.

We do not know who is responsible. All we know is that we lag, once again, far behind, not the government of Canada, but the other provincial jurisdictions, and I think that is a significant thing.

There is another area, while I am talking about this. The Premier opposite—and certainly the Treasurer, if he has done his homework in his new portfolio—is aware that the government of Canada announced to the provinces almost two years ago that it was prepared to withdraw from 15 per cent of its take of the corporation income tax available from the mining industry. It was put to the provinces to make their own individual decisions as to how this money would be used. The provinces could simply fill that room themselves and thus increase their own net income from that source or they could undertake other programmes to foster expansion of the mining industry.

Once again, the Province of Quebec—and I believe this was under the Union Nationale jurisdiction—immediately saw fit to use this room to expand the prospects of the mining industry there and it reflects in the level of employment in the mining community in that province.

The Province of Ontario has taken no action. I put it specifically both to the Premier and to the former Treasurer, in a debate similar to this that was undertaken this fall, and said it was our position that the province should not take up this additional income but should make it available to the mining community itself, not in any way to improve their incomes except in the long run, because it should be made available under an inspected programme so that these additional funds would be channelled into the expansion of exploration and development.

If that had been undertaken at the time the federal government made this tax room available—now almost two years ago—then the problems that we face in the Tri-Town area because of the closing down of those mining communities might very well have been obviated.

The Treasurer is speaking to the Premier now and perhaps they can come up with a decision in short order, because it seems to me that the advisers to the Treasurer and the former Treasurer have been lax in not putting forward a positive programme that could have made available the usefulness of this initiative; not because it comes from the federal government, but because other provinces have reacted differently to this province and that is where the comparison must come.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Just one point of order so that the record is clear. I am advised that the federal government made that statement not two years ago but less than a year ago. I would, of course, further point out—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member would want to be quite fair. This would have been no help in the Tri-Town area because those particular firms were not paying tax in any case.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor and will continue with his remarks.

Mr. Nixon: If I simply might reiterate the point that other provinces accepted this opportunity and built on it with more imagination than this province.

Mr. Singer: That would not be hard either.

Mr. Nixon: We have been reduced, on the part of the government, simply to saying

that unemployment is the responsibility of another jurisdiction. It is difficult to decide that. The Premier and his chief adviser, the Treasurer, are quite convinced that the responsibility lies in only one place. We, on this side, feel it is much broader than that.

My second point actually is a bit of history—and fairly recent history—and I know that the Treasurer will check my dates in these matters because it has to do with those periods of time during which the government of Canada was attempting to take some of the heat off the economy. Even Conservatives opposite were concerned about the pressures of inflation and what it was doing not only to those people who are earning wages and living on fixed incomes, in the case of our pensioners, but how it was affecting the business community. I think, as a matter of fact, the present Minister of University Affairs, the former Minister of Revenues (Mr. White), said on December 23, 1969: "It is not appropriate for Ontario to be blamed for the inflationary spiral which is in effect an international problem."

Mr. Singer: Who said that?

Mr. Nixon: The former Minister of Revenue. I think that he is right. I think that he was right on that occasion. Certainly the pressures of inflation, if not worldwide, were certainly experienced by most of the jurisdictions in the free world and I would ask that reasonable gentleman to draw his own conclusions with regard to the matter that we are discussing today. Let us, Mr. Speaker, look at the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of University Affairs): If the hon. gentleman is inviting a comment—

Mr. Nixon: Oh, not at all.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point for comment.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Might I suggest that unless it is a matter of personal privilege or a point of order, the members on all sides of the House refrain from interrupting the speaker who has the floor. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. Nixon: Then during the period of the federal programme to contain the economy and take some of the heat out from under it—I am looking at the date here—I believe

one of the most important announcements was made on December 23, 1969, which prompted the then Minister of Revenue to wash his hands of Ontario's responsibility in that situation. That, members know—

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition is making certain assertions and asserting that he is quoting a position held by me. I think in fairness I should have the opportunity to contrast the inflationary conditions which existed in the western world and which did indeed affect Canada with the fact that since that time international conditions have not increased unemployment but, in fact, international conditions have greatly decreased unemployment in Canada from what it would otherwise have been.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister, of course, has no point of order and he has every opportunity to engage in the debate later and make his point. The Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, as a result of that federal programme, there was a lot of political flak, not only today but over the many months since the original announcements. After all, federal civil servants were dismissed and laid off. The federal programmes were reduced. Even though the hon. Treasurer deemed fit to quote the former Premier, we all know that the response of the government of Ontario was substantially, by its words, in support of a programme under federal initiative to contain and control the expansion of the economy at that time. I remember seeing a copy of a letter signed by John Parmenter Robarts, or whatever his name is—

Mr. Singer: Himself?

Mr. Nixon: —by himself, which was sent to the heads of all of the municipalities—I regret that I do not have a copy of the letter here—telling them to undertake every possible means under their control and at their disposal to cut expenditures, particularly capital expenditures, at the municipal level.

It was the proper thing to do, and a good many of the municipalities took it very seriously and I think there was a reduction of at least the potential expenditures at the municipal level, and there certainly was at the federal level, but in the meantime the provincial budget continued to soar and spiral, reaching almost \$4 billion last year. At the

very same time when this was going on, we would have expected this administration to take some steps at least to order their affairs to bolster substantially what was, according to the public expectation, a Canada-wide programme.

I ask you, sir, to recall that during that specific period of time this government entered into a building programme, the like of which we have not seen for many years. The new office complex directly to the east of this building, a project which had been postponed for a few months, was entered into at a cost of \$64 million at the very time when other jurisdictions, both municipal and federal, were attempting to reduce the pressure on the building trades.

Mr. Trotter: They did it with borrowed money.

Mr. Nixon: On August 6, 1969, the federal government announced that the Prices and Incomes Commission and the federal government were engaging in a series of discussions aimed at reducing inflationary provincial capital expenditures. In fact, it became public knowledge that throughout the months of July and August, 1969, several meetings took place between the Prices and Incomes Commission and senior provincial civil servants. Yet in the very same month, on August 27, 1969, in fact, the government of Ontario, through the then Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) let the initial contract for Ontario Place, an expenditure, a special expenditure, of \$13 million.

Mr. Singer: Now \$25 million.

Mr. Nixon: If there ever was a capital expenditure that was non-essential in the context of a tough struggle against inflation, Ontario Place was it. It is a beautiful frill which could have been constructed at a low point in the business cycle, and to let the tender at the peak of the inflationary period was certainly wrong.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Then, Mr. Speaker, on October 24, 1969—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Then, Mr. Speaker, on October 24 of that same year, just two months after the negotiations, the government of Ontario let tenders for the Mowat and Hearst blocks of the Queen's Park complex for an additional expenditure of \$24 million.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) has been interjecting in the last few moments, and his new ministry, which is located at the corner of Bay and Bloor, with the minister's suite on the 8th—or 9th floor is it?—where he can look down on the green fields of downtown Toronto, was built in that very same period of time.

Mr. Singer: Been redecorated three times? Or just twice? How many times did he have it redone?

Mr. Nixon: The new ministry of Financial and Commercial Affairs was built at the same time at the corner of Wellesley and Yonge Streets. This is the way, Mr. Speaker, that this particular government tried to control the pressures of inflation. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that they are prepared to say that their former leader was clairvoyant enough to know that these buildings should have been built at a time of very high employment when those in the building trades were already under serious competition, and which resulted in some of the largest wage boosts of any particular area in the whole economy.

What should have happened is that the Minister of Public Works, or the Premier if it was considered important enough, should have come before this House and said, "Here are the plans for a new office building for our public servants because we believe that these civil servants should be brought home to Queen's Park." Remember that lovely phrase? That was the justification. He might have gone further and said, "Here are the plans for a new Department of Agriculture that we are building in the heart of downtown Toronto, a new institute—"

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: Of course it was a leaseback. It would not have been built if the government had not given the order. It was a leaseback. We understand leasebacks. Another leaseback was the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, something that the former minister himself did not know what it would cost, Mr. Speaker. When we asked him—we pressed him and pressed him—he finally said it would cost only \$2 million a year for 30 years. Of course, he said, the janitorial services will be thrown in at no extra charge.

This is the approach that that government opposite has taken during these years of heavy inflationary pressure. They mouth the kind of support for the government of

Canada; the Minister of Revenue got up and said, "Of course, this is world-wide and there is nothing that we can do about it." They went their merry way, spending the taxpayers' funds with the profligacy that I have described to you.

What they should have done and what would have been done under a Liberal administration was the acceptance of the fact that we do need something at the Exhibition; maybe built on steps or on stilts out in the lake there. I think that is going to be a great building. Certainly it has been promoted sufficiently to us, but to build it at a time of inflationary pressures is ridiculous.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Members are not very happy over there. Why do they not keep quiet and listen for a while?

Noisemakers; empty noisemakers!

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, these plans should have been presented to us and approved after debate. The money should have been debated and voted and put in the Ontario Savings Office if we could not find perhaps even a better or safer place to invest it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: Absolutely; there is nothing wrong with it. Then, as soon as the economic indicators began to turn down last year, even if the Legislature had not been in session, it would have been the responsibility of the government to pull the plans off the shelf—completed, discussed and approved—take the money out of the bank and get the programmes going which could have had some reasonable effect on priming our economy; instead of announcing a few more liquor stores in Tory ridings which was the extent of the government's approach.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If this was not so absurd it would be funny.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Right, all right, there is nothing the matter, at least, with using the funds at our disposal—which in the building of highways and public buildings amount to \$750 million to \$800 million a year—as a fiscal instrument for once, rather than as an instrument of Conservative patronage. This is surely what must be done. It should have been done in the past and it must be done in the future, Mr. Speaker.

The government has lost opportunities for increasing job opportunities in Ontario by

lack of an overall industrial strategy. For example, Ontario Hydro in April, 1970, signed a contract with the Ontario-Minnesota Pulp and Paper Company to export up to 37 kilowatts of power per day over the next 10 years to the Boise Cascade paper plant in International Falls, Minnesota. According to the statements made by O-M's vice-president Crump at the National Energy Board's hearings in February of this year, a substantial amount of that total is required for the construction of two new facilities, a veneer mill and a stud mill, in International Falls—that is on the American side of the river.

The government of Ontario has an obligation to get a complete and accurate breakdown from the National Energy Board of these figures. The minister has announced the withdrawal of, or at least a reconsideration of their support, but we should know how much of the energy is to be used for normal growth as opposed to how much is to be used for new facilities on the American side. It is not clear why Ontario could not have negotiated a better bargain, if it is supplying the relatively inexpensive power to Boise Cascade. At least, those additional facilities could have been built in Fort Frances where the employment situation is as desperate as it is anywhere else.

We are lacking this sort of an approach, so that the facilities and the strength, the responsibilities and the powers of the government of Ontario can be brought to bear. The most recent example is that which was put before us in the Speech from the Throne and, after that, rather weakly defended by the new Minister of Trade and Development in charge of housing.

In addition to the government dragging its feet on the federal loan, which I have already referred to, the Throne Speech promised—what was it?—"a potential of 132,000 jobs in the next year" which has been shown to be a near fraudulent overstatement. If we accept the Ontario Housing Corporation's own figure in this matter, the programme will produce 4,000 more units this year than last, and if we apply the Ontario Housing Corporation's own ratio of 44 jobs per unit, we reach a total of 17,600 jobs, just one-eighth of the total announced in the Throne Speech. And even that figure, Mr. Speaker, is conditional upon acquiring sites for the units.

Also I think we should recall that no time limit was put on this programme. They may do it over the next 10 years, or, like so many of the government's housing programmes, they may not do it at all.

Certainly to be fair, we could add another 1,500 jobs as a consequence of the direct provincial participation in the guaranteed mortgage loan programme, but if we assume that the banks would have earmarked their \$100 million for housing in any event—after all they are not—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: Does the Minister of Trade and Development mean to say that they are doing it out of the goodness of their hearts and just for Allan Grossman? Come again! The minister is just being flappable.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): They are doing it because our government is making arrangements.

Mr. Nixon: The figure of 19,000 jobs is an absolute maximum when we examine the statement made by the minister over the last few days. Now this total must be compared with the most recent Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures we have on employment in Ontario, which shows that 201,000 people are presently looking for work.

The 1970 Ontario budget papers reveal that the total federal government expenditure in Ontario during the 1968-1969 fiscal year was estimated at \$3.86 billion, while total Ontario government expenditures amounted to \$3.6 billion—they are roughly equal, until, of course, we remember that as part of our income there is a \$980 million block transfer as our share of the income tax, plus half the cost of education, plus more than half the cost of welfare—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Half the cost of what?

Mr. Nixon: Post-secondary education.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Then say so.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): And not capital cost either.

Mr. Nixon: All right, all right, which means, of course, that there is a substantial federal involvement in all of our programmes. As a matter of fact when the former Minister of Education used to go about opening these "Hon. William G. Davis Schools" around the province—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Just five.

Mr. Nixon: There were just five? That is fine. But I used to get a little edgy because poor old Ben Benson up there was getting the blows from everybody for collecting all

the tax, the money then comes back here and is handed out for school construction and you know who goes and cuts the ribbon and smiles broadly at his supporters in the area.

An hon. member: If you have seen some of the films—they are pretty expensive.

Mr. Bullbrook: Senior citizens' housing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will deduct half of that money again from—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The Leader of the Opposition forgets he takes the money from here first and hands it back.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would simply suggest to you, sir, that the municipal expenditures, running last year at about \$1.58 billion, when added to our provincial expenditures mean that we have a much larger fiscal area of responsibility here even than the federal government.

So for the Treasurer to say there is such a small bit we can do, such a small percentage of the total public expenditures over which we have control, that we must turn to the government of Canada for initiatives, I would say—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: To get some of our own money back.

Mr. Nixon: —certainly we will, we should, and we must look to the government of Canada for initiative and leadership, but the government of Ontario must take initiatives and leadership as well.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier made reference to the fact that this year there were going to be 1,400 jobs for young people provided as a direct response to the government programme. Since he is so careful in his precision and accuracy today, he should have said that this is less than 4,000 jobs more than were provided last year. My point is this, that although—it is a fact. I see that the Minister of Trade and Development is sneering and scowling, it happens to be a fact; it is a fact. Obviously he is incompetent.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The minister is very sensitive today.

Mr. Nixon: He does not know how to assess the value of these programmes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is trying to distort it.

Mr. Nixon: There is no distortion. When the Treasurer says they are providing 14,000 jobs, I am saying fine, they provided 11,000 last year, so that if we are going to assess its value we have got to know what the change is.

Mr. Lewis: The minister dares use that word "distortion" to us?

Mr. Nixon: It is the change that means everything, and it is change which you fellows resist.

I think that it was the public relations experts that got at the minister when they devised the name for the programme which eludes me, but the acronym for which spells out the word SWEEP. I think the minister is trying to get back to those great old days of Home Ownership Made Easy and wild rivers—some members may remember that particular Speech from the Throne which was an election document. I am afraid those fellows opposite have fallen a bit short of the mark in their efforts as read to us, particularly in the area of dealing with employment that they put before us a few days ago.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): It will be a great sweep.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We have never heard any of these and I do not suppose we ever will.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would assure you sir, that we on this side are deeply concerned with the unemployment levels of the province. Unlike the government opposite, we are prepared to say that the province has the funds and the responsibility to do more than has been done in recent weeks and months. One of the first things that must be made public is factual criticism of the, let us say, rather weak approach during recent months that this government has put forward.

Mr. Trotter: Very weak approach.

Mr. Nixon: Certainly the Premier's excuse for his delay in picking up the federal funds to foster public works is a poor one indeed.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Would the member mind saying "loans."

Mr. Nixon: As a matter of fact, I have a feeling that most of those funds were spent on printing signs saying: "These elm trees are cut down in a programme by the Province of Ontario, Prime Minister William G. Davis." I have the impression that those

signs were up, I think it was early Saturday morning following his elevation. Somebody in The Department of Highways is worried about his job and he does not want to get into trouble with the new Premier.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Two weeks, it took two weeks.

Mr. Lewis: To put up some signs?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, we agree with the contention of the resolution. I have tried in as mild a way as I can, and in as factual a way as can be understood by members opposite and yourself, sir, to say that we agree with the resolution—

Hon. Mr. White: The hon. member did not discuss the issue at all.

Mr. Nixon:—but we feel that there is a substantial weakness in it. Particularly a weakness in the points put forward by the Treasurer who is the main spokesman for the government side. That is, he is trying to wash his hands like Pontius Pilate and say that the responsibility lies elsewhere. Just like the Minister of Revenue did so many months ago, when he said, "We have nothing to do with inflation, it is world-wide."

So, sir, in order to point up these matters I would say that we agree with the resolution but it does not go far enough, and therefore I move, seconded by Mr. Singer, that the following words be added: "And regrets that the government of Ontario has failed to take any meaningful steps to help alleviate this serious situation."

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member does not have one idea of what he has said today.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: That is right, fellows. That is right. The member knows that is right.

Mr. Singer: That is right. The Treasurer was so late that shouting is not going to protect him. Pity him—that is the worst speech he has given.

An hon. member: I did not think he could be worse than before, but he was.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He ought to be quiet, like I am.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, there are, as always, certain comparisons between the federal Liberals and their dependents in the Ontario Legislature. It is a matter of fact

that no government in Canada has, as one can recall, wreaked more havoc in terms of unemployment in this country than the federal Liberals. It is indeed remarkable that the Liberal Party in Ontario can participate in this debate and not make a single concrete suggestion to alter the situation in Ontario through the entire course of its remarks.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: We just heard the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has a point of order.

Mr. Nixon: I call to your attention, sir, the use of the 15 per cent rebate on the mining payments which has not been used by this province as one specific area which is probably too sophisticated for the leader of the NDP to understand.

Mr. Lewis: It certainly is too sophisticated.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Speaking to the point of order, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition should know, what Quebec has done has not taken effect. It is a proposal which was advanced by Mr. Benson in the federal white paper, which he has since backed off from and the situation has not changed at all. It has not changed at all.

Mr. Nixon: Quebec has it in this area.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Quebec has not moved; it does not have the liberty to move.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

An hon. member: That is right. We say we will do it; is that all right?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Wrong again.

Mr. Nixon: Or you say you will not do it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Wrong again!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I know with what exultation the 207,000 unemployed in Ontario will greet the rebating of the 15 per cent tax on mining companies as a panacea to solve unemployment in the province and they will look on it—

Mr. Nixon: He is worried about the silver miners.

Mr. Lewis: It is the most nonsensical solution I have heard of in some time.

An hon. member: Better than the Tories' solution, and that is saying a lot.

Mr. Lewis: It was fairly obvious why the debate was called, if the Premier will allow me. It was called to engage in the not so gentle clouting of the federal Liberals, and for the provincial Conservatives to crow with self-congratulatory ardour at their own achievements. The first can still be done, of course—it is possible to take on the federal Liberals from time to time—but the second is now impossible; the crowing is now impossible in the light of the way in which you so expertly lanced yourselves over the last few days on the economic cornerstone of your Throne Speech policy.

More will come of that in a moment: I make no apologia for the federal Liberals; nothing can be said of them which is sufficiently of feeling and toughness. Doubtless the Prime Minister—I mean Pierre Elliott Trudeau—has a love affair with the Canadian people which will wear off at some point in time and with it there will be revealed as cynical and as arrogant an abuse of power as we have—

Mr. T. Reid: The hon. member better hope so. Is his son running for mayor?

Mr. Lewis: My son is not yet of age; when he is I will commend it to him.

Mr. Sargent: We are just lucky we have you people here.

Mr. Lewis: It is interesting to note the use of the reference to \$17 million which the federal Liberals offered. Another federal Liberal, one sought feverishly by the provincial counterparts, termed it an economic and moral disaster. Now obviously even for Paul Hellyer the federal policy is indefensible. It is interesting to see it defended here this afternoon.

The upshot of that detestable policy federally, as everyone knows, is 675,000 unemployed across the country, and in Ontario, workers expendable in the so-called fight against inflation to the level of 207,000 unemployed. This province has not yet seen fit to retrieve the situation.

Mr. Speaker, these are Ontario workers. While it is true that the federal policy has contributed enormously to the levels of unemployment, and while it is true that the so-called world-wide inflation has been fought

in Canadian terms by dismissing people from the work force in arbitrary, bloodless ways—in a way which shows as little milk of human kindness flowing through a politician's veins as it would be possible to imagine—there has nonetheless in this province, been no evidence of any appreciable policy to handle matters of unemployment.

I may say, if the provincial Treasurer will allow me, that what was disappointing about his remarks at the beginning of today's debate was that they managed to convey a résumé of everything the government has so far done—most of which, Mr. Speaker, is entirely inconsequential in terms of the problems with which we are faced.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, our record ranks with the worst in the nation. One cannot imagine a more disgraceful litany of inactivity than has characterized the Conservative government in Ontario in the last several months. One might look at the pattern, Mr. Speaker. In December, there were 146,000 unemployed; in January, 201,000; in February, 207,000.

The figures for March are not yet published, but in any given month over last year we are between 48 per cent and 67 per cent beyond the previous unemployment levels, and all of it countenanced with equanimity by the Conservative government opposite.

As a matter of fact, gentlemen, during the Tory leadership race, 6,000 additional Ontario workers were unemployed. Everything we did throughout those months to attempt to force a special sitting of the Legislature, to plead with the then Premier to introduce certain regulatory changes in the laws, to ask for specific job enactment policy—everything we did during that period of time, Mr. Speaker, was scorned and mocked and went unheeded. As a result the government reaps the whirlwind which is felt today, and uneasy lies the head that wears the crown of virtue about job-creating policies, as we will see in just a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a look at the effects generally, beyond those of statistical enumeration. The loss of goods and services which Canada has suffered as a result of people not working is roughly tabulated this way; it is generally conceded, as the Premier and the Treasurer know, that for every one per cent of unemployed we lose approximately \$1.5 billion of gross national product. If it were possible to reduce our unemployment levels even now to what the Treasurer called a tolerable level of three per cent—but which we reject as intolerable—we

would be able to generate for the economy between \$4.5 billion and \$5 billion worth of goods and services—almost 25 per cent of which would return by way of taxes. It would allow us to generate the kind of pump priming which most members in this House believe is necessary in order to get the economy moving again.

Let me put it another way, Mr. Speaker; to catch the full flavour of it. Between August of 1969 and August of 1970 in the Province of Ontario, the employable heads of families on welfare rose by 79 per cent. The employable single people on welfare rose by 129 per cent. The total number of employable people of all categories on welfare in Ontario in that period of time rose by 98 per cent.

Close to half the people receiving general welfare assistance today, Mr. Speaker, are employable, and in 1970 this government saw fit to disburse in excess of \$30 million by way of general welfare assistance to those desperately seeking employment. One can then imagine what the projected figures for 1971 are likely to be like.

Those on fixed incomes in this extraordinary period of continuing inflation (because inflation has not been contained) and reckless unemployment (because unemployment continues to accelerate) have felt the brunt most grievously. There is yet to be the slightest suggestion on the part of the provincial government that it would increase allowances to people on pensions or other welfare allowances so as to bring them into line with the cost of living.

In other words, every single opportunity for the gentlemen opposite to reverse the balance and to correct it has been avoided. What have we done; what have we done in the Province of Ontario? Let me briefly recollect.

Our programme has been, Mr. Speaker, in two parts:

1. A provincial-municipal grants programme providing \$7.5 million to create 7,500 jobs lasting approximately three months each—which is less than 2,000 man-years of work, to put it in the context which the Minister of Trade and Development now uses.

2. In Ontario at the moment we have a seasonal employment programme involved primarily with elm tree removal. Can you imagine the full weight of intellectual creativity given to the government's civil servants to have fastened on the elm tree removal programme? Can you think of how

all of them came together, all the weighty intellects of government, Treasury Board and departments alike, sitting down to devise a scheme which would erode the extraordinary unemployment levels and fashion 2,500 jobs for 3½ months, each costing \$4.6 million, to remove dead elm trees? That works out to about 800 man-years.

Parks improvement: 1,550 jobs at \$3 million or 700 man-years. Accelerated highway construction: 370 jobs for \$1.75 million, or 400 man-years.

The total they have managed to provide in the second programme is something like 4,400 jobs or, if you add it all together, 11,920 jobs provided by the Province of Ontario to combat unemployment; 11,920 jobs.

The unemployment figures went up five times that level during the Tory leadership race alone, and the government pretends to come into this Legislature and deplore the unemployment levels in Ontario.

It really smacks of bad grace that the Premier thinks that a programme of that kind is sufficient on which to base a pugnacious declaration this afternoon—11,920 jobs, 207,000 people unemployed, and that is supposed to masquerade as a programme responding to the crisis of unemployment.

The government's programme is, in fact, a travesty. It is doing incalculable damage to the long-term economic interests of the province—not to mention, if you will allow me to say it, the long-term political interests of the Tory party. They should surely be able to manage something rather more effective and rather more dramatic and impactful than that particular programme.

I want to make some comparisons this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I shall not belabour them at length, and I am not going to berate the government unduly. But I want to make some comparisons, which are really rather interesting, with another province which has a different kind of government, and which had an almost identical unemployment level—five per cent in Manitoba as compared to 4.7 per cent in Ontario.

By using public works programmes and the sudden infusion of public housing stepped up for the winter months and a municipal winter works programme, which was to be completed by June 15, and by paying the labour costs for various municipal undertakings right across the province, the Province of Manitoba managed to create 10,000 jobs and 4,500 man-years of work, compared to Ontario's 11,920 jobs and 4,000 man-years of work.

In other words—think of it, Mr. Speaker, just for a moment—the Province of Manitoba created one additional job for every 69 persons in the labour force. The Province of Ontario created one additional job for every 782 persons in the labour force. That is really a phenomenal comparison. Let me make it even more direct.

The Manitoba population is 13 per cent of that of Ontario. Its labour force is 12 per cent of that of Ontario. Its gross provincial product is 11 per cent of that of Ontario. Its revenue returns based on the fiscal year 1970 are around 11 per cent of those of Ontario. But it created decisively greater job opportunities than the Province of Ontario even contemplated, starting from almost exactly the same level of unemployment. As a matter of fact, it was a little higher in the Province of Manitoba.

If we were able to extrapolate the Manitoba experience and apply it to Ontario, we would have had 100,000 new jobs in this province or 45,000 man-years of work. Now 100,000 new jobs, Mr. Speaker, is not a phrase which is in any great repute these days. The Minister of Trade and Development and the Premier have tried to embroider it by suggesting it can be 132,000 new jobs. That, of course, is in ill repute—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not say "new jobs."

Mr. Lewis: We will get to that in a moment.

Mr. Sargent: The minister implied that. Pretty sneaky!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I make the comparison because it is necessary to gain some perspective. There are some who would argue from the Conservative benches, as the minister of the Treasury indicated, that somehow our capacity to invest in Ontario, somehow our own provincial revenue, is sufficiently marginal that a major impact could not be made. But, as I stand here, Mr. Speaker, it is incomprehensible that a government, over a five-month period, is restricted to the creation of 12,000 jobs with 207,000 unemployed, and then brings a resolution into the Legislature which says, "We deplore the economic policies of Ottawa."

If they deplore the absence of policies to fight unemployment, then they must look to themselves, not to Ottawa.

The government then hoped, as the crescendo of public concern mounted, to take the heat off by one of those extravagant pro-

nouncements to which the government is addicted in the Throne Speech.

In the last decade of Conservative administrations, it is doubtful that any economic cornerstone, that any Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, collapsed so quickly and so catastrophically. Reputations cannot be salvaged in that particular fiasco. The government knows; it has the experts; that is what surprises us on this side of the House. It has a Treasury Board with skilled civil servants. It has an Ontario Housing Corporation with skilled civil servants. It has all kinds of people on whom to draw in order to give the financial data and the numerical data on which to base an announcement in the Throne Speech.

The government chose to draw on none of them. It came into the House with an inflated, preposterous assertion. It was unable to defend it in advance; it was unable to defend it in retrospect. It is absolutely indefensible. And yet, all of the material was at hand.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This was prepared by the experts.

Mr. Lewis: All of the material was at hand.

Mr. Nixon: Maybe that is the problem.

Mr. Lewis: I will tell you what the government was doing—it was up to its old tricks again, and thought, that in order to give us the full flavour of continuity with the regime that was, it would introduce it in the Throne Speech. And now the Throne Speech rests in tatters 72 hours after it was introduced. The new Minister of Trade and Development, I hope to refer to this in my own Throne Speech, even has the same speech writer as the old. I was amazed to receive—I am not sure whether it was from the hon. "Stanley Grossman" or the hon. "Allan Randall," one of them—one of his speeches came to my notice; it was the first speech he made. Lo and behold, it was the same speech writer with the same corny jokes, with the same extravagant expletives and with the same nonsensical formulations.

Mr. Nixon: Surely the jokes have got better than that!

Mr. Lewis: How do you expect to run a government in that fashion, when the transition is so obvious?

Mr. Peacock: D-day is fast approaching.

Mr. Lewis: However, the minister, with acute embarrassment, will doubtless correct it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I just told him not to call me Allan J. Grossman.

Mr. Lewis: Right, right. The Throne Speech pronouncement, which was to rescue the unemployment problem, destroyed the credibility of the government. More important than that, Mr. Speaker, it dashed the hopes all over Ontario that something new was in the offing and the government cannot—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what the member is trying to do.

Mr. Lewis: The government cannot play that way with public exploitations.

I want to tell the minister something.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, unadorned, without all the preamble and the reckless use of figures, it is not a bad programme. It is fairly modest. It is well below what even the federal government has projected by way of housing starts.

It is not adequate, but it might have been inserted in the Throne Speech as an indication on the government's part that it was serious about trying to combat unemployment in the Province of Ontario. But it was not that. The minister refused even to give it the substance which it had by overdoing it. Let me just remind him—I want to raise these things and then set them to rest for once.

The Throne Speech promised 30,000 new homes at least. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we will get a total, perhaps, of 8,000 new homes, only 4,000 of which will be built in the public sector by the Ontario Housing Corporation. The credibility gap is too large.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Only 4,000?

Mr. Lewis: Only 4,000 over and above what was before.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Over and above? Well, so what? That is a pretty good record. That is quite an accomplishment.

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Mr. MacDonald: It was a new home construction programme not a continuation of the old one.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just read the Throne Speech.

Mr. Lewis: I have it. I will read it. We will read it together.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Slowly!

Mr. Lewis: It is prefaced by a paragraph talking about unconscionable levels of unemployment: "To combat unemployment and to provide for the needs of our people, the government will commence a new home construction programme." That is pretty clear. Not much room for ambivalence or ambiguity there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A new programme?

Mr. Lewis: Right. "Using funds generated from the private sector and the governments of Canada and Ontario, \$1.5 billion will be injected into the economy of the province."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Right so far. Everything is right.

Mr. Lewis: Fair enough. "This will establish a potential for 132,000 jobs during the next year, the construction of 30,000 units of housing and shelter for 90,000 people."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Potentially.

Mr. Lewis: Now, entirely implicit in that—everything that is in the Throne Speech suggests that all of that was to be new housing and most, if not all of it, was to be new jobs.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, not at all.

Mr. Lewis: That is what it is.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): All these people up here were wrong.

Mr. Pilkey: The press was wrong then?

Mr. Pitman: The Minister did not explain it very well then.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will deal with that.

Mr. Peacock: What was that? Say that again?

Mr. Lewis: Is the Prime Minister now retreating from his interjections?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. I am not sure to which one I have made it.

Mr. Lewis: Make both of them again.

Hon. Mr. Davis: However, I intend to contribute to the debate.

Mr. Lewis: Fine! I am sorry I was not listening more acutely.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, looking at the programme now as it stands, even if it is

fulfilled. The projection of the federal government, of Robert Andas, was a 15 per cent increase across the country—15.5 per cent increase—and even on the basis of the new programme, the increase in Ontario would only be 10.9 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It would be 25 per cent if we only get 20,000. The member's figures are wrong.

Mr. Lewis: All right. In fact, the new jobs which will be created lie somewhere between 7,000 and 30,000. The figures are very vague. Indeed, it may be the bottom of that limit because no one is certain whether or not those homes will actually be built.

Mr. Pitman: Hear, hear! That is the point.

Mr. Lewis: No one knows that. It is just part of the plethora of promises.

Fourthly, Mr. Speaker—just another observation—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): A hypothesis.

Mr. Lewis: No immediate impact is to be felt from this programme at all. That was perhaps the cruelest stroke. No immediate impact. The government has not even yet received the tenders of which it spoke from the private sector. It has not been able to isolate where the public sector will invest in the immediate short term. It does not know whether those jobs will be created in the summer or in the fall or next year, but the government pretends to tie them to current unemployment levels. That, sir, is dishonest. That is dishonest.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No housing programme will. Can I ask the member a question? Does the hon. member know of any housing programme he could conceive which would put people to work tomorrow?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. Renwick: The minister used it.

Mr. MacDonald: Why did he not bring it up last fall then?

Mr. J. Renwick: That is the fraud.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member thinks we should not have a housing construction programme at all because people cannot be put to work tomorrow?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, with great respect if that is now the case, I do not know what lead time the minister gives his government.

Three months? Six months? He is the minister in charge; I will ask him the question. How long before they begin?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Our programmes now—

Mr. Lewis: No, no, the new programme, the new home construction programme.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is accusing us or me of playing with words and I accuse him now of playing with words. The hon. member implied that because there was a construction programme going on now and the government makes plans not only for the continuation of the record programme we have already put into effect but to add to it, unless we can prove that another man will go to work tomorrow because of the additional programme we have added to it, it does not mean anything. That is utterly absurd.

Mr. Lewis: The minister talked about 132,000 jobs being created in the context of present levels of unemployment. I am just trying to indicate to him that that was calculated in its misleading intent—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the member mean we should not have done it at all? We should not have put in a programme?

Mr. Lewis: I will come back to housing. I want to end with some observations about what we would do by way of a housing programme.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, another government in this country, that of Manitoba, moved 1,200 public housing units forward directly into the winter period and began them in a matter of two weeks after the announcement had been made in order to provide interim employment at a time when unemployment levels were so high. But this government was unable to demonstrate where a single new dollar would go into the public sector. It has not received the tenders from the private sector. As I pointed out that the government cannot tell us whether it will be OHC land, CMHC land or private land. It does not know when the effects of this programme will be felt. It cannot masquerade, therefore, behind some grandiose announcement.

Well, it has rebounded on the government in the way it should, because it was not the kind of thing which should ever have been announced. In fact, Mr. Speaker, let me go on: The implication of half a billion dollars, while it may be real, involves something in the area of \$71.9 million from the province,

which is new money, of which \$41.6 million is budgeted for capital investment in 1970-1971.

Now let us see what has happened to provincial capital investment money budgeted by this province for housing purposes. In 1968-1969, the government budgeted \$62 million for this purpose. It spent \$15.4 million. In 1969-1970, it—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Wrong.

Mr. Lewis: Look at the public accounts. The government budgeted \$56 million; it spent \$40.2 million. In the immediate years for which information is available, there was a very serious shortfall between the amount of money budgeted for housing investment and the amount of money which the province actually spent. To pretend that there will be any change in the next year without giving us the details is to pretend that somehow the government's housing policies of the past have had substance. I say to the minister they have had no substance at all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member's figures are entirely wrong. His figures are wrong.

Mr. Lewis: Can I remind the minister that his 1971 housing programme to combat unemployment is an exact duplicate of the 1969 programme announced in the budget, the mortgage programme which flopped. Does he recall the headlines? It was a story by Geoff Stevens on June 25, 1969. Let me read Geoff Stevens' lead paragraph:

FIVE PER CENT DOWN ON HOUSE, LOW
SECOND MORTGAGES UNDER ONTARIO
PLAN

The Ontario government will offer \$50 million in second mortgages this year to assist an estimated 15,000 middle-income families to purchase condominium units or to buy new homes under the Home Ownership Made Easy programme, Trade and Development Minister Stanley Randall said yesterday.

Do you know that the \$50 million was never used; that the government was not able to build a single house or to provide a single mortgage with it; that the then Minister of Trade and Development stood in the House and worried about it, because it could not be picked up in 1969.

As a matter of fact, that minister's announcement to the Legislature: "Which followed negotiations with the leading lending institutions in the province," revealed the

government's efforts to attract additional commercial capital into the housing field at a time of rapidly rising interest rates and tightening money supply—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Except that we succeeded at this time.

Mr. Lewis: This was a \$50 million—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: With, I might say, the initiative of my predecessor we have now succeeded, where he was not able to; that is all.

Mr. Lewis: The 1969 programme was a \$50 million success, so it was announced. Then, when it collapsed, the 1970 budget—now note this—announced another \$50 million programme, except it turned out to be the same \$50 million for condominium and related development.

Mr. MacDonald: They are taking in their own washing.

Mr. Lewis: Back on April 4, 1970, again in *The Globe and Mail*—this time by Dennis Anderson—the following paragraph occurs:

Anyone who has studied Stanley Randall's record of unfulfilled promises as Ontario's minister in charge of housing probably could not entirely fight off an impulse to skepticism at the announcement this week of a \$50 million mortgage fund to help middle-income home buyers. After all, it was only last year that Mr. Randall said the province would establish a \$50 million mortgage fund to help middle-income home buyers. The fund was indeed established but it did not help anyone.

In 1969, \$50 million; in 1970, \$50 million. The only difference is that in 1971 it looks as if the government is only going to spend \$20 million.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How much did the Ontario government use in 1970? Does the hon. member know that?

Mr. Lewis: The minister is going to give us those figures.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Use the right figures. Would the member like a correction?

Mr. Lewis: We have asked them from the minister all week. He will speak and he will tell us. Fine.

Mr. MacDonald: I hope they are more accurate than the last time the minister spoke on this topic. I hope we can understand what he says.

Mr. Lewis: I recall to the minister's mind the Malvern project in 1953 when the government acquired the land; 18 years later there is not a single house on that land. I remind the minister of the Chapel Glen housing announcement in 1967, which was going to provide low-cost housing. In 1971, there is not a low-cost house to be had on that land. I remind the minister of the announcement in January, 1967, of the HOME programme—20,000 units to be available to the citizens of Ontario. So far something slightly under 5,000 units have been disbursed to the citizens of Ontario.

How can we invest any of these promises with substance? What possible evidence is there to suggest that anything the government has indicated in the area of housing will emerge as a reality for Ontario? Not only is the plan bizarre in its miscalculation, but it is ill-conceived in the way in which it is designed and it will result in very little indeed. It may result purely in meeting the levels of last year but in no sense providing for what is required this year.

I shall not deal further with it. The minister will enter the debate about housing in an attempt to retrieve the fiasco created by the government itself, whose own ability to govern in situations like this comes seriously under question.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that there are solutions. Some have been hinted at. Let me expand them. They are all subject to one premise and the premise very simply is that of full employment for the Province of Ontario. It is a premise which must provide employment for everyone, short of perhaps one to two per cent of the population, along the following five proposals:

1. A house-building programme in Ontario to a level in excess of 100,000 units this year with the provincial portion immediately accelerated.

Our commitment to that is total and, Mr. Speaker, may I say on behalf of this party that if we have to borrow in order to build those homes, then we are better to borrow than to maintain 207,000 people unemployed. But let me add, Mr. Speaker, that it may not be necessary to borrow, because the former provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) himself indicated that we should be using the pension funds of this province as a way of tapping reserves for the construction of homes and other desirable social projects. That to us seems to be a perfectly appropriate source.

2. There must be tax relief for low-income earners in the Province of Ontario, as part of overall tax reform, but as a first particular of that reform. It may be that the provincial Treasurer can beat the federal government about the head for its previous inactivity in tax reform areas, but if he really wants to alter economic conditions in Ontario, then on April 26 he will provide tax relief for low-income earners in the province and get the economy moving again, by way of credits or rebates or higher exemptions, or whatever it is, however the government chooses to do it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: On our own personal income tax form.

Mr. Lewis: Yes. Well in negotiation, I assume there are certain things the government can do as a provincial government, as it has done for homeowners, as it has done for farmers, as it has done for others, and as a matter of fact, as the government has done for those on the guaranteed income supplement. It is entirely in its hands if it would wish to do it. As a matter of fact, the government has even talked in Ontario about a provincial income tax.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is what I say.

Mr. Lewis: Obviously the minister feels the horizons are unlimited.

3. That the Province of Ontario must immediately provide supplementary allowances to those who are on fixed incomes whether they are receiving family benefits or whether they are in receipt of old age pensions. There must be supplementary assistance to whatever level the government deems reasonable in terms of cost of living, or perhaps more appropriately based on what the Economic Council of Canada regards as minimum for life and health.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Tax credits.

Mr. Lewis: The tax credit system is an obsession. It is just a fixation of the government.

Mr. J. Renwick: It is a Social Credit device.

Mr. Lewis: I would prefer overall tax reform rather than dismembering the system in this fashion.

Mr. MacDonald: Pre-election political gimmickry. This government did it in the last election; it is doing it again now.

Mr. J. Renwick: The people of Ontario are fed up with the tricks.

Mr. Lewis: The fourth point, Mr. Speaker, is the rapid acceleration of provincial and municipal public works projects and the payment by government of labour costs for those municipal projects in a given period of time, let us say by July 15. If we really want to move the economy quickly in terms of the unemployed, then this is one of the most creative ways to do it. It is old-fashioned; it is reliable. But it works. And it would work extremely well for this government if it were willing to undertake it.

One of the things that bewildered me about the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, was that certain of the public works to which he pointed have in fact created jobs—even if accidentally—at the time of greatest need in Ontario. That seems to me to be a useful thing. You do not always prime the pump when the cycle is at the lowest ebb because it takes too long for the investment effects to be felt. It is really rather sad that we are doing it at this moment in time rather than having done it a number of months ago.

Let me say that we in this party would carry things rather further in terms of provincial subsidy to municipal and related works. I think the government might consider paying the labour cost to individual agencies of government, that this money could be available to the Ontario Hospital Services Commission or to conservation authorities, or to similar semi-autonomous groups, for labour costs by way of accelerating their projects.

I would go even further, Mr. Speaker. If you really wanted to have an imaginative proposal that extended this formula further, then certain segments of the private sector which act as public agencies could have their labour costs defrayed. Let me give the example of children's aid societies, of Elizabeth Fry, of certain of the treatment centres, of many of the areas which now have capital projects waiting which, were they to be given the labour costs, would probably accelerate those programmes. They are socially desirable. They could be scrutinized by government and they would provide an extraordinary impetus to job creation in the Province of Ontario so that we do not tie ourselves to the traditional modes.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, regarding the programme of which we have talked often, the use of young people between the ages of 16 and 24, where there are 18 per cent unemployed or greater—I refuse to fight over

the statistics—the reality is evident. In services to people—mental health, daycare centres, public health, indoor and outdoor recreation, aid to the aged—all of these related career lines, which in fact are not expensive, generate their own income and can introduce extraordinary efficiencies as well as introducing real cutbacks which are, all in all, to be desired.

Were we to do this, we would then join the expansionary policies of Manitoba and Quebec, and on that note I will end. You see, an interesting thing has occurred in Canada. Despite the depressive policies of the federal government and the truly unhappy effects which have resulted, Manitoba and Quebec—independently, on their own initiative—have taken Trudeau head on.

Let me point out to the Premier that if Ontario were to introduce the kind of budgetary changes I have suggested and the kind of programmatic provisions inherent in this proposition, then we too would begin to prime the economic pump in a dramatic way.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, in the face of concerted action from Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec, the federal policy no longer becomes viable. They will have to retreat; they will have to change. It cannot be maintained if the major provinces in the country, particularly the two central provinces, pursue economic policies that are entirely contrary to those of the neurotic, deflationary activities of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, for whom workers in this province are expendable commodities. That is a really fascinating proposition which faces the Province of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: The weak link is Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: My colleague is perfectly right: Ontario is the weak link in this equation. If we take the initiative, then we change policies for all of Canada, and unemployment will begin to reduce in significant ways.

So far, we have capitulated to federal government policies. We have not responded at all.

Mr. MacDonald: This government should not have agreed with them, that is all.

Mr. Lewis: As a result, Pierre Elliott Trudeau has in our Prime Minister a very close and admirable ally, rather than a politician who wishes to reverse the process. As it is, Ottawa has abdicated, Ontario has abdicated, and therefore political days around here for some governments are numbered.

I end, Mr. Speaker, with a sub-amendment, seconded by my colleague from Peterborough, that the motion of the Treasurer be further amended by adding the following:

And, further, that this House expresses equally grave concern over the abject failure of the government of Ontario to offset the job-destroying policies of the government of Canada in not having implemented:

1. A major house-building programme over and above the 85,000 units now planned for 1971;

2. An immediate tax cut for low-income earners;

3. Additional allowances to those on fixed incomes;

4. A municipal-works acceleration programme, with labour costs assumed by the province up to July 15;

5. A commitment generally to long-term full employment defined as no more than a seasonally adjusted rate of two per cent.

And this House calls upon the government to adopt such measures forthwith.

Mr. MacDonald: Now the government has a programme; all it need do is to act.

Mr. Sargent: I missed out, how many jobs did the member—

Mr. Speaker: Before I put the sub-amendment, I think perhaps to regularize matters I should also put the amendment, because the debate is now proceeding of course on the motion as amended and now as sub-amended.

The amendment was moved by Mr. Nixon, seconded by Mr. Singer:

That the following words be added to the resolution:

And regrets that the government of Ontario has failed to take any meaningful steps to help alleviate this serious situation.

Then by way of sub-amendment it has been moved by Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Pitman, as follows: That the motion of the Treasurer be further amended by adding the following:

And, further, that this House expresses equally grave concern over the abject failure of the government of Ontario to offset the job-destroying policies of the government of Canada in not having implemented:

1. A major house-building programme over and above the 85,000 units now planned for 1971.

2. An immediate tax cut for low-income earners.

3. Additional allowances to those on fixed incomes.

4. A municipal-works acceleration programme with labour costs assumed by the province up to July 15.

5. A commitment generally to long-term full employment, defined at no more than a seasonably adjusted rate of two per cent;

And this House calls upon the government to adopt such measures forthwith.

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Labour):

Mr. Speaker:

Of all the problems I have had to face as a member of Parliament for over 20 years, this is the worst. Technically and financially, the government's policy has been a near total disaster. Morally, it has been a total disaster.

So spoke a member—a courageous member—of the Liberal government during a forceful address in the House of Commons on March 25 last, just one week ago.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Thus Paul Hellyer broke a long silence since his resignation from the cabinet. Paul Hellyer is not the kind of member, sir, to take his party loyalty lightly, but as he said: "I have no alternative but to speak on their behalf." One would have thought that Mr. Hellyer's remarks would at least have caused Prime Minister Trudeau to reflect even momentarily—to perhaps even re-examine the government policies—but no, this weekend in Brantford and in Niagara Falls it was the same old record playing.

He continually holds over the nation's head the club of price and wage controls—and just on that point, sir, and I am sure my friends in the third party would agree. I do not know why they always talk wage controls. Why not income controls?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Carton: His only answer, and his repeated answer, even on Saturday, is "Unemployment is going to have a tendency to rise."

Mr. Pilkey: Is this government advocating wage controls?

Hon. Mr. Carton: As to the alarming figure of small business failures, Mr. Trudeau's answer at Brantford was: "Some small businessmen could not grow in the way the consumer wanted. This is the way the economy develops." What a heartless answer. Then the next day in Niagara Falls on the same question as to small business he answered: "Being forced out of business happens every day in the week in a free economy."

What else would one expect by way of answer from the leader of a government whose white paper proposals, if implemented, will drive the last nails into the coffin of the small businessman throughout the nation?

Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of the unemployment crisis is that it is a cruel, deliberate policy proposed to fight inflation. It is a policy, as mentioned by the member for Scarborough West, that is just not solving the situation.

For almost two years we have heard the federal government say, "We have to fight inflation." Then Prime Minister Trudeau said last Christmas Eve, on December 24: "Inflation no longer exists in Canada." Three months later one of his colleagues in Montreal, when he was talking to the Board of Trade, said: "Inflation is about to be brought down." The governor of the Bank of Canada said just two weeks ago: "Inflation will be worse in a few months than it was last year."

Surely it is obvious by now that the proposed cure for inflation is simply not working. Surely it is time that the federal government began to re-examine its policy which affects adversely those that government should be trying to protect—the little man and the little business.

Even big business is standing pat, **Mr. Speaker.** Projects are being shelved, awaiting the outcome of the white paper proposals. The three per cent surtax was to remain in force only for one year. It has now been in three years.

And what about the farmer? I have mentioned the little man, the little business, big business. What about the Ontario farmer?

Mr. T. Reid: And their property taxes?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Hogs today are \$2 per hundredweight lower than 10 years ago; eggs are three dozen for \$1; broiler chickens are away down; lamb is down; and so on goes the list—and yes, sir, tobacco is at its lowest price in 10 years. Yet the farmer must pay higher prices than ever before for machinery, for fertilizer.

To compound the situation, sir, with the free trade in respect of agricultural implements between Canada and the United States, it appears that with the laying off of thousands of workers by Massey Ferguson that this industry could well move to the United States.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the nation is floundering and I venture to say, sir, that one of the major causes of unemployment is simply that the people of Canada have lost confidence in Mr. Trudeau's administration. There is a psychological depression hovering over the whole country.

Mr. Sargent: There is not too much here at Queen's Park either.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Businesses are failing that otherwise would have hung on. Businesses are cutting back that otherwise would have held their own. Businesses are holding their own that otherwise would have expanded, and many business ventures have just been shelved because of uncertainty.

We have the lowest per capita growth of any industrialized society in the world and we have the highest level of unemployment in the western world. And that is quite an achievement, sir, for a country as plentifully endowed by nature as is our Canada. We have an educated people, some of the world's richest resources, some of the world's finest agricultural lands and we have the lowest growth and the highest unemployment.

Yes, sir, the Trudeau administration is a forward one—forward with unemployment; forward with the demise of small businesses; forward with the white paper implementation and, just for contrast, backward with a just society.

I read the debates, sir, that took place in the House of Commons a week or so ago on a non-confidence motion which was moved by the Progressive Conservative finance critic on the alleged failure of government economic policies and I thought that all three opposition parties put forward some positive alternatives to the government.

Certainly, appeals for voluntary restraint have not worked. I doubt the merit of a suggestion made by the leader of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Douglas, of the establishment of a prices review board.

On the positive side—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. minister is becoming a real Tory since he got that position.

Hon. Mr. Carton:—uncertainties in the taxation field should be cleared up by Mr. Benson.

Mr. MacDonald: Mental ossification setting in.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Selective tax cuts should be made to those most needing relief.

Mr. MacDonald: What happens to the progressives?

Hon. Mr. Carton: The tax should be removed from building materials. The three per cent surtax should be abolished and a winter works programme should be reintroduced.

There are a few constructive suggestions already advanced, Mr. Speaker, by the opposition parties in Ottawa. Apparently they have had no effect on Prime Minister Trudeau in view of his weekend statements and I somehow doubt that any remarks made by me in this Legislature would cause him to pause and reflect. But I close this part of my remarks by saying, with the utmost sincerity, that the present Trudeau administration policies on inflation are morally wrong—they are callous and they are instilling in our people a sense of despair and helplessness and what is more pertinent, they are not curing inflation.

Now, sir, I would like to be parochial for a very few moments in connection with my own department.

Accelerating technological changes and developments are taking place in Ontario with great rapidity and as automation progresses, the need for trained hands and skills becomes increasingly apparent. Some of the routine jobs will be taken over by mechanical equipment. The trained employee will have to be more flexible and adapt his skills to keep pace with the changing environment. Due to the demands of modern industry traditional trades may begin to fragment as technology develops and elements of these trades may be re-grouped to form new occupations.

In response to these technological changes, the industrial training branch has been experimenting for the past three years with a new approach to training, based on a modular or block system. The basis of modular training is that the workers attain blocks of training and knowledge which can be assembled to provide a skill for an occupational area.

Pilot projects in this system are currently being undertaken in the tool industry in Windsor—

Mr. Sargent: When do they graduate?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I am coming to that—and a very successful project is being conducted at Polymer in Sarnia to develop petrochemical plant maintenance skills.

The programme requires that:

1. The work functions be identified.
2. The training is broken down into manageable units.
3. The worker is pretested.

This type of training will permit workers to have two or more skills and thus allow greater occupational mobility.

In this period of soft employment, it is of particular importance to maintain employment standards, in order to guard against potential downward pressures on wages as a result of surplus labour. As of April 1, the minimum wage in Ontario was increased to \$1.65 per hour in general industry. The increase places Ontario's minimum wage on the same level as the present minimum federal wage. The construction minimum rate is now \$1.90 an hour.

Through amendments to The Employment Standards Act which came into effect on January 1, the government has sought to minimize the impact of economic developments which result in the shutdown or part-closure of a plant and to assist workers in adjusting to the change. In the case of mass layoffs or plant shutdowns, the regulations stipulate that an employer shall not terminate the employment of 50 or more workers in any four-week period without providing written notice to the employees and to the minister.

I might mention, sir, that the leader of the New Democratic Party mentioned earlier in the question period about some of the benefits in the federal legislation. I would point out to him that in the federal legislation there is no need to give the employee notice and I think that is one of the things that perhaps they should look at. I think that is quite pertinent.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): They are going to give them money—severance pay, that is what counts.

Hon. Mr. Carton: In the case of individual terminations without cause, the amount of notice is based on the length of the employee's service. Thus one week's notice is required for workers with three months to less than two years' service; two weeks for those with two years but less than five years'

service; and four weeks for those with five but less than 10 years' service; and eight weeks for those with more than 10 years' service.

The advance notice required by the Act gives discharged employees more time to find other employment and to take advantage of various programmes provided by the federal and provincial governments to assist. In the first three months since the legislation came into force some 30 companies have given the department notice of their intention of laying off some 3,200 employees. A few are going out of business, others are closing down part of their operation or are moving to another area of the province.

Mr. Peacock: How many are exempted by the regulation?

Hon. Mr. Carton: The government has been involved with all of these companies in order to ensure that all possible assistance is given to the employees who are affected by mass layoffs. To ensure that the maximum information and assistance is provided to workers, an interdepartmental committee has been established and represents the provincial departments of Labour, Education, Social and Family Services, Trade and Development, Treasury and Economics, as well as the Canada Department of Manpower and Immigration.

The main purpose of this committee, sir, is in ensuring compliance with the notice provisions of the Act and in notifying other agencies which may also be able to assist displaced workers. The committee also tries to assist employers on an informal basis by giving guidance and advice to ease the impact of a shutdown or a layoff.

In closing, sir, there was a question addressed to the Prime Minister by the member for Scarborough East and it had to do, I believe, with young people who are not students, and I would like to point out to him a programme that is implemented through my department.

Programme 1—we have what we call "Apprenticeship," and this involves the training of youths desirous of entering construction, industrial, motive power and service trades. It requires the signatures on a contract between the apprentice and the employer. Implementation of this is by direct branch administration with the assistance of field staff.

Of the apprentices currently under contract, 88 per cent fall within the 16-to-24

age group. The apprentice must have reached the age of 16 years. A few trades require only a grade 8 or 9 education, with grade 10 being the normal requirement. Certain construction trades demand a grade 12 standing.

As of December 31, 1970, the total number of apprentices reached 18,728. During the period under review 4,540 were registered, 3,036 completed the contract and 2,035 were cancelled for various reasons.

Another programme we have is "Training in Industry." This is a short-term training which involves those skills required in industry which can be absorbed by the trainees within periods of from one to 12 months. The training can apply to any group of persons who are unskilled or unemployed, or who through technological change require upgrading or retraining. The direct administration is by the branch, and we have reimbursed the sum of \$441,260 to firms that have helped assist us in the training costs.

The age groups could vary from students leaving school at 16 years to adults of 45 to 50. The age statistics are not available, but in the period under review 5,376 persons have entered training while 3,638 have graduated. And as an estimate, only 10 per cent to 15 per cent of these would be in the 16 to 24 year age bracket.

There is a third programme called the "Progressive Achievement Testing" and this programme was developed to aid those persons, particularly youths, who left school at an early age and without the minimum educational requirements for apprenticeship. The tests are applied only to persons 19 years of age or over who after three years in the workforce are presumed to have increased their general knowledge. The test will confirm the level which in the majority of cases indicates the equivalent of grade 10 or higher.

The costs of this programme, sir, are minimal, and tests are conducted in Toronto, Ottawa, Pembroke, Peterborough, Sault Ste. Marie, St. Catharines, Sudbury, Thunder Bay, Timmins and Windsor. Administration of the tests are normally carried out by the local community college in the area, with the results being analyzed by the college representative and a member of The Department of Labour counselling staff. As mentioned above, the test normally is applied only to persons 19 years or older, and the majority fall within the 19 to 24 age group. As of December 31, 1970, a total of 1,906 have attempted the test and of these 1,082 have passed.

Lastly, sir, there is a "Youth Employment Service"—pre-employment training designed to more adequately prepare disadvantaged hard-core youths for employment. This is a project of the Rotary Club and the YMCA of Toronto, in co-operation with the industrial training branch of The Department of Labour.

Costs of the initial project were minimal; Staff costs were minimal; and a training programme is developed by this branch. The age group varies from 16 to 24 with an average age of 18 to 20.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the positive steps that have been taken by my department.

In closing, I must say that I am somewhat disappointed by the leaders of the two opposition parties in their approach to this particular resolution. Firstly, as was pointed out by the member for Scarborough West, the leader of the official opposition mentioned only one concrete suggestion—that was the mining tax. On the other hand the leader of the New Democrats mentioned—

Mr. Sargent: What has the government offered? Nothing.

Hon. Mr. Carton: —really only increased borrowing. They were talking about the—

Mr. Deans (Wentworth): Re-establishment of priorities.

Mr. Carton: They were talking about the hardcore provinces speaking to the federal government. I was hoping that on this resolution today all three parties would join in a unanimous resolution that could be presented to the Prime Minister at Ottawa to show him that this Legislature does mean business.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, in rising to talk on this debate I hope to be fairly reasonable and rational about it—

Mr. Pilkey: And short.

Mr. T. Reid: —and fairly pointed.

In the last few days we on this side of the House, and the people of Ontario, have been treated with two rather astounding documents. The first is the one made by the Minister of Housing, and Trade and Development, on April 1, and the press has spotted that as being basically a misleading and fraudulent document. The second document is this incredible statement by the Treasurer made in this place today.

It is not a statement of economic policy at all; it is a hastily prepared diatribe, if you like, against the federal government. And that it is hastily prepared can be seen by the hon. members on page 10 for example, where the Treasurer states this:

There is an immediate need for increases in consumer spending and investment to bring the provincial economy back to a full employment level of three per cent.

Mr. Speaker, if this government intends to have a full employment policy whereby three per cent of the labour force is employed then I feel sorry for us all. It is hastily prepared. He obviously did not even understand it when he was reading it, otherwise he would have corrected that three per cent to 97 per cent.

Another example of the silliness of this statement made by the provincial Treasurer today is this, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: He did not write his speech; someone else wrote it for him.

Mr. T. Reid: On page 10 he makes a great ado about the fact that there were almost twice as many people in the 14-24 year age group unemployed in the first two months of this year than there were in January and February, 1970. He makes that statement, "twice as many." Then he goes on to say that he is going to have a policy that will create only 14,000 jobs compared to 11,000 last year for young people. Mr. Speaker, he acknowledges there is a critical problem in the youth unemployment group. The problem has doubled in scope and yet he has a programme that, at the most, increases in scope by less than 30 per cent.

It is this type of inconsistency in this type of so-called statement of policy, that can only leave many people in this province laughing in disgust.

Again, on page 13, the Treasurer makes a great to-do about having provided jobs for approximately 12,000 persons through a variety of programmes during the present winter-time crisis. There are two points. I thought the leader of the New Democratic Party made one point very well. Those are not 12,000 new jobs. At least 4,000—possibly 6,000—of those jobs would have been created anyhow by the natural expansion of the provincial government's expenditure programme. So we are not even talking about new jobs.

Even if we assume this government did create 12,000 new jobs, what effect has that

had on the unemployment levels in this province? Instead of having an unemployment level today of 219,000 people we have an unemployment problem of 207,000. I say that type of piecemeal, nibbling approach to the elimination of serious unemployment in this province by this government deserves to be castigated by all people.

Seriously, getting away from the nitpicking analysis of this rather silly statement that has been read in this place, I would like to take off, if you prefer, from a point made very capably by the leader of the New Democratic Party. It is simply this. This government has tried to associate its housing programme, which was supposed to create 130,000 new jobs, with the current unemployment levels in this province of 207,000. That is fraudulent. That should not be accepted by the people of this province.

Going on from there one finds in this statement by the Treasurer a number of references to the fact that this government really cannot pursue a fiscal policy because this government does not have the powers to do so or the ability to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I quote from page 13 of the Treasurer's remarks. He said this,

I must remind you that the amount of discretionary fiscal policy that the provincial government can normally undertake is very limited, representing no more than a few per cent of the total budget.

This, to me, lies at the crux of the argument that my leader has made concerning the inability of this government to understand and to implement fiscal policy on its own in conjunction with the federal government.

I make this very basic point, Mr. Speaker, because this government's policies during the last couple of years when we have had a crisis of inflation combined with increases in prices and unemployment, this government's response to that has been based on its statement and apparent belief that it can do nothing in the way of having a fiscal and debt management policy to follow on its own.

I would just like to expose forever in this place the fact that this government has been hiding behind its own inability to have policies that could counteract, first of all, inflation and secondly, unemployment.

I would like to refer to a study prepared for the Ontario committee on taxation. It is titled "Theory of Fiscal Policy as Applied to a Province" by Clarence L. Barber. I would like to put into the record of this House Mr. Barber's utter repudiation of the position that the Treasurer has taken in this

place today concerning the ability or the inability of a provincial government the size of the government of Ontario to effectively have policies to stimulate employment and to stabilize prices.

I will just read directly, Mr. Speaker. This is from chapter 2, starting on page 24 of the report I referred to. These are just the key sentences of Professor Barber's arguments concerning the ability of a province to effectively implement fiscal policy on a counter-cyclical basis. Mr. Barber says this:

In their discussions of fiscal policy economists have usually had the central government of the country in mind. Yet it is not entirely clear why provincial governments should not pursue a conscious fiscal policy.

Professor Barber goes on to say:

It is clear, to begin with, that the size of the income or population that comes under provincial control does not rule out the possibility of a fiscal policy. For although Canada as a whole is much larger than any individual province, the large provinces compare favourably in size with many independent countries.

That is the first point—that the size of this economy, the number of people in this province, Mr. Speaker, is greater than many national economies that exercise effective fiscal policies on a counter-cyclical basis.

Professor Barber continues briefly on page 29, stating this:

In evaluating the ability of the Canadian provinces to pursue an independent counter-cyclical policy much depends on the severity of the cyclical fluctuations which are anticipated.

He continues:

On the basis of the post-war years to date, there is reason to believe that the typical cycle will consist mainly of a reduction or cessation in the normal rate of growth and perhaps occasionally a small and short-lived decline in gross national product. In cycles of such moderate amplitude almost of all the Canadian provinces have ample power to pursue counter-cyclical fiscal policies. The only provinces that might have difficulty would be the four Atlantic provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I make this point again to underline it. Professor Barber says he is referring to moderate fluctuations in the business cycle. But even for large fluctuations in the business cycle or the economic cycle,

a province the size of the Province of Ontario, with the resources it has, with the command over debt management policy it has, this province can and could and should in the past have played an effective role in fiscal policy in this province.

Professor Barber continues, getting somewhat more specific, Mr. Speaker, by way of example, and I quote:

Thus in periods of economic slack provincial governments could increase the share of their current capital expenditures financed out of borrowed funds. In more expansionary periods they could finance a larger share of capital expenditures out of current revenue or, if it proved desirable, run an overall surplus. To achieve this result, each provincial government could vary tax rates or the size of its capital expenditure programme or both. The decision whether tax rates or expenditures should be varied would have to be made in the light of the kind and location of unemployed resources and the probable effectiveness of either change in reducing the level of unemployment.

It is all here, Mr. Speaker, in a report prepared for this government on how to use its own fiscal powers and debt management powers to do something, first of all over the past few years, about the rate of inflation in this province; and, secondly, right now to get more than simply 12,000 of the more than 219,000 who are out of work back on the job.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Nothing about wage or price control there, though.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, there is one more paragraph that is very interesting to nail this government's ineptitude in understanding basic economic policy—

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Is it by a professor? If it is, forget it.

Mr. T. Reid: —to put them right against the wall. Professor Barber has said this—and he was hired by this government to write this report, which they have obviously never read.

It has been a conclusion of this analysis that provincial governments in Canada should develop an active fiscal policy directed toward the objectives of low levels of unemployment, reasonable stability of prices and an adequate rate of economic growth. The traditional view that fiscal policy is appropriate only at the central government level cannot be supported.

Most of the differences between the position of the central government and that of a province are differences of degree rather than kind and should not prevent an active fiscal policy on the part of provincial governments.

He concludes, Mr. Speaker, by saying, "This is particularly true of the larger provinces such as Ontario." For the provincial Treasurer to stand up in this place, Mr. Speaker, and to state twice in his prepared text, "I must remind you that the amount of discretionary fiscal policy that the provincial government can normally undertake is very limited," shows a total ignorance of the basic power of government to use fiscal policy to do something effective at the provincial level in the way of unemployment and inflationary price increases.

The second comment I would like to make, Mr. Speaker—the second part of my comment—has to do with what this government could have done over the past three years, in the way of price control, to alleviate the rate of inflation, if you like, in this province. I would like to discuss the concept of "economic stability" which has to do with the relationship between unemployment and prices, and I would like to put my remarks in the context, if you like, of the government's own definition of economic stability objectives.

The working definition of economic stability which became accepted in cabinet decisions in this province, and in cabinet discussions, and among the senior civil servants and in their documents, by the time of the last provincial election, Mr. Speaker, was summarized in April, 1966, by the economic and fiscal sub-committee of the Ontario advisory committee on confederation. That definition is found on page 304 in the background papers and reports of the committee on confederation published in 1967. It is a very brief, succinct definition of economic stability. It says,

Economic stability is most easily translated as the maintenance of reasonable full use of existing capacity to produce, without creating inflationary price increases. In terms of unemployment, it implies the attainment of an Ontario rate of perhaps two per cent and national average rate of three per cent to four per cent. In terms of prices, it implies a rise of 1.5 per cent to two per cent per annum.

That is the definition of economic stability that is being used by this government, which has been used in its economic decision-mak-

ing over the past three and a half years in which I have been in this place, sir.

Let us examine those policy objectives. This government says that an unemployment rate of two per cent is the objective compared to the national average of three to four per cent. There is an assumption in the policy objective of this government, Mr. Speaker, that in this province, primarily because of the power of the fiscal tools of the provincial government, the unemployment rate here can be kept to between 50 and 60 per cent of the national average.

With regard to prices, the price stability objective is 1.5 per cent to two per cent per annum. Mr. Speaker, what is the reality in this province? The reality in this province is this: The annual unemployment rate for 1970 in Ontario was 4.3 per cent, compared to a six per cent rate across Canada. That proportion of unemployment in Ontario was nowhere near the stated policy reality that could have been achieved by this government, that reality being, sir, that when Canada has an unemployment rate of six per cent, in Ontario it can be three per cent to 3.5 per cent. I suggest, sir that the unemployment gap between potential reality in this province is a function of provincial fiscal policy. That gap between 4.3 per cent which actually happened and the attainable goal of three or 3.5 per cent is the direct responsibility of this government. In their failure to achieve their own policy objective they must be condemned in terms of their own definition. In terms of prices, we have had a consumer price increase in this province, Mr. Speaker, of between four and 4.5 per cent per annum instead of 1.5 to two per cent per annum, which is the stated objective of the economic policy stabilization policies in this province.

So the point is that the policy objective of economic stability as defined by the Robarts government has simply not been achieved. We have today an unemployment rate of 6.5 per cent, that is to say, sir, of 207,000 out of a work force of 3,120,000, and we have an inflation rate of over four per cent. Not only that, there has been a failure to keep the Ontario unemployment rate down to less than two-thirds of the national average.

Where and how did the Robarts government and its current successor fail in its policy to contribute significantly to economic stability in Ontario over the past three years? I shall make, if you like, sir, one basic argument having to do with the failure of this provincial government to use its powers to

attempt to achieve its own price stability objective. This is a policy strategy that could have been used in addition to an overall fiscal policy.

I remind the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that in the Treasurer's remarks to the Legislature today he quoted the then former Premier in March, 1970, and in those quotations the then Premier made it very clear that this government—this Conservative government—did not agree that "the methods of current federal fiscal monetary policy are irrefutable."

Time and time again through the statement of this government today, quoting their past Premier, and making up their new arguments, they have condemned the monetary and fiscal policies as exercised in Ottawa, over the past two years particularly. But not once in here did they come up with alternative strategy for controlling inflation, not once did they say there are other ways of getting at inflation in the Province of Ontario. I say this, sir, that there are other ways in which this government could have acted quite forcibly to curb inflation, thereby making policies designed to increase employment much less obnoxious in terms of the inflation trade-off.

The Ontario government could have significantly reduced the rate of price inflation in Ontario over the last three years if it had chosen to do so. Let me be exact. The implementation of a range of fairly mild provincial price regulation policies by this government could have reduced the annual rate of consumer price increases from its actual upward climb of four per cent per annum during the last two years to less than two per cent. That is to say, price policies by this government could have achieved the two per cent inflation rate only, which is near to its minimum policy objective and much closer to the maximum policy objective of a 1.5 percentage rate as established in 1966.

Such a significant levelling off during the last two to three years of price increases in the goods and services purchased by Ontario families would have enabled this government, in particular, to have pursued another set of policies, fiscal and otherwise, designed to increase the supply of consumer goods and services most subject to demand-pull inflation, such as housing, which would also have created jobs as a byproduct.

My argument is quite straightforward, Mr. Speaker. Over the past three years, the Tory government has had the constitutional powers to reduce selectively the rate of short-run inflation in the cost of housing, or shelter if

one prefers, and to reduce the rate of short-run price increases in health care services to Ontario consumers. It chose not to act, sir.

Over the past 10 years, this Tory government has had the constitutional powers to increase the long-run supply of housing and the long-run supply of health care personnel, services and facilities, thereby cutting out what is called the inflationary gap of excess demand in the longer run for those particular goods and services. Such policies, Mr. Speaker, would have meant that today, we would have had a much lower rate of unemployment. But, again, sir, the government chose not to act.

Let me detail my argument of policy negligence by this provincial Tory government. I have here, sir, the national DBS consumer price index, and this is what it says: Prices in this index increased eight per cent over the two-year period 1969 and 1970. That is an annual rate of four per cent.

Of particular importance in the consumer price index was the housing component. It is important for two reasons:

1. In this index housing has a very high weight of 32 per cent, with two subcomponents of shelter at 18 per cent of the total and household operation at 14 per cent of the total.

2. The rate of inflation of the shelter component was almost 11.5 per cent, compared to the average of eight per cent over the two-year period for the total index.

Furthermore, the weight of 18 per cent for shelter in the consumer price index is based on the 1957 expenditure allocation of an average Canadian family, not on a 1970 expenditure allocation.

Now, sir, the importance of this is this. The Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto calculates that the average Toronto family today uses up about 23 per cent of its family disposable income on shelter, a proportion which rises steadily as family income drops. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, inflation to many, many people in Ontario has virtually been one thing alone—large rent increases on top of a large rent to start with, which was consuming one out of every five dollars earned, and increasing property tax bills for education on top of large property tax bills to start with.

"Shelter price inflation" is what it should be called and it has been the most significant reason for many urban Ontario families experiencing a decline in the real purchasing power of their family income. It was, and is,

the strategic area of price restraint over which this provincial government had the public responsibility to act to achieve its own economic stability goal of reducing inflation in this province to consumers to two per cent or 1.5 per cent a year down from the four per cent actual.

Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, if, during 1968 and 1969 in particular, this provincial government had taken the initiative in examining and exposing the excess profits made by landlords who were charging tenants what the market would bear. And if it had then legislated a strategy of rental review boards, which we in this party advocated, with the power to limit rent increases—that is, to limit rent inflation—on the criteria of no excess profits, inflation in the shelter component of the consumer price index in Ontario would have been cut in half, sir, that is to under two per cent a year for 1969-1970. This one strategy alone by this Tory government across there, sir, could have meant a sizeable cut in the inflation rates of the total consumer price index, due to the heavy weight of shelter in the consumer purchasing pattern.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Singer: Is that a point of order?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Would he permit a question?

Since inflation, I think it is generally agreed, is nation-wide, both prices and all other areas—

Mr. Bullbrook: World-wide.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Would not action by the national government be the effective way to have tackled it, rather than to say one province?

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I will just reply to that by saying that as long as this government believes it is castrated in the field of this type of policy, the inflation in this province will continue and unemployment will rise at the same time. That is the basic point I am trying to make.

This government, this cabinet—Robarts, before it—believes it is castrated in terms of fiscal and selective price review policies as I have explained today.

I just reiterate this to the minister who asked the question that, if you look at where people's money is going in terms of their purchases, you will find, particularly in urban

Ontario, that 25 per cent of their disposable income is going into shelter; another 14 per cent is going into goods and services such as hydro, to support living in shelter. That is where inflation has been most rampant in this province and that is the area in which this government, if it had had the guts and nerve and proper research, would have moved in and limited price inflation.

Mr. Makarchuk (Brantford): And what was the Bank of Canada doing all this time?

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I will turn to another area of the consumer price index called "health and personal care." It had an inflation rate over that 24-month period of 11 per cent compared to the average rate of growth of eight per cent over that two year period, and it has the weight of seven per cent. This government could have effected a cut in health care costs in this province to the consumer if it had had the guts to realize that it would not only be good for people but would cut down the rate of inflation.

We have the highest premiums in Canada in this province, Mr. Speaker; we could have cut down there. We should be reviewing the health fee schedules; we could have cut down the rate increases in health care services there. We could increase the number of doctors over a longer term period, decreasing if you like, their ability to push up prices, and particularly in the field of drug costs which are a large component in the consumer price index for many families. If this government had the guts to act against the drug lobby we could cut drug costs there.

It is this type of thing, Mr. Speaker, that this government should have been doing over the past 10 years, and especially over the past three years, if it was really concerned with inflation to the consumer, and it is in this area where this government has failed to act. We can go through a whole variety of programmes that my leader has suggested. Take the hydro rates. You talk to the consumer in his house, you find out where there has been inflation and what he has paid for, it is his hydro rates. Why has this government not controlled hydro rates? Why has this government not insisted that the surplus funds available to Hydro go into keeping prices low instead of simply stashing away excess surplus funds in some account? It is the same as the excess profits of the landlords across Metropolitan Toronto and other urban areas in this province.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this government could have implemented specific regulatory

measures to reduce price inflation significantly in the short run in Ontario. I believe that the consumer price index could have been held down to a two per cent annual increase in 1968, 1969 and 1970, instead of a four per cent annual increase on the average for those three years, through the direct action of this provincial government.

The consequences for unemployment of having actually done so are all too clear—provincial price regulations being a direct substitute for blunt federal restrictive monetary policy and blunt federal-provincial restrictive fiscal policies.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Talk to your friends in Ottawa.

Mr. T. Reid: We must try to find out where the price increases have really taken place to the average consumer in this province. It is in the area of housing, shelter and services to shelter. In the long run—to get back to the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs' earlier remarks—in the long run the way to curb inflation of shelter costs and the costs associated with shelter is to build more houses and to build them now, and to have been building them over the past three years. In the long run the way you stop price inflation in shelter and housing is to create more housing, a greater supply of housing.

If this government had had any inkling of its ability to manipulate in terms of fiscal policy it would have put in its half-billion-dollar programme not a couple of days ago, but planned it eight months ago, and it would have been a real half a billion dollar programme, Mr. Speaker, and not a fatuous façade of one.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I think we must look forward and not back, but I think as long as this government comes in here on the pretext of a serious debate on unemployment in this province and sits down with a silly asinine statement as read into the record of this House by the Treasurer, we are not going to have a serious debate. This thing by the Treasurer is a chopped-up political document. It is not worthy of Ian MacDonald and some of the other economists in the public service of this province, and I would say they probably did not even see it. This was thought up in cabinet and the Treasurer and Premier had some political advisers there to write it for them.

This does not make any sense economically. Politically it looks backwards. It tries to say the federal government is responsible; and we all know the federal government shares

a degree of responsibility in it. But to not look forward, to not come up with programmes, to not look seriously into, if you like, a \$15 million programme for youth and youth-student employment in this province—not just in the summer, but over the entire 12-month period of the year—without getting into that type of programme you are a façade, you are a fake, you are fraudulent.

If you are really interested in doing something about employment in this province—to create employment up to 97 per cent of those wishing to work in this province—you would have a real half billion dollar housing project which would, in fact, create 130,000 new jobs instead of simply what they have come up with, Mr. Speaker.

If they are really serious, and if I understood the new Minister of Labour, I believe, if he really wants to know what this government can do to do something about unemployment through a private system, through a free enterprise system, the government would be using the Ontario Development Corporation as a basic tool of fiscal policy, not just something trumped up to allocate a few more funds here and there. You would have as one of its main criteria, not simply the location of industry, but you would give the money in terms of the labour component, as my friend from Windsor-Walkerville has pointed out.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think that if we look ahead instead of looking backwards, the message is very clear. We have to have more expenditures to create the jobs. Those greater expenditures have to come from the public sector and the private sector. At the same time, if we are really serious about the problems and the inequities of inflation, we should at least have a committee looking into the ways in which this government can check monopolistic pricing in this province and the ways in which this government can check the abuses of excess profits, particularly by landlords.

Until the government stand up in here and say they are considering ways of restraining inflation, particularly in those areas which eat up a large part of the consumer pie, such as shelter, medical attention and so forth; until they stand up and say they are examining ways of controlling inflation in those areas, the people of this province and people like myself cannot take them seriously.

Ross Munro wrote about this government's fraud in the *Globe and Mail* on Saturday, and I would hope that he or some other able reporter in this press gallery will take the

Treasurer's statement and consult with some of the best economists who could be judged to be non-partisan—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We read about your fraud. If we can only understand it.

Mr. Singer: The hon. minister is awfully sensitive about that.

Mr. T. Reid: —to go through this thing and just pick it apart for the shilly-shally document it is. Mr. Speaker, this government deserves to go out of office.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We do not agree with the hon. member.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): We are against that.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, it is with some nostalgia that I rise to partake in a debate on unemployment, because it was about 10 years ago almost to the day, that I made my first political speech—and I was speaking about unemployment at that time. The staggering thing about it is that the arguments have not moved one foot forward in the last 10 years. Only the participants have changed. I noted in the Speech from the Throne that wonderful line that we have reached “unconscionable levels of unemployment.” This is not usually the kind of language His Honour is provided with to speak in this particular chamber. I just thought I would look up the Speeches from the Throne in 1959, 1960 and 1961.

Mr. Diefenbaker led the government in Ottawa, and a Conservative government at that time held the reins of power in the Province of Ontario. It was rather interesting to discover that in the *Hansard* of that day, 1959, there was talk about there being a recession throughout America and that, “Unemployment has caused us great concern.” In 1960, there were only expectations of continued expansion, that unemployment would be reduced. In January, 1961, we discovered the ratio of unemployment was below the national average.

I bring this to your attention, sir, simply for this reason: That this debate is a very cruel, rather disgraceful game to realize that, while we are speaking in this House, there are over 200,000 people in this province who have been told that their skills are unnecessary, that they are a drag on the economy and in many cases they are being berated for having to accept welfare and unemployment insurance and all the other means by which

we keep them alive. Well, at least, we keep them apart from the buying public so that the rest of our economy can survive.

So I say to you, sir, that it is not with any great joy that I partake in this debate. But I must say that in this debate, the New Democratic Party and its leader have put forward positive, sensible, rational, acceptable ways by which unemployment can be reduced immediately.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pitman: We have given this government a programme. If it has not got the brains to do something with the programme, then let somebody else put a programme into effect.

An hon. member: Dreamer.

Mr. Pitman: The programme which this government has brought down to this chamber a few days ago has turned out to be a hoax. It is known to be a hoax from one end of this province to the other. I am not going to go over what my leader has already said about the glorious housing project that has been brought forward. As for the elm tree removal plan, I think all one can say about that is that it indicates the obsession of this government with deadwood. One could have hoped for something just a bit more imaginative.

Mr. Lewis: Believe me, there is plenty of it to be expert about. We could have our own project in the back benches over there.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Better repeat it.

Mr. Pitman: All I can say is that the only point this debate seems to have is simply to try to take some of the sting out of the chaos that has existed in Ontario over the last number of months. Because it has been a double tragedy—a tragedy perpetrated by the Ottawa government obviously but perpetrated as well by this government. In spite of the fact that the leader of the Conservative Party decided to step down in the last days of November and in spite of the fact that the party in power was obsessed with the problem of picking a new leader, buying all the balloons, buying all the pamphlets and looking after all the arrangements in Maple Leaf Gardens, this government was in power; it had a responsibility to govern. The people who were unemployed were badly served indeed by those who held the reins of power in this government during those months.

Indeed, what can be more ludicrous than that a programme was announced on March 4 to encourage municipalities to initiate work at \$1 per head. This was supposedly a programme to deal with seasonal unemployment. It was announced on March 4, and one noticed how quickly municipalities were expected to bring forward programmes. I notice it is now April and there are many municipalities that have yet to bring forward a programme—not because they do not want to, but because they have to go through all the forms which this government expects and then the programme is withdrawn by June 30. How ludicrous, how ridiculous, how disgraceful.

I would suggest to this government that this is the richest province in Canada. It is the industrial centre. It deserves some imagination, some wit, some intelligence in the carrying out of its affairs.

Mr. Lawlor: When is this government going to start?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Dead elms.

Mr. Pitman: In many ways, it is in the area of provincial jurisdiction that changes really have to be made in the long term. In my few remarks this afternoon, I am going to concentrate on the long term, because the short term has been quite effectively dealt with by the leader of this party. I need to say nothing more on that area.

I do want to say a great deal about what we must do for the 1970s and the 1980s.

Mr. Ruston: He did not say anything, you know.

Mr. Pitman: He said a great deal. Either the member was not listening or he cannot understand—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman:—and I am afraid that we cannot be responsible for the latter, the complete lack of understanding on the part of those to our right.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself to the long-range programme. This province, of course, like every other province in Canada, is obsessed with growth as the answer to unemployment. And because of the fact that this is the only thing that this government can really create, we have to play this game on the short-run. But I can assure you that if the power of government is given

to this party, we intend to provide long-run solutions. We intend to give some hope. We do not think the kind of actions of government which mean that people must go out of their jobs every few years, because of the so-called myths of free-enterprise or the myths of the free economy—the invisible hand, and all the other nonsense that is paraded about as justification for unemployment. We do not think that it is necessary or indeed, to use the words of this government, that it is “conscionable.”

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There goes the NDP leader's Tory image. Back to the radicals.

Mr. Pitman: We know that neither this country nor this province really can depend on non-qualitative growth in the future.

Mr. Lawlor: Have you ever tried to shake an invisible hand?

Mr. Pitman: There is every reason to question that a growth-production-consumption-waste-pollution syndrome can even allow our ecology to survive. Yet in the Speech from the Throne, after a passing reference to ecology, a few changes in the government responsibility and passing portfolios around, the only answer this government had was more growth. Even with continued growth this province cannot keep its people working. The inexorable march of cybernation is destroying jobs day by day. Even without the constant closures by multinational corporations, the jobs in existing plants are becoming fewer. One noted with some degree of abhorrence that the only answer of this government to that problem is to hold a conference.

Even certain aspects of the service industry are being automated. The pattern of the nineteen sixties has been that there are fewer and fewer jobs in terms of the proportion of those who wish to work, and that is the simple answer and it is the most obvious one.

How have we been dealing with it? Well, we had a certain amount of growth, quite non-qualitative growth—as the Minister of Energy and Resources Management well knows now—in relation to Dow Chemical and any other plants which will undoubtedly be brought into the courts in a few months.

The other way we have done it, as the minister who has now become the Premier of this province knows, we have hidden our unemployment in schools. We have kept the kids on ice. We have kept them out of the labour market. As I have said before—I do not want to repeat this statistic, but if we

return to the holding rate of our schools from 1962—our schools and our colleges and our universities—we would have double the unemployment in Ontario right now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is a very specious argument and no one should know better than the hon. member.

Mr. Pitman: It is not a specious argument, Mr. Speaker. I would be very glad to go into those statistics any time the Prime Minister wants to carry out a debate on this particular aspect.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will. The hon. member has just given me the germ of an idea.

Mr. MacDonald: I am glad the Premier has something to fill that vacuum.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have never heard the hon. member make a more specious argument than that.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, not only do we have to provide the policy, we even have to supply the germs of the ideas of the people on the other side of this House.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That one is just as interesting.

Mr. Pitman: May I go on? The Prime Minister knows this to be true. If he only asks those who are being kept in school, those—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Heavens above! The members opposite advocating universality, free accessibility—

Mr. Pitman: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, those do not replace any policy in education. But, we will come to that at some other time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The trouble is, hon. member educated him.

Mr. Pitman: We have ridden our unemployment, Mr. Speaker, but it is an expensive and self-defeating method, and the future costs will make it prohibitive. It is this long-term project which the province has not even begun to comprehend, even to understand so far as to try and cope with.

And what is the effect of this? Well, the effect on people who are not working, of course, is devastating. I do not want to be maudlin and sentimental about what it is like to be unemployed. I am sure every member in this House surely has people phoning them every day who are unemployed.

Mr. MacDonald: Ask Benson's son.

Mr. Pitman: They are people who want very much to work and to contribute and to be a part of this society.

As well as that, it has another effect—another spin-off. One only has to go into the schools and colleges and universities of this province to know what that spin-off is. It, too, is devastating. It destroys the morale of students who are working their way through universities and colleges. It destroys even those who want to see some job at the end of their high school career and who know there will be no jobs when they graduate.

I suggest it is undermining the performance of many young people in this province, because Canada will graduate this spring 142,000 students from our colleges and our universities, an increase of 23 per cent—and I would suggest that it would be well over 23 per cent in this province. But there will be fewer jobs, more unemployment—more unemployed scientists, more unemployed engineers, more unemployed teachers, to mention only a few representative professions.

This trend will continue—with variations, of course, over the next number of years, relating to the short-term economic drives which we have talked about here this afternoon.

Now we are injecting another level of certified graduates from our colleges of applied arts and technology. As the Prime Minister now realizes, I spent some of my time travelling about the province going to colleges of applied arts and technology and talking, in a very constructive way, to the people who were in those colleges. I discovered myself in one college—and I was there the same day as they were coming from the various employment agencies. There were about three times as many students in that college and there were 60 per cent fewer employers coming to talk to those students. Not a very happy prospect for the young people who were sitting in the classrooms and in the lecture halls of our province. And in that particular sector—the colleges of applied arts and technology—they will dramatically increase over the next number of years, and indeed so is their pessimism increasing.

Mr. P. J. Yakubski (Renfrew South): Has the hon. member written Trudeau?

Mr. Pitman: Well, Mr. Speaker, have I written Trudeau. You see, that is really the most meaningless way we can spend our time

in this Legislature. We can berate the federal government and we can berate our poor friends here to the right who have to defend the federal government, but really that does not get us much farther forward, does it? What we in this part of the Legislature are trying to do is to give the government something to do for the next few months which will put people back to work.

There will be massive under-employment. That is the hidden tragedy of the kind of economic policies of both the Conservatives under Mr. Diefenbaker and under this government and our friends here to the right under Mr. Trudeau—the under-employment.

Mr. Yakabuski: What about Labour in Britain?

Mr. Pitman: There happens to be a Conservative government in power in Britain, too, and they are making a mess of that.

Mr. Yakabuski: We do not want any of that here.

Mr. Lawlor: Back to the boondocks.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: I might say having a Ph.D.—

An hon. member: As soon as the Tories took over we had chaos.

Mr. Yakabuski: They will bring stability to that nation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: The stability of death. Rigor mortis.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, our friends across the way seem to want to discuss the economy of Great Britain. Maybe they feel they can do more with that than they can with this province, but nonetheless—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why is the member discussing the economy of Manitoba?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We have heard a lot about Manitoba today.

Mr. Pitman: I suggest that there will be massive under-employment. Now, having a Ph.D. and driving a taxicab may give that person some kind of means of making ends meet, but it is a massive cost of providing largely untransferable skills in many cases. It is totally unacceptable and very, very expensive.

As I say, in regard to this long term prospect, and as I say I do not want to refer again to what my leader has already said in terms of the short term, we have already solved that problem for the government. Now we will try to get the government moving in what you might say is a more long-term direction.

We have got to move in some way from what could be called a production-work society to some kind of a leisure-learning society; a society which provides full employment although obviously everybody will not be employed in what we now call work all the time. In this kind of a direction the people of Ontario have some right to expect some vision, some imagination. The question is how can we distribute meaningful, contributive activity? How do you distribute opportunities for leisure? How do you distribute opportunities for learning?

What we are really talking about, Mr. Speaker, is a humane decent society, because I have seen the other kind of society which our friends on the other side seem to feel is worth continuing. What is a work welfare society like? It is a nasty, brutish society and even today I have witnessed a change in the atmosphere in the communities of our province as unemployed become welfare recipients and are accused of laziness and sloth by those who must work to support them supposedly.

Mr. Lewis: Like the Attorney General's comment.

Mr. Pitman: It erodes the good will, the sense of decent compassion, the very atmosphere which makes any kind of community life possible. It is this disgraceful aspect of this entire mass which has seen the humiliation of welfare recipients who have been denied dental care, even medical attention, because municipalities have had their budgets destroyed by the rising cost of welfare services.

It may be possible for the Minister of Social and Family Services to bring an additional budget down to this Legislature and get another \$50 million, but what does the municipality do? How do they deal with their welfare services when the unemployment rises and the people run out of their unemployment insurance and they find themselves on the rolls of the local municipality? That is what I mean by an inhuman, indecent kind of society. Who can measure the psychological effect of being unwanted and part of the unemployed?

I might mention also the point made by the member for Riverdale, a comment he made this afternoon; what psychological effect this morass of the last few days must have produced across this province. People who believed they were going to work, they were going to be part of the 132,000 who were going back into the working world, find that there are 9,000 jobs. Nine thousand?

Mr. Lewis: Who knows?

Mr. Pitman: Who knows? Perhaps the minister will tell us in a few moments.

Mr. Lawlor: He told us 100,000.

Mr. Pitman: As I say, this is not maudlin sentimentalism.

Mr. Lawlor: Did the hon. Minister of Trade and Development write it?

Mr. Lewis: Grossman number three?

Mr. Pitman: I suggest to you, sir, it cuts to the heart of any oratory about the quality of life, a so-called pervasive theme of the Speech from the Throne we listened to a few days ago.

I am going to make just a few suggestions for you to build upon, on a long-range basis, on what my leader has already said this afternoon.

It is time this government began discussions with business and labour leaders, as well as those in the service sector working toward the reorganization of our industrial society. The idea that shorter work weeks, longer holidays, six months sabbatical periods can bring about some redistribution of work and leisure is obvious. It is time to start now toward defining the directions of our new leisure-learning society and this government alone can initiate that kind of response. I say government has more of a responsibility than simply to supervise misery or reacting in panic to short-term chaos.

Secondly, it is time the Ontario government gave leadership in entering into discussions with professions. The present direction will lead to a few highly-skilled, overworked—in terms of time—and with skills underemployed in time-consuming activities in place of what one might call a pyramided profession. A more realistic and definite role can be found for medical paraprofessionals and aides, teacher assistants and teacher aides, legal aides, and social worker assistants and social worker aides.

In short, we must find a role in a service-oriented society for the contribution of many

people who have neither skill nor educational attainment to be full professionals in the interpretation of the present. The province must take the lead. This is the responsibility of our provincial government. One cannot handle this kind of thing through the federal government and blame them for not taking the initiative.

I suggest it is lunatic to encourage a society in which there are a few overworked professionals and no opportunity for others to serve. Only government can provide a common group for national discussions and eventual action.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What is the hon. member saying? Be a little more specific.

Mr. Pitman: The Prime Minister asks me to go into specifics?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am serious.

Mr. Pitman: I am very serious, too. I think it is time that we sat down, the Minister of Health, with the medical profession, the Minister of Education with the teaching profession, and began to work out the roles of teacher aides and teacher assistants, ensuring that there will be a place in a pyramided kind of society, in all of these pyramided professions. We have not done it. There have been attempts. The commission on the healing arts alluded to certain areas, even to the area on social work, but we have not done anything on a provincial level to do that thing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: How does that utilize more people?

Mr. Lewis: It provides new career lines.

Mr. Pitman: Obviously it utilizes more people. We can use thousands of young people. For example, helping—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We have a surplus of elementary school teachers.

Mr. Pitman: But there is no surplus of nursery school teachers for the nurseries that do not exist, because they are not brought into effect by this government.

We need thousands of young people and teachers who will teach retarded children and emotionally disturbed children. We have a million of them in Canada by this CELDIC report. There are all kinds of services to people.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In that way the member is going to add substantially to the total number of students, by education.

Mr. Pitman: Indeed it will. The great problem in the elementary school is with the present budget cuts. What is happening is the present pupil-teacher ratio is being raised. In other words, fewer teachers are going to be employed in the province's schools next September than were last September, simply because the budget cuts have created that effect. That is true. One would hope that the government might be able to use—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: Obviously the Minister of Education would agree that what we need at the elementary level is more adults per student—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: The government is the trouble.

Mr. Pitman: —a higher number of adults per student. If one wants to teach a young person how to read, write, or do obvious skills, then one needs a higher ratio of adults to students. If the government is not going to be able to provide ten students per classroom per teacher, then it had better be able to do it with teacher aides and teacher assistants—in other words, a pyramiding of people who have lesser skills who can participate in our society.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Just add to the pyramid of millions and millions of dollars to implement the programme.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: My answer, Mr. Speaker, to the Prime Minister is that he adds millions and millions of dollars to the welfare rolls for those people who are not working in those jobs. It is as simple as that. But as long as you decide—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: It seems to be the most simple statement I ever made in this House, Mr. Speaker, that once you decide in a society that you are not going to let people starve and die because they cannot eat, then you are going to have to support them some way. You can either support them through some sensible way of keeping them at work, or you can put them on welfare rolls and let them vegetate and create the kind of brutish and inhumane society—

Hon. Mr. Davis: This pyramiding of personnel is not really relevant.

Mr. Pitman: It certainly is. If the Prime Minister cannot see how relevant that is, he has not comprehended the whole direction of our society for the next 20 years. I do not think I can explain it to him all here tonight.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The Prime Minister is gathering the germ of an idea. He should think about it overnight.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am and I am looking forward to tomorrow.

Mr. Lewis: He should just let it infect him tomorrow.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, if I might continue.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, some create diseases, others antibiotics. I am suspicious that this could be a disease.

Mr. Pitman: Third, end the use of schools as custodial institutions for youth and adolescents and as a method of keeping them out of the employment picture and make educational services available to adults. Schools should be reaching out to those who are unemployed, rekindling the desire to learn and grow. And in the present system we have, if a person is on welfare and he tries to get into a college of applied arts and technology, he is taken off welfare. That is the reaction. Because of this ridiculous, almost horrendous division of responsibility between the federal and the provincial levels and said enforced idleness and erosion of skill and optimistic attitudes are positively encouraged. I think continuing in adult education can become the major emphasis, and I see little in The Department of Education to see this fact at the present time. Only when all our resources are not expended on the holding operation of our schools and young people are given an opportunity to contribute to the needs of the community can we really turn our attention to the creation of an educative society instead of a school-obsessed society. It is not a matter of teenagers taking jobs from the older workers. A rational dispensation will see young people working at their own level in the economy, with full opportunity to return to school or college at a later time.

It seems fantastic that we in the opposition had to press the Minister of Social and Family Services to see the guaranteed annual income as some solution, some level of solution at least, in this kind of a parliament we are dealing with today. Only that kind of a pattern can make sense either financially or educationally in an affluent society. Allowing enforced schooling of the young to gobble up all the resources of human development is wasteful in the long term and pointless educationally. It is counter-productive, as it discourages learning in school and encourages boredom and inactivity.

One might give another suggestion in the long term in the kind of society we must be moving toward. The pattern of time-tabling education creates a glut of young people on the labour market every summer. Yet The Department of Education has made only the feeblest efforts to make educational facilities usable all year round so that young people are given the opportunity to continue learning when they want to.

The pathetic response of this government to the tourist industry—that was the thing which really floored me. The former Minister of Trade and Development—at least he had flair and colour—but for the present minister to rise in this House and say we are going to give \$1,000,000 to the tourist industry, not one penny more than I think was given last year, all we are going to do now is make it possible for a few of them to take advantage of it, because what has happened in the past year of course is that the whole programme lay in shambles.

I think there were two loans made across the whole of Ontario to the tourist industry, and now we are going to make \$1,000,000 available—almost the same \$1,000,000 last year—at a time when this is one industry that could provide some employment for the young people who are leaving our high schools and our colleges and who desperately need summer employment.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member said it was peanuts.

Mr. Pitman: I think it is peanuts but I did not actually say it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member did the other day; he said \$1,000,000 was peanuts.

Mr. Pitman: Well if you go out and talk to a few tourist operators, they will tell you it is a good deal less than peanuts; but I will not use that kind of language in this Legislature.

However, one might even take a look at the role of the minimum wage and the effect it is having on our tourist industry and see some thrust on the part of the government to perhaps subsidize in that area in terms of student employment across this province.

Well, my conclusion, Mr. Speaker. I do not intend to provide, you might say, a government programme for the next 10 years, but I think we have tried this afternoon to provide you with a programme in the short and the long run. The greatest principle of a democratic government is that it fails to move quickly enough to cope with the crisis, and it is this ineffectiveness which turns men and women to other methods of organizing their affairs. I call on this government to show just a little initiative and imagination in trying to cope with the obvious challenge of a post-industrial age.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Trade and Development is not in the House, and on his behalf I adjourn the debate.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving adjournment of the—

Mr. MacDonald (York South): No other Tory has anything to say.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This will go on again tomorrow.

Mr. MacDonald: I know.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Before moving adjournment of the House, we will go ahead with this debate tomorrow afternoon, hopefully to conclude, and then Wednesday we will move into the Throne debate.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:53 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 5, 1971

Admission policy at Lake of the Woods hospital, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon	177
Negotiations with OSSTF re May 3 deadline, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis	177
Meeting with Mr. Bourassa re federal-provincial conference, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	177
Steps to implement student unemployment aid programme SWEEP, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. T. Reid	178
Widespread illegal trafficking in drugs, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon	179
Negotiations with government of Canada re nursing home coverage, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Ferrier	179
Bargaining rights of CATTs teachers under new Department of Universities and Colleges, questions to Mr. White and Mr. Welch, Mr. Lewis	180
Problems of building another hospital in Moosonee, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Ben	180
Amending Bill 96 to conform with federal legislation, question to Mr. Carton, Mr. Lewis	181
Amending Bill 83 to conform with federal legislation, question to Mr. Carton, Mr. Lewis	181
Alternative employment for employees losing their jobs at Cobalt Refinery, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Jackson	181
When capital fund to assist small business will be in operation, question to Mr. Grossman Mr. Kennedy	182
Statement re government action against Dow Chemical Company, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Bullbrook	182
Giving of moneys for dam projects to Grand River Conservation Authority, question to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Worton	182
Proposal to OMA re accepting less than 90 per cent of fee schedule, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Lewis	183
Feasibility study re dispensing alcoholic beverages in plastic containers, question to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Sopha	183
Request of Chinese community re amendment to Toronto plan, question to Mr. Bales, Mr. Deans	183
Facilities for treatment of crippled children in Ottawa area, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. MacKenzie	184
Testing and approving of non-phosphate detergents before allowing on market, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Burr, Mr. Trotter	184

Terms of agreement between operating engineers and major railways, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Yakabuski	185
Control of off-track betting, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Singer	185
Alleviating short-term problem confronting Sudbury area patients re hospitals, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Martel	185
Policy of Scottish and York Insurance Company re Insurance Act, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Good	186
Purchase of German chain saws under deal elm removal programme, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Gaunt	186
Grant to Nisku Corporation Co-operative, in pulp and paper, questions to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Lewis	186
Plans re more Ontario young people being able to study medicine, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Ferrier, Mr. Peacock	187
Number of hourly-rated employees having employment terminated during last year, questions to Mr. Auld, Mr. Ben, Mr. De Monte	187
Inquiry into conduct of certain OPP officers, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Singer	188
Presenting Department of Municipal Affairs summary of financial reports, Mr. Bales	188
Farm Products Marketing Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading	188
University of Toronto Act, 1947, bill to amend, Mr. Ben, first reading	188
Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Young, first reading	189
On notice of motion No. 1, Mr. McKeough, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Carton, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Pitman	189
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Wishart, agreed to	225
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Davis, agreed to	225









ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

**(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 6, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon, our guests in the east gallery are students from MacKillop Public School, Richmond Hill, and Main Street School, Toronto; and in the west gallery, Glendale School, Simcoe, and Hillside Public School in Clarkson. Later this afternoon, we will be having visitors from Durham College in Oshawa.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement related to Ontario summer youth programmes. There has been considerable concern expressed about the problems which students will face this summer in finding employment. With the increase in general unemployment during the fall and winter, it is expected that there may be a significant decrease in job opportunities for students.

The Ontario government is naturally concerned about this problem and is therefore taking steps to assist greater numbers of students to find employment or become involved in developing their skills and interests during the coming summer. At the same time, we hope that our efforts will provide encouragement to the private sector, which accepts continuing responsibility in this area as well.

Each summer the Ontario government employs a large number of students in all of its departments, boards and commissions, to assist in regular programmes and to provide special services during the summer period. This summer, over 14,000 young people will be working in the government, a substantial increase over previous years. This is an increase of 3,000 over the number hired in the summer of 1970.

Included in these 14,000 jobs will be 2,000 places for young people working on a new programme in the environmental and ecological field. We are calling this programme SWEEP, Students Working in an Environmental Enhancement Programme. This programme has been developed in response to the request of young people to be involved

in the improvement of our environment and will cost \$2.4 million. One thousand of these places in the SWEEP programme, many in the northern part of the province, have been allocated to The Department of Lands and Forests in an expansion of that department's activities, which will include improvement and clean-up in our provincial parks, tree planting in parks and on Crown lands, as well as a number of activities related to the preservation of fish and wildlife.

The other 1,000 places have been allocated through The Department of Energy and Resources Management for the employment of students in the 37 conservation authorities throughout the province. These young people will be involved in improvement to conservation lands and streams as well as in an intensified cleanup of roadsides, streams and lakeshores in the province.

Employment in this programme will be open to students 18 years of age and over and application forms are available by writing to SWEEP, in care of either The Department of Lands and Forests or The Department of Energy and Resources Management, Queen's Park, Toronto.

Filling the other 12,000 summer jobs in the provincial government will be students from every type of background and in every part of the province. Many of them will be employed to replace regular staff during the summer holiday period in offices and institutions. The Department of Lands and Forests will hire 2,050 17-year-olds in its Junior Forest Ranger Programme. Many students in technical and scientific courses will be employed in jobs requiring special skills in the fields of resources, highways and transportation.

Students will be working in special projects, including water, highway and geological surveys and various research programmes carried on by the government. Others will be employed in the Niagara Parks Commission, in tourist information centres, in activities such as the Fort Henry Guard. Students from the social and health sciences will be involved in summer internship programmes, while other university undergraduates will be helping in the property

assessment programme. Students will also be working as hosts, hostesses and supervisors at Ontario Place, and others will find employment in privately operated restaurants.

The government has also approved over \$900,000 for other new programmes, both provincially and locally, to provide summer activities for young people. This expenditure is for the development of programmes to challenge and involve young people in physical, social, artistic and creative activities. To co-ordinate and supervise these programmes, which could involve approximately 63,000 of our young people, it is expected that nearly 1,100 students will be employed, primarily outside the Ontario public service. The programmes involved are outlined as follows:

One of these activities is Project SOLE. This project, Summer of Learning Experiences, is an outgrowth of the SEED programme which has been operated successfully in the Toronto area for the past three years. Project SOLE will be established in 24 communities this summer.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Project what?

Hon. Mr. Davis: SOLE—Summer of Learning Experience.

An hon. member: Sounds fishy.

Mr. Lewis: Sole and seed. How about that! But it does not compensate for the absence of the programme.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Young people will be hired as co-ordinators, and they in turn will be calling upon many other citizens in these communities to provide their time and talents in establishing summer educational programmes in a wide variety of subject areas of interest to young people. The project is being administered under the direction of a provincial committee which includes representatives from the SEED programme, The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship and The Department of Education.

In another of the new programmes, 200 high school students will be selected to participate in a summer of service while they gain experience in the health and social service fields.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): SOS.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Summer of services. SOS.

Mr. Lewis: SEED and SOLE and SWEET and SOS.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is no name attached to this.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): One will come.

Mr. MacDonald: That will be tomorrow's announcement, the name for that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Each will receive a \$400 award for the summer and these young people will be providing services to homes for the aged, senior citizens' recreation centres, day nurseries, sheltered workshops and the Ontario Hospital schools. This programme will give young people interested in the health and social services field an opportunity to make a contribution to the social needs of our province. This programme is being administered by The Department of Health and The Department of Social and Family Services.

Another important activity will be the expansion of the Ontario Youth in Action programme. In this programme the province cost-shares with municipalities and agencies the salaries of community youth workers at the request of the municipalities or agencies. Provision has been made for the employment of up to 300 youths in this programme who may be involved in activities such as the development of local youth enterprise programmes, expanded recreation programmes, formation of local youth councils or the development of community activities which may range from pollution programmes to the development of additional services to senior citizens.

In the activities outlined, we are providing opportunities for young people to become involved in the problems of the environment, social needs and in new educational experiences. There are many young people in the province, however, who have special talents and interests in the arts and we have developed three new programmes to encourage and assist such young people.

In the theatre arts, support and expansion of theatre programmes are being provided for in conjunction with the Ontario Youth-eatre. Regional theatre programmes will be established and support will be given to the development of a provincial company. This will enable many interested and talented young people to gain experience in all phases of the theatre arts. Many of the smaller communities in Ontario will have an opportunity to see the plays produced by the students involved in this programme.

Funds have also been provided for a summer music programme to establish a corps of young Ontario musicians. These musicians will develop their musical skills and will travel the province providing concerts and shows upon the request of local municipalities and youth groups. The productions will be developed entirely by the young musicians with the guidance of several experienced co-ordinators. I cannot give any undertaking as to the type of music that will be provided.

In two or three other areas of the province we shall establish handcraft production centres where young people who have ability in the crafts can be provided with adequate and competent leadership. These crafts would be mainly geared to the tourist industry and sales outlets will be established in conjunction with the centres. We are also providing funds for a travelling team of artists who will provide concentrated courses for skill training in various art media in Ontario communities during the summer.

In the encouragement of athletics, we shall continue our assistance to the competitive swimming programme. This year, in addition, we shall assist communities with the expansion of local track and field programmes. In many communities, recreation committees, local branches of the Royal Canadian Legion or other service clubs will employ skilled young people as community track and field coaches and the province will assist in this programme through the provision of regional and provincial co-ordinators; the development of leadership courses for community coaches, and of community, district and regional meets for the young people involved in this programme. From these programmes, young people with an interest and talent in swimming or track and field will be given an opportunity to develop their skills, and it is from this group that we shall expect to discover many of our competitors for the 1976 Olympic teams.

The youth-in-action, arts and crafts, drama, music and athletic programmes will all be administered by the youth and recreation branch of The Department of Education, and young people and municipalities interested in these programmes should direct their inquiries to that department.

Another summer activity involving a younger age group will be an urban-to-rural exchange of young people 12 to 15 years of age. Youngsters from our cities will have an opportunity of experiencing today's rural way of life by living with farm families for short periods during the summer. The province

will be hiring students to work with community organizations in the development and co-ordination of this programme. We hope that 5,000 to 6,000 young people will be involved in this exchange. This programme is being administered by The Department of Agriculture and Food.

The student self-help project undertaken by The Department of Labour is already meeting with an enthusiastic response. Under this programme, guidance and assistance will be provided to secondary school students to establish their own service businesses over the summer. Co-operation is being received from the Ontario Chamber of Commerce and Junior Achievers. All high schools in Ontario have been contacted about this programme.

We have been pleased to learn that corn companies in southwestern Ontario will be hiring at least 4,500 students for approximately one month in a special corn-detassling programme. Government officials are working with the companies involved to ensure that student manpower will be available when required and that appropriate accommodation can be found for those who may come from outside the area. This is an example of the way in which co-operation between industry and government can assist in providing summer employment opportunities.

I would also like to add that the government is willing to offer consultative services and guidance to other private businesses and industry that may be interested in sponsoring or undertaking special projects to employ students this summer.

The total cost of our public service employment programme for students and the other activities I have outlined will be at least \$18 million. This is made up as follows:

	Number employed (000)	Cost (millions)
Ont. govt. regular summer programmes	12	\$14.7
SWEEP programme	2	2.4
Other programmes primarily outside the Ont. public service	1.1	.9
		<u>\$18</u>

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that these efforts will provide a positive contribution not only to the students involved but to the many communities and citizens who may benefit from the results of these activities.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table two documents relating to national tax reform. The first is "Ontario Proposals for Tax Reform in Canada, Part 3—Taxation of Corporations and Shareholders," and the other is "Ontario Studies in Tax Reform, No. 5—Technical Study on Integration."

These documents deal with the central issue of what method of taxing corporations and shareholders will be best for Canada in the years to come in terms of workability, economic growth and federal-provincial tax uniformity and flexibility.

Two other papers containing Ontario government proposals for reform of the Canadian tax system were presented last year, as were three other tax reform studies. A further tax reform study, "Tax Reform and Revenue Growth to 1980," should be available for tabling within approximately one week. These papers and studies were preceded by Ontario's own 1969 white paper entitled, "The Reform of Taxation and Government Structure in Ontario," which dealt with reform of the provincial and municipal tax structure.

This represents a constructive contribution by the Ontario government to the national tax reform process. It would not have been possible except for the foresight of my predecessor, the present Minister of Highways and Transport (Mr. MacNaughton), and his courage in making certain that the Canadian public had the benefit of a broad set of well-developed alternatives to the main features of the federal white paper. The people of Ontario and of Canada will long be indebted to the former Treasurer of this province for his major contribution to the common goal of a broadly acceptable national tax reform which will serve Canadians well in the years to come.

Now, sir, what these papers and studies make clear once and for all is that, while there are three levels of government, there is only one taxpayer. This means total tax burdens at all levels of government—not just one tax at one level of government—must be taken into account, if increased fairness that means anything to people is to be achieved.

It means that public-sector expenditures must be restrained so that relief in one set of taxes is not offset by increases in other taxes. It means that tax reform should make a positive contribution to economic growth, if both the unemployed and employed are to reap any benefits that matter.

Finally, it means that the joint use of tax fields requires a partnership approach, based on frank exchanges of views and on a realistic sharing of revenues which reflect soundly developed spending priorities at all three levels of government.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): A secret closet there. It would not let any word out.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is useful to note at this point that the federal government has already responded to many of our concerns by agreeing that there shall be no tax increases as part of tax reform; by acknowledging the small business problem and by making some modifications in the original harsh proposals directed against mining investment. Further, the Commons committee report, as far as it went, increased the chances that necessary changes in the original proposals will be made.

But more is still required if national tax reform is to be broadly acceptable, durable, and the basis for essential uniformity of the federal and provincial income tax system.

Firstly, the personal income tax should incorporate low-income allowances and credits, including refundable credits for property taxes, and sales taxes in order to concentrate available tax relief revenues to those who need it most and minimize compensating tax increases for other taxpayers.

The federal integration proposals discussed in the paper and study presented today must be dropped.

Tax reform changes must now be scheduled on a priority basis of what the people and the economy need most and not on what is dictated by the requirements of a massive once-and-for-all tax package, whose primary effect is to produce unworkable tax complexity.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Has the minister spoken to the people?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Above all, there must be a willingness on the part of the federal government to open up tax reform to real provincial involvement and participation, so that the final legislation that is adopted will ensure a sensible and unified fiscal system for all Canada.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Where does the separate provincial tax come in?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am delighted that the Leader of the Opposition is here. According to this afternoon's paper, he made no contribution yesterday and he is well on his way to making no contribution today.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I bet there was a phone call, Mr. Speaker, from Ottawa from Ben, saying, "Where was Bobbie yesterday in that debate? There is no mention of him in this afternoon's papers at all."

Hon. Mr. Davis: Wait until we get around to the 17 million.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Really rather sad! Mr. Speaker, all this means that the 1971 approach to tax reform should be to introduce now, effective not later than July 1, reform to bring in low-income taxpayer relief via a system of selective credits without other tax increases or changes, to promote needed private investment on which the battle against unemployment necessarily depends.

If this were done, the immediate social and economic urgencies of tax reform could be met without further delay and without inflationary price increases. Further delay on these two tax reform priorities would not only be unconscionable but also completely unnecessary. Immediate reductions in taxes on low-income Canadians without other tax increases are possible and fully justified in terms of both social and economic requirements.

The most important single contribution the federal government can now make to tax reform is to drop any form of direct integration of personal and corporate tax. Once this is done, tax reform becomes manageable, and a sensible ordering and timing of the several reforms becomes possible. It will not be practicable either for provincial governments to act responsibly in the exercise of their fiscal jurisdiction or for taxpayers to respond sensibly and constructively to a tax reform comprising 500 to 1,000 pages of detailed amendments to practically every section of The Income Tax Act. There is no possible way such an approach can add up or be acceptable to anyone.

If low-income relief and positive investment-promoting measures are taken this year, the following sort of approach would make sense for the remaining reform measures:

Presentation, for federal-provincial discussion, of a separate capital-gains-revised estate and gift tax system. Given the long

delays, we doubt if an agreed tax system could be in force before July 1, 1972.

Presentation of a draft bill of technical amendments with at least four to six months for comment from taxpayers and provincial governments.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude on an optimistic note. I am hopeful that the federal government recognizes the sincerity and the concern behind the views presented by the Ontario and other provincial governments. I am sure they must recognize that the hopes for solid federal-provincial co-operation in many fields, from the constitutional talks to the most routine relationships, depend heavily on the decisions they are now making. I feel sure they must now realize that the original white paper, in addition to being inappropriate in many respects, was also too ambitious in terms of quantity. This means the attention of the federal government must now be on tax reform priorities and timing as well as on substance.

I would only add that, like my predecessor, I will go anywhere at any time to advance the cause of positive tax reform in this country.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Has the Minister of Correctional Services anything? The hon. Minister of Citizenship.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to be able to introduce at this time to the House 31 civil servants from many parts of the world who are at present seated in your gallery at the north of the chamber.

They are attending a three-day seminar arranged by the department in co-operation with the Canadian International Development Agency of the government of Canada and our Ontario Departments of Agriculture and Food, Education, Health, Municipal Affairs and the Treasury Board, from which speakers are describing to the students the procedures which govern the operations of their departments.

I should explain that these young people are in the midst of a course in public administration at Carleton University in Ottawa and today are accompanied by Professor David M. Watters of that faculty and Mr. John Beggs of the federal government.

All our visitors, Mr. Speaker, have been chosen by their respective governments to learn as much as they can about Canadian

methods of administration. We are happy that Ontario has been chosen for the eighth consecutive year to conduct this seminar. Together they represent 15 countries—from Afghanistan, Hong Kong, Indonesia and Malaysia in Asia, from Botswana, Lesotho, Nigeria, Swaziland and Tanzania in Africa, from the Caribbean islands of Barbados, Jamaica, St. Vincent, and Trinidad and Tobago, and from Guyana and British Honduras.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I speak for all our members when I wish them every success in their studies and even greater success when they are able to apply what they have learned to the greater advancement of the countries from which they come.

To each of them we extend the hand of friendship and goodwill.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief statement with regard to the issue being discussed in the press in relation to the Ontario Hospital School for the Retarded in Orillia.

I think the first point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that one has to accept the statement by the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) insofar as it relates to the fact of overcrowding at Orillia. I think one also has to realize and remember that Orillia and Smiths Falls were developed when concepts were very different in relation to the care of retarded children.

I think, also, Mr. Speaker, I should assure the members of the House that newer concepts known to many of them in relation to decentralization and community orientation of our facilities are in the mill and are in progress with the assistance and help of the Association for the Mentally Retarded.

We have 10 such institutions in the province, Mr. Speaker. Three of them are large; the others are under 300 beds and, as I am advised, the question of overcrowding and staff is not apparent in these institutions. We are proceeding, I am happy to say, with the Prince Edward Heights complex which will relieve Smiths Falls to a degree. As I think the hon. members may know, our programmes generally are widely accepted internationally for their quality. I think, in particular, the Children's Psychiatric Research Institute in London is an outstanding example.

This morning, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: That is an assessment. That is for diagnostic, not treatment purposes.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence:—I asked the department and staff at the Orillia Hospital to ensure that the facilities at Orillia were open to all the media—press, radio and television. I do hope that the members of this Legislature will take an early opportunity to increase the number of visits that they make to our institutions and, of course, this applies to the media and to the press.

I will, as Minister of Health, go as far as I possibly can to open the doors of these institutions, and I will do this, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members, to the extent that I am able to protect the patients themselves and protect the staff itself.

Mr. MacDonald: This is a welcome change.

Mr. Lawlor: A far more intelligent attitude than that of his predecessor.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I may say, Mr. speaker, I make the plea that both the members and the press use this as an occasion for constructively informing the public, as I am sure they will, because it would be very sad if the people of this province were to lose confidence in a programme which, I think, admittedly is good, and in many ways is excellent, but as the Minister of Health I place as a top priority for improvement.

An hon. member: Very well done!

Mr. MacDonald: I hope some of the minister's colleagues take note.

Mr. Lewis: Now that is a change that this House welcomes.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

SEPARATE INCOME TAX

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, further to the statement made by the Treasurer, can he inform the House whether or not the papers presented to us today contain a recommendation for a separate income tax or the possibility of such a tax?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder, as a supplementary question, if that means that the minister has retreated from his statement made some weeks ago that he feels that this is a possibility for the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, had the Leader of the Opposition been listening he would have found out that—

Mr. Trotter: Answer the question.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —these papers related to the integration proposals of the federal government. They did not necessarily relate to what our view on a separate income tax would be or would not be. They deal specifically with a subject.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, a further supplementary: Would the Treasurer then instruct me as to whether or not the integration of the personal and corporate income tax might not have a reflection on whether or not the province proceeded with the plans put forward in the white paper by the Treasurer's predecessor and reiterated by the incumbent in this office, that the government was looking forward to a separate income tax?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If the federal government decided to proceed with what we believe is to be unworkable and unwise legislation, then certainly that would have a very large bearing on the decisions which we must make in this government.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary question in this matter, Mr. Speaker: Can the Treasurer inform the House how his plans as the new Treasurer to reform our provincial tax system can be related to his urging the government of Canada to proceed forthwith with their plan.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: By suggesting that the government of Canada could proceed now to bring relief without tax reform, as we have been discussing for the last two years. Tax reform in a legislative sense can be done today by the government of Canada tomorrow moving through a system of tax credits to bring relief to the people of this country who need relief now and not a year from now or not two years from now.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary: Can the Treasurer inform the House what is impeding him in bringing about tax reform at the municipal level, which has been deliberated by this House for so long and for example, has led the city of St. Catharines yesterday to vote to petition for a private bill to secede from the regional government because of provincial inactivity.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I suppose the largest single impediment to what we would like to do in terms of general provincial municipal tax reform is our lack of elbow room in certain tax fields—

An hon. member: Stay out of the Niagara region.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —most notably, income tax. We in this government also have many monetary problems, as I indicated to the House yesterday.

Mr. Nixon: Almost a fiscal nightmare.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Our corporation taxes are off some \$47 million from our forecast figures, for example—\$47 million out of a tax of \$450 million brought about by the destructive policies of the member's Liberal friends in Ottawa.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, is a supplementary question directed to the Premier permissible? A question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: There is a supplementary down there. Does the member for Lakeshore have a supplementary?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, Mr. Speaker, of the Treasurer: Would the attempt to maintain the provincial government's own corporation taxes in effect in the face of an integration by the federal government?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Exactly; that is the only way to prevent it.

Mr. Lawlor: Let the Treasurer answer it.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Let us hear his answer.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: See the unity we have over here. The former Treasurer replied exactly as I would have; I would put it exactly in those same words.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary of the Treasurer: I take it from his exhortation to the federal government about personal income tax incorporating low income allowances and credits, including refundable credits for various areas, that he regards it as totally within his purview on April 26 to do the same thing independent of the federal government.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, not through the income tax system because we do not have control over it; in the simplest possible terms, we do not have control over the income tax form. We do not have control over the rates of weekly deductions. For example, the federal minister tomorrow could say that he proposes to remove the surtax, which would

mean that he would order the Queen's Printer at Ottawa to reprint all those tax tables which employers struggle with, which would have the effect of putting money into the economy—not tomorrow; I suppose a month from now or two months from now. Our problem is that to make moves such as that, we would require to give notice, I think, by next fall, or July, not to take effect until January 1, 1972.

Mr. Lewis: A year-end credit.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, and a year-end credit would not put money into the economy right now. I am not defending at this point the necessity for a personal income tax of our own but that is the sort of freedom which it would give us. In the absence of responsible action by the government at Ottawa, we could move on our own which we are not free to do now.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary, is it fair to conclude from what the Treasurer said that in the absence of action from Ottawa, it is impossible that the government of Ontario can take any remedial tax steps?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I would not say it is impossible. What I have said is that it is very difficult for us to take those kind of tax steps which would stimulate the economy immediately.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of a further supplementary: Would it be fair then to say that the headlines in today's newspapers which hint about a tax reduction are, in fact, over-optimistic?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I must confess, Mr. Speaker, I really did not look at the headlines. I looked through—

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I was looking through all the small print, as I said earlier, trying to find out whether the leader of the Liberal Party had been here yesterday and there was no mention of his name.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

CAPITAL GAINS TAX

Mr. Nixon: I have a question on this same matter I would like to direct toward the Premier. Did he disagree when Premier Bourassa said he felt that Ontario supported

Quebec in its contention that there should be no capital gains tax?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall Mr. Bourassa saying to me in our private conversation there should or should not be. Quite frankly, at the press conference there were a number of issues mentioned, and I did not indicate my support or otherwise for two or three things that the Premier forgot to suggest.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: It is referred to in the small print that his colleague to his left reads so avidly, where the statement is attributed to the Prime Minister of Quebec in this regard; and the Premier is not aware that this statement was made?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not only that, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister of this province did not support any specific mention of any tax alterations.

Mr. Nixon: Well, it would be a surprise if he did.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, has the Premier of this province had contact with Premier Bourassa to discuss the downgrading of his proposal—Premier Davis' proposal—to have a conference on foreign investment which Quebec sees as worthy only of observer status?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the Premier of the Province of Quebec or somebody designated by him will certainly be invited. As to how he or his government responds is entirely within his purview.

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR YOUTH

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier, further to his statement on student employment:

Is it possible that some of the \$18 million that he predicts will be spent to further student employment this summer could be directed toward employing young people to assist in the manning of the facilities of the Ontario Hospital schools where the short-comings were pointed out yesterday by the member for High Park?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there is a section under the summer employment programme related to The Department of Health where young people can involve themselves

in this aspect of it. Just how many could be employed, how many could be beneficial, is something I am sure the department will undertake.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Will the Premier undertake either to inquire himself or have the Minister of Health look into the possibility of a specific direction toward the Ontario Hospital schools of some funds from this programme?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is already mentioned in the statement.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): A supplementary question to the Premier on this subject, Mr. Speaker: Regarding the 60,000 young people in the age group 14 to 24, referred to by the provincial Treasurer yesterday as being out of school, looking for work and unable to find it right now, will those young people who are non-students be eligible for the programme the Premier has outlined today?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there are some aspects of it as it relates to the community-oriented programmes where the qualification as a student is not necessarily a prerequisite.

Mr. T. Reid: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could the Premier tell us how many young people there are in the Province of Ontario between the ages of 14 and 24?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the hon. member how many there are between 14 and 24 but I would be delighted to get this very important information for him.

Mr. T. Reid: If the Premier does not know how many there are, how can he say that his programme will anywhere meet the need of approximately half a million young people?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in my statement I did not say that this would meet the needs of all the young people in the Province of Ontario. I very specifically stated there is also a responsibility upon the private sector, and I invited the private sector to consult with the government as to how we might involve ourselves with them in the development of more opportunities for student and young-people employment over the summer months. I want to make it abundantly clear that no programme of this government has said that it will involve all the students or provide student employment for all the young people between 14 and 24.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Yorkview has a supplementary?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question to the Prime Minister, how soon after the close of the academic year will these jobs begin and how many weeks is it envisaged that each student will work?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as far as the job programme relates to the post-secondary, the majority of those opportunities will be available from roughly—I am guessing at this, I could be a week out—the third week in May until September; and of course as far as it relates to the high school programme, those students will be very actively and constructively involved until about mid-June so those programmes will not commence until they have completed their academic year.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary. Without pushing the Premier too far, how many more—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: I apologize for my—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. Lewis: I can understand that the member for Frontenac-Addington (Mr. Simonett) feels he should support the Premier in this.

How many more students and young people does the Premier estimate are seeking employment this year over last?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the hon. member how many more students will in fact be seeking employment this year over last year. It relates to the ambitions of certain students themselves. There are a number of students who will be involved in travel programmes; I cannot give any accurate estimate at this point as to the number.

I can tell the hon. member that as far as the government is concerned, we are providing for an increase of some 3,000 students over last year, which, on a percentage basis—which is perhaps the best way to tackle these things—represents 27.2 or 27.3 per cent increase over our involvement last year.

RELIGION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Education: Has he maintained the moratorium against the initiative of any new programmes for the teaching of religion in the public schools that was established, I believe, last fall by his predecessor; or is it now possible for school boards to implement on their own initiative new programmes in these fields?

Hon. R. S. Welch (Minister of Education): There is no change in the policy.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: To make that clear then, it is not possible for a school board to implement a new programme in this area?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, whatever the policy was, it is being maintained.

Mr. Nixon: I see.

Mr. MacDonald: That is keeping your skirts clean.

Hon. Mr. Davis: On a point of order, in that the Leader of the Opposition always wants to be factually correct, it was not a moratorium that was declared. It was indicated that the boards would be having guidelines and can move into this programme in September of 1971.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary to the Minister of Education, which I am sure he will now be able to answer. Are these guidelines going to be ready to allow the school boards to move forward with the initiatives in these areas?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Certainly.

Mr. MacDonald: You fellows bail each other out with the greatest aplomb.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

NIAGARA REGION TAXATION

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Premier: Can he explain the exchange of correspondence which took place between himself and the city of St. Catharines around the amounts of taxation they are paying to Niagara regional government and their wish for a meeting?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot explain my own correspondence to the extent

that one can or cannot read it. I have indicated—and we have been discussing it within the last not too long period of time—that we shall be meeting with the people from St. Catharines as it relates to their problems.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: did the Prime Minister refuse to meet with them?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I have not yet.

Mr. Lewis: No, he has not yet!

Hon. Mr. Davis: And I may even meet with them.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, how condescending.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I am sure the people in Niagara will be exuberant at this prospect.

Mr. Singer: They will be holding their breath.

Mr. Lewis: It may be that we will have them visited in person.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We may have it solved without.

Mr. Singer: How lucky can they get!

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): We will take care of things in St. Catharines. They are all totalled up.

ONTARIO HOSPITALS FACILITIES

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker? What, in fact, is the timetable or physical alteration of the facilities in Smiths Falls and Orillia?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I cannot answer that, Mr. Speaker. I will take it as notice and perhaps prepare for the hon. member a list of projects and timings generally.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Lewis: I have a question.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West has a supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister also provide for the House a breakdown of the proposed hiring of additional staff in the Ontario Hospital school system over the next period of time; also, the per diem rates which are paid in the Ontario Hospital school system at the moment?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Certainly this kind of information will be dealt with when the estimates are before the House. I had better take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Scarborough East a supplementary?

Mr. T. Reid: Would the need for additional facilities for the uneducable retarded children of the Province of Ontario decrease if this government had a programme whereby such children could live at home and attend day-care centres up to the age of 18, instead of being cut off at the age of 12, which is, at present, the case?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): How many would the hon. member take?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: As I tried to underline when I was speaking earlier, Mr. Speaker, the whole thrust of our programme is to decentralize and the ultimate limit of that, of course, is home care and home training.

I may say, right at this moment, I have held up a couple of building projects this week because I want to reassess whether or not we can break some of these institutions down into even smaller units. By this, I hope, we will not have any ultimate delays, but the thrust to break down the institutions and units is very real to me.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member a further supplementary?

Mr. T. Reid: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Why does this government cut off grants to schools like the Eppleworth School for children when they get over the age of 12, thereby forcing the parents to either—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has asked his question. He is now adding editorial comment.

Mr. T. Reid: Why does the minister not do something effective about it?

Mr. Yakabuski: That could be a future Minister of Education if miracles are possible.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has a supplementary?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Does the minister plan any immediate steps to hire more staff for Orillia?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: More staff? I do not know whether I can answer that. I sup-

pose I could be cute if we were adding one person. Let me assess that, Mr. Speaker, to see if it is significant in our planning.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: I have a new question.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further supplementaries?

Mr. Deans: A supplementary; yes, sir.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Yes, this is a supplementary question.

What has happened to the construction of a facility for children promised for the Nickel Basin in 1959 by the former Premier on the eve of the 1959 election?

Mr. MacDonald: The former Premier twice removed.

Mr. Speaker: That is hardly supplementary but the minister may answer it if he so wishes.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): That is a good question.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: It is a commitment which will be met. I recall studying it the day before yesterday. I will try to get the hon. member an answer.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Yes, sir, a supplementary question. Can the minister indicate whether any of the existing facilities at the Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital might be made available for those retarded children over the age of 18 who presently have no facilities in the area?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I will ask my official to assess that.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West has the floor for further questions.

OMA FEE SCHEDULE

Mr. Lewis: I am inclined to give the minister the benefit of the doubt in this area after suffering it for so many years.

Would the Minister of Health reveal to this Legislature the various propositions which he put to the Ontario Medical Association about the fee schedule?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there would be any advantage to be gained from that. I do not like the word "proposition."

Mr. Lewis: Proposals?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: "Proposals" is not exactly the word either.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): What kind of a love-in has the hon. minister there?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, it is certainly not my ambition to destroy the medical profession of this province.

Mr. MacDonald: Not even disturb it, let alone destroy it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary: Inasmuch as a vast sum of public money goes to pay for Ontario health insurance plans, why is it that the members of this Legislature and the public cannot share with the minister the alternatives—not the fiats, but the alternatives—which he has presented to the medical association? What special prerogatives have they and the minister to do it secretly? It is public legislation.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: This is not the negotiation, Mr. Speaker, of a collective agreement.

Mr. Peacock: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: That is it exactly. That is why the minister should make it available. He is arguing against himself.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The association itself, the executive, is not in itself in a position at this moment to bind the government. I am simply sitting down around the table and discussing alternative proposals and solutions that might come to some effective result.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): And negotiating.

Mr. Lewis: With public money. The minister is negotiating with public funds.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I am not negotiating with public money. There is no negotiation because neither of us can bind the other and the situation is not one where, by statute, I have any authority to.

Mr. Lewis: Certainly the minister is negotiating. What else is he doing?

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Does he mean they tell him what to do?

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Is the minister engaged in some frivolous exercise with the medical association, or is he going to be presenting to cabinet some particular position?

An hon. member: The hon. member is the one who is being frivolous.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly be presenting the cabinet with alternatives.

Mr. Lewis: Then the minister should share it with the members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The hon. member will have his chance to share it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Humber has a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: The minister has negotiated with the doctors behind the scenes every time and have they not dictated to him?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! The member for Humber has a supplementary question.

Mr. Lewis: With the insurance companies; with the doctors!

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Will the Minister of Health inform the House, if he can, the depth of the conversations between himself and the representatives of the Ontario Medical Association touching on the possibility of the medical profession accepting 87 per cent of the agreed-upon prescribed fees for their services in lieu of 90 per cent?

Mr. Shulman: That has been voted down.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I thought I answered that question yesterday, in the House.

Mr. Ben: The hon. minister mentioned it.

Mr. Yakabuski: Read *Hansard*.

Mr. Peacock: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Ben: Can the minister tell us the depth of his discussions with them? Could he, please?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I do not know how one would define the depth of a discussion.

Mr. Ben: Is there a prospect of the medical association accepting 87 or 87.5 per cent of the minimum fees?

Mr. Lewis: No, they voted it down.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister states that he has answered the question. He is quite able to do that.

The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, in the light of the minister's first answer, does he intend to ask the Legislature to amend The Health Services Insurance Act to give him the authority he says he now lacks to negotiate?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: That will be a matter of government policy. It certainly will not be something that I will tackle on my own.

Mr. MacDonald: Fat chance of this government giving him that power. Why does the government not get public support to strengthen its hand? Does the minister want to lose these negotiations like your predecessor did?

Mr. Lewis: The government bows to them every time. The OMA is the strongest trade union in the province.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Scarborough West further questions? The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

SENIOR CITIZENS' RENTS

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development. Will senior citizens receiving the guaranteed income supplement and living in Ontario housing be permitted to keep all of their increased supplement or will some portion of it be taken away by way of rent increases?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I am not as familiar with this subject as I would like to be. I will take that as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough.

CERTIFICATES FOR TEACHERS

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I might direct a question to the Minister of Education.

I wonder if the minister can assure the many hundreds of teachers who have graduated from teachers' colleges and who will be graduating this spring from teachers' colleges and who will not have jobs that the qualifying period for permanent certificates will begin after they receive employment rather than the stipulated five years, I think it is, that now exists?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I cannot give such an assurance this afternoon, but I will be very glad to take the problems, to which the hon. member makes reference, under advisement.

Mr. Pitman: Would he be prepared to discuss this with the teachers' organizations and make some decision in view of the fact that the teachers' colleges will soon be dispersing their occupants to all parts of the province?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I will be very happy to discuss this matter with the teachers' federation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Highways and Transport has the answer to a question.

DEAD ELM REMOVAL PROGRAMME

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: In answer, Mr. Speaker, to a question asked by the hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

The department purchased a total of 783 chain saws; 170 were of German manufacture. Quotations were obtained on a local basis from firms which could provide maintenance service for the equipment and specifications were established for this purpose. Two German firms were noted as suppliers or manufacturers. One is a firm called Style—130 of this manufacture were purchased—and 40 by a German manufacturer named Solo. As I say, they were purchased locally on a tender basis, and having met the specifications it seemed satisfactory to purchase them.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): What was the difference in price quotation between the two German makes and the next highest Canadian make of saw?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not have the information, Mr. Speaker. That question was not asked of me yesterday so I did not proceed to get the information. If this is a supplementary question, I will take it as notice and get it for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: A further supplementary?

Mr. Gaunt: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. minister concur with this policy or will he issue a directive to his department officials to stop this type of practice, this type of buying practice?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will issue any such direction. I do not see the need for it. I do not want to get into a long-ranging debate with the hon. member. I would suggest that the federal Minister of Trade and Commerce would suggest to him that possibly if we are going to sell merchandise to Germany, we should buy something from them. I think this balances out very well.

Mr. Lewis: Because the government negotiated that loan.

Mr. Speaker: A further supplementary?

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): A supplementary?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We used some of the money.

Mr. Lewis: And you sold your soul when you sold Ontario.

Mr. Jackson: Of the same minister, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: If it is a supplementary, of course it is of the same minister.

Mr. Jackson: I just wanted to remind him.

Mr. Martel: My, the Speaker is testy today!

Mr. Jackson: I was trying to get his attention, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry if I offended you.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member's leader was occupying my attention.

Mr. Jackson: Were any of the saws that were purchased by the Ontario government made in Canada?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Pardon me, I did not hear the member? Mr. Speaker, if his colleagues would keep quiet I might be able to hear him.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Speaker, were any of the saws that were purchased by the government made in Canada?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I thought I answered that. I indicated that out of a total of 783 chain saws, 170 were of German manufacture; the rest were Canadian made.

Mr. Martel: Thirteen.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, 613!

Mr. R. M. Johnston: What school did the member go to?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: You did not go to any.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

PROVINCIAL SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker: The last question before this was asked by the member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Singer: While the Treasurer mentioned in his statement that he hoped there would be revised estate and gift tax systems which are both federal, he neglected to mention anything about provincial succession duties. Does the Treasurer intend, at long last, to make the succession duty system similar in form to the estate tax system and to do away with two unnecessary civil service empires that are required to do the same purpose?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The concern of the member for Downsview is understandable, Mr. Speaker. I can only tell him that all these matters are under consideration from time to time.

Mr. Singer: Yes. Under review.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

TRANSFER OF COMMUNITY PLANNING BRANCH

Mr. MacDonald: A question of the provincial Treasurer: Is it the government's intention to transfer the community planning branch from The Department of Municipal Affairs to Treasury and Economics in order to co-ordinate it with regional development?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not to my specific knowledge, and I suppose I might have some knowledge of it if it were about to happen. But I suppose like all things, that matter is under review as well and it might well be—

Mr. Deans: Germ of an idea.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It might well be that the government commission on productivity might have some recommendations in that area, but there are no such plans at present.

Mr. Lewis: They are going to take the rap for everything, that little productivity committee.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are a very good committee.

Mr. Lewis: Right, we sat in on their meetings.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East.

TESTING VACCINE ON CHILDREN

Mr. T. Reid: I have a question of the Minister of Health, if I can gain his attention, Mr. Speaker. Is the hospital school at Orillia still using the children there, the mentally retarded children there, as guinea pigs for the testing of various types of vaccine? To be specific, Mr. Speaker, is that hospital still giving parents only 10 days to reply to requests to have their children used for testing of vaccine which is not on the market because it has not been adequately tested?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I will take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale.

SENIOR CITIZENS' APARTMENTS

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development. Has the minister's department made final arrangements to take over the senior citizens' apartments in Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is correspondence either on the way or presently in my office for consideration. It will be considered.

Mr. Trotter: By way of supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is there any guarantee, or will there be any guarantee, that if and when the province does take over the homes for senior citizens the rent scale will not be raised?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact we have not come to any decision as to whether we will take it over, that supplementary question is strictly hypothetical. I could not give the hon. member an answer to that.

Mr. Trotter: Have you any idea when you will take it over, if you—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have not decided to take it over. If, as and when we do, I will be in a position to give the hon. member that information.

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary? The hon. member for Brantford.

ODC LOANS TO FISHERMEN

Mr. Makarchuk: I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development. Can the minister indicate why ODC loans to fishermen are made only on the basis of economic viability when, in fact, legislation passed in this House was to provide loans to fishermen on basis of injury to the fishing operation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I did not hear that last part.

Mr. Makarchuk: "When in fact legislation in this House was to provide financial assistance or compensation to fishermen on basis of loss of business."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I will take that under advisement. I am really not as familiar with that as I would like to be. I will get the information to the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION GRANTS

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Highways and Transport: When will details be given of the new grant system to assist municipal public transportation?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, as soon as they have been developed.

Mr. Deacon: A supplementary to that: Is it the plan of the minister to announce this new system prior to any decision being made on the Spadina Expressway, as the grants system could have a material effect on the design of such expressway?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Substantial work is being done on the development of these grant proposals, Mr. Speaker. I very much doubt if they can be brought to any final conclusion in time to have an effect on the decision in respect of the Spadina Expressway. I cannot relate the two very well.

Mr. Deacon: A further supplementary. Since the decision to provide a new system of grants was announced nearly a year ago, has there not been sufficient time now to prepare the details and provide them to the municipalities?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, Mr. Speaker. I would say not. If that was the case, I would have been able to discuss them in detail with the hon. member today. My predecessor in office was given, I understand, until December 30 to produce a report. We have been addressing ourselves to that report since its completion and, as I say, there is fruitful work being done but we have not yet developed the total grant programme.

Mr. Deacon: Has the minister not made up his mind yet?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, not yet.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

SPEED GOVERNORS FOR AUTOMOBILES

Mr. Young: A question of the Minister of Highways and Transport: In view of the damage that occurs in high-speed accidents, particularly such as the one that occurred over the weekend in Toronto, has the minister given any consideration to limiting the upper speed capability of motor cars manufactured and sold in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I must apologize to you, sir, and to the hon. members for saying that my course in mechanics was not pursued to the point where I can answer that question. I will take it as notice and have somebody who is more

knowledgeable than I provide him with the information.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, if I might ask the minister: Is it not possible that cars can be manufactured that will not go more than 90 miles an hour, with speedometers registering no more than 85?

Mr. Yakabuski: Oh, come on. The hon. member wants to go faster than that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I rather think that is possible, but let me find out the details of the questions the hon. member asked me. I will respond later on.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex South.

POSSIBLE AID FOR GREENHOUSE INDUSTRY

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

In relation to his announcements concerning capital grants for plumbing equipment and electrical wiring, does this capital grants programme extend to the greenhouse industry and, more particularly, to the segment of that industry that is growing flowers? If so, does the five per cent retail sales tax figure in the computation of the total grant?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): I will take the question as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

VENEREAL DISEASE CONTROL

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): I have a question of the Minister of Health. What action is The Department of Health taking to cope with the ever-increasing epidemic of venereal disease in the province?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: There has been a programme announced. The guts of the programme, I suppose, is firstly, in an educational way, to impress upon doctors and the medical profession generally to report with greater regularity, despite the fact that they are required to report as a matter of law. An educational programme is being developed for young people in particular. We are opening up more clinics.

Those are three particular parts and the hon. member will notice the publicity and

educational impact of this as soon as we are ready to start the programme from that point of view.

Mr. Ferrier: A supplementary question: Is the programme still under preparation or is it actually in effect in the province now—the recommendations of the task force that were tabled a year ago?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The establishment of the clinics is proceeding from a practical point of view. The steps to try to improve the reporting system is in tow or under way. As far as I know, the only significant part of the programme that has yet to be developed is, of course, the public relations and educational side.

Mr. Ferrier: A further supplementary: Does the minister think, as this problem seems to be getting worse, that maybe some more drastic measures may be necessary?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: We shall have to try to measure the effects of this particular programme. All I can say is that my recollection is that each of the recommendations made by the task force has either been set in motion from a practical point of view or has been accepted for further action. At this moment I do not think we can do more than that.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East.

GRANTS FOR RETARDED STUDENTS

Mr. T. Reid: I have a question of the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. In view of the statement by the York County Board of Education that students in schools for the trainable retarded cost twice as much to educate as students in secondary schools, will the minister explain why school boards receive the same grants per student for these two very different categories of students?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I think in ascertaining the operational costs, which are the subject matter of the ceiling, various factors are taken into account with respect to the averaging and I would be very glad to get those calculations for the hon. member. I have not got them here.

Certainly, in the discussions that we are now having about the ceiling and in the general dialogue going on, there have been many boards which have drawn attention to the need for the recognition of this as one of the weighting factors. Certainly, as far as

subsequent years are concerned, I am prepared to listen to any representation that boards or teachers or anyone interested in education might want to make with respect to those factors that would influence the overall cost. But at the moment these costs, and the whole field of special education, are reflected in the averaging of the per pupil determination.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that the York County Board of Education on March 25, 1971, implied that it is going to have to cut back on its programmes for the educable retarded children because of the ceilings imposed by the minister's predecessor?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I have not read the account to which reference is made, and it would be unfortunate if that type of programme was in fact cut back.

I think, though, while I am on my feet, I must say that the decisions with respect to what will constitute the educational programme in any jurisdiction will remain the decisions of the local school boards within their budgets. This is the sort of decision which local school boards, accountable as they are to the elected in their area, will have to make. I might share my concern with respect to the elimination or the curtailment of this programme or that programme, but the decision ultimately will have to be made by the local school board.

Mr. T. Reid: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of what the minister has said, could he explain why there is a special ceiling for elementary school education and another ceiling for the secondary school education? How can he explain local autonomy if he imposes that type of restraint?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Really, Mr. Speaker. In arriving at these particular guidelines or ceilings, one has to take into account the facts and information as to what the cost of educating pupils in the two levels was.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS SUPERVISION

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education. Can the minister indicate what positive steps are being taken to improve the supervision available in elementary schools in order to cut down on drug abuse and the sale of drugs to small children by older children?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I am unable to give any particular information insofar as any one school board is concerned. This is a matter of supervision which is under the jurisdiction of principals and those who are appointed by school boards in the area. Unless there is some specific area on which the member wants this information—if he does have a specific area and he would like to have some information—I would be only too glad to get it for the hon. member. I cannot, in any general answer, respond to that question.

Mr. Deans: I have a supplementary question. Might I ask the minister whether he believes that the recent announcements of cutbacks in educational spending will result in better supervision of the children and thereby a reduction in the number of children suffering from drug abuse?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I am not in the business of answering hypothetical questions. It is difficult enough to answer the factual ones.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Parkdale.

REGULATIONS ON HEARING AIDS

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health, if I may interrupt that conversation over there. Does the minister intend to bring out regulations to license the distribution of hearing aids?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The question of licensing the distribution of hearing aids is one which is being dealt with by the ministry of Financial and Commercial Affairs and by the federal Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs; the federal government looking at it from the health point of view and the adequacy of the instrument, and the province, of course, looking at it from the point of view of sales techniques and honest dealing.

It has not, as I recall, been required to be a problem of this Department of Health.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary question, is the minister aware that he is now the fourth minister in the last six years on that side of the House who has kicked this question around between two departments? Check with the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Dymond) to see if I am not right.

Mr. Speaker: Is that a supplementary question?

Mr. Trotter: He insisted it went in The Department of Health and not in The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Question?

Mr. Trotter: Well they are just playing volleyball with that question.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: May I reply to that, Mr. Speaker? There is no volleyball at all.

Mr. Trotter: There sure is. I keep asking the same question.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well you can have the same answer—he could have had it six months or a year ago—and the answer is that this is a live matter of policy between The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs and Mr. Basford's department, and they are the people who are working on it.

Mr. Speaker: This ends the question-period time.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mrs. Pritchard (Hamilton West), from the select committee appointed to prepare the lists of members to compose the standing committees of the House, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee recommends that the lists of standing committees ordered by the House be composed as follows:

1. **PROCEDURAL AFFAIRS:** Messrs. Bernier, Bukator, Demers, Dunlop, Edighoffer, Evans, Farquhar, Gilbertson, Gisborn, Gomme, Hodgson (York North), Jessiman, Johnston (St. Catharines), Kennedy, Meen, Peacock, Ruston, Simonett, Stokes—19.

2. **LEGAL ADMINISTRATION:** Messrs. Belanger, Boyer, Deans, De Monte, Good, Haskett, Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton), Lawlor, Morningstar, Pilkey, Price, Mrs. Pritchard, Randall, Reilly, Rowntree, Singer, Smith (Simcoe East), Sopha, Winkler—19.

3. **HUMAN RESOURCES:** Messrs. Ben, Braithwaite, Connell, Downer, Dymond, Ferrier, Johnston (Parry Sound), Morin, Morrow, Pitman, Potter, Reid (Scarborough East), Mrs. Renwick (Scarborough Centre), Reuter, Rowe, Smith (Hamilton Mountain), Trotter, Ville-neuve, Yaremko—19.

4. **NATURAL AND PHYSICAL RESOURCES:** Messrs. Allan, Bolton, Burr, Carruthers, Gaunt, Hamilton, Henderson, Innes, Johnston (Carleton), Martel, McNeil, Newman (Ontario South), Reid (Rainy River), Rollins, Root, Smith (Nipissing), Snow, Whitney, Yakabuski—19.

5. **ESTIMATES:** Messrs. Brown, Davison, Evans, Gilbertson, Haggerty, Hamilton, Henderson, Hodgson (York North), Jackson, Jessiman, Johnston (Carleton), Newman (Windsor-Walkerville), Newman (Ontario South), Sargent, Smith (Simcoe East), Smith (Hamilton Mountain), Spence, Villeneuve, Yakabuski—19.

6. **PUBLIC ACCOUNTS:** Messrs. Allan, Breithaupt, Bullbrook, Deacon, Demers, Haskett, Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton), Johnston (Parry Sound), MacDonald, Makarchuk, Deans, Moringstar, Reilly, Simonett—14.

7. **REGULATIONS:** Messrs. Belanger, Boyer, Downer, Dymond, Kennedy, MacKenzie, Morin, Paterson, Price, Mrs. Pritchard, Randall, Renwick (Riverdale), Worton, Young—14.

The quorum of the said committees 1 to 5, and of the private bills committee, to be seven in each case. The quorum of committees 6 and 7 to be five in each case. Substitutions to be permitted in committees 1 to 5 only when considering estimates. Such substitutions to be announced to the chairman by substitute members at the opening of the meeting.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, I think, before adopting the motion, one or two remarks should be made respecting the composition of the committees. Two days ago we discussed the restructuring and the reassignment of tasks to the committee. I think that we should note, before adopting the report, that for the first time perhaps in the memory of most members of the House, we will find cabinet ministers, Minister without Portfolio in each case, taking attendance and taking participation in the standing committees of this House.

I think that is worth pointing out, Mr. Speaker, because it means, obviously—quite clearly, that the government has extended itself considerably in order to maintain its predominance of membership of the committees—in the case of the general committees at 12, and in the case of the smaller specialist committees at nine members for the government party. In order to provide members for each of the 12 places on the major committees, the government has had to draw on the membership of the cabinet,

because it does not have sufficient strength outside the cabinet—

Mr. Nixon: It is getting so big.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not at all.

Mr. MacDonald: Of course, they have to.

Mr. Peacock: —to fill all those places.

Mr. MacDonald: They do not have 48 places outside the cabinet.

Mr. Lewis: What about the vice-chairman of the ONR?

Mr. Peacock: There are four major committees and there are 12 places on each for the government members, a total of 48. There are how many members in the cabinet—24 now; 26? In any event, there are insufficient private members on the government side to fill all the committee places, so we find ourselves with executive members in this House taking part in the business of the standing committees.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): The members need their experience and expertise.

Mr. Peacock: There is nothing, Mr. Speaker, we are advised by the Clerk of the House, in the precedents of this House to preclude such membership on the part of the cabinet, but I say it is against the traditions of the House. It is against modern parliamentary practice that the executive take part in the work of the committees of the House. The committees of the House are to relieve the House of duties that it can otherwise not perform effectively—

Mr. Singer: The member is making up his own rules.

Mr. Peacock —but beyond that, Mr. Speaker, the committees of the House are to achieve an independence of the executive which cannot be achieved in the House. That is one of the purposes of the standing committees, as I see it, and I believe it is found, and expressed by the authorities, in modern parliamentary practice.

Mr. Singer: Name one; name one authority!

Mr. Peacock: The Prime Minister spoke in reference to the Speech from the Throne of the importance of new countervailing forces to the growing executive authority. Now here we have anything but the enlargement of independence of the House by the presence of members of the executive council of the

Province of Ontario on those same standing committees.

Mr. Speaker, it points up even more forcefully, the necessity for bringing to the support of the standing committees of the House every resource which can reasonably be brought to their support, in terms of full *Hansard* reporting of the proceedings of the committees, in terms of expert staffing of the committees, both from the office of the Clerk of the House and from other branches of government, depending on the work that is referred to the various standing committees by the House.

I hope that—I guess by this point hope is not something that should be expressed, because we do not see the Prime Minister fulfilling the promise of the Throne Speech in this regard at least—the House will be given somewhat greater means to cope with the growing executive authority of the government. But it would have been expected that where ministers of the Crown are to take part in the proceedings of the standing committees then those same standing committees receive increasing support to carry out their own investigative functions, to carry out a more adequate examination of legislation and estimates that are referred to them by the House. This can be done only if the Prime Minister, to begin with, accepts the recommendations of last session's standing committee on public accounts for the provision of full staff and *Hansard* proceedings.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not want to prolong this discussion but I do take exception to the suggestions from the member opposite as they relate to the decision to have members of the cabinet on the standing committees. I have not been a member that long in this Legislature, but my memory does go back a period of time, and there have been cabinet ministers on standing committees of this House. There is no question about this whatsoever. I would challenge the hon. member to establish a precedent or a rule that precluded this.

What disappoints me, Mr. Speaker, is that I am making a very real effort, as is this government, to give some meaning to the standing-committee work. The fact that we have Ministers without Portfolio to participate in and serve on these committees, Mr. Speaker, I think is a very clear indication that we intend to do so. The negative attitude expressed by the hon. member really does not give me much encouragement as to his party's desire to make these committees meaningful too.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I had one point to raise, briefly, in this debate. Now I have two.

The hon. member for Windsor West is correct when he states that traditionally in British parliamentary experience, cabinets have not been involved, except on the rarest of occasions, in committee work. The fact that on that side of the House there was such a reaction when he made the statement is just indicative of the fact that we in the province of Ontario, in keeping with our rather basic violation of some of the traditions of British parliamentary experience—which we have been cleaning up, I would concede, in the last few months—did not have cabinet ministers on our committees. The Prime Minister presents his case in terms that this is evidence of his seriousness in making the committees work. Time alone will indicate whether or not the government is really more meaningfully serious in terms of making the committees work.

But the Prime Minister himself will have to recognize that in making that assertion he is coming in conflict with another very important principle in the operation of the committees, namely that the committees should help to provide a balance to the Legislature and the back-benchers as opposed to the growing power of the executive. You simply cannot in a clean-cut way, do something in that direction if you are going to have cabinet ministers on the committees. I am not going to argue that point any further. This is experimental and we shall find out.

The reason I want to tie it in with my second point is that I am increasingly mystified as to why the government, when they chose to implement last year's recommendations of the standing committee in the public accounts for changes in the committee procedure, did so almost completely except in one instance. The one instance is that they decided they were not going to accept the proposition of the right of substitution in committees 1, 2, 3 and 4, the four omnibus committees. We have all agreed that there will be a right of substitution in the estimates committee; that was the practice we developed in our experimentations over the last two or three years.

I repeat—the standing committee last year suggested that this should be true of the four major committees. The government obviously somewhere at some point dug its heels in and said no, there will be no rights

of substitution. In other words, the 48 members on the government side, including some members of the cabinet, are divided into groups of 12, no one of which can exchange with each other by way of substitution in those four main committees.

Obviously we made no headway with the steamroller majority of the government on the striking committee, because the best that they could come up with from the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) is, "This is experimental; let us see how it works." Well, that is the put-on we always have to deal with. It is the smart Irish way of trying to avoid something being considered and accepted now, because they know if we do not get it accepted now the likelihood is that it might not get accepted for five or 10 years. So, it is like a six-month hoist. It is hoisted into perpetuity.

However, the point I want to make with the Prime Minister is this: "Why is the government intent on denying the right of substitution? The counter argument we got—and I can see the partial validity of this—is that it is difficult for the government to have enough members at each committee. When the committees were big and there were 17 of them, the members would have to be in many committees and you might, in some committee where some hot and controversial and potentially embarrassing issue was coming up, find yourself short-handed. Therefore, you want to try to avoid that.

One argument was put by a government member on the striking committee that, "We want to make certain that our members are at each committee," presumably to cope with that problem they have had in the past—but their logic is in reverse. If you have the right to substitution then it means that every member has an obligation to be there or, if he cannot be there, to get somebody else in his stead; or alternatively, if somebody is particularly anxious to go to any given committee because of the topic that may be there at any given meeting of that committee, he can go to a member on the committee and say, "Look, I would like to be there today. Have you any particular urgent desire why you want to be there today, and if not can I take your place?" If that flexibility is granted, the likelihood is that you are going to have greater attendance, rather than lesser attendance. So it seems to me that the logic of your argument is in reverse.

My fear, I say through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Prime Minister, is that we came up with a proposal which had flexibility and in

denying the right to substitution in these four main committees we are creating something of a straitjacket. I predict that the government is the party that is going to suffer by this, because—to the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Winkler) who has had to cope with the problems of whip in other jurisdictions as well as here, I entreat him to heed me—if you have got at any given committee meeting a topic that is not particularly attractive or interesting to a number of members, on the government side or elsewhere, they are going to stay away. They will sleep in at the Royal York; they will do business elsewhere; they will not be here. If you have the right to substitution, if they do not want to be there because they do not like that topic, then get somebody else to be there, conceivably because he does like that topic and he does want to be there.

So you are imposing unnecessary inflexibility which you are ultimately going to be the victim of more than anybody else.

I do not know whether at this stage it is possible for us to make a plea from this side of the House that the Prime Minister should think about this and perhaps even indulge in that authoritarian procedure of overruling his own majority on the striking committee. Maybe if he talked with them they would recognize the wisdom of his remarks, if not now then at some relatively early date.

Mr. Martel: No, now! Now!

Mr. MacDonald: I know the Prime Minister is very cautious. He likes to contemplate these things. He likes to sit on the top of the fence for a long time before he drops off.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I never drop off.

Mr. MacDonald: So I am not going to break his normal pattern of approach, preferably today but if not today—and I am very serious about this, because he is going to be the victim of the straitjacket he is creating more than anybody else, and in the process he is going to inhibit the development of the most effective kind of committee procedure; which, let me assure the Prime Minister, we in this party want.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Forty-four votes nearly dropping off there!

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): I am very much concerned with what has been discussed here today. I would like to point out that British committees usually are select committees, and in fact, are not

the same as our standing committees in concept, because British committees are usually established for a purpose, an individual purpose. However, that is only one point.

There was one matter which was not in this committee report that was referred to it, as I understand, by this House; therefore, I feel perhaps this committee should be re-established for another sitting to consider it, and that is the all-day Wednesday meetings to be held for committee work. It was not in the report. I think it is a good suggestion.

The other thing is that I do not see any problem of exchange of membership for the purpose of consideration of a matter in which a member in a particular riding is interested. I think it is a distinct advantage to the members of this House to be able to sit on a committee on an interest that has an effect on his individual riding, rather than sitting in another committee on a matter that does not pertain to his riding.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member is in favour of flexibility then.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: So I do argue with the member on that—I do argue for flexibility in this instance. I think it is perfectly valid and should be considered.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not to prolong it further—I think I indicated at the time the motion was introduced for the establishment of the four committees that it was my intention—and I have to phrase this very carefully so the Leader of the Opposition does not think I am imposing my own thoughts upon him or the committee—that I would make a motion to refer to the procedural affairs committee a question from this House as to the feasibility or practicability of sitting all day Wednesdays for committee hearings. It is my intention to do this tomorrow so that the committee on procedural affairs can report back to the House very shortly and we can then determine whether this will be the procedure for the balance of the session.

As to the observations from the member for York South, I am one of those who believes in flexibility. I have no personal problem with this type of approach. However, I am also very concerned about the matters of principle related herein, and that is, there should be some continuity as it relates to personnel if the committees are to have a meaningful role in the activities of this House.

I find it just a bit contradictory in my mind, listening to the observations he has

made here today and over the past three or four years, as to the need for committees—and it must be more than the committees, it has to relate to the membership of the committees, to become involved in some of these situations if matters of substitution are sort of automatic.

I am quite prepared, **Mr. Speaker**, to re-assess this after a period of time if it is not working, because I want it to work. But I think there is very great merit in establishing these committees without the right of substitution so the members will have a continuing interest in those subjects that are relevant.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the Prime Minister think he will get greater continuity by having the people absent rather than having somebody there?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, of course, our members will attend.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh? Those words we want recorded.

Mr. Nixon: As this confrontation moves to the point where we are going to have little men with black pencils in all committees, let me point out to you, sir, that the virtues of continuity lie not within the large boundaries of these new committees but in the subjects that they would discuss, and it seems to me—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: All right! —in the subjects that would be discussed. I believe that the Prime Minister is making an error when he does not say that his natural flexibility would lead him to permit this sort of substitution. We have had this argument many times before and I feel that they have moved into this inflexible position more by mistake than anything else.

Surely it would be the intention of the same people to attend the committee when the broad field of education, for example, is being discussed. We have certainly said on this side that, over a period of years—over the period of Parliament—people with a special interest in education would become substantially expert in this if they availed themselves of proper committee opportunities, which have never been available up until now. They have not been for the last eight or 10 years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Where are the experts?

Mr. Nixon: Well, all right, Mr. Speaker. For the Premier simply to say he is going to solve it by insisting that his members attend and in fact do not sleep in, as the member for York South has implied that they might—and that they have—surely is not the best answer.

There is an opportunity now for the Premier, with his well-known flexibility and well-known good humour, perhaps to try the flexible approach before trying the rigid approach. I think surely this would be the approach that he normally would take if he had not got into some difficulties that were made for him by others.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, a point of clarification: As I understand it, in the estimates committee substitution will be permitted in accordance with the procedures which were established before. I then take it, following the same logic, that, for example if the estimates of The Department of Health are before the human resources committee, there would be substitution within that committee. But if, instead of the estimates of The Department of Health being before the human resources committee, there is a bill relating to a health matter—a bill introduced by the Minister of Health, or a commission, responsible or reported to this House by the Minister of Health—substitution would not be permitted.

If that understanding is correct, surely it makes it quite ridiculous to suggest that in the area of the estimates only, substitution be allowed in a human resources committee, but that when bills and other matters of equal importance and concern are before that committee, that no substitution be allowed. That is my understanding of what the ridiculous nature of the prohibition against substitution is going to result in so far as we in this party are concerned in participating in those standing committees.

On the point that my colleague the member for Windsor West made, I think it is a strange corruption of the usages and customs of the House to suggest that what was an exception in times past about a member of the executive sitting on a standing committee, and which is the very exception which in ordinary English language is often used to prove the rule, that suddenly the exception becomes the rule.

I suggest that there is very real consideration, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that you take under advisement this question about whether or not, in the history of this

Legislature, from time of its inception, on what occasions cabinet ministers or members of the executive council sat on the standing committees as members of the standing committee, and whether or not that was not the exception that proved the rule that in normal cases this did not occur, rather than to have the conclusion arrived at that the exception now becomes the rule. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that you take that matter under advisement.

Mr. Speaker: Any further discussion?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The second order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment of the motion that this House express its grave concern over the serious unemployment prevailing in Ontario and throughout Canada.

NOTICE OF MOTION 1 (Continued)

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, let me at the outset, in adding my humble views to the debate which is taking place on the serious unemployment situation which we have, say that it is my view that the unemployment situation in Canada is really the worst national disaster we have had since the war.

In my view it is the most callously designed measure ever undertaken by any government as a solution to any problem. I recall the experiences of many of us—and I am sure there are others in this House—during the Depression, in which many of us were practically demoralized for many years, riding the rods and sleeping in parks and carrying on for four, five and six years without any hope at all of carrying on any kind of fruitful life.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I had to delay my wedding plans for over five years, although I suppose if I was living in today's morass I would not have delayed them.

Mr. Speaker, no one who had experienced those things during the Depression could ever tolerate the kind of a solution—so-called solution, as I say—to any problem which the

federal government has inflicted upon Canada to fight inflation.

The federal government is really saying to all of the people of Canada: "In order that your dollar will buy more, we will put you out of work so that you will not have a dollar." That is really what they are saying and what they have been doing. Any action, Mr. Speaker, in my view, would have been better than the action which they have taken.

It is also the reason, Mr. Speaker, why we have to move carefully on the question of economic nationalism. It is all right, Mr. Speaker, for people in high places, who are employed, to feel that it is all right to carry out such a programme at the expense of hundreds and thousands who are unemployed.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that anyone who seriously reviews the situation as it exists today and really knows what is going on in the ranks of the unemployed, considers that the so-called solution regarding anti-inflationary measures is cruel and unforgivable and that any such solution which is put into effect for fear of losing control of our economy would be just as bad.

We are fighting inflation today at the cost of some 700,000 unemployed and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we do not want to fight for what is called today economic nationalism at the expense of some two million unemployed.

Our job is to keep people working while carrying out a policy of encouraging Canadians to invest in our economy. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I urge all to take care and move carefully in the matter of the so-called economic nationalism so that we do not arrive at the same solution as the federal government in respect of its anti-inflationary policy. We must keep an eye on our labour force. We must keep them employed, as I say, while devising plans for incentives to Canadians to invest in their own economy, which, Mr. Speaker, is what this government is going to do so far as it is in our power to do so.

In addition, of course, and this I think has been mentioned by others, the problems created are left largely to the provinces and the municipalities to struggle with. Mr. Speaker, my department here in Ontario is left with the dilemma resulting from federal policies of discouragement of foreign and domestic investment greatly needed to provide new employment opportunities.

Policies on the textile, footwear, rubber and chemical industries; decisions on tariff and quota protections to existing Canadian industry; and indeed the whole issue of taxation have provided an air of uncertainty in the minds of many manufacturers. Consequently, my staff is aware in its day-to-day contacts with businessmen, of investment deferrals, both foreign and domestic, amounting to over \$200 million during the past year—and we have documentation for this, Mr. Speaker if any member wishes me to produce it. This expansion could have provided for thousands of new employment opportunities.

Another matter is the deferral, in 1969, of the capital cost allowance on commercial buildings, forced upon Ontario by federal action. Although construction continued strong in Ontario, designating the province as one of the areas for capital cost deferral has tended to delay projects which otherwise would have provided many further construction jobs at a time when unemployment in the province is high.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): How about the provincial sales tax?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We also face the problem of the dissipation of the energies of my department in seeking solutions to layoffs and plant closings when they could be otherwise occupied in promoting new industrial development. The trade and industry division of my department is being forced to spend more and more of its time on problems concerned with plant phase-outs and layoffs.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): By the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Indeed, there are many members present who come to me almost daily and ask my department to do what we can in order to help out a situation in their own area in respect of phase-outs, layoffs and so on. Many of these are related to the floating dollar, new imports—

Mr. Peacock: We do not ask much of the minister.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): We certainly do not ask The Department of Labour to do anything.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —as a result of freer trade and lower tariffs, and the emergence of competition from low labour-cost countries.

The result is that my staff spends much effort studying and reporting on situations over which we as a province have very little, if any, control. This detracts seriously from time that could be given to more constructive efforts in improving technology, introducing new products for import replacement and promoting new industries which would provide employment for Ontario.

The exchange rate on the Canadian dollar is also, of course, impeding exports. The current exchange rate of the Canadian dollar vis-à-vis the U.S. dollar is providing a marked negative effect on many Ontario manufacturers engaged in export sales. In particular, our automotive parts manufacturers and our wood-using industries have been severely pinched by the rising value of the Canadian dollar. As members know, the automotive business is one of the most highly competitive markets in the world and a few percentage points often make all the difference in winning or losing a contract.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): The minister can help them by eliminating that production machinery tax.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This also applies to wood industries, which particularly affect northern Ontario.

Since a great number of jobs in Ontario are dependent upon these export markets, we strongly urge the federal government to peg the dollar at a point which would provide our exporters with a more realistic competitive base on which to maintain high levels of production.

We urge the removal of the three per cent federal income tax surcharge. The three per cent tax surcharge was introduced as a temporary measure, not a permanent one. We feel it should be abandoned to meet today's needs and permit efficient growth in employment and business.

In view of our urgent need to create employment and to sustain competitive business, we favour strongly the immediate rescinding of the three per cent federal income tax surcharge on individuals and corporations.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): What about production machinery?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Retained earnings are a major source of capital investment in business and are usually the cheapest source of funds to expand business and create employment. They are less expensive than external financing and thus do not contribute to in-

flation. Our businesses require reinvestment to maintain and create employment in an efficient manner, and punitive taxation inhibits this reinvestment and therefore employment.

A three per cent increase in income to our employed citizens would stimulate domestic market demand and create a demand for workers to meet the needs of expanded markets. It would also provide Canadians with funds to invest in Canada and its future and accelerate our growth.

The loss of the three per cent tax surcharge revenue could be compensated for by increased expansion of revenues from the remaining normal income taxes.

The federal regional economic expansion programmes have done little for Ontario. Some parts of the province are as underdeveloped as some parts of the rest of Canada which are actually receiving this programme's support. On the other hand, we know that incentives are provided to other parts of Canada which are more developed than many locations in Ontario which do not fall within the present federal regional economic expansion programme.

It is desirable to encourage Canadian control of its own economy, but such a policy must be carried out over a period of time, having regard for its effect on the well-being of our people.

To resist or discourage foreign investment solely to satisfy our national pride when there are some 700,000 Canadians out of work—including 200,000 in Ontario—surely would be at the very least, most unwise. Under ordinary circumstances, in Ontario alone we must create at least 100,000 new jobs annually.

It is true and desirable that a significant proportion of our people are concerned with the problem of control of our industry and commerce—and so they should be—and so is this government. As I stated in an interview in *The Globe and Mail* of March 17, I prefer the positive approach; that is, the encouragement of Canadian ownership rather than the discouragement of non-Canadians from investing in this country.

A single province, of course, could not on its own restrict foreign investment. That would simply lead to that province losing to other provinces, funds urgently needed for its economic health.

Mr. Speaker, my department will continue to make every effort to maintain and foster a favourable business climate in spite of the

economic difficulties in which this country finds itself today. Indeed, we are stepping up our programmes to meet the pressures that face us. We will do all we can so that much-needed new industrial development will not be discouraged at a time when employment is so necessary.

As the year progresses, I am optimistic that the economy will improve and many of the new capital projects which have been delayed will take place. Recent surveys have indicated a pickup in capital investment programmes as 1971 progresses. In fact, new investment expenditures for the Province of Ontario are expected to be higher than the Canadian average. Total private and public investment in the province of Ontario is expected to advance by nine per cent this year over 1970. All of this will undoubtedly create a more optimistic and buoyant economy and contribute significantly to the reduction of our excessively high levels of unemployment at this time.

Programmes of my department that we will be pursuing in an effort to provide the right business climate for the creation of new jobs are:

(a) Stepped up assistance to manufacturers wishing to establish new plants, expand existing facilities and enter joint-venture and licensing arrangements;

(b) Increased assistance to manufacturers to sell abroad in other markets of the world;

(c) Further assistance to manufacturers in expanding product lines through product prospecting missions and industrial technology development missions;

(d) Expand services to manufacturers exploring overseas markets including assistance in entering international trade fairs, establishing new plants and licences abroad, the promoting of Ontario engineering services abroad, and the provision of export forums and seminars;

(e) Exploring potential for adding to our EEDEE award programmes which encourage the creation of advanced techniques and design of Ontario products;

(f) Provisional additional support for programmes by our 14 existing offices located in prime markets abroad, and exploring the potential for additional offices in untapped markets of other countries;

(g) Broaden the scope of our business opportunity mission programme to accommodate new investment interests in other parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Development Corporation's role will be broadened to accelerate investment in new and existing industry and thus create additional job opportunities right here in Ontario. Performance and repayable loans already approved have provided many thousands of jobs in our slow-growth areas and this number will be substantially increased.

These ODC performance and repayable loans have spurred additional private-sector investment in Ontario's industries amounting to over \$100 million in the last two years.

These direct stimulants to employment and investment will be further enhanced through measures announced in the Speech from the Throne. A new venture-capital fund for Canadian-owned businesses will be set up to encourage the development of companies with exceptional growth potential which cannot be serviced through normal financial channels. This assistance will also be provided the companies with good export potential and for those Canadian companies wishing to participate in joint ventures.

Canadian small businesses will be given greater opportunities to expand and provide additional employment through an enlarged programme of aid, which will make loans available for this purpose in all parts of the province.

Advisory services for small businesses will also be expanded to provide technical, financial and managerial advice with a view to improving their performance. With a view to increasing employment in our tourist industry, I announced a few days ago in the House financial assistance to upgrade the facilities of our tourist resorts and attractions.

As a further positive indication of this government's concern to encourage Canadian-owned businesses without discouraging foreign investment, the Equalization of Industrial Opportunity programme will be amended. The amendments will result in greater incentives being available for Canadian companies than for others.

The government will be making available the moneys required to carry out this enlarged programme of investment and creation of direct job opportunities.

Ontario Place, which will open on May 22, is currently employing directly in construction over 600 men on the job, as well as many hundreds in manufacturing establishments preparing material. These men are drawn from all occupational groups—labourers, carpenters, steelworkers, cooks, architects, draftsmen, film producers, to name just a few.

When Ontario Place opens, approximately 800 students will be employed by the government and Ontario Place concessionaires. These students were recruited from all parts of Ontario, and I believe that when hon. members see this staff they will be very proud of it. In addition, our surveys indicate that Ontario Place will be extremely well attended and this should help business and thus employment at hotels, motels and restaurants.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, one of the major programmes of the government that will have an effect on unemployment will be the housing construction programme.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So long as the opposition keeps trying to denigrate it we will keep repeating it because it is such a positive approach.

Mr. J. Renwick: What is the variation on the theme today?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Has the minister no honour, no personal shame?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, that is why I am on my feet. I have personal honour.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, before dealing with it I would like to comment on some observations made in yesterday's debate and question period.

During the course of yesterday's debate, it was suggested that OHC did not expend all the moneys which were budgeted for its use. I am not too sure—I think the hon. member for Scarborough West made this point.

I am advised that in no year did the Ontario Housing Corporation not take advantage of every dollar available to it except in those years when, because of federal action, money was frozen in the middle of programmes.

Mr. Lewis: This government budgeted it, and it should have spent it independently of federal money.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): That is absurd!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that shows the ignorance of the hon. member for Scarborough West in respect of how housing plans are carried out in this province and in every province.

Mr. Lewis: We voted the money.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would permit me to ask a question? The public accounts, as shown for March 31, 1970, show that about \$6.5 million was left unexpended from our own funds voted for in this House for Ontario Housing Corporation. Then for student housing we voted over \$7.5 million—

Mr. Peacock: Sixteen million dollars!

Mr. Trotter: I am sorry—\$16 million.

Mr. Peacock: A total of \$16 million.

Mr. Trotter: No, a total of \$6.5 million unexpended for Ontario Housing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I get the point.

Mr. Trotter: And for the students we voted over \$7.5 million, of which almost \$5 million was not spent, and this is our own money we voted.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I get the point, and Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Trotter: Now do not tell us—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now just a moment. Mr. Speaker, I stand to be corrected on this, but I would say this—

Mr. Trotter: Yes, corrected again.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now just a moment.

Mr. Trotter: The minister is just trying to give us a snow job.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You make plans to invest X billions of dollars. You make it in conjunction with CHMC—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, you do, and you cannot stop or start these plans overnight. These plans are made, and if the federal government does not carry out its portion, you are left with some money on that particular occasion. Of course you are!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: An example of what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, happened during the 1968-1969 Hellyer task force on housing. During all that period of time all loan commitments for social housing were frozen across Canada by federal action. Now you just do not automatically, as of tomorrow, get all your plans together, because the programme is frozen. I mean without having

much experience in this department it is obvious to me you cannot all of a sudden pull in all your plans and all the potential builders, and as of two or three weeks put a programme into effect.

Mr. Lewis: The government had \$56 million. You choose your priorities and you build.

Mr. Trotter: Of course.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am also advised, Mr. Speaker, that when in the 1968-1969 budget year CMHC did not allocate funds to individual provinces, but offered them on a first come, first served basis, Ontario used 98 per cent of all federal funds available for family and senior-citizen housing in the calendar year 1967—

Mr. Deans: That left \$4.6 million of the government's own money.

Mr. J. Renwick: That was an election year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and 93 per cent in the calendar year 1968. So much for the fact that the government did not use the money that was available.

Mr. Lewis: That was a demolition job!

Mr. Peacock: What about last year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it is too bad the hon. member—as a matter of fact, it was the hon. member for Scarborough West who indicated that no plans were available to initiate the \$100 million guaranteed mortgage loan programme which we announced. He said we had no plans to put into effect.

Mr. Lewis: I did not say that as a matter of fact.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think the hon. member will find that is what *Hansard* recorded.

Mr. Lewis: I am just looking at the *Hansard*—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am informed that already some 4,550 units, representing \$84 million, are in the hands of banks for consideration. Additionally, some 3,000 units, representing another \$65 million, are being processed by the Ontario Housing Corporation. These units were processed and approved by the OHC in preparation and anticipation of the commitments by the banks which we just concluded.

Mr. Trotter: What is the interest rate?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The interest rate, if I recall, is the interest rate usually charged under NHA; I think it is somewhere around 8.75 to nine per cent. Now do not hold me to one half a per cent; I think that is what it generally is.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a question? Yesterday he said he would give us the figures for the amount actually expended in 1970-1971. Before he moves on, can he give the House those figures?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will give the member that before I am through, because I have these figures.

The hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) yesterday chided the government for not building more units, yet in mid-February in the Scarborough *Mirror* he is quoted as protesting the fact that OHC was planning to build some projects in his riding. He suggested a family in need of rental assistance should be placed in existing housing, presumably through the OHC rent certificate programme.

What the hon. member said yesterday, is in fact a contradiction of what he said in February. Further, his suggestion that OHC can meet Metro's public housing needs without erecting buildings, it must be obvious to everyone, is naive.

Mr. Peacock: On a point of order, I believe the minister may not be fully reporting the reason for the objection by the member for Scarborough East. Was the reason for the objection by the hon. member for Scarborough East the same reason for the objection in my own community—the unconscionable density of the project proposed for that borough?

Mr. Lewis: He called it a highrise ghetto, and he retracted. But at least the minister should have given the full story.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The information that I gathered was for the purpose of answering the question he raised yesterday.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Peacock: Do not ram those rabbit warrens—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member telling me that the hon. member for Scarborough East did not suggest that the families in need of rental assistance should be placed in existing housing? Am I wrong in that?

Mr. Peacock: I did not quarrel with that. By the way, how is the rental supplement programme doing?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: One thing at a time.

Mr. Lewis: Has the department rented a house yet? In the last three years? That was a Macaulay programme in 1962.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, to deal with the housing programme itself, this programme is a dynamic one.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: It gets more dynamic with every successive announcement.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are out building houses right now and finding new sites.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it is a dynamic one in spite of the fact that the opposition is attempting to downgrade it. As I have stated on a number of occasions, getting into the details of the figures can be very confusing.

Mr. Lewis: The minister should know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And the hon. member should know, because I am going to show him where he has been confused. As a result of this, there have been a lot of incorrect conclusions arrived at, including the conclusions arrived at by the hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Trotter: Is the member wrong again?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me try again to clarify.

Mr. J. Renwick: It is getting a little repititious.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): So is Manitoba.

Mr. Lewis: What is that about Manitoba?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: First the suggestion is that the government should not have presented this programme including the number of proposed starts, but only that in excess of what was accomplished last year. That is utterly absurd!

Mr. Lewis: Oh no!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is to say that if a record number of housing units were built last year, and if we had just proposed a plan which would equal it, that in itself would not be a tremendous accomplishment, which it would have been.

Mr. Lewis: Get another speech writer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course it would be a tremendous accomplishment; and of course the government is going to tell the people that we intend not only to carry out that record housing construction programme, but in fact intend to exceed it considerably.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The federal government has a four-year policy.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We of course, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Trotter: Does the minister not wish he were back at Correctional Services?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have a target for producing a potential of 30,000 units a year.

Mr. J. Renwick: It is potential.

Mr. Lewis: The minister has a target for producing a potential.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is nothing wrong with that, even for the hon. member who has a great ability to glue phrases together. If he thinks about it, that does make some sense.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: For example, if you put up a building, somebody has to furnish the building. Now if they do not furnish the building your plans were wrong, but the potential was there, was it not?

Mr. J. Renwick: If nothing happens, it is not the government's fault.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is warning us.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Remember Tommy Douglas! One and one half houses a month for 17 years.

Mr. Lewis: If we do not build, we all bow before the potential.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have this target and we have a target of actual physical starts of 20,000 units in this calendar year. The 20,000 units alone would be a 25-per cent increase over last year—a tremendous accomplishment, if we can do it. Certainly, Mr.

Speaker, it is advisable to set our target high so that the whole machinery of government and all those involved in the programme will have an optimistic target to shoot at. Surely, it is better to plan for 30,000 and reach 28,000 than it is to plan for 18,000 and reach 16,000.

Of course the opposition would like us to present a Throne Speech, I suppose somewhat along the following lines: "Your government plans to inject \$500 million into the economy, but remember this is not all our money, so take it easy. As a matter of fact, a small portion of it might turn out to be ours."

Mr. Lewis: That is not a bad thought.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: "And, while we are planning on driving for 30,000 units, remember this would only be 14,000 over last year."

An hon. member: Tell us the truth.

Mr. J. Renwick: Tell it the way it is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: "And remember we must not talk about the potential of the employment of 132,000 people, because the whole business might not work out that way and maybe only 60,000 will be employed."

In other words, the opposition would have us put a programme before the people and put every possible negative aspect in it.

Mr. Randall: They have all things negative over there. They are all negative.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, when this government proposes to the people a programme for housing it does so with a view to, as I say, gearing all the machinery of government toward meeting a high standard of achievement and encouraging the public and investors not to lose faith in the economy. Every effort of the government will be geared to that goal.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Not bad! All the way.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let us find out how many negatives the opposition can really find in our programme, even though they are trying very hard.

Mr. Lewis: Not ourselves—*The Globe and Mail*, the *Toronto Daily Star*!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now an hon. member has asked me to give him this information

today—the hon. member for Windsor West, is it?—he asked me to give him this courtesy, even though members do not give it to me. Let me answer the question.

Questions were asked in order to find out exactly how much new money Ontario itself was putting into the housing programme for the coming year. I have made the point, and I make it again, that I would hope we could put \$500 million into the economy without a dime of our money. I think that would be a great accomplishment. Is it necessary for us to borrow, in Ontario, \$400 million to prove it is a good programme? However, let us get to the prepared answer.

Suggestions have run all the way, as far as Ontario's own money is concerned, from \$50 million used by the hon. member for Scarborough West on a TV programme, which I watched, to some \$71.9 million by a columnist, which they were quoting here. They are both wrong, very wrong.

I am advised that in 1970 the Ontario government's share of the housing construction programme was \$93.8 million. In 1971, as planned by the government—and I add here, as was explained as clearly as I could do it—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Smile when you say that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —in every statement that has been made—it will be, in fact, \$222 million.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on! One hundred and forty-five million of this is a carryover.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why does the member not listen? If the hon. member will listen, it will be \$222 million, which is made up of the various facets of housing which were explained previously. One should really add to that, \$100 million of the bank money which—

Mr. Haggerty: The government has not got that yet.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —because of its guarantee by the Ontario government, is in fact a charge against the government's credit if called upon to honour its guarantee.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if we were trying really to blow up the programme beyond what it was, we could have said—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman:—that our government really is involved indirectly with its own credit and moneys, up to \$322 million.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no way at all, Mr. Speaker, that anyone can make this factually less than what it is. Therefore, to recapitulate, let me bring it—

Mr. Lewis: But it is not true.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me bring it out clearly again.

Mr. Lewis: How much of the \$220 million is carryover?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will tell the House all that. Just hang on. Hold your breath.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: So Ross Munro was right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of the \$500 million, all that—was it Ross Munro?

Mr. Lewis: I think it was.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was Ross Munro, or whoever wrote that article, who said the programme was evaporating. What he was saying, in fact, when I read the article, was that what he thought was being injected into the programme by the Ontario government was a lot less than he thought appeared in the Throne Speech.

Mr. Lewis: That is true.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That would not have evaporated the programme even if it were true, because all he is talking about is who put what money in.

Mr. Lewis: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It has nothing to do with the programme, if \$500 million is being injected into the economy this year, is that true?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I ask the hon. member for Scarborough West if \$500 million of new money is injected into the economy this year for this programme, would he be happy with that?

Mr. Lewis: It is not sufficient. The government building only 85,000 units.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of the \$500 million that will be injected into the economy—

Mr. Lewis: No, no. The government is planning to.

Hon. Mr. Grossman:—\$210 million will come from CHMC, \$222 million by OHC and \$100 million by the banks, guaranteed by us, for a total of \$532 million.

Mr. Peacock: May I ask the minister, will he ask the House to vote \$225 million as a loan or advancement to Ontario Housing Corporation in the 1971-1972 estimates?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If it is necessary to ask for the money, it will be—

Mr. Lewis: No, but the government will not, because it is not necessary.

Mr. Peacock: The government does not intend to make a direct investment from the funds of \$225 million—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is where your \$145 million—let me explain to the hon. member with the short crash programme of education I have had in this. You see the \$50 million the hon. member referred to the other day as being in the estimates. You have to have \$50 million to commit about \$100 million. You have to have that. The \$50 million was expanded last year. There is \$155 million, let us say. The \$145 million you are talking about has yet to be injected into the economy this year. Now you know there is not even a play on words—that you really committed yourself to that last year. That is not what we were saying. We said this money will be injected this year. Is that true or is it not? That is all that matters.

Mr. Lewis: Well, it has not been true in the past. It just has not been true.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What little faith.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is what we plan. If it turns out not to be true I will be a stinker.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): We are not going that far.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The fact still remains that whether it was previously committed, as I say we inject it into the economy this coming year. Let us make no bones about that. Unless it turns out the hon. member finds we come nowhere near that, then he can take us to task. But suppose we had not produced

a programme of housing—suppose we said, “Let us not set a high target because they will say we have set high targets before and we have not reached them”—although last year we exceeded the target. You say you are going to talk about spending a lot of money—and you may not spend it. We may get to the stage where some other federal government controls may hold us back. We do not know that. But then we would have been accused of lacking any kind of imagination to do something about the economy in this province.

Mr. Lewis: They have been below target every year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let us get to the other one. I am not backing down from anything we said in this statement.

As to the flak from your other side regarding the potential number of jobs, Mr. Speaker, we have only used, and I repeat it again, the formula which has been well established by economists and also used by the federal government to show the multiplier effect of employment created by such a basic industry as housing construction—and surely there is no mystery about that because everybody agrees that it is because of the multiplier effect of that industry that it is an important one.

Mr. J. Renwick: What is the multiplier?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Otherwise, we would be laying stress perhaps on other things to some extent.

Mr. Lewis: All right, fine. It has a multiplier effect.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If course it has a multiplier effect.

Mr. Lewis: It depends on what kind of housing you build. You have student housing and senior-citizen housing and the multiplier effect is reduced dramatically.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not reduced dramatically. I mentioned that to the hon. member the other day when he used the ridiculous figure of 0.07 and I told him—

Mr. Lewis: I said 0.7.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was 0.07, but even 0.7 is wrong. I told him that the multiplier effect used by—I guess it is the National Housing or CHMC—is 4.8 and I said that OHC used the multiplier effect of 4.4 because of the mix of public housing and

others, so that was taken into consideration. Does the hon. member want to call me a stinker because it should be 4.3 when we get to the end of the year and perhaps we cannot accomplish that?

Mr. Lewis: I do not want to call the hon. minister anything.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Do not be so offensive.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My integrity is at stake because I made a statement to this House. I want to make sure I can back it up, because I am very careful about statements I make in this House.

Mr. Lewis: It is not his integrity—it is his statistics and reporting that are at stake.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I have got to be careful about statistics given to this House. I should be able to back them up. This formula has been proved in the past as being fairly accurate. Now these are the economists. I am not an economist. This is the formula they use, and again there was no mention, I repeat, in the Throne Speech or my statement that the 132,000 potential jobs were all going to be new jobs and nobody—

Mr. Lewis: It was the whole implication.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and no way can prove that at all. The fact is that it will be a tremendous accomplishment by this government if we are able to generate through this housing programme 132,000 jobs directly or indirectly, new jobs or by managing to keep people from losing their jobs today. If we manage to keep that many people employed because of this programme, anybody looking at this thing objectively has to say, “That will be a hell of a good job if you can accomplish it.”

Let me further point out that we are just talking about the generating of jobs created by the expenditure of the \$500 million and that does not include the tremendous amount of housing which will be built through other sources which we anticipate will total—well, including ours—between 85,000 and 90,000 units.

Mr. Lewis: Which is below your target.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Below whose target?

Mr. Lewis: Below your government target set by the former Treasurer in 1968, so do not pretend—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So this is our target today. Last year we exceeded our target, did we not?

Mr. Lewis: No, you did not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course we did.

Mr. Lewis: No, you were 12,000 units under your target even last year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Whose target? Do you mean for the whole of the province including private—

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, all right.

Mr. Lewis: Do not say "Well" and toss it away.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course I toss it away.

Mr. Lewis: The minister's credibility is at stake.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The credibility is what the government can do and that is why we talk about potential. If it fails in the private sector somewhere to reach a target, that is another matter altogether. We do our best to help them if we can.

We have set a total, Mr. Speaker, it is a target we are sure to get and Ontario Housing Corporation and my predecessor deserve a tremendous amount of credit for exceeding their target last year. It was a tremendous job and I hope we will succeed as they did last year in exceeding our target this year as well. We are looking at the future optimistically. We want our people to look at it optimistically. We want foreign and domestic investors to look at Ontario optimistically and even though we know the nitpickers in the opposition and other places would like us not to succeed, we can and we will.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but comment on what has been said to date, because as a great German theorist said when it came to war: "The best defence is a good offence." And I must say that the government is trying to put a good offence, because it certainly has not got much of a defence.

Mr. Speaker, I sat here and I listened to the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) berate the federal government for its inactivity, trying to recite why this province's hands were tied; saying that it had no power to do this; it had no power to do that; and

all the power was in the federal government and therefore the province could not do anything. And the Minister of Trade and Development gets up and says: "We will do this;" "We will provide this;" "We will give opportunities;" or "Opportunities will be provided to do that," and so on.

The question arises, Mr. Speaker, if today The Department of Trade and Development will provide an opportunity for such and such, or will do such and such, and such and such, and such and such—evidently intended to completely wipe out unemployment—why did it not do this last year, and why did it not do it the year before, and why did it not do it the year before that? If it could do it this year, it could have done it last year. As has been pointed out time and time again, it had at least \$145 million on hand with which to start.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He would have been sick over it. The hon. member for Riverdale said he would have been sick over it.

Mr. Ben: There would have been a lot of people who would have been sick over it. So all we have here is one minister condemning the conduct of the other minister and in fact contradicting him.

Mr. Speaker, I am getting rather sick and tired of hearing all this emphasis on foreign investments coming in, the lowering of the interest rates, increasing the gross national product, because to me it seems collectively to be a lot of hogwash. The minister who just sat down, the Minister of Trade and Development, is talking about lowering the interest rate and attracting foreign investment.

Mr. Speaker, if you lower the interest rate too low the investment will not come into this country because they can get a higher return in the country of its origin. So some place there is a cutoff, where if you lower the interest rate beyond a certain point you are not going to get foreign investment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When did I mention all this?

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, let us put it this way. If the hon. minister did not, his predecessor obviously did. But he was certainly talking about bringing in foreign investments, of that there is no doubt.

Mr. Speaker, we live in an era of technology and this technological progress is evident all around us, be it in the city, or on the farm. The production of food, which

once occupied half of our population, now requires less than 10 per cent and even then we have difficulty disposing of the surplus.

Mr. Haggerty: Seven per cent.

Mr. Ben: I say less than 10 per cent, Mr. Speaker, and my friend here says less than seven per cent. In fact, Mr. Speaker, one efficient farmer can produce enough food to feed 24 people.

Mr. Gaunt: No, no, 34 people.

Mr. Ben: The figures I have are 24 and I am not going to get caught in an argument. The fact is, even at 24 it would be less than five per cent and even then we have a surplus.

Mr. Martel: The Liberals are arguing against each other.

Mr. Ben: Now what has the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), sitting back across there with his chin buried in his—I should say the Minister of Agriculture and Food Production, who is sitting there with his chin buried in his chest. What has he done to find an export market for our surplus food products?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Yes, I can tell the hon. member. He does want me to tell him now?

Mr. Ben: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In 1969 we increased it over 1968 by \$35 million and last year we increased it by a greater amount than that—and those are increases over a previous \$150 million.

Mr. J. Renwick: That is just not good enough.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, the minister has got up to tell us how the farmers, through their own initiative, were able to increase the export of food, but he did not answer the question as to what his government did to bring that about.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Come on, George.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will.

Mr. Ben: The hon. minister had his chance.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have the right to reply.

Mr. Ben: He had his chance, so he should sit down.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, surely I have the right to reply?

An hon. member: Sure he has.

Mr. Ben: We will put his name at the foot of the list.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It was the Ontario Food Council that did it. They did it right through the piece—all the way. They are a great organization, working with the farmers, not against them, as my friend would have it.

Mr. Ben: Yes—when it comes to the production of goods, we can now produce, with less than 20 per cent of the available labour force, all the necessary goods and still have a surplus of goods.

Mr. Martel: The Liberals do not want to talk about unemployment because of their federal friends and the Tories because they bungled it so badly.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, the foregoing factors are again compounded by a population growth.

Mechanization and automation boosts output and cuts costs and has been made necessary by deteriorating sales prospects, rising production costs, increased foreign competition and lower profits. The result has been that while output has soared, the number of blue-collar jobs, as they were once called, has decreased.

We have had this in the mining industry, the steel industry, the auto industry, the petroleum refining and chemical industries; we had it in the construction industry, and we have it in shipping.

Many, many years ago, I think it must be 25 years ago, during the time of the Second World War or shortly thereafter, John L. Lewis, who was then the president of the United Mineworkers of America, foresaw that workers were going to be laid off by automation and increased mechanical efficiency and he at that time provided that the mine owners set aside a certain amount per ton of coal mined to look after the people that would be displaced by—

Mr. Peacock: He is in court right now to answer for the disposition of those funds.

Mr. Ben: John L. Lewis?

Mr. Peacock: His successor.

Mr. Ben: It is not John L. Lewis. At any rate he foresaw what mechanization was going to do and he made some provision.

In shipping, Alfred Bridges, or Harry Bridges as he is better known, out on the west coast made provision for the introduction of pallets and containers, through having the marine shippers and owners make provision for the people who would be displaced by the increased efficiency followed by the use of pallets.

In our own country—in our own city, as a matter of fact—what is hitting the headlines these days is Charles Irvine and Bruno Zanini of a new union that has been formed, fighting the Toronto District Trades Council, in trying to form this new union.

And what it is about, according to what has been written in the paper, is the fact that the plasterers are finding difficulty getting jobs through the introduction of what is called “dry-wall.” So they are trying to find some solution to the problem.

We had, in the automobile industry, Reuther striving for earlier retirement ages and higher pensions for those who are retiring at an early age.

All these things have been facing us and yet this government has done absolutely nothing to help to solve some of these problems.

Since one has to offer at least some kind of a solution to this problem, I could say this. We levy corporate profit taxes—corporation taxes. Perhaps what we should do to encourage export is give a rebate of corporate taxes on profits earned on goods that are exported. That might help to make our goods more economical abroad, cheaper to purchase, and might induce more manufacturing for export here and use more people. I offer this as a partial solution.

I fear this: that the fact that we increase our exports and increase our production does not necessarily mean that we will have to hire more people so to do. Because not only are we faced with unemployment these days, we are also faced with under-employment. People are working fewer hours, so even if we were to increase our production by five, 10, 15 per cent, I question whether it would provide five, 10, 15 per cent more people with work. But at least it is a partial solution to this particular problem.

Not only are people being displaced by machinery, but people are being replaced by machines, that is by automation and also by new techniques.

For example, the bricklayers are being dis-

placed, not because there are too many of them but because they do not lay bricks in the course of construction as they once did. They now use modular or precast construction. In other words, the introduction of new techniques is doing away with the need for people like bricklayers.

I have already mentioned plasterers. We have less need for plasterers because there is less plastering to be done because of the introduction of dry-wall.

Still others have been replaced by computers linked to machines. Mr. Speaker, my most vivid memory of Expo 67 was watching the Kodak display where a machine was assembling projectors without human intervention, at least in the part that was visible to the spectators.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): The hon. member has a machine in Ottawa that is disassembling the country.

Mr. Ben: This machine or apparatus had parts flowing toward a tall column and somebody must have fed the parts into the machine behind the scenes, but the assembly was done by this machine.

It was frightening. There was this one machine producing all the projectors that perhaps Kodak could sell, with perhaps a half a dozen people in the background making sure that the parts flowed into the proper slot.

In the same display further on, they had a computerized machine which was drilling. I think it was engine blocks or something. But it was selecting the proper tool, doing the work necessary of that tool, replacing the tool, taking a new one, doing the next step.

These things have been facing us for a long time. It is a problem of cybernetics, I think, the way we refer to it.

What has this government done to prepare the people of Ontario to face up to the problems that are rising out of this automation and computerization out of cybernetics? Not a blessed thing. Or not even a cursed thing. They have not been doing a thing. All they can do now is say what they are going to do to help solve the unemployment problem, whereas their inactivity, their lack of foresight, their ineptitude, led up to the gross unemployment that we have at the present time.

Surely there must be a comprehensive study started and carried out as expeditiously as possible to find out what we, as a government, can do to help relieve some of the

pressures that are going to be brought on our people by these problems.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other factors contributing to unemployment. I think that the member for Scarborough West mentioned married women in the work force. More and more women are joining the labour force when, in fact, less and less of them are required.

A lot of them are joining it because they are marrying later and they are self-supporting, others are because they are widows. Still many more are working because they are the sole bread-winners; others because they must supplement the income of their husbands. Some are working to buy something special, to go on a trip, or join the jet set, and still others because they want to work for something to do or just to show that they are equal to the men.

The fact is this has created a problem. It has contributed in no small measure to unemployment as we know it.

Mr. Makarchuk: That is a lot of nonsense.

Mr. Ben: An hon. member at the back says it is a lot of nonsense. So be it.

Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate that this generation, insofar as Canada is concerned, has not seen a war, not since our participation, then called police action, in Korea. If we look upon that as the United Nations' police action, I guess there has not been participation in a war by this country since the end of the Second World War.

Further, we have not lately had a re-armament policy which, under normal circumstances in the past, has helped to create some employment. To be truthful about it, we have had a decrease in the number of people on our defence staff, or defence forces, which has also put more people on the market looking for jobs.

Mr. Makarchuk: Why do you not consider scrapping the government?

Mr. Pilkey: Who engineered that deal?

Mr. Ben: Perhaps what we should look around for are a few more Bonaventures and spend money fitting them out even though we are just going to sell them subsequently for scrap to Taiwan.

Mr. Pilkey: Surely you do not want another Bonaventure fiasco?

Mr. Ben: At any rate, the fact is that this also has, in some ways, caused unem-

ployment. Again, the government has done nothing to fill the vacuum.

Another factor, Mr. Speaker, is over-population. Not too long ago, even in this century, large families were the vogue because they were looked upon as security in one's old age and because so many children died in infancy, or at least before maturity. The state now assumes responsibility for the aged, and medical science has now progressed to the point where anything beyond two children is, in fact, over-population. If one person could produce enough food for 24, one member of the work force could produce enough production goods for 20, then the more children that are born, the more surplus labour we have. Again, the government has done nothing to deal with this particular problem.

A number of years back, Mr. Speaker, we looked forward to the people who were being displaced by automation going into what is called the service industry. We said that as automation comes we are going to have more and more leisure time and therefore more and more people are going to go into the industries which are going to supply us with services in our leisure, goods to use in our leisure. More golf courses would open up and more cottages in summer resort areas.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the service industry itself is going self-service. Motels and motor hotels are replacing hotels. In motels you do not require parking attendants, bellhops, doormen, or room service personnel. Your ice is supplied free by a machine at the end of the corridor and next to it stands an automatic vending machine which, upon receiving sufficient coinage—

Mr. Makarchuk: Is this the level of the Liberals' economic policy?

Mr. Ben: —will deliver food or drink, hot or cold.

Mr. Makarchuk: One mule driver for each ass.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): The hon. member is wandering.

Mr. Ben: To add to that, Mr. Speaker, we dreaded a television repairman coming to our house and saying that he had to remove the set to his place of business. That is no longer necessary. You do not have that threat any more, because now, he can replace the printed circuit in your television set before the ink on your cheque is dry.

We now have high-speed automatic elevators which do not require personnel to operate. I understand that in New York, 40,000 elevators were replaced by automatic elevators. You can dial direct now, anywhere in North America. This displaced a lot of telephone operators. Our shirts come drip-dry; our trousers come with a permanent press in them. Everything is now geared to use as little intervention of services as possible. Again, the government has done nothing in this particular respect.

Mr. Makarchuk: Better ban paper panties next, eh?

Mr. Ben: The only thing that is still active, Mr. Speaker, are the mouths of the people to our left who keep yak, yak, yakking.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): And never say anything.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The hon. member is a bit drip-dry himself.

Mr. Ben: There is actually a way to solve this problem. A lot of activity producing nothing. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the problem before us is a mess. It requires more knowledge of economics, science, and human psychology than can be expected of any of us here or, in fact, of any human being.

This does not mean that we should shun the responsibility or try to hide it like a slovenly housewife sweeping dirt under a rug. That this government has done nothing to date to solve the problem—what is less, even tried to—does not mean that it cannot be solved if we put enough men of education and understanding to the task.

In the late 1950s during the reign of the Hon. Mr. Diefenbaker, the first, and we hope, the last—100,000 men were enrolled, or enlisted, or mustered, whatever phrase would be more appropriate, into, I do not know whether I should use police or militia—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The government might bring them up here and try them.

Mr. Ben: —but it was called the Emergency Measures Organization. Prior to the Diefenbaker government they called it the civil defence organization, but the name did not sit well with a lot of people so they changed it. These people were supposed to be trained in looking after disasters, both man-made and natural, but the truth of the matter is that they spent most of their time pounding the pavement.

The hon. member for Scarborough West spoke of having youngsters contribute their services in the social service. I consider that to be a splendid idea. I also think, Mr. Speaker, that we could set up, provincially if not nationally, a period of national service for our youngsters. By this I am not implying that all the youngsters are going to be impressed into a militia or the army and shoulder rifles.

I would not be surprised if the majority of the youngsters did choose to go into our defence forces and learn to fly an aircraft or learn to sail a boat, or operate a power boat, or even learn signals or some other such trade—radar for example—in the land forces.

But many others would choose to do social work of the nature that was referred to by the member for Scarborough West. Many of them, for instance, could be used to open roads into our northland. These roads would open the northland for tourists. They would also encourage people to establish themselves there permanently to serve the tourists. They would open the north to more prospectors with the hope of opening it to mining industry and even secondary manufacturing industry. Others could choose to go up to the Arctic and work with the Eskimos and the Indians, but I do not think that it would be harmful to anybody, to any of our youngsters, if at age 18 that they were liable for two years national service.

Mr. Makarchuk: Are we having a children's crusade in northern Ontario?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Is this Liberal policy?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Tell Trudeau; that is a national jurisdiction.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): In the north?

Mr. Ben: I do not think that it would hurt any youngster to contribute a couple of years to the interests of Canada.

I think we also have to change our concept of education. I do not think we can any longer threaten our children with the admonition that if you do not work hard at school you will not get a job and will starve or will become a common labourer. Children know that they will not starve and they can receive welfare before, while or after attending school.

So, what we have to do is inculcate in them the belief that if they do not study hard at school and do not learn to study and work hard all the time their life will be a

bore and they will be unhappy. They must learn that leisure time need not be loafing time. We will also have to train more and more people for those service industries where the human element is still important; serving people in resort areas, in restaurants, in convention centres and so on. We have got to impress upon our youngsters—

Mr. Makarchuk: Keep it up and it will clear the ranks in no time.

Mr. Ben: —that serving is not necessarily slavery.

Mr. MacDonald: They are leaving in droves.

Mr. Ben: I beg to differ with the hon. member for—

Mr. Martel: Sudbury East.

Mr. Ben: No, for York South. On taking a count of the House I noticed that the membership here has increased by at least 30 per cent since I got up to speak.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: They obviously did not hear the hon. member.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): The hon. member better quit while he is ahead.

Mr. Ben: Thank you. I appreciate that and recognize that.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member certainly attracted the Tories.

Mr. Ben: Most governments have, on the shelf, a lot of public works, to put into effect at the time of unemployment and my own leader, the Leader of the Opposition, comments this government's shelves were like Mother Hubbard's cupboard—bare.

Mr. Yakabuski: Would the hon. member recite that in its entirety?

Mr. Ruston: The hon. member for Renfrew South would not understand it anyway.

Mr. Ben: This government had already started many of its projects, as my leader pointed out, during time of high labour costs and full employment and it has little to do now.

But there are many things it could do for this city—

Mr. Lawlor: I do not like to see anybody unemployed but we would not mind seeing the member out of here.

Mr. Ben: —not because I come from this city, not because this Legislature happens to be located in this city, but because, in fact, it is the capital of the Province of Ontario. For example, the Legislature could subsidize the construction of a domed stadium; not, again, because it is Toronto, but because it could be used not only for professional sports which would have to pay and pay well, but for the training of our athletes for participation in Olympic events.

In Toronto one cannot practise Olympic diving, at least in the wintertime. The Donald Summerville Olympic pool located on Woodbine Avenue has facilities for practising diving but, unfortunately, it is open only during the short summer season.

Mr. Makarchuk: Can the hon. member not get the pool seasonally adjusted?

Mr. Ben: We could make a greater contribution toward the construction of subways, which I think was raised here already.

The city of Toronto proper, as distinguished from Metro Toronto, is plagued by the fact that it has a combined sewer system—that is, one sewer outlet or pipe carries both the domestic sewage and the storm sewers and it was estimated that it would cost approximately \$300,000 to correct this defect. This is something that could be done, not only to help cure unemployment but to help the Minister of Energy and Resources Management cut water pollution. This would be an admirable undertaking for this government.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other partial solutions, and I offer these as my suggestions, not necessarily the suggestions of this party.

We have been discussing welfare quite recently, as a matter of fact continuously, and deploring the large numbers on welfare. **Mr. Speaker,** it is my feeling that if we were to add another 25 per cent or even less to the amount that we now pay out under general welfare assistance and had the people who receive the total sum employed on these public works we would cut down on the unemployment and have something to show for our money after it was all over. We would have a much better city, a much better province and a much better country in which to live.

Mr. Speaker, these are just some suggestions that could be implemented. This government has got up here on two occasions since this debate started and tried to put all the blame on the federal government. I, **Mr. Speaker,** do not wish to whitewash the federal government. I feel that they also were amiss in not—

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The hon. member is quite happy with Trudeau, is he?

Mr. Ben: —looking after a lot of these things that I have mentioned. They also do not have any programme to counteract the evils of automation and computerization and cybernetics. But two wrongs do not make a right. Just because one government has fallen down on its share of the responsibility does not absolve this government for falling down on its share of the responsibility and it has, indeed, fallen down.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Pierre sure fell down.

Mr. Ben: For this it cannot escape the censure of the public at the next general election. This I can predict.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I want to deal, for a moment, with some of the comments that were made by the Minister of Trade and Development when he spoke earlier today, because I feel that though his comments may not have been intentionally misleading they certainly were not as accurate as they might have been.

Mr. J. R. Simonett (Frontenac-Addington): They were accurate.

Mr. Deans: Thank you. The Minister of Trade and Development indicated in his speech—and I want to quote from it:

Policies on the textile, footwear, rubber and chemical industries, decisions on tariff and quota protections to existing Canadian industry and indeed the whole issue of taxation has provided an air of uncertainty in the minds of many manufacturers.

Consequently, my staff is aware in its day-to-day contact with businessmen of investment deferrals, both foreign and domestic, amounting to over \$200 million during the past year. This expansion could have provided for thousands of new employment opportunities—

And in a little aside it says: "We have evidence to support this—note A." And I want to read to you note A and leave it with you, because if this is the evidence upon which the minister makes decisions for the people of Ontario it is pretty flimsy.

He is quoting from a speech by Paul Hellyer—who is a noted expert in the field, I must say—in the House of Commons on March 25, 1971:

"Technically and financially the federal government policy has been a near total disaster. Morally it has been a total disaster." He states that as a result of anti-inflationary measures taken by the federal government, "the capital flow for new investment has not been sufficient to provide

meaningful opportunities for the large numbers of young people now entering the labour market."

He goes on to say:

He has estimated the loss of approximately 100,000 jobs resulting from anti-inflationary measures. A great many of these could—

And I stress the word "could."

—have accrued to Ontario which accounts for over 40 per cent of the Gross National Product.

If this is the kind of substantiation that the government has for the policies that it brings in then we are in trouble. If this is the evidence that the minister—a substantiated statement that there are deferrals of investment in the Province of Ontario—is using to build up the programme that he says is going to create more employment in this province, I think it is time he gave it back to the previous minister, because he was more palatable than that.

In addition to that, the minister dealt with the Ontario Housing Corporation and its grand programme of \$500 million worth of expenditure in the next year. The minister did not really deal with it very well. It has been charged by the opposition that much of this money is money that ought to have been spent—in fact was budgeted for—over the last two years; money that was never spent by the government to meet the needs of that particular time.

In the year 1968-1969, we voted in this Legislature \$62 million for housing. We spent \$15.4 million—a short fall of \$46.6 million. No matter how you cut it, no matter how you try to elaborate on the fact that the federal government did not have money available or would not make money available, there was voted by this Legislature over \$46 million which could and should have been used to provide housing and was not.

In the year 1969-1970, we voted \$56 million. That was a considerable decrease from the previous year, and we spent \$40.2 million, a short fall of \$16.2 million, in a year in which housing was considered to be a top priority; in a year in which the government spoke very forcefully in the Throne Speech about its housing programme—and again \$16.2 million was left unspent. It is no wonder the government can afford to spend more money this year. One might wonder whether the \$93.8 million that the government says it may have spent during the year 1970-1971

was ever spent. There certainly has not been any proof of that to date.

The fact of the matter is that the programme that is being offered by the government today as a massive housing project is, in fact, simply an effort by the government to catch up on its totally inadequate programmes of the last three years. The truth of the matter is that there is no more money being spent right now by this government in the field of housing than there was made available by this Legislature over the three-year period and that went unused. I think it is time that these things were on the record.

The whole problem in unemployment is more than just providing some sort of piecemeal effort at this particular time to meet a crisis situation. I think everyone in this Legislature appreciates that we are going to have to provide some kind of additional opportunities for employment right at this time. But the reason for the unemployment goes much deeper than that.

The reason for the unemployment is simply a lack of overall fiscal policy by the government of Ontario. It is a lack of policy toward establishing a more stable economy and this has been a policy that has been pursued by this government over 28 years. Everyone knows—anyone who has studied even the most elementary economics, anyone who has studied parliaments or governments over the course of the last half-century, would appreciate without a doubt—that there are recessions. We should have been able to recognize that as long as we left the economy in the hand of the private entrepreneur there were going to be recessions and that government had a responsibility to set about, to establish, on behalf of the people over whom it governs, the kind of stability in the economy that would ensure that when there were minor dislocations in the employment market, they would not be permitted to snowball into the kind of unemployment that we have today.

The first priority of government is to ensure that the well-being of the people over whom it governs is looked after. That is a requirement that means that in this particular kind of society we have to ensure there are job opportunities. It is not enough to hope that development takes place. It is not enough to trust to some person, well outside the realm of government circles, that they may or may not expand; or that they may or may not seek out new markets; or that they may or may not export. The government has to be involved in the decision-making in a very

real way if it is going to have any impact on ensuring that jobs will be available for people; not only the people who are looking for jobs today but the people who will be coming on to the work force, into the employment market, over the next half-century. This is not being done.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Let us have some solutions.

Mr. Deans: We are coming. Do not worry about it.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Cut off more investment?

Mr. Deans: It is interesting that the Minister of Pollution is here because it is in his area that much of the work could have been done and was not. I think we have got to begin with the basic premise.

We have got to begin with the basic premise that the ultimate responsibility for the economy rests with government. That there are very few people in the economy, whether they be private citizen or whether they be corporate interest, who blame other than the government for a recession or unemployment. And that if the government is going to be charged with the responsibility when things go badly, they have a responsibility to be part of the decision-making in order to ensure that things do not go badly.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: What about prime interest rates?

Mr. Deans: This government has sat very self-satisfied for 28 years on its haunches and done very, very little to try to promote any kind of government direction for the economy of this province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member left out the part that—

Mr. Makarchuk: The member is getting the member for Renfrew South stirred up now.

Mr. Deans: Let me say to you—

Mr. Makarchuk: It was not bad in Manitoba yesterday. You lost Manitoba.

Mr. Lewis: The government knows that there was a by-election?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: That is your mythology.

Mr. Deans: I want to ask how often do you hear the unemployed on the streets blaming the board of directors of the steel company, or the board of directors of Canadian Westinghouse, or of Inco or of any other

national company or any other small company for the fact that they are unemployed? The blame ultimately rests with government and therefore the responsibility to make sure it does not happen rests with government.

Now the secret to this is to develop the kind of co-operative relationship between industry, trade unions and government that will bring about an interest in the province never before seen, that will guarantee that the government is involved along with those other areas of society in planning the economic growth. That is something that this government has failed to do.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Co-operative socialism.

Mr. Lewis: Right, What is wrong with that? You do it with the hospital workers.

Mr. Deans: Let me say to you that this government has made its position very clear. It does not think that it ought to meet with the people in the decision-making parts of the large corporations in Ontario to determine what can be done to offset unemployment. This government does not believe that planning is a necessary part of ensuring economic stability and growth. This government is prepared to be led by the nose like a small boy around the province, setting things up every time some corporation decides to establish a manufacturing process in an area. That is the basic problem: There is no direction; there is no attempt at direction. There has never been an effort by this government to sit down with corporations to determine what is in the best interest of the Province of Ontario rather than what is in the best interests of a few people who happen to be shareholders.

Mr. Yakabuski: Oh come on!

Mr. Deans: Okay, fine. That is interesting. Let me read to you. On June 8, 1970, I raised such a point with the then Treasurer and with the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and asked him during the question period whether either the Treasurer or the Prime Minister would undertake some special effort to offset what was at that time a 36.2 per cent increase in unemployment in and around the city of Hamilton.

I asked him if he would undertake to meet with the various corporate heads to discuss with them what action might be contemplated co-operatively by this government and then to ensure that the unemployment would not rise. And his answer was, "No." He did not think that the government ought to be involved in these kinds of things.

Well, I would ask him the question: What is the government going to be involved in if it is not involved in such things as layoffs, unemployment, plant dislocation and loss of revenue to the province? What is it going to be involved in if those things are not the direct involvement of the government?

This government has had nine months in which to pursue some form of discussion with the people who are running the corporations, who are laying off the people left, right and centre right across this province—and I say to you that absolutely nothing has happened, nothing. In fact, what has happened, if anything, is that we have paid out more of the taxpayers' money and we have fewer jobs in return for it. And I think that is a problem!

In the nine months that passed, the lay-off I was particularly concerned about at that moment at International Harvester took place, and the people were laid off. Unemployment in Hamilton and area has risen to over 20,000 people during that nine-month period. Still no government action!

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Since we adjourned last November this government has said nothing since.

Mr. Deans: Today, in the month of April, we stand in this House and go through this ridiculous debate. Why was there no action during the last nine months? Why are we now starting to talk about unemployment when unemployment has been running rampant throughout this province over the last year? Why is it that the government now stands up and reads into the record such idiotic statements as the one from the Treasurer and the one from the Minister of Trade and Development over the last two or three days?

The Minister of Trade and Development, in talking of his housing programme, talks about the fact that we need more time, that things do not happen overnight.

Let me remind him, in his absence, that just immediately prior to the 1967 election, the then Minister of Trade and Development stood some place in the province and made a great announcement that on Saltfleet Mountain adjacent to the city of Hamilton we were going to build housing complexes to house 90,000 people. Not one blade of grass has been turned since that day. This is the time it takes.

When we heard last Tuesday it would take a while, last Wednesday that we cannot do

it overnight, last Thursday that it takes time, on Friday that we are working at it, and on Monday that it is going to materialize—I wonder just when. Does this government expect us to believe it? I wonder.

The point really is this, though: The projects that are being put forward by the government might well have been of some benefit had they been put forward when unemployment was at its start. But unfortunately it saw fit to do so little at that particular time; it saw fit not even to spend the moneys that were available, and here we now face a crisis situation.

Mr. Peacock: This government ignored every warning.

Mr. Deans: Every single warning that was put out by every individual right across the country was ignored by the Province of Ontario, and it is to that we turn.

It has been generally conceded that to a great extent the branch plant nature of Ontario's economy is a major contributing factor to unemployment. Studies over the last number of months have shown fairly conclusively that a sizable portion of the unemployed is caused—

Mr. Yakabuski: Studies by whom?

Mr. Lewis: What about Renfrew Aircraft over there?

Mr. Deans: —by foreign-controlled corporations consciously making a decision to cut back in subsidiary operations abroad in order to shore up a lagging economy.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: What about those labour heads in Detroit?

Mr. Pilkey: What about them?

Mr. Deans: One would think that since these warnings have been issued over the last 12 or 14 months—in fact these warnings have been issued over the last two or three years—the Ontario government might have recognized that it would be unable to control its own economy and economic growth unless it came to grips with that problem. What do we find? At the height of unemployment now it starts talking about doing something—

Mr. Gisborn: And when the steel industry is going at full capacity and has been for the last three years. Explain that.

Mr. Deans: One might have thought that the government, a year or a year and a half ago, would have taken a serious look at its

ODC programme to see whether we, the people of the Province of Ontario, were getting benefit for the millions of dollars that were being spent; that in fact we were deriving new jobs; that in fact there were more jobs in the labour market because of the expenditure, as a result of the expenditure. But this has not been the case.

Mr. Yakabuski: This has been the case.

Mr. Deans: It has not been the case.

Mr. Yakabuski: It certainly has.

Mr. Deans: Well, that is an interesting point. Let me tell the hon. member about it. This government made available \$500,000 to Abitibi—half a million, in case the hon. member cannot count—that was to provide for between 30 and 91 jobs. That was the intent of it. Let me tell the hon. member what happened there, because it is interesting. Abitibi, after getting the loan, laid off 85. Half a million bucks, of the taxpayers' money and there is a shortfall of at least 14 jobs.

Mr. Yakabuski: There was no shortfall.

Mr. Deans: In order words, we are 14 jobs fewer in the province as a result of that half-million-dollar expenditure.

Mr. Pilkey: That is right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Yakabuski: Do not twist the facts.

Mr. Deans: Do not twist the facts? How can I twist facts? I am telling the truth. Just listen to it; there is more. It will be educational for the hon. member.

Mr. Yakabuski: It was an isolated case.

Mr. Lewis: An isolated case? Tell them about Renfrew Aircraft over there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. members would allow the member for Wentworth to carry on. If the member for Scarborough West and the member for Renfrew South wish to engage in the debate, the latter can, of course, later.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, through you to the member for Renfrew South, on May 29, 1969, Canadian Westinghouse got a quarter of a million dollars—we are all familiar with that—which was to provide a number of jobs in the Orangeville area. We are not exactly

sure how many jobs but it was to provide a number. It certainly did not provide as many jobs in Orangeville as it lost when they moved from the area of Toronto to the Orangeville area, but in addition Canadian Westinghouse on February 13, 1971, announced the closing down with a loss of 275 jobs. That cost us a quarter of a million dollars. At least it is not as bad as the other. After all, the other cost half a million dollars and we lost 13 jobs. This time it was a quarter of a million dollars and we lost 275 jobs.

How about the case of Courtaulds? You heard about them when they closed down their operation in the Cornwall area—let me read it to you just so that you understand it—throwing out of work over 100 people—600 people, as I recall—and got from the government of Ontario a loan of \$199,083 to employ between 12 and 46 people. Not a penny to be returned. In that same company, 600 people are unemployed and they get almost \$200,000 of the taxpayers' money to provide between 12 and 46 jobs—and nobody knows how many it did provide to this point. You wonder about unemployment? This government is creating unemployment. It is buying its way right into it.

You talk about your unemployment situation: Let me give you another—there are all kinds of them; we have them by the dozen. Oh yes, this was a good one—Domtar.

You all remember Domtar, I am sure. This is the government policy for creating jobs. Domtar got \$484,008 in one loan and \$439,333 in another to create a possible total of 99 jobs in both or 73 jobs depending on which you pick. What did they do? Let us have a look and see. Let us find out what Domtar's situation was.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The pulp and paper industry happens to be in trouble.

Mr. Deans: Yes. It certainly is.

They phased out one of their divisions at a cost of 260 jobs. We spent something over a million dollars—close to a million—to provide a maximum of 99 jobs; they close their operation down and put out 260 on the street. Maybe we could have better spent that money, do you not think?

Mr. Lewis: They made \$18 million profit last year.

Mr. Deans: There is not any question at all—

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): There are 1,600 employees there year round; why not think about them?

Mr. Yakabuski: He is just twisting the facts, that is all. He only reads one side of the coin.

Mr. Deans: That particular company did not need our money. One cannot help wondering just how much we can afford to spend to create unemployment. How much more do we have in the bank that we can draw out and use to create more unemployment in the province? When are we going to start spending some money to start creating employment in the province?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: How does that create unemployment?

Mr. Deans: Let me give another example. The Minister of Energy and Resources Management will be tickled with this one. This is a nice one. I want to tell him about it.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I want the hon. member to tell me how that creates unemployment?

Mr. Deans: He has heard, no doubt, of a situation that arose in Hamilton recently with a company called H. G. Wright. I raised it before. H. G. Wright was a very profitable little company, operating in Hamilton and doing quite nicely. The employees there were earning about \$3.25 an hour, living quite comfortably in the community. H. G. Wright came to the government and said, "We would like to move out in the Caledonia area. Is there any way we could get assistance, because our plant is obsolete. It is on three floors and it is pretty difficult for us to operate in this kind of an environment." The government said, "No, we cannot give you any money."

Selkirk Metalbestos, though, which is located in Brockville and is a subsidiary of Wallace Murray Corporation, an extremely wealthy multi-national corporation in the United States. It met with the Ontario government and said, "We are thinking of putting an addition on our plant at Brockville. How about lending us—giving us, not lending us—some money." So they gave them \$77,067. Selkirk then purchased H. G. Wright. Within two months it was purchased. Within 14 months it was phased out, and that \$77,000 created, I understand, about six jobs in Brockville. We lost almost 70 jobs in Hamilton.

I wrote to The Department of Trade and Development and I asked if it would investigate this because it did not make much sense that we would be giving money to a company in order that they could enlarge their operation, in order that they could buy out their competition, in order that they could dislocate 62 workers. So I asked. Do you know what they wrote back and told me? I will read it to you. This is the letter back from Mr. Etchen. He said:

In April, 1969, the Wallace Murray Corporation of New York, which is the parent company of Selkirk Metalbestos, acquired the H. G. Wright Company of Hamilton.

I had told him that in the earlier letter so that he would know.

At the time of the acquisition the H. G. Wright Company was profitable. Since that time, however, the company has run into a loss position. Projections of future operations indicate that this position will deteriorate further if operations are continued at the Hamilton plant. The company therefore decided to close down the Hamilton plant on purely business grounds.

Well now, I ask you.

So I said to them, "Did you think to take a look and find out why it became unprofitable? Did it ever occur to you that maybe it was designed that way? Did it never occur to you that maybe the whole exercise was aimed at establishing the priority position of Selkirk in the field and that they themselves manufacture a similar, though not interchangeable product, and that they intended at the time of the acquisition of H. G. Wright to phase it out? And that they built the addition to employ half a dozen people with the \$77,000 that they got from the Ontario government, and that 62 people in Hamilton are now unemployed?"

No, it did not occur to them. Sixty-six more unemployed to add to the total. And then you take a look. These were people who had been there for years, who had worked in this business. It is not a business that wanted to go out of business; it was a business that wanted assistance in order that it could continue, and this government refused it. This government cost that particular municipality and those people an opportunity to continue in their jobs. That is how this government meets the unemployment crisis. That is how it provides a good economy for the people of Ontario to benefit from. One wonders, one seriously wonders. He might ask the question, "Was the product that

H. G. Wright manufactured a profitable venture?" That is a fair question, and I am glad he asked it. I will tell you the answer. There is a company in Hamilton—I am talking to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management—

Mr. Lawlor: That is the question he would have asked if he had thought of it.

Mr. Deans: That is right. The situation was that another company in Hamilton invested \$100,000 of its own money—a very small company, J. A. Rider. It has employed about 20 of the former Wright employees at its own expense in order to put back into production the product that Selkirk phased out. The product was obviously profitable and obviously the \$77,000 should be reclaimed. Obviously it should go to Rider because he is the one who has created the employment. He is the one who has created for the people, who were dislocated by the actions of this government, an opportunity to be employed, and it is to him that the money should go.

I ask you seriously, Mr. Speaker, do you not think it is only fair that if a man will provide, out of his own resources, employment for 20 people, and another company with government funds can only provide for six, that man should at least receive some compensation in order to assist him in his endeavours? Not this government; not this government. They are interested in spending money, and their interest has simply created unemployment, and they have done it and they have done it well.

Mr. MacDonald: No interjections, Mr. Minister?

Mr. Deans: There are so many! You do not have to go through the whole list, although we have something like 28 pages of companies in Ontario which have received hundreds of thousands, millions of dollars of tax payers' money. My contention is that the ODC and its staff have not had an adequate followup on the expenditures that were made in order to ensure that there are indeed more jobs on the labour market.

It is not nearly enough to say that each particular plant is a separate entity. You have got to consider the operation in its entirety. You cannot give money to an operation to build one very small plant in one area while it is phasing out hundreds of employees in another. There is something wrong, something morally wrong, about that kind of a position, and that is the position that the government of Ontario has been

following for at least the last five years. I question its validity.

Is this the kind of thing that we expect from a government that is interested, really interested, in creating employment? No, I doubt it. The whole matter of whether or not the branch plant economy is the reason is fairly well indicated by the fact that unemployment in Canada in January of this year—taking into consideration all of the fancy ways in which it is calculated—stood at about 6.6 per cent. It was higher than the unemployment rate in the United States, which was 5.6 per cent. Considerably higher.

That was as a result of the kind of thing that I am talking about. It was as a result of the parent company consciously withdrawing from the foreign market the products that were marketable in Canada. That brought about a great deal of dislocation and unemployment of workers in this province. This government continues, day after day, to hand out the largest loans, actually gifts, to the largest companies as long as they are multi-national and have lots of money in the bank.

The main criteria seem to have been—in spite of the pronouncements of the Minister of Trade and Development—the main criteria for receiving money from the government of Ontario seem to be that you do not really need it; that if you need the money you cannot get it; and if you do not need it, all you have to do is come and ask for it. It makes me wonder.

How many of these companies do you honestly believe settled or located in the areas in which they are now located because they got a grant from the Ontario government? That is certainly is no way to establish a more stable economic picture across this province.

It is not by direct grants to companies that these things are established. It is not by handouts to companies that have more in assets than the province of Ontario. It is not by providing an extra half a million dollars for them to invest somewhere that they determine that they are going to locate in any particular area. If this government had spent the money that it had spent on these loans in providing the necessary services in the areas in which unemployment was highest, we would have been able to encourage industrial development to take place.

What has been done in that area from Sault Ste. Marie to Sudbury? How much effort has been put into providing some kind

of reasonable alternative to the situation which prevailed until November of last year and still prevails; where unemployment is so high that, in many instances, in municipalities the total employable force is unemployed.

What is being done by this government to provide those people with employment?

Mr. Gisborn: How much does the government expect back before the next election?

Mr. Deans: What is being done in areas in northern Ontario to provide for employment for the people who live in those areas? Absolutely nothing. In fact, the Minister of Mines said not long ago that there was nothing he could do in the latest plant closing, which one of my colleagues will speak about later.

I cannot help asking—and I have taken much longer than I intended—if the government—

An hon. member: The member is doing very well.

Mr. J. Renwick: He is really getting to the government.

Mr. MacDonald: At least it has silenced them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He is really getting to the member. The members are nearly asleep over there.

Mr. Deans: I do not blame him. He is very tired. He does a lot of walking.

Mr. Gisborn: It is hard to watch that activity over there.

Mr. Deans: He is the walking man. It really makes me wonder if the government's attitude toward the unemployment situation is real. I do not think it is. I think it is a sham. I think it is a big front for the lack of activity over the last nine months. I am convinced, as I look at the record of this government and the kinds of ways in which it has spent money, the efforts that it has made, that there has been no conscious attempt made by this government at any level to establish itself as a leader in the field of reducing unemployment in the Dominion of Canada, and particularly in Ontario.

There has been nothing done, absolutely nothing done to establish the government's priority position in planning the economy of this province. There has been little, if any, effort at all to bring about some kind of a

co-operative effort in the way of guaranteeing that the government is not only made aware after the fact, but is made aware during the planning stages of the proposed shutdowns, the proposed layoffs, and the reasons for them; not only that, but also in bringing to the government's attention the expansion possibilities and the expansion proposals of the various companies that are thinking about enlarging operations in this province.

Surely it is not nearly enough for the government to go running around after companies when they have decided to locate in an area and then trying to meet their needs. Surely it is important that the government must take a lead in determining what the economic priorities are, and that does not mean handing out money. We have said a number of times, that one of the ways to establish a basically sound economy is that the people must have a fairly reasonable control over the resources of the country; that they must have a control over the resources of this province; that the government can, if it so desires, create economic stability as long as the government has a full say in the disposition and use of resources in the Province of Ontario.

From the other side, as often heard, are cries of anguish that we are trying to take over. I want to read a quote. I will read this quote, because I think it will be of interest to you:

Let this be a declaration, not only in relation to natural gas, but in relation to our great resources generally, not in any spirit of selfishness, not in any narrow approach, but rather with the idea that as trustees for future generations of Canadians, along with an export which may be carried out under wise and appropriate conservation and control, our main purpose will be the future welfare of Canadians themselves.

That might have been said by the leader of the NDP in the debate on having control of the gas in Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: It might have been said by Karl Marx.

Mr. Deans: Do members know who it was said by? The hon. George Drew.

Mr. Sopha: Really?

Mr. Deans: It seems to be good for the Tory soul to cleanse itself once in awhile with a statement of purpose—a purpose which it never at any time intends to fulfill.

Mr. Gisborn: A right man like that defeated on a liquor question.

Mr. Sopha: He made Goldwater look like a Marxist.

Mr. Deans: It makes you wonder whether we are going to face another six months of total inaction on the part of this government and whether the people of this province are considered to be expendable by this government; or whether they are going to go about trying to establish some kind of overall control that will ensure a co-operative control that will ensure that there will not be the kind of unemployment and dislocation occurring again in this province that we are seeing at this particular time.

Surely we can learn from past experiences. Surely we can learn from the years and years of history that unless the government is prepared to move immediately there are indications of recession in the country or the province, we are going to be faced time after time after time with the same kind of situation that we have been facing over the last year and that we are going to be facing for the next year. It is too late now to say that the government is on the move and that it is going to create another 85,000 homes. It is far too late for the Treasurer to stand up and talk about a new policy for taxation. It is not nearly good enough to get up in this Legislature and talk about the federal government and its policies that have wreaked havoc on the people of Ontario, albeit those things may be true.

The problem is basically that this government has failed to govern; that this government has failed to grasp the significance of economic planning and the ensuring of economic growth in an orderly and rational way, and that this government has sat back and permitted the planning for the Province of Ontario to be done in the corporate boardrooms. That is the reason why we face unemployment today, and it can only be overcome if we are prepared to make a radical and drastic change in the manner in which government operates, and if government is prepared to step into the breach, and if government is prepared to do the kind of planning that will ensure that we will not be governed by people, not only by those in corporate boardrooms in this province, but by people who live well outside the confines of this country.

I say to this government now that it will be defeated. It will be defeated because it has no will to govern. It did not have a will

to govern, but the economy of the province was too strong and it withstood all of the bungling of 28 years. This government's economy was sufficient that it was able to withstand the kind of irrational bungling that took place by people like the ministers of the Crown, most of them still sitting in their places, over the last three and a half years and over the previous 25 years.

There is one thing for sure: this government has reached the end of the road. The province's resilience is no longer there, and without proper and adequate economic planning there is going to be the kind of unemployment in this province again that we are facing now, only I suspect it will be worse. Because we are totally unable, in this kind of an economy and the way this government operates, to provide the numbers of jobs that will be necessary not only to meet the unemployed today but to meet the unemployed that will be coming on to the work force over the next five years.

There has been absolutely no provision by this government to try to provide jobs for people who are coming on to the work force. All one needs to do is take a look at the numbers of young children growing into the working age, coming to an age when employment is a necessity, and one can readily see that under the present administration there is not going to be any opportunity for them to find employment. And employment is important; it is important to the average individual. I know of very few people who want to sit home and watch television. I do not know of very many people who are not interested in finding a job.

I happen to think that if this government were progressive, which it obviously is not—Conservative though it may be—there would be a programme undertaken now, for example, to reduce the work week to a level where there would be additional employment and there would then be a greater sharing of the natural wealth. And there would be a programme undertaken by this government that would ensure that the natural resources of this province are used in this province to develop the kind of salable materials that can be sold at a reasonable profit. This has not been done, and I think that we can scrap this kind of give-away programme that we have been following over the last four or five years and replace it with a programme of incentive by providing adequate services throughout the province to ensure that orderly, economic growth takes place.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Speaker, although I really want to deal with another aspect of this total problem and perhaps bring some other information, which I think any debate such as this requires to be laid on the table if it is to be a meaningful debate, I would like to just comment on what the hon. member for Wentworth has just said. As far as I have ever seen, and I am sure even he will have to agree, there is no other government in this country that has done as much over the past few years to create new jobs than this government.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: He can drag out all his stories and illustrations, he can talk all he wants about the Ontario Development Corporation—and nothing is perfect, I suppose—but still the indisputable fact is that more jobs have been created in this province, and they have been here.

Mr. Randall: A great disappointment to that crowd over there though!

Hon. Mr. Wells: And I think that if they had been lacking, and if the super-salesman from Don Mills had not been here, the people of this province would have been the worse.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The Premier decided he could do without him very quickly. He was the first one to go.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, what I really want to talk about today, as I say, is another aspect of this whole problem. First, I want to perhaps give what I would say are some of my personal feelings and they are these: The root cause of this problem we are discussing today, the root cause of unemployment, is inflation, and the blame for it falls on each one of us.

Mr. J. Renwick: Over there!

Hon. Mr. Wells: When I say each one of us, I am not talking about governments or parties; I am talking about the member for Scarborough North, the member for Scarborough West, the member for Wentworth and the member for Downsview—everyone here.

Mr. Singer: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Because I think when we look around and see what has gone on in our society over the past few years we cannot but be convinced that the blame for inflation lies with us.

Mr. Lewis: Who are you talking about?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Companies, no matter what they say, have wanted more profit. Labour unions, no matter what they say to the contrary, have wanted more wages. Landlords have wanted more rent. Merchants have wanted higher prices. Mr. Speaker, even we in this Legislature have wanted increases in our salaries.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): They need more money. They like to eat.

Mr. Martel: They like eating.

Hon. Mr. Wells: And so it has gone around and around in our whole society. We have all wanted more, we have raised prices, we have got fantastic wage settlements, such as the construction industry. We have seen people raise rents, and time and time again it has been put to us that we—

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): But we have produced more.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Not as much.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —as individuals in this society, Mr. Speaker, who love freedom and believe in freedom, it has been put to us—

Mr. Lawlor: This is a lecture in elementary uneconomics.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —that we voluntarily should do something about this and we have rejected it.

Mr. Lewis: What kind of nonsense is this?

Mr. J. Renwick: Who determines the prices of the basic commodities in a society?

Hon. Mr. Wells: They have rejected it, we rejected this and I said all segments of society have rejected it.

Mr. Speaker, we have been asked if we would voluntarily control wages, we have rejected it. People have been asked if they would voluntarily control prices, they rejected it. We have rejected this and the Prime Minister of Canada has said this—much as I place much of the blame on him for the situation we are in now—he said that the people of this country rejected any voluntary programme to put any controls on those things which govern our economy and so we were faced with inflation. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lawlor: Do not blame us all. Do not blame poor old Elliott.

Mr. J. Renwick: He is engaged in a little visionary thinking. That is not why we were faced with inflation.

Mr. Lewis: That has nothing to do with inflation.

Mr. J. Renwick: Absolutely nothing to do with inflation at all.

Mr. Randall: They have verbal diarrhoea over there.

Hon. Mr. Wells: You, know, they could argue on and on but the—

Mr. J. Renwick: This is an administered price economy and that is what causes inflation.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The Prime Minister said on the weekend that the government had to cool the economy after Canadians refused to accept voluntary wage and profit guidelines last year.

Mr. Lewis: The hon. minister would do better quoting his own Premier. His words tend to make more sense from time to time.

Mr. Makarchuk: That is not what the Treasurer says.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, as I say I really do not want to talk on this part of the problem, but I am just saying because we found ourselves in this particular situation—

Mr. Lewis: Someone has to come to your defence.

Mr. Makarchuk: He should be out in the back benches if he is going to talk that way.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —Ottawa felt they had to act and they acted and because of their monetary and fiscal policies unemployment has resulted.

Mr. Lewis: When does the minister think we will come back to this?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Now I do not agree with their policies, because I think their monetary and fiscal policies, coupled with the very great fear and uncertainty of the Benson white paper, have caused jobs not to be created. Jobs either disappeared or they were not created, and these policies have brought us to the dire position that we find ourselves in today.

Many of my colleagues have talked about some of the answers to this, but as I say, Mr. Speaker, the other dimensions—the new

dimension that I want to add to this problem today, which I think just again shows the urgency of all of us finding a solution and taking action on it—is to look at this problem in terms of people, not just economic statistics, cold economic statistics, which we become very accustomed to deal in when we deal with a problem such as this.

We should look at this problem in terms of human beings—men, women and children who are being desperately affected because of this situation, because of this problem today.

These are the people—the men, the women and the little children—who, Mr. Speaker, become the pawns in this great economic game that is being played by a lot of unnamed government mandarins and 300 or so staff in the Prime Minister's office in Ottawa. These are the people who are being affected and I would like to say something about the way they are being affected and the way all of us are being affected in relation to the programmes of our department.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, our department deals with income maintenance programmes. We are charged with offering assistance to those who, for one reason or another, are unable to provide for themselves—those who do not have sufficient income for the basic necessities of life. Of course, Mr. Speaker, one result of the unemployment situation is this—that there are a great many more people than is normal who find themselves now in the position of not being able to work and obtain an income through the normal economic process.

By their nature, Mr. Speaker, of course, the programmes of our department do not in themselves alleviate the unemployment problem or indeed the economic conditions which lead to it. But our programmes tend to reflect the economic conditions that we now find ourselves in and, of course, when unemployment increases, as we now find it, there is naturally an accompanying increase in our assistance caseloads.

The programme in The Department of Social and Family Services most directly connected with this problem is our general welfare assistance programme, a programme that is administered by the municipalities under The General Welfare Assistance Act. In this past year there has, of course, been a rapid acceleration in payments under this programme. I should say, in use of statistics here and I am just going to give a few of them, a case means either a single person or a family and this is counted regardless of the

size of the family. A beneficiary means in this case everybody—a child, a parent, a single person—everyone together who is receiving assistance; all persons and dependants who are receiving assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the January figures, that is the number of cases on general assistance, have gone from about 40,000 in January, 1968, to 43,000 in January, 1969; 48,000 in January, 1970; and 76,000 in January, 1971. I would draw your attention Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the caseload figure for January, 1971, is a 58 per cent increase over January, 1970.

During the same period, 1968-1971, the number of beneficiaries, that is the total number of men, women and children who are on our programme, not just cases, has risen as follows: 109,000 in January, 1968; 116,000 in January, 1969; 127,000 in January, 1970; 188,000 in January, 1971. This means an acceleration, Mr. Speaker, in the past year from 127,000 to 188,000—an increase of 48 per cent.

We have slightly more up-to-date figures, Mr. Speaker, for Metropolitan Toronto. You may be interested in knowing that in February of this year there were about 59,000 beneficiaries on our general welfare assistance programme as compared with 37,600 one year ago, an increase of some 57,000.

Expenditures, Mr. Speaker, under the general welfare assistance programme have, of course, increased along with the rise in the caseload figure. In 1970-1971, a gross amount of \$58,834,000 was voted for assistance under this programme, under which The General Welfare Assistance Act, of which \$21,580,000 would be the net provincial cost.

Mr. Speaker, our actual expenditures for this year have been approximately \$87,240,000, with \$32,127,000 net.

It will be recalled that supplementary estimates were presented here last September for an additional \$22 million and we had to approach the Treasury Board just recently for a Treasury Board order for another \$6.5 million. This means, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Sargent: This is not the seat of the member for Don Mills; not his seat—a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —the complete expenditures for general welfare have gone up now to about \$109 million—\$109 million, including the municipal share. This, as I say, is something in the neighbourhood of a 40 to 50 per cent increase over last year.

Mr. Sargent: How much federal money?

Hon. Mr. Wells: This in itself—and I will show you, Mr. Speaker—shows the effect that the unemployment problem is having. Now in connection with the general assistance programme, the Ontario seasonal employment programme, which was brought in specifically to offer jobs to those who did not have them and who were on welfare provided employment for a number of recipients of general welfare allowance. A total of 4,420 men have been employed on this programme and of them 2,400 were referred by welfare offices. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that a majority of those referred by welfare offices were heads of families and many of them—about 95 per cent—are still employed under this programme.

Mr. Speaker, the family benefits programme has also increased from a year ago. In March of 1970 there were 61,500 active family benefits cases and in March, 1971, there were about 70,500. We have been unable to determine exactly how this caseload has increased, but there are certainly indications that a number of cases of people who are disabled and aged have come to our caseload because they can no longer find part-time employment or do the kind of things that they were able to do when employment was more prevalent and they now, therefore, find themselves as one of our cases.

And it appears that if these other sources of support are available to them, that it is reasonable to assume that the unemployment situation is one of the reasons why alternative resources are not as readily available to this group as formerly, and they now find themselves on the family benefits programme.

The next few statistics I think are very interesting and they point up what I referred to early in my remarks—

Mr. Martel: When something is asked in the minister's department one gets a nebulous answer.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —the human effect that this problem has on people. It is significant to note that the number of cases on family benefits resulting from desertions and divorces has increased sharply in this recent year. I think that these statistics are very relevant to our current social and economic situation and conditions.

In March, 1969, there were 6,400 cases receiving family benefits who were deserted wives. In March, 1970 there were 8,671 and in March, 1971, there were 11,303, in other

words an increase of one-third in women or people who had been deserted receiving family benefit allowances.

In the case of divorces, Mr. Speaker, in the figures from March, 1970, to March 1971, there has been an increase of 70 per cent, from 1,550 divorce cases receiving family benefit to 2,517.

It seems very likely that the stresses resulting from unemployment have been a factor in this very rapid increase in the number of persons seeking to turn to public assistance as a result of divorce and desertion. We all know that lack of employment brings with it attendant family problems and can contribute to the breakup of families.

I think that in looking at these figures in this context, Mr. Speaker, it is also interesting to note that the number of cases of widows and family benefits where social and economic pressures are not an important factor, have actually decreased slightly over the same period. Whereas there were 6,322 widows receiving family benefits allowance in March, 1970, there are now only 6,135—a decrease. Costs of the family benefits programme have of course increased proportionately just as our general welfare programme has increased.

Mr. Speaker, no one questions that unemployment as a problem goes much beyond the aspects of economics and statistics. It affects people. It seems clear that the most deplorable feature of unemployment is its social consequences and its impact on those temporarily unable to be productive and working members of the society. We all know what it means in our society to have a job. It means a position and a recognized place in the community. It means a regular income. It means being a productive and contributing member of the community, and it has a bearing Mr. Speaker, on one's feelings of self worth and self respect.

In times such as this when a person may be laid off through no fault of his own, the first thing we usually consider is the loss of his pay cheque. But, Mr. Speaker, we should remember that all the other attitudes and feelings which are a part of his job are also threatened, and all of them are an important part of the social fabric. It is appalling to consider the cumulative effects of these social consequences of unemployment.

In our assistance programmes we have attempted and we have accepted the principle that those unable to work, and those able to work but for whom jobs are not available, should secure social assistance. In

this province our legislation establishes social assistance as a right when conditions of eligibility are met and through this means this government ensures that income will be maintained and that a person's dignity and self respect will be supported. However, Mr. Speaker, as a person I believe, and our society believes, in the economic and social value of work. This debate and the general public concern about unemployment demonstrate that. The great majority of those securing assistance who are employable would much prefer to be employed. They do not want to be unemployed.

While I would not for a moment downgrade the importance of or the need for social assistance for those out of work, I would stress that there are severe negative social effects from this problem of unemployment and, of course, the best solution is a return to a high level of employment. And I would say we in this government are doing our share to insure that, and we are putting all our efforts to this end. But I

would say, let us see Ottawa do the same. Let us see them quit putting us on.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I should try to cover part of the ground—

Mr. Speaker: I think perhaps the hon. member might move the adjournment of the debate because in five minutes he probably is not going to make any contribution.

Mr. Farquhar moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, tomorrow we will move on to the Throne debate.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Youth summer employment programmes, statement by Mr. Davis	231
Tabling two documents re national tax reform, statement by Mr. McKeough	234
Introducing 31 civil servants from many parts of the world, Mr. Yaremko	235
Facilities at hospital school for retarded at Orillia, statement by Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence ..	236
Separate income tax for Ontario, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer	236
Agreement with Quebec's contention re capital gains tax, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis	238
Youth summer employment programme, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Young, Mr. Lewis	238
Teaching of religion in public schools, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Nixon	240
Correspondence with St. Catharines re taxation amounts paid to regional government, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis	240
Time table of alteration of facilities in Smiths Falls and Orillia, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Lewis, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Martel, Mr. Deans	240
Propositions put to OMA about fee schedule, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Ben, Mr. Peacock	241
Senior citizens receiving guaranteed income supplement and living in Ontario housing, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. B. Newman	243
Qualifying period for permanent teachers' certificates, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Pitman	243
Chain saw purchases for Highways dead elm removal, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Jackson	243
Provincial succession duty system, question to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Singer	244
Transfer of community planning branch to Treasury and Economics, question to Mr. McKeough, Mr. MacDonald	244
Using mentally retarded children for testing of vaccine, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. T. Reid	245
Taking over senior citizens' apartments in Toronto, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Trotter	245
ODC loans to fishermen made only on basis of economic viability, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Makarchuk	245
New grant system to assist municipal public transportation, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Deacon	245

Limiting upper speed capability of motor cars, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Young	246
Greenhouse industry and capital grants programme, question to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Paterson	246
Coping with venereal disease in Ontario, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Ferrier	246
Grants for trainable retarded students, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. T. Reid	247
Supervision in elementary schools to cut down drug abuse, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Deans	247
Regulations to license distribution of hearing aids, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Trotter	248
Presenting report, select committee re standing committees, Mrs. Pritchard	248
On notice of motion No. 1, continued, Mr. Grossman, Mr. Ben, Mr. Deans, Mr. Wells	253
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Farquhar, agreed to	281
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Davis, agreed to	281



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We have many guests with us today in the galleries. In the east gallery are students from Holy Family Separate School in Toronto; in both galleries from Danforth Technical School, Toronto. Later today we will have students from George Brown College here in Toronto; from Rosethorn Public School in Toronto, and from the Laurentian Senior Public School in Kitchener.

Statements by the ministry.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): So that is why the minister is here.

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, I am usually always here for prayers.

Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wish to announce changes in the regulations under The Department of Correctional Services Act, 1968. One of the significant changes provides for an extension of the authority of superintendents of correctional institutions to permit them to grant temporary absence from institutions of up to five days for humanitarian or other rehabilitative reasons.

The new regulations also provide for changes in the names of various adult correctional institutions, including the replacement of the terms "reformatory" and "industrial farm" with the term "correctional centre."

Under the temporary absence programme introduced by the department on August 26, 1969, superintendents were authorized to grant absences of up to three days to selected offenders. This type of absence has been utilized to permit men and women serving sentences in our institutions to go into the community for a variety of reasons.

For example, individuals have been permitted absences to go for job interviews, to arrange academic and/or vocational training programmes, and for numerous other reasons related to their rehabilitation.

One of the widest uses has been to permit individuals to return to their homes during a family crisis such as a serious illness, or a death in a person's immediate family. Authority to grant absences of up to three days was vested in superintendents primarily to ensure a flexible and immediate response to emergency situations. Empowering superintendents to grant absences of up to five days in length will facilitate distances. In the past, absences of longer than three days required the approval of the deputy minister.

Under the present amendment, absences of from six to 15 days, or a series of daily absences to permit a person to participate in a training and/or educational programme, or to work at gainful employment in the community during the day, will continue to require the approval of the deputy minister.

Approximately 98.5 per cent of those who have participated in the temporary absence programme during the past 17 months have done so successfully. Of a total of 2,245 participants in this period, only 32 have had their privileges revoked. The success of the programme has been due, in large measure, to the sound judgement of superintendents and their staff at institutions in the screening of applicants.

The terms "reformatory" and "industrial farm" do not reflect the wide variety of programmes provided in our correctional institutions today. Therefore these names are to be replaced by the term "correctional centre," which more appropriately describes our present programmes and facilities; for example, the institution formerly known as Monteith Industrial Farm will be called "Monteith Correctional Centre."

The department operates five training centres which provide academic and vocational training for young men 16 to 25 years of age. In the past there has been some confusion of these centres with training schools for juveniles. Therefore, to distinguish them from training schools, our training centres for young men will be known in future as "adult training centres". For example, the institution known formerly as the Ontario Training Centre, Brampton, will be known as the Brampton Adult Training Centre.

These changes in regulations will go into effect as of the date they are published in the *Ontario Gazette*.

Mr. Speaker, as this is my first statement in the House as minister of this department, I would like to conclude my remarks by informing the hon. members that since being appointed to this post I have travelled across a great deal of the province visiting various institutions. I met many staff members and held discussions with inmate councils and, through a series of conferences, I have met the superintendents of all our institutions. I also met many provincial judges at a recent judges' seminar.

I am impressed by the staff of my department at all levels. I realize that there is still much to be done in the field of corrections—that we must continue to move forward. I am confident that with the support of the dedicated team of correctional workers drawn together by my predecessor and colleague, the hon. Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman), my department will continue to consolidate the gains of recent years and to innovate programmes to meet the needs of tomorrow. I look forward to co-operating with all the hon. members and to keeping members informed of progress and new programmes within the correctional system.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Just tear down Millbrook.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): I hope the hon. minister is not going to follow the closed-door programme of his predecessor.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Pardon? Sorry, I did not hear the hon. member on that.

Mr. Pitman: Tear down Millbrook.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

NIAGARA REGION TAXATION

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier if he is still uncertain as to whether or not he will meet the delegation from the city of St. Catharines over the difficulties they are experiencing with regional government?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I have referred this matter to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales). If the matter is not resolved I have indicated that I would be quite prepared to meet with the mayor of St. Catharines.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: They are going to meet with the Minister of Municipal Affairs in the near future and if that is not satisfactory then the Premier is prepared to meet with them?

Mr. J. Renwick: The Leader of the Opposition got that right. That is what the Premier said. That is what the man said.

METRO TORONTO WELFARE BUDGET

Mr. Nixon: Question: Is the Prime Minister planning to meet with Metro Chairman Campbell with regard to his request for additional support on the welfare budget of Metropolitan Toronto which has been increased 50 per cent over last year?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Trudeau turned that down.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the Metro chairman had a singular lack of success with the federal administration. I do not know that he has requested an appointment with me. Certainly if he requests such an appointment I would be quite prepared to see him.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask further if the Premier would look with favour on his request to improve the contribution that this province makes toward the problem of welfare in the metropolitan area?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that we have not had a meeting with the chairman of Metro and in that he has not made any request of me at this point, I will not speculate as to what my reaction will be.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary: If, in fact, the Premier's reaction were positive would it not be possible—even without an agreement at the federal level—to make an additional contribution which would be met at a minimum of 50 per cent by the government of Canada, whether they agree with the need or not?

Mr. Speaker: Of course, this is an entirely theoretical question which does not form part of the question period. If the Prime Minister wishes to give an answer—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, just to amplify my first answer. The request has come in now for a meeting and a meeting with the Metro chairman is, at this moment, being arranged.

Mr. V. Singer (Downsview): Ho! That was quick information. Where did the Premier get that from—a carrier pigeon?

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Mr. Singer: What will they think of next?

Mr. Trotter: Assuming the Premier does meet with the Metro chairman—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the hon. member want us to meet with them?

Mr. Nixon: Sure we do.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Good.

Mr. Singer: We just like the Premier to be informed, that is all. Find out what is going on.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale has the floor for a supplementary.

Mr. Trotter: I have a supplementary of the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. Is there any possibility that the government will have a policy in order to assist any municipality—Metro Toronto or not—in order to assist them with the increasing welfare lists that they have? Has the Prime Minister any overall policies?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there has been no determination of any alteration in government policy as it relates to welfare benefits and there is nothing further that I can add at this moment.

Mr. Singer: Naturally.

FOREIGN OWNERSHIP OF LAND

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests: Did his department take part in the study, the results of which were announced yesterday, indicating that 92 per cent of the recreational lands in at least one township immediately north of Sault Ste. Marie is owned and controlled by foreign interests, and that the general average is 46 per cent in the Lake Superior area north of Sault Ste. Marie?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the study that the hon. member is referring to.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Did the minister not make a statement—I believe about six

months ago—that his department was undertaking a study of this type so that the government could be informed as to the extent to which our recreational lands had been lost to Canadian control?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I did have a committee within my own department to study the terms of—not the terms of reference—but what other jurisdictions were doing, what other provinces were doing in Canada and what other states were doing as to the disposal of their own land for cottage purposes.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): What is the minister talking about? British Columbia passed the bill last year as I pointed out to him.

Mr. Trotter: He does not know what he is doing.

Mr. Sopha: Six years ago.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The study indicated to us in a general manner the areas in the province where cottage land had been sold. It was a study in a very general area, but it did not go into specifics as to how much Crown land you are referring to in the Sault Ste. Marie area; this would be a very extensive study.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Was the member referring to Crown land or private land?

Mr. Nixon: The land is now owned privately. It was no doubt originally Crown land.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): So was the county of Brant.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The study that I had, Mr. Speaker, referred to Crown land.

Mr. Nixon: I think one of the few Canadian residents in that township is the former Attorney General.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could say—yes, my cottage is in the township of Fisher, and the lands there have been owned by the Americans since, I would think, about the turn of the century; purchased as lumbering property. Much of the share has been reacquired by Canadians and others, but that is a situation that has prevailed over the years and it is the same through other townships in that area.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You mean during the Hepburn regime, too?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would think during the Hepburn regime.

Mr. MacDonald: Interesting.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Lands and Forests tell us when the results of his study and survey can be seen by the members of the House?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This study, Mr. Speaker, was a study within our own department. As a result of that study, an announcement was made in the Throne Speech whereby cottage lands in the future would only be leased and Canadians would be given preference. We would be glad to send him a copy of the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: I do not need a copy of the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to see a copy of the study that is available to the minister. Surely, if that was the basis for the Throne Speech announcement, rather than the urging of opposition members, we should have the information that is available to him. Would he undertake to give it to us?

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough had a supplementary.

Mr. Pitman: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether it is a supplementary to the original question, but it is a supplementary based on the minister's reply. When will his department have information as to how one goes about leasing lands and forests land? Apparently at the present moment there is no way by which anyone can lease anything in the Province of Ontario from The Department of Lands and Forests.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, this information will be known in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. MacDonald: Next week's statement before the orders of the day.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will take his turn. The member for Scarborough West is next for a supplementary.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I am certain

I recollect accurately that the minister informed the House he was taking an inventory of recreational land holdings in certain parts of northern Ontario, and that he would share that inventory with us when it was completed.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I have just informed the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, that this study was completed and I would be pleased to make it available.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, I understood the minister's answer to suggest that it was a study of approximate or parallel legislation. As I recall it, it was a study of the nationality of recreational land holdings in northern Ontario and that he would share that with us and he indicated so in the House at the time.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, the study that I had undertaken was a study of the amount of Crown land that had been sold for cottage purposes to Canadians and to non-Canadians in the last 20 years and the percentage in those areas. It was sort of a general study and this information I will be pleased to make available.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview has a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: The minister would be pleased—sorry, he will make it available?

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is the minister yet able to tell us whether the leasing arrangements will involve leases of nine years or 99 years or 999 years and what the rates of rental are going to be?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: As I just indicated, Mr. Speaker, in the very near future this information will be available.

Mr. Singer: Yes, yes.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, in view of the loss of private recreational land to non-resident ownership as well as Crown land, is the minister prepared finally to do a major inventory of what is left to Ontario by way of our own ownership and release that to the House, on the basis of which policy can be made?

Mr. Sopha: It is too late.

Mr. Lewis: The government is losing most of northern Ontario.

Mr. Trotter: It is a giveaway programme.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any jurisdiction in the world where private land is interfered with. At the present time, in 1971, we have more land in Ontario in public ownership than at any time previously. We have close to 200,000 acres more now than we had in 1961.

Mr. Trotter: And we have more foreign-owned land, too.

QUETICO PARK

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question of the Minister of Lands and Forests. Will he comment on the statements made to the advisory committee on Quetico Park, that there is in fact only one game warden supervising the provincial regulations in that area—I think he calls them conservation officers—is the minister satisfied with the policing of government game regulations in Quetico Park?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, we have increased the number of conservation officers in the province. A year ago we also increased the aerial detections in addition to our own planes, and I am not aware of any problems in Quetico. If the member can bring to my attention specific areas I would be pleased to look into it.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question, really in response to the minister's comment: Is he not aware that the charge was made before the advisory committee on Quetico that the park is—I think the word used was a "mess," because of lack of supervision? If he is not aware of that perhaps he would look into it and give us some further information.

A supplementary question associated with this same matter: Can the minister assure the House that the ban on logging and lumbering operations in a part of the park, which he announced some months ago, is in fact a permanent ban, and not just a holding order?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that public hearings are held—for instance, today in Thunder Bay; they will be in Toronto next week, April 14 and 15. This advisory committee will be reporting some time this year and I am very optimistic that this whole matter of Quetico will be resolved within the next few months. As I indicated in the House two months ago, in the northwestern area of the park, under volume agreements,

there is a moratorium. The only area that is logged at the present time—there was a bit of logging, but none now; all logging has ceased until next fall; there is no logging going on during the summer months—is somewhere less than one per cent. I believe 15,000 to 18,000 cords were cut during the past winter.

Mr. Nixon: One final question then, Mr. Speaker, really for clarification: Am I to understand then that the area which is covered by what the minister calls a moratorium, is simply something to hold the situation until the review of the committee, or is it a permanent moratorium?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this is more or less a permanent moratorium.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brantford has a supplementary?

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): On the same question, can the minister indicate who the government officials are who are using government airplanes to fly into the park and establish structures?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No. I would like to get that information. I would be pleased to look into it.

JUG MILK COMPANIES

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. Is he undertaking any further investigation on the operation of jug milk stores, particularly in light of the rather expensive practice of confiscating the manager's deposits without any right of a hearing or appeal?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have no investigation that I am aware of going on at the moment, Mr. Speaker. I carried on some investigation when I was in The Department of Justice. As far as I am aware we have no complaint on this matter before us. That may be the case. If it is so I will check and see, but there is no general investigation going on.

Mr. Nixon: A further question, Mr. Speaker. Was there not an investigation undertaken—

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary?

Mr. Nixon: —a supplementary—undertaken by the minister's predecessor in the matters

concerning franchises? Was it not begun under that committee?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We have a committee on the studying of franchises which has made an interim report recently and I met with that committee—that is, on the general question of franchises. We have that study going on and I expect the final report from that committee before the end of this month.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary—

Mr. Nixon: On a point of clarification, will the minister undertake to review this situation that I have put before him?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, most certainly.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth has a supplementary?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, is the minister not aware that I asked for a study of this particular matter some nine months ago by the previous minister and that it was referred by him to the franchise committee, and that the study obviously is inadequate if the minister does not know anything about it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would listen, I just said—

Mr. Deans: I am listening; he knows nothing about it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —that I am aware there is a committee studying franchises and they have reported to me once. I have met with them; they have given an interim report. They have promised their final report before the end of this month. It is too bad I have to be repetitive, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: Well, it is too bad that I have to be repetitive. By way of a supplementary question, is the minister not aware that an investigation was asked for in this House of the operations of the Becker Milk Company as a result of their withholding managers' deposits? And is he not aware that the previous minister sloughed it off?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any such thing. I do not pretend to be aware of every question the hon. member asks or demands, but I do know that there is a committee on franchises, which has been working, which has been studying, which has reported and, if I may repeat again, Mr. Speaker, will make a final report before the end of this month.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Parkdale has a supplementary?

Mr. Trotter: I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the minister would table a copy of the interim report of that committee on franchises?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will not undertake to do that, Mr. Speaker, at this moment. Such reports are generally for the use of the department for framing its policy—

Mr. MacDonald: Why?

Mr. Lewis: Why?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will not undertake to do that at this moment. It may be possible—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If the members want to get my answer, there may be information in such reports that is not for the use of the House but for the use of the department. I will have to judge that when I get the report.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

GASOLINE PRICE INCREASES

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Prime Minister in this instance: In view of the indications from the presidents of Imperial Oil, Gulf Oil and Shell Canada that gasoline prices are likely to rise in the immediate future, has the government requested a justification for the price hike which the consumer will pay?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I noticed that report in the press. The government has not requested a justification from those three firms of the possible increase in price.

Mr. Lewis: Such precision! May I ask the Prime Minister a supplementary question?

Does not the Prime Minister feel that in the public interest these companies should be brought before the Ontario Energy Board or at least a committee of the Legislature and requested to legitimize their increases?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I say, I have read this in the report. I am not prepared to suggest that they should go before the Energy Board. Quite frankly, I am not sure the Energy Board's area of jurisdiction would include this, and I do not anticipate

that the standing committee related to certain matters of this House would necessarily be involved with this discussion.

Mr. Nixon: But they could be and should be.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not know that they should be.

Mr. Lewis: Why not? Does the Prime Minister not want those committees to have the autonomy he implied?

Mr. J. Renwick: It is energy, is it not?

Mr. Lewis: Would the Premier indicate whether there will be any special effort to cope with the very sharp anticipated rises in northern Ontario, which are always disproportionate, as some of his colleagues recently pointed out, and which will be felt in this instance?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways and Transport (Mr. MacNaughton)—the new Minister of Transportation and Communications to be—indicated that there is a study under way within his department as it relates to the cost of goods in and out of the north.

Mr. MacDonald: Tra-la, tra-la, that has been going on for 50 years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is there.

IMPORTS OF ALBERTAN OIL

Mr. Lewis: The minister when he was provincial Treasurer refused to tell us of his conversations with Imperial Oil at a previous time.

May I ask the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, has the government of Ontario been consulted in the National Board's report that imports of Albertan oil will be restricted in the case of the Province of Ontario?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): I think, Mr. Speaker, that question would be more appropriately referred to the Minister of Mines under whose jurisdiction matters of energy are now lodged.

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Mines: Has the Province of Ontario been consulted in the proposal put forward by the National Energy Board that imports of oil from Alberta into Ontario would be decreased substantially?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question by the leader of the New Democratic Party, to my knowledge—and I have not been in touch with the Energy Board—I know nothing about this request at all. I would be glad to find out and report back to him.

Mr. Lewis: Some interest should be taken in matters of energy.

Mr. J. Renwick: You will find the National Energy Board in Ottawa—

PUBLIC TRANSIT POLICY

Mr. Lewis: When it is not in Fort Frances.

May I ask another question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker? When can the Premier give some indication of government policy on public transit in view of the efforts to extend the Scarborough Expressway, now that we have dealt with the Spadina Expressway for the moment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there were references, of course, to public transit in the Throne Speech. It was also indicated in the Throne Speech the budget would be coming down on April 26, if memory serves me correctly, I expect there will be more elaboration on that particular situation at that time.

Mr. Lewis: That is all, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the member object?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

MONITORING STATIONS FOR AIR POLLUTION

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management: Will the minister consider setting up more monitoring stations in the Windsor area so that the air pollution index may be recorded for pollution coming from the industrial complex on the east side of town, rather than the monitors as they are now, recording pollution from the United States?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, that is where we assume most of it is coming from. The present location of the monitoring station on University Avenue was indicated to give the most accurate reading for the index as far

as this whole city is concerned. It is quite possible that we will extend that monitoring service and add further stations to our index, as we intend to do in Sudbury, but in the meantime we are trying to include other cities in the index. We can only do so much at once.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary: Is the minister aware that the monitoring station on the unemployment insurance office building, because of the prevailing westerlies, does not give a true recording of Windsor pollution but really records a pollution coming in from the United States, and the setting up of a monitor in the east part of the city, where the heavy industry is located, would give a more accurate picture and at the same time would be able to test the effectiveness of controls that are being presently implemented on the part of Ford Motor Company, Chrysler Manufacturing, Hiram Walkers, Dominion Forge and so on?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there are now two stations in operation in Windsor—one at University Avenue and one located at the Morton dock just south of Windsor. These are, of course, fed into the index system to give an accurate reading. Now the hon. member requests that we establish stations in the more heavily industrial area. I might say, first of all, that we do have monitoring stations in the area of the Ford Motor Company and Chrysler plants. These stations are not included in the index but they are used, as the hon. member indicates, to judge whether or not these industries are complying with our orders under The Air Pollution Control Act. It is quite possible that by having these particular stations, which are close to these industries, in the index, you would not get a fair median reading of the atmospheric conditions over the whole city.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that the locations of the two stations today are on the west side of the city and because of prevailing westerlies they do not record anything on the east side of the community, and only record it on days on which the wind blows from the east?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member has a rather incorrect impression or idea of what the air pollution index is intended to do. We are not attempting to measure winds or any pollution that may be carried by prevailing winds. We are attempting to measure the condition over the city

under certain atmospheric conditions and particularly when there are inversions. As the hon. member will recall, the more serious situations when we get the higher index readings, were days when there were no winds. There were no prevailing winds of any kind when there was stagnation, and this is when we get an accurate reading of the condition over a particular city.

Mr. B. Newman: Another supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: This will be the last supplementary.

Mr. B. Newman: Is the minister aware that when the pollution index records 20 on his two present monitors in the area of a heavy industry, it could be 60 or 80, so we definitely are not getting a true reading?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

ORCHARD HOUSE CONTRACTS

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Public Works. In the matter of the demolition of Orchard House at the Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital, did the highest bidder, C. S. Wark, who bid \$89,000 receive the contract, and did they subsequently sublet their sub-contract for work to the lowest bidder, Apex, who bid \$50,000, and if so, what happens to the \$39,000?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, from memory, as I recall there were five bids—four or five bids. The low bidder did not cover all the requirements of the bid, including, I think, some of the filling of the excavations with grass or sodding. The lowest bidder who conformed to the tender call was Wark, and its tender, I believe, was \$83,000.

Mr. Deans: The highest bidder.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The highest tender—this was the cost of taking it down. They were not paying us anything. We had no bid in which anybody offered us money for the building. This was the charge to us and the other two bids were from, I think, Toronto firms, and they were in the order of \$110,000 to \$115,000.

Mr. Deans: Might I ask the minister by way of a supplementary question, is it true that Wark subsequently sub-contracted the work to Apex, who bid \$50,000 in the initial bid?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid I cannot answer that question, Mr. Speaker, because I think it was last week that the contract was signed, but—

Mr. Deans: April 2.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —I can find out and let the hon. member know.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Agriculture and Food has the answer to a question asked yesterday.

POSSIBLE AID FOR GREENHOUSE INDUSTRY

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to provide the answer to the hon. member for Essex South, whose question I took as notice yesterday. Capital grants are available to the greenhouse operators, including those who produce flowers in greenhouses. On the question concerning the application of retail sales tax, it is dealt with the same as it is in the purchase of any other building material. The sales tax does apply to their particular purchases.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is the minister experiencing any difficulty in trying to determine whether the flower producers are in fact a part of agriculture, or are they considered as industry for other purposes in this province; and can any direction be given in this regard in relation to matters affecting not only sales tax but The Department of Labour?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Any questions pertaining to The Department of Labour, I think, more properly might be addressed to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Carton), Mr. Speaker. But as far as our department is concerned, we look upon the production of flowers as an agricultural activity in that it involves the use of soil and, as all crops do, the use of sun and air and water in proper amounts.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex-Kent.

NUTRIENT REMOVAL PROGRAMME

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Has the minister got any plans to assist municipalities in installing new equipment to take phosphate out of their sewage in order for them to meet the deadline he has set up?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, it is hoped that our programme of assistance—as far as nutrient removal is concerned—as indicated in yesterday's news releases, will be implemented in time for the municipalities to meet deadlines as laid down by the IJC. There has been no decision on that. I have been meeting and having discussions with the federal Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Davis, who has indicated that he is prepared to accept the IJC recommendations and to assist the Ontario government and its municipalities in meeting these deadlines, and until those talks are concluded, I really cannot say anything definite to the hon. member.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Family—

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview has the floor.

SCHOOL FEES INCREASE

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Welch), but since the matter to which I refer may well have taken place under the former Minister of Education, I would like to ask the question of the hon. Prime Minister. Is it true that The Department of Education approved an increase of fees for the DeVry Institute of Technology on 970 Lawrence Avenue West from \$350 to \$400 a quarter? What was the justification for this increase and is this a general increase across the province in institutes of this kind?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I must confess I did not hear the name of the institution.

Mr. Young: DeVry Institute of Technology on Lawrence Avenue.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am just guessing that this is a private trade school and the question of whether the fee increase is subject to the trade school regulations is doubtful. I will ask the Minister of Education to get the specific information, but I think we will find that this is not within the purview—the determination of the amount of fee—of The Department of Education. It is a private trade school, upon which there are no grants payable, the only supervision being that of bonding to make sure that the students who pay fees receive

the courses, and so forth. I do not think we are involved in fee structures.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary: Perhaps the Prime Minister is not aware that the letter which went out announcing that increase said, and I quote: "This increase has been approved by The Department of Education authorities."

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot take responsibility for what an institution may say. As I say, this is a private trade school. I will find out for the hon. member whether fee increases or fee determination is subject to the approval of the department. I will have the Minister of Education let the hon. member know.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Highways and Transport has the reply to a question asked by the member for Yorkview.

SPEED GOVERNORS FOR AUTOMOBILES

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can report back to the hon. member that the province has agreed with the federal government that the responsibility for safety in cars at the point of manufacture or import is the proper responsibility of the federal government. It is assumed by the Minister of Transport for Canada.

I would advise the hon. member that my predecessor has made representation to the federal Minister of Transport for Canada that consideration be given to the matter that he expressed concern about yesterday.

Mr. Young: A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker: May I ask the hon. minister is it not true that the provincial authorities set the speed limits on the highway? I suppose this is a mechanical thing rather than simply a speed limit. The two are interrelated.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There is an interrelation, of course, to the extent that speed limits are, in fact, set by the provincial government, The Department of Transport. This is quite correct. The other, however, relates to matters concerning the manufacture of automobiles. As I have stated, that is, in initial terms, the responsibility of the federal government. However, as I say, my predecessor has made representation to the federal Minister of Transport in this respect.

Mr. Young: Is this not a method of enforcing the speed limit?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Right!

Mr. Speaker: Member for—a supplementary?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Does this responsibility of the federal government also include children's car seats? If so, will the minister not be able to take any action on the request from the consumers' association that standards be set up?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, is the member talking about the portable car seats that go into an automobile? I do not know that these are manufactured by the automobile manufacturers. I rather doubt that they are.

Mr. Shulman: Ford and General Motors.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Probably, probably. It could be taken up in the manner that the hon. member suggested. I will be happy to pursue that for him.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

SALE TAX LOSSES

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A question of the Minister of Revenue: Is the minister aware that substantial sales tax revenue is now being lost on the sale of securities by Ontario residents when they deal with brokers outside the province?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, in responding to that statement, I must say that I am aware of it. A change in the policy was recently made so that Ontario security dealers would not be in the position of losing transactions simply on account of the tax.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a promising maiden speech.

Mr. Deacon: I have a supplementary to that. Is the proposed legislation going to put the responsibility for payment of tax on the seller of the security as well as on the broker so that the tax will be collected by the province?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will have to take that part of the question as notice because the original question was different from the supplementary. I shall inform the member accordingly.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Hamilton Mountain.

USE OF PARK FACILITIES

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, a question of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management: Can the minister inform the members of this House as to when the general public might be able to use the newly acquired facilities at Fifty-Point Park?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: This summer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: After they have got something; it took the government what, 15 years after it started?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Highways and Transport—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: This summer.

Mr. Speaker:—has an answer to the question asked by the member for Huron-Bruce.

DEAD ELM REMOVAL PROGRAMME

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This is in response to a supplementary question asked by the hon. member yesterday. As I recall, he asked what the price difference was, or the difference in quotations on German-made and Canadian-made chain saws. Am I correct?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Sorry, I did not hear the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The price varies in accordance with the size of the saw. The price for a German-made 16-inch saw was \$209. The price for a Canadian-made 16-inch saw was \$236. The price for a Canadian counterpart 16-inch saw was \$236. The German saw was \$209; the Canadian-made saw \$236.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): About \$30 difference in price.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The price of a German-made 24-inch saw was \$223, and the Canadian 24-inch saw was \$244.

As I pointed out to the hon. member yesterday, Mr. Speaker, quotations were obtained on a local basis and the prices vary slightly, as can be expected, by a few dollars, depending on location.

It was necessary, I think, to take into account the matter of servicing these saws;

and we also felt that it was desirable to buy the saws locally in the areas where the elms were being cut. To this point in time, Mr. Speaker, we have had no complaints from any of the sellers.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary.

Mr. Gaunt: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister, just as a matter of interest, were these saws purchased through central purchasing?

An hon. member: That is interesting.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, Mr. Speaker. Time and circumstances did not permit us to go through that routine for the few saws that are involved. I suggest to the hon. member they were purchased locally and the local merchants really liked the business.

Mr. MacDonald: In other words, the minister is opposed to central purchasing?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The member for Huron-Bruce has another supplementary.

Mr. Gaunt: A supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister think it would be a good idea to give a 10- to 15-per cent price advantage to products made in this country over and above those of foreign make, as they do in Quebec province, for instance?

An hon. member: Yes; we think we should.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is an expression of opinion that I do not care to make.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has the floor for a supplementary.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Does the minister find that going through central purchasing takes an inordinate length of time under all circumstances?

Mr. Speaker: This is not supplementary to the original question. The member for Hamilton East has a supplementary?

Mr. Shulman: Is it not supplementary to his answer?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It was not what I had in mind.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): My supplementary question to the minister is: Is the minister not aware that the previous Minister of Trade and Development established Canadian guidelines and he did permit a percentage mark-down for goods made in Ontario of good quality and price?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I must say, Mr. Speaker, I never thought we would get into the wide-ranging debate we are in today over the purchase of some chain saws to get on with an emergency programme to provide employment.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deans: Answer the question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: There might be a couple of hundred more people working in Peterborough.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I really do not know how to respond to the hon. member's question. I did make a comment yesterday—probably a superfluous one at that, Mr. Speaker—but I think the former Minister of Trade and Development would have said that "trade is a two-way street." If we buy something from Germany, they will be more inclined to buy something from us.

An hon. member: Say yes or no.

Mr. Gisborn: It takes a lot of thinking.

Mr. Deans: That pay cheque—

Mr. Sopha: Where is he now?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He is still around.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Lewis: As soon as those loans came out, the former Minister of Trade and Development went into the hotel business.

\$40 MILLION SEWAGE PROGRAMME

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management regarding yesterday's announcement of the \$40-million programme to install facilities capable of removing a minimum of 80 per cent of phosphorus from sewage at municipal and institutional treatment plants throughout the province. If municipal sewage were recycled as organic fertilizer, would the only reason

for this \$40 million expenditure then be the fact that phosphates have not been removed from detergents?

An hon. member: Wake up, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I think I understand the hon. member's question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: He is asking if the government is subsidizing the detergent companies by \$40 million.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Why does he not answer it then?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Hon members opposite must have caucused this question!

Mr. Speaker, I think that if the recycling of sewage was not effective, as the hon. member indicates, we would still have to make this expenditure because the expenditure is, for the most part—as the information indicates—for nutrient removal only. It is only for nutrient removal and it is an extra expense based on a minimum of 80 per cent removal of phosphorus.

Mr. Burr: A supplementary question: Apart from the human sewage and the phosphates from detergents, what other phosphates would there be to be removed at the sewage plant?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Outside of the possibility of agricultural runoff getting into the sewage system in some way, none.

Mr. Burr: It boils down to the question—

An hon. member: It does not boil down.

Mr. Burr: If it can be boiled down, the question is: Is the minister abandoning his programme to remove phosphates from detergents?

Mr. T. Reid: It boils up.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, Mr. Speaker—this of course is a federal regulation. The maximum amount now is 20 per cent, and we hope that that will be down to nil by 1972.

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, does this mean the minister is abandoning his plans to recycle sewage as organic fertilizer?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I did not hear the first part of it.

Mr. Burr: Is the minister abandoning his plans to recycle human sewage as organic fertilizer?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We are not abandoning our plans. That programme is still in the experimental stage. We are still involved in research and in trying to perfect it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Citizenship and Provincial Secretary has the answer to a question asked by the member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Okay, tell us all about it. Remember I thought of the idea first.

PLASTIC CONTAINERS FOR ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Just wait, maybe the hon. member did not want that to happen.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Sudbury asked the question the other day:

I should like to ask the Provincial Secretary if my understanding is correct that the Liquor Control Board is actually studying the feasibility of dispensing alcoholic beverages in plastic containers in order to decrease the pollution potential of the landscape by the bottles they presently use?

The answer is in three parts.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Yes, no or maybe.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: With respect to beer, the answer is no, because the Brewers' Warehousing Company, operating on behalf of all the breweries of Ontario, has a 96 per cent return on its beer bottles.

Wine: No. However, the wine industry is continually researching to find alternative types of containers. One Ontario winery is presently using a clear plastic bottle for a Canadian sherry.

Mr. Sopha: Right.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Spirits: No. However—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: However, the LCBO is co-operating with the government, and particularly with the litter control council of Ontario, chaired by the Deputy Minister of Energy and Resources Management; a senior representative is sent to each of their meetings. Canadian distillers are keenly interested in the future of plastic containers.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Nipissing have a question?

REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ALGONQUIN PARK

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister received a report from his advisory committee on Algonquin Park, and if so when will he table the report and will he comment on the content of the report?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I have received an interim report and my understanding is that this matter will be discussed at their next meeting, which I believe is April 15.

Is this correct? Is the next meeting of the advisory committee on April 15?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I asked the minister if he had received the report from the committee.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, I have received the report.

Mr. R. S. Smith: And is it his intention to table it in the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, that decision has not yet been made.

Mr. Singer: Decisive, pertinent—

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has now expired, and I think that the Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship has some very distinguished visitors whom he wishes to introduce to the members of the House.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I would draw to the attention of the hon. members of the House that in Mr. Speaker's gallery there is a very distinguished parliamentary delegation from Italy. In visiting Canada they are today the guests of the government of the Province of Ontario and of the capital city of Toronto, and I only wish that I had the time to tell you the details of the contribution that these dozen distinguished personages have given to the political and public life of Italy.

Earlier at a luncheon today one of the leaders of the delegation told us of the very high regard that the people of Italy have for Canada, not only because of so many of their kin being in Canada, but because of the very close relationship that has grown in the past decade.

I would like to read into the record the names of the distinguished government.

Senator Antonio Pecoraro, one of the leaders of the delegation; the hon. Giuseppe Fracassi, a co-leader with the delegation; Senator Luigi Anderlini; Senator Vittorio Naldini; Senator Michele Zuccala; the hon. Giacomo Bologna; the hon. Vittore Catella; the hon. Claudio Clanca, the hon. Lorenzo Isgro; the hon. Bruno Corti; the hon. Sebastiano Vincelli; and, as I said to them earlier, Mr. Speaker: Anche per noi è un piacere di darVi il benvenuto nella nostra grande provincia dell Ontario.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, it certainly is, on behalf of my riding, a pleasure to welcome the Italian parliamentary delegation to this country. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I probably have the largest riding of Canadians of Italian descent and of Canadians who are immigrants from Italy in Canada.

I would like, as the first Canadian of Italian descent to sit in this House, to welcome them to Ontario and to Canada: Benvenuti, Parlamentari italiani. Speriamo, che la Loro venuta qui sarà molto felice.

Mr. Lewis: Given the—

Mr. Gaunt: The hon. member cannot speak Italian.

Mr. Lewis: In a moment. Given the profusion of political parties in the Italian legislature, the distinguished parliamentarians will know, of course, that there would inevitably be an additional party here, and we too extend our warm greetings. I know, alas, only one phrase in Italian with which I have been schooled: Votate per il candidato socialista democratico.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. De Monte: I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker—not in a debate with my friend, the leader of the New Democratic Party—but I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Bologna is sitting in the gallery. He is the member for the area from which my mother and father came from many years ago.

I would like to specifically welcome Mr. Bologna, the member for Venezia Giulia, the member for the Friulano language and people in Italy, and I would specifically like to say that he is a Liberal. We had a long talk at the dinner we had this afternoon, and it certainly is a pleasure to talk to a fellow Liberal from the Parliament of Italy.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence presented the annual report of the inspector of legal offices for the year ending December 31, 1970.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Sir, if I may say to you, the report is not yet available from the printers, but as soon as it is it will be distributed.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): A bit premature is it not?

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves the procedural affairs committee consider the possibility of the House not sitting on Wednesdays to permit the use of the full day for meetings of standing committees and make its recommendation to the House with all convenient dispatch.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

LANDLORD AND TENANT ACT

Mr. T. Reid moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Landlord and Tenant Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to prohibit landlords of residential premises shutting off the supply of electricity to their tenants.

PUBLIC UTILITIES ACT

Mr. T. Reid moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to add to the Act the provision that a corporation supplying electrical power cannot permit a landlord to shut off the supply of electrical power to residential premises occupied by a tenant.

LANDLORD AND TENANT ACT

Mr. Deans moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act to amend The Landlord and Tenant Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is for an amendment to provide for a standard form of lease, and the amendment also provides for a rental review board with power to determine the amount of rent in individual cases where an increase is demanded.

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

Mr. Deans moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to require that drugs and medicines be sold only in childproof drug containers.

ADMINISTRATION OF MEDICINE IN SCHOOLS

Mr. Ben moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act to control the administration of medicine in schools.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to control the giving of medicine to children in schools. The bill requires that certain conditions precedent be met before a pupil is given medicine in a school and requires that a record of the giving of medicine be kept in each school. The bill also provides for control of experimental drug programmes in schools and requires a public hearing before such a programme is commenced.

REGULATION OF DRIVER TRAINING SCHOOLS

Mr. Burr moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act to provide for the regulation of driver training schools.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide for the regulation of the driving school industry in order to improve

service to the public. Provision is made for the registration of operators of driving schools and the licensing of driving instructors. Provision is also made for the setting of minimum standards for such schools, the instructors and the instruction given.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day I would like to advise the House, and particularly the member for Downsview, that I have now had Bill 8 introduced by him checked, and I am advised that the new standing order 86 has cleared this problem. While there are two sections of the bill in question which would cause indirectly the expenditure of public funds, they do not specifically direct the allocation of funds; therefore I must conclude that, under the provisions of the new standing order, this is not a money bill.

I would also like to give the members advance notice of Mr. Speaker's dinner. This year we started rather late and the normal time in March, of course, is past, and April is well on its way, and I would ask that the members, and members of the press gallery and those whom Mr. Speaker normally expects to attend will reserve Wednesday evening, May 19, for Mr. Speaker's dinner. In due course invitations will be issued.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I begin this Throne Speech entry perhaps in rather unorthodox fashion, by introducing a visitor in the Legislature who is relatively close to the leader of the New Democratic Party. I hesitate to invoke the dynastic spectre in the full light of the Ontario Legislature, but I would like to introduce the federal member for York South, the deputy leader of the New Democratic Party federally, Mr. David Lewis.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Is the member his campaign manager?

Mr. Lewis: Well, I have stayed rather carefully away from involvement in the federal leadership campaign.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Laxer does not think so.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): That is setting a precedent for the leadership campaign.

Mr. Lewis: I repeat: I have stayed rather carefully away from involvement in the federal leadership campaign. I have indicated only those whom I do not support. That encompasses all save one.

I am very pleased to be in the Legislature at this moment. There have of course been, as the young new Premier (Mr. Davis) opposite knows, many memorable moments over the last few months. I recall, as he must recall, that night in mid-February when he ascended to the throne. Some in his party are wont to recollect aspects of that evening which are not as congenial; but the moment that sits best with me is when the former Premier (Mr. Robarts) turned to the microphone and said, if I have it correctly, "Willie, my boy, the best to you."

And I thought, what a stirring of reassurance swept through Ontario as the family compact was asserted yet again to give us that sense of enviable continuity. Ashen-faced and drawn though the Premier might have been on that occasion—nonetheless it did signal just how strongly the crown prince was accepted into the bosom of the family.

It is very hard to imagine, for instance, that the former Premier would have greeted the victory of the current Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) with the words "Bertie, my boy" or the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) as "Bobby." He might have said "D'Arce." Had the present Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) won, on the other hand, he would have announced to the delegates that Mr. Lawrence was the new Premier.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It might have sounded better too.

Mr. Lewis: It is a different Premier today, is it not? A little more sartorial elegance, I may say, in the latter weeks, Mr. Premier, chaperoned as he is by Arthur Harnett and under contract to Alan Eagleson, and programmed by Martin Goldfarb—quite a life he leads as a politician and as a Premier. Not that he is—

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): The hon. member left out my wife.

Mr. Lewis: I am going to get to that. Not that he is undergoing any discernible change, mind you. Both of us have our image

problems. I should not be self-righteous about it, but in reference to his observation I was going to say that surely there are limits. What right has Alan Eagleson to comment on the length of Kathy's skirts? I want to tell you something: She is the first lady of this province at this time and Alan should be told to confine his aesthetic observations to hockey, which would be vastly more appropriate.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: You mean Bobby Orr's hair?

Mr. Lewis: He does better in that regard. I could not help recalling those insightful quotations of John Zaritsky, unfailingly accurate, alas, in what he writes in the paper from time to time, when he reported that lengthy analysis of the Tory party and said:

Helping Mr. Davis and his ministers decide what to say will be the results of a poll now being taken by Martin Goldfarb Consultants of Toronto. Mr. Goldfarb, whose previous accounts have included a major auto company, a razor blade manufacturer and the federal Liberal Party, says his in-depth research polls will help Mr. Davis find out how to handle the issues. It will show him whether the issues are the result of communication problems or legitimate divergent opinions within Ontario.

The Premier therefore joins the illustrious company of all the other politicians who have turned to democratic sources for their policy formation. One can see Tory commercials with the Premier shaving with a Wilkinson blade, or perhaps—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are they made here?

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, they may be made here. But I do not want to confine this discussion. As the Premier knows, being a man of great observation, there is a third party in the Legislature. That party has no image problem—as Frank Scott said of William Lyon Mackenzie King—"He had no sides because he never took shape, and he had no shape because he never took sides." So it is fairly easy therefore to quote Trent Frayne about the enigma party—I think he called them the Liberals in an off moment—that they too have this problem. He said in his article on January 16:

For a fact, though, there is another party—

This is the enigma party, the Liberal Party.

—which has made a career since the Second World War of organizing governments in Ottawa and wakes in Ontario. Confronting them is an almost ludicrous paradox. In nine federal elections since 1945, the Liberals have been the leading vote-getting party in Ontario six times. In eight provincial elections since 1943 they have only acquired more than 35 per cent of the vote and obviously have never led.

But that is not to say—with a great friendship for my colleague in the Liberal Party, who was equally charitable to me—that they are not trying, and perhaps the definition will take shape along the way. I thought I should put it on the record just to share with the House because it is rather useful.

The various comments from the current Liberal handbook, with which they will fight the next provincial election, cow us all into submission. On page 36 of this handbook is the heading “Local Policy and the Provincial Campaign.” Liberal candidates are told:

There are times when we may want to play down some of the stands the leader and the party have taken. For example, in your area our separate school policy may be unpopular.

Well, I am glad that Father Matthews came into the Legislature just to note that—well, it is nice to feel fairly flexible. On page 38 of the same handbook they stress the importance of being flexible in these words:

Flexibility is vital. Our policies are not equally popular everywhere. Before the election is called, the candidates should visit local plants and have little chats with the managers. But when the campaign is under way, make a tour of the plant in company with a worker, not a manager. During the active parts of the campaign when you visit industry you will want to be identified with the working man.

A very prescient party.

“A candidate not at your best on a platform”—ah, there will be many of those should arrive just before it is his or her turn to speak and then leave for another meeting. In extreme cases you can be represented by someone else. Take your committee’s advice on this matter.

the manual advises.

Then—I suppose this came directly from the leader of the party; it smacks of his bon vivant attitude—it says:

There are all manner of gimmicks designed to attract attention to the candidate

and to breed stories about him. Perhaps he can shoe a horse, or kiss a baby, and thereby earn some publicity. Publicity is good, but not at the price of credibility. A candidate looks best when he is doing what comes naturally.

Like shoeing a horse, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: I will just conclude this with a little epilogue.

The use or misuse of television can decide the result of an election perhaps more than any other aspect of the campaign. Candidates must be assessed frankly. They fall into three categories: the dominant persuasive, the benign moderate and the avoidance type. The latter must avoid television at all costs. There are many in every campaign and they must—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Very good advice.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: The member for Renfrew South should not feel self-conscious; this is a Liberal manual.

There are many in every campaign and they must be steered away from most forms of television at all costs. He is likely unattractive-looking and next to hopeless on the public platform.

Well, that is an inspired résumé of the Liberal Party. With that I terminate that portion of my remarks.

Mr. Singer: Would the hon. member give us a few words of Steven Penner? Tell us about Penner—

Mr. Lewis: I did not want to drag out a file I have, and I will not be provoked.

Mr. Singer: —and how many times he tried to get in.

Mr. Lewis: In the last many months, Mr. Speaker—particularly for that period, I guess it was mid-December to mid-February—there was more life in that desultory government over there than one has seen for a quite considerable period of time—a lot more animation. Dare I say it, even cabinet solidarity was breached and the true affection with which each of the colleagues viewed one another was displayed from time to time. However, I do not intend to recall those words to the Premier’s mind; he would not expect that of me.

There were more vigorous pronouncements—some real, some absurd—for the last 28 years. Especially for four of the contenders—four of the contenders, minus Mr. Pharand.

You may recall, Mr. Premier, that someone suggested that education costs should be cut to 33 per cent of the budget; that all logging in Quetico be banned; that everyone believed in the recycling of wastes in Ontario; that the Ontario Savings Office was to become a full loan and trust company; that the Ontario Northland Railway would provide idyllic transportation possibilities for everyone in the north; that commodity costs for all products in the north would be equalled with the south, even if the south had to pay more—that certainly smacked of realism! That drugs and paramedical services would be included in health care costs; that there be complete disclosure of campaign funds—I did not notice that in the Throne Speech, but one of the nobles opposite suggested it.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): It is strange that not one of them is here.

Mr. Lewis: They agreed that there was “waste and fat in education”. The Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) said on January 26 in an apoplectic moment—he had many apoplectic moments—at one point in the campaign he lost control of himself altogether, said—and I quote—“the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party has not a divine right to go on governing, and if we think we can do business from the same old stand as in the past”—forgive me for mentioning this—“we are going to wake up and find the NDP doing it for us.” A very prescient insight on the part of the present provincial Treasurer.

So it went, with a variety of model programmes and useful disclosures. Only one of the major candidates, Mr. Speaker, managed to avoid commitment on almost any single issue at any point during the campaign. It will not astonish anyone in this Legislature to learn that he emerged victorious.

True to the traditions throughout; the traditions of longevity, passivity and immobility which characterized the Tory party for the considerable period to time prior to the present moment; despite all the storm clouds—and the Premier will admit there were a few—the party decided not to be half safe; and their caution has not gone unrewarded.

The Tory party and its momentary enthusiasms have been expertly dampened. Since the Premier took office there has been a period of listlessness, almost despondency.

This rather surprises me a little; I thought there would be more verve.

As I recall, until the Legislature reconvened there were only three major policy pronouncements. One was to create 8,000 jobs. The next was the announcement by the Minister of University Affairs around post graduate students, which Harold Greer called a “palpable misfire.” The third was Dow Chemical, about which there will be much debate in this Legislature; I will not belabour it right at this moment. Beyond that everything was focussed on the Throne Speech, the document which would unveil to Ontario the inspirations of government.

I do not know who wrote the Throne Speech. I suppose if others had written it, it might have been a document of a little greater life. The Attorney General I gather, before he does anything Mr. Speaker, goes through a particular ritual. When his profile was released during the campaign by Sheilagh O’Connor, his campaign press secretary, it said:

The first move Allan Lawrence made to get into the Ontario leadership campaign was totally typical of the man. He went to his doctor for a complete physical check-up, rated A-1, and only then did he instruct his cadre of volunteers to step hard on their campaign throttles!

Mr. Nixon: He learned that from Diefenbaker.

Mr. Lewis: And then he enlisted the support of the current Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Wells) who is profoundly concerned about his cholesterol count. It sort of runs in the ministerial family.

Had the Throne Speech been written by the present Attorney General you can imagine what its contents might have been. Had it been written by the current Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko), think of the pages we would have given to the problems of native affairs in the Province of Ontario and the new sensitivity that might have been shown.

If it had been written by the former Minister of Trade and Development it probably would have begun, roughly, in this way: “Ladies and gentlemen. Ontario is a vast province. Let us not treat it in a half-vast way!”

Do I catch the feeling, the tone, of some of the earlier efforts of the hon. member for Don Mills?

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): I will supply the hon. member with the material at cost.

Mr. Lewis: Right! Just get me a bed in the Constellation Hotel. I will be glad to settle for that.

Mr. Randall: The best room in the house for twice the price.

Mr. Lewis: Right, fair enough.

I, for one, would have wished that the current Minister of Labour (Mr. Carton) had written the Throne Speech because then we could have had little erotic sketching conveyed to the House, in the corners.

Mr. Nixon: Erotic?

Mr. Lewis: Erotic, yes, for those who recall those matters which concern the Minister of Labour.

However, with the exception of housing and unemployment, which suffered a rather sad decline in reputation in that portion of the speech, the rest of the speech, the Premier will have to admit, had very little in it that was daring, or original or novel. I just remind him, even though it is a kind of painful litany, of the compendium of the predictable in that Throne Speech—much of it taken from the opposition, of course, hardly stirring the blood to excitement. Our policies now advance roughly a generation beyond those which the Premier chose to include in the Throne Speech.

It was, in a sense, a quite soporific document. Does he remember that he included that the government would give preference to Canadian-owned businesses seeking grants and loans—a startling change in public life in Ontario—that the ODC and the NODC would do the same; that Crown land was to be leased? The Minister of Lands and Forests was profoundly excited about this move, debated as it has been for only, I think, 43 years now in Ontario, yet not touching on the reclaiming of public access to beaches or recreation land generally.

The government is going to set up a Department of the Environment to intensify present programmes and new approaches to eliminate pollution, an environmental council, a committee on government productivity to examine Hydro and energy resources. The government is always giving attention to the creating of “functional and integrated and balanced transportation systems”—whatever that kind of gobbledgook means—the government has raised ambiguity to the level of statecraft in the Throne Speech.

The government has set up a Department of Colleges and Universities and a Depart-

ment of Transportation and Communications. It might have pleased some in the Legislature, but this fetish of creating departments and interchanging them has never had the greatest of appeal for those of us in this party. This absolute fixation with departmental reorganization is as clear a substitute for policy as one could possibly find.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It is a Liberal preoccupation too.

Mr. Lewis: It is a Liberal programme too, of course.

There is a land bank programme; consumer protection—there is a novel idea—more efficient delivery of health services; a word about Ontario Place. I look across and see a sort of slightly blemished imitation of John Parmenter Robarts. At least his pre-election manifestoes had spirit, they had panache, they had moments of electricity. This document barely survives scrutiny before the reader lapses into somnambulism. That is hardly worthy of the efforts to strike the sense of a new regime in Ontario—

Mr. Nixon: The readers are pretty weary.

Mr. Lewis: —and yet, Mr. Speaker, the Premier had the audacity to say in the document:

This address has indicated the new ministry is fully aware of the existence in Ontario of many problems of a serious and urgent nature. Measures to deal with these matters have been described.

In our humble submission—and I shall now get to that part of it, Mr. Speaker—those matters have not begun to be described. There is so much that is wanting and absent in this Throne Speech that it is now beyond the capacity of government to retrieve it. There were some areas that were touched on so lightly, so inconclusively, so marginally, that it makes one wonder whether the capacity to govern has not faltered completely.

One of those areas, extraordinarily enough, was that of economic development and growth in the Province of Ontario. It was as though, Mr. Speaker, the entire Design for Development plan on the part of government had been abandoned. It was as though thoughts of economic development, regional development and regional government no longer constituted a priority for the government at all.

How can it be that one has a substantive document like a Throne Speech, which at least hints at certain propositions which might

be implemented by government, and that economic development—the very basis of provincial life in terms of the effects on the citizens in this province—how can it be that that is excluded almost totally from the document?

One would hope that it was excluded because the government had decided to abandon it; but I fear not, because the splendid procession of reports which the government has now produced—some while the session was in recess are renewed for the province and for Ontario.

We have committed ourselves to an untenable pattern in the Province of Ontario. We may be locked in. I suspect that only a change in government—and we on this side of the House, while not sanguine, look forward to it—but only a change in government may indeed alter the pattern.

This Design for Development programme on which the entire future of the province is based. It is stunted in its conception, Mr. Speaker; it is misdirected in its analysis; it is trivial beyond belief; it is a great abortive epic in the life of this government. However, it is the brainchild of the men who surround the Premier. I am not at all sure how much the Treasurer himself had to do in its makeup—or the Premier himself—but the first monumental publication, as it were, was the Toronto-centred region plan. The more we learn about it—because this is a cumulative process—the more it must be rejected. The government cannot proceed with it. It would not be tolerable. The premises are false and the argument is wrong. It is an untenable document and it is absurd that in this Province of Ontario it should be given serious contemplation at this time.

First, Mr. Speaker, the Toronto-centred region plan—and it is increasingly reinforced by ministerial pronouncements—accepts the whole pattern of rate of growth and productivity in and around Toronto in an entirely predetermined way. It is as though, for a moment, all the Tories had become Marxists and believed in determinism as the sole factor in looking at the way in which growth patterns evolve in and around Metropolitan Toronto.

Second, after bowing to this fetish of growth for growth's sake, the plan then deposits eight million people—contemplate it, Mr. Speaker—by the year 2000 in an uninterrupted cordon of industrial concentration from Montreal to Milwaukee. It governs our lifestyles accordingly for the next 30 years, as though the worship of some kind of indus-

trial juggernaut at this end of the province made good and compelling sense.

Third, the government has locked us irretrievably into the vortex of American control by virtue of that programme. And many of us have drawn attention to the problems that are involved. The Premier shakes his head. Let me read to him and refresh his memory, because I am sure he has studied all the documents carefully. What is called "The International, National and Provincial Context of this Plan" says—and I think it is probably worth just putting on the record:

The development of the region—

that is the Toronto-centred region—

—obviously is greatly dependent upon the role of the region in the northeastern quadrant of North America.

1. The Toronto-centred region is strongly influenced by major metropolitan centres of northeast North America—New York, Boston, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis—

it does mention Montreal—

—the market within 500 miles includes 900 million people.

2. The region is in close proximity—

Hon. Mr. Davis: How many people?

Mr. Lewis: Ninety million. I am sorry.

The region is in close proximity—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member upset me for a minute. I wondered what had happened.

Mr. Lewis: What had happened. Right!

Mr. Randall: Get that fly speck in the right place.

Mr. Lewis: Right, okay! The member may return to his reading. You know, I think his new appointment has gone to his head. Some of us thought there would be a change.

Mr. Randall: There is.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, but in which direction?

Mr. MacDonald: Humility might then descend upon the member.

Mr. Lewis: To continue, Mr. Speaker:

2. The region is in close proximity and has strong economic linkages to the heartland of American industry, which is found in the Chicago-St. Louis-Cincinnati-Cleveland quadrilateral and reaches eastward in both Canada and the United States to such leading seaports as Montreal and New York.

3. With increasing economic interdependence these linkages have stimulated a development corridor between Chicago and Montreal.

They call it the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence megalopolis, of which the Toronto-centred region is a major sector.

I am skipping point 4 for the moment.

5. This region performs a leading manufacturing, financial and cultural role in Canada. The manufacturing predominance is partly a result of the adjacent location to American firms with branch plants producing for the Canadian market.

Mr. Speaker, I put it on the record because it is the essential premise on which the plan is based; it dictates the direction of the plan. The minister knows that the special map which accompanies the book called the "Toronto-centred region: Northeastern North America Context" deals with radials depicting development corridors. And where do the radials go? They go to Milwaukee, Chicago, St. Louis, Indianapolis, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Washington, Philadelphia, New York, Boston, Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury, Ottawa, Montreal. That is the nature of the radials. Now for us, there is no—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Where have they missed?

Mr. Lewis: Well, they have missed Timmins, they have missed the Lakehead, they have missed western Canada, they have missed essential arteries within this country. They have focused entirely on increasing economic interdependence with the United States. There is no sense in this government's mind that economic developments can move along other corridors. That is the problem. The problem is that it has fixed us into this locked position and it is prepared to let us languish there and lock us in until the year 2000 at least.

There is no serious analysis now or before of land-use planning. How much land for industry, for recreation, for agriculture? There is no decisive look at environmental factors, which are barely touched on. There are more arterial highways from Bowmanville to Kitchener directing development, with no guarantee of how much money there will be for public transport. There is so much gibberish in that report, so much nonsensical formulation of a statistical and rarefied kind that it often reaches heights of indigestible nonsense.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, as well, that regional government is wholly irrelevant

to the context of this report. It is as if the Oshawa formulation did not exist; it is as if the Fyfe report had not been published for Kitchener-Waterloo and area. It is as though Hamilton-Wentworth or the Halton-Peel set-up had not been contemplated at all. The report just runs roughshod over any existing schemes of regional government or regional organization without any effort to correlate the two.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, with great respect, it is not true.

Mr. Lewis: It is most certainly true.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will just await my opportunity to speak.

Mr. Lewis: By all means. We will be very pleased to see how regional government integrates with this report. It will be very useful. There are so many—

Mr. MacDonald: We look forward to the Premier finally entering the debate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the member want me to speak ahead of his leader?

Mr. MacDonald: Is the Premier going to speak after him? That is the point.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no. I will be speaking at the end.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, the Premier is not speaking next? Well, I will see if I cannot provoke him during my discussion of education.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I may not be here to be provoked.

Mr. Lewis: Yes I know. The pressures of state will ease him on his way.

Hon. Mr. Davis: May not.

Mr. Lewis: When we are a government and a cabinet, I want to tell the Premier, through the Speaker, and opposition members are speaking in important debates we are going to have the benches filled as a matter of policy. It makes very little difference—these things waft over the benches—but I noted last Friday morning with the Leader of the official Opposition speaking in the Throne Speech debate there were no more than four of the Premier's cabinet colleagues here at any time, and their total numbers dwindled to 11 at one point. One could at least have that moment of humility to think that there are occasional thoughts offered on this side—if not always valid, at least in goodwill—which are heard by government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Leader of the Opposition says we have taken their entire platform.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I will not haggle with the Premier. I just point out the way in which this government views the legislative process and the committee process and the whole business. However, these are the rituals we perform, and I shall continue performing.

There are so many unanswered questions about this Toronto-centred region plan. How will the growth in the west be controlled? How can this government produce a plan almost a year ago and to this day not indicate to the public a single substantial piece of evidence on how it is going to relocate industry or control growth? Does the government intend to purchase private land for recreation? If so, in what quantity, and at what cost?

What happened to Century City in the process of the plan? What happens to Peterborough and the eastern part of the Toronto-centred region? What incentives will be used to designate the location of industries? Why should they go where they have not gone before? I hope this government does not use the generation of hydro-electric power as the incentive for growth points—but I will come to that a little later.

This government has left a gross legacy to future generations, if it insists on proceeding with it. The fact is that everyone from the Ontario Institute of Town Planning through to a number of independent consultants has indicated how faulty the plan is. It is a growth plan in isolation. It confirms our client-state position, and it is a growth plan that acquiesces to intense, self-defeating, antisocial urban concentration. It is the work of unimaginative minds, Mr. Speaker—hurried, scattered, superficial and inadvertently revealing along the way the Tory view of the Province of Ontario.

Let me remind you, if I can find it now, what the document says in terms of other regions because there was one giveaway in this report which is perhaps more revealing than any other aspect of it.

Point 4 in the "Putting of the Perspective" says:

Because of the location within the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence megalopolis, the Toronto-centred region probably can increase its economic role in processing resources which currently originate in northern Ontario and move to major markets in the Chicago-Detroit-Cleveland industrial area.

What happens to "Design for Development: Northwestern Ontario Region"? What happens to "Design for Development: Northeastern Ontario Region"? How much bad faith can one government maintain in the process of drafting these unrelated ad hoc documents which do so much to mutilate principles of planning? Any integrated proposal which might be made by relatively unsophisticated people, let alone the panoply of planners which the government has at its command, would be better.

That one sentence I quoted, in itself, can be the death knell for northern Ontario. Do not think that the people of northern Ontario do not know it, because they do. They are well aware of what it is that is intended for them, and they are in the process of rejecting it fairly dramatically.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I guess that is why we were left out of the Throne Speech.

Mr. Lewis: Let me therefore turn to the next production in this epic—because after all it is the basis of the government's plan for the entire province—"Design for Development: Northwestern Ontario Region". It is again, one of the most disappointing documents currently being examined by the people of the northwest. Its aims are far too limited. Its policy recommendations range from the modest to the negligible. It sets out a catalogue of problems which have been enumerated a thousand times before.

The Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Wishart) surely cannot suffer it forever, and I suppose I should deal with it momentarily.

Incidentally, I would be truly pleased if the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) could stay for a moment or two because I want to deal with him on north-eastern Ontario. Some of the government members must surely be a trifle embarrassed about what is being done to northern Ontario in the name of the government of the Province of Ontario.

Do members know what has been demonstrated in this northwestern report? The report states that the primary sector is capital intensive and labour static; that there is a large distance to major markets; that there is a dependence on United States markets; that the health services are dependent on Winnipeg in the far northwest rather than having any internal viability; that the tourist services are poorly developed; that in terms of growth

and employment in value added, manufacturing in northwestern Ontario lags considerably behind that of the province, indicating that the region's competitive position is continuing to weaken.

Then they study it with graphs and observations which are really quite remarkable and when that is done, a series of glimpses of the obvious—they set out their goals, breathtaking in their precision and insight. I am not sure that all the members of the Legislature have heard—I am not sure all the members of the New Democratic Party have heard—what the government of the Province of Ontario was able to fashion in its report after years of study.

Listen to the remarkable goals which have been discovered by the Minister of Lands and Forests and the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. They want to reduce the annual and seasonal rates of unemployment. They want to increase male and female employment opportunities—well, there is a rare insight given to government in a report of this length. They want to increase manufacturing employment. They want to optimize the use of prime forest resources. They want to increase accessibility between centres of population.

There is a most extraordinary revelation which occurs on page 64. It says: "Reduce air and water pollution." Now how do you like that for striking new ground for government in economic development? "Reduce the incidence of poverty." Who thought of that? Which civil servants did they bring together for that? Under public safety they have, "Reduce the rate of accidents"; "Reduce the incidence of crime"; "Reduce the incidence of fire"—and what are their recommendations? What are their recommendations? Eighteen thousand jobs over 20 years. Nine hundred jobs a year. That is their total recommendation in terms of work. To diversify the economy, to bring in some secondary manufacturing; but nothing set out in specific terms. To talk about the more advanced phases of resource processing and manufacturing which should be located in northwestern Ontario. How does that jibe with the Toronto-centred region plan?

Mr. MacDonald: They have written off the north.

Mr. Lewis: They have already written off northern Ontario. They are not going to develop the new processes. Everything in the report is conditional. None of it is asser-

tive. Your absence of policy recommendations in this report are an insult to the people they are designed to serve.

Perhaps I am forgetting something in this report; this report which used all the creativity and capacity of six different departments of civil servants. They say there is another section of northwestern Ontario to which we should turn our attention? The native population? The Indian population? Lo and behold here comes the Provincial Secretary. Well, let me tell him—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): I have been here all the time.

Mr. Lewis: Good. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, what the report on northwestern Ontario economic development says about the Indian people in that part of the province, to give you the full flavour of its analysis. On page 1, it had this comment: "Over one-tenth of the regional population is of Indian origin. Many of these people live in small, isolated settlements, widely dispersed across the northern part of the region."

The Indian people do not enter into the discussion again until page 44 where there is a classification of organized municipalities in northwestern Ontario with every single piece of population data given—including all of those that are unclassified—and at the bottom, it says: "None of the above population data includes Indian reserves." And then the third and last time which Indian communities are represented in this report in any substantial way occurs on page 76 as a preface to the recommendations and it reads: "A number of recommendations are marked with an asterisk. These have particular implications for the Indian community and will be discussed further at appropriate times." And there you have it. So much for that particular social and economic problem.

All of that is characteristic of the empty superficiality of all of these reports for which there will be political debts to pay in the next provincial election. But quite apart from any political debts, which should be aside from it, it is a great pity indeed that you see fit to release these kinds of documents. The best of them all, of course, was the "Design for Development: Northeastern Ontario Region"—ah, the minister smiles slightly—

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): That should make him blush.

Mr. Lewis: On January 23, 1971, Mr. Speaker, I was there. What a pleasure. There we were in Timmins—250 people breathlessly

awaiting the unveiling of this document which would recast development for northeastern Ontario. At all the other conferences there had been five, six or seven ministers present.

Behold, when the curtains were pulled back, who walked out on to the stage—alone, isolated, nearly in tears—the Minister of Lands and Forests. Where was the then Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. A. F. Lawrence)? Where were all the others?

It was quite a remarkable performance. I have not seen anything like it in some time. It was a cultural event in Timmins—that is how all of us felt of it. A sort of evening with the “theatre of the absurd,” that was it.

It was billed as the announcement for the Design for Development of the northeastern Ontario region. I thought all the ministers would be there to receive the plaudits of the crowd. For “high camp” it was unequalled entertainment; it was of rare vintage. One of the best single put-ons in the province. There were slides and satraps and civil servants and slogans and majestic formality and carnival boosters—all the trappings of government, you know. The designers who wrought the product—

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Was the former Minister of Trade and Development there?

Mr. Lewis: No, he was not there; he stage-managed it.

Mr. Randall: Sounds like an NDP convention.

Mr. Lewis: I wish our conventions were like that on occasion. And then when it was all over—I may say that this document has more graphs per page, more charts, more delights for the designer’s eye and mapmaker’s pleasure than any other single document the government has so far produced. This one is 300 pages long—the minister was so embarrassed about it he said to the audience, “Now do not expect anything new. I am merely repeating in this document things you have known before.” I wonder if I can catch the full flavour of the minister’s words, I feel I do not have them here—oh yes, I do. He said:

Let me caution you here that you are not likely to discover any startling or unexpected revelations in this report. It is, after all, an analysis of the region which you know best, a description of the trends which you have been experiencing at first hand.

Mr. MacDonald: More of the same old thing.

Mr. Lewis: To continue:

The report outlines in statistical form many of the changes which are well known to you.

Well, the report took five years to prepare. Five years for phase one. Imagine the prospects for phase two. There are some unexpected revelations in this report and I would like to share them with the Legislature. This report, unlike the northwestern report, has 82 goals, and some of them have the most astonishing priority. I think right at the beginning they are set out. I am not sure that I can read them into the record without trembling. I am not even sure I can find them—but they said things like this, Mr. Speaker:

Increase female employment opportunities. Reduce housing costs for low-income households. Reduce recreation accidents. Increase the numbers of doctors and dentists. Increase adult education. Preserve historic sites and buildings.

They have this most extraordinary pre-occupation with accidents. “Reduce recreation accidents.” They go into it in great length. They even had a separate section on public safety, and under it they say that the goal of public safety—I hope this sits well with everyone—is “to reduce the hazards to life and property from external events and maintain personal security.”

Mr. MacDonald: Reduce the common cold too?

Mr. Lewis: Some may think that is a generalized pronouncement, so in order to make it more particular, the following revelation appears: “The hazards of drowning appear to merit attention only in those districts bordering large masses of water.”

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: I can understand why it took five years. You know, the wisdom of the ages takes some time to filter through, and one should not jump to these historic conclusions impulsively. You take a little time to sift away, to savour, to measure, and then you promulgate a document of this kind. It is absolutely astonishing that they would dare to do it.

Now, the minister was not railroaded out of town, in fact, he was greeted most respectfully. There were only two people in

the audience who were a little acid with him. One was the member for Cochrane South, and one was the member for Timiskaming (Mr. Jackson), who wondered aloud what kind of nonsensical array this was, and they received for their efforts the quiet support of the crowd. But I may say, Mr. Speaker, that what is so disappointing about this particular document, of course, is that it misses the point entirely.

The minister makes all the appropriate observations. He says that the population in the northeast is declining. He says that it is now a slow-growing economic area. He says that manufacturing employment is declining in many centres but there is no substantial additional employment in forest-based industries; that the income per capita is below the provincial average; that there is a marked absence of communication facilities; that the problem of retraining is particularly acute; that the infant mortality rate is 10 per cent higher than that of the rest of the province; that housing is inadequate in quantity and quality. I am quoting from the report.

Can he tell me who has been in power for the last 28 years?

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: These things occur, sure, and the minister dares to document them in this kind of a report.

Then, as though the refinements are not sufficient, he brings it down to the context of the districts of Timiskaming and Cochrane. Let me tell him what it shows, in case the minister himself has not done the statistical analysis.

In Timiskaming, the labour force rate of growth in 1951 was 17,000 plus. In 1961, 16,000 plus—a positive decline. The same for Cochrane. The infant mortality rate for the northeast generally, is 22.4. For Ontario, it is 19.6, for Timiskaming, it is 28.7. Per capita income improvement between 1961 and 1966, in the northeast generally, 34 per cent, in Ontario, 32 per cent, in Cochrane 29 per cent. Doctors per thousand in Cochrane, 69 as compared with 83 in the northeast, and 132 in Ontario. Dentists per thousand, 17 in Cochrane as compared to 22 in the northeast and 38 in Ontario. Manufacturing employment is below any acceptable standards through the other areas in the northeast compared to the rest of the province.

What is contained in the report, Mr. Speaker? Not a single positive suggestion

worthy of the name. What kind of illogical proposition is this—to press upon the people of the Province of Ontario something called Design for Development on which our economic future is based? The Toronto-centred plan is distorted and the northwest plan is inadequate; the northeast plan is a fiasco and the minister will lock us into a series of ad hoc unrelated propositions, I repeat. It is simply not tenable. It is especially not tenable in northern Ontario.

I want to make a particular point of that. This government has abused, exploited, discriminated against northern Ontario shamelessly for its entire period of office.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: There is no other area—

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister of Mines knows this better than anybody else.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Go up to Kenora and see. The member should have been there on the 19th, the greatest day of history.

Mr. Lewis: Sure, sure!

An hon. member: We can get lots of quotes from the minister to document it.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I will be back. The NDP cannot find a candidate up there. What are they talking about?

An hon. member: The government just silenced the minister by putting him in the cabinet.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact with the two by-election wins in Manitoba I would urge you to seek other employment, Mr. Minister. Kenora will now go the way of all political flesh.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Let me remind the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, through you, that they condescended to give northern Ontario two paragraphs in the Throne Speech. My, that must have gladdened the heart of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. Two paragraphs! I think one of them related to the new department undertaking a review of the cost of transporting goods into and out of northern Ontario. Twenty-eight years in office and that is what the government leaves for the people of the north and the government expects to hold a single seat the next time around.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): We will increase our seats.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The government will increase its seats? Why even in Cochrane North we anticipate our majority to be somewhere between 3,000 and 3,500—and the minister's is a little tougher.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Yes, we will. Five more seats.

Mr. Lewis: The minister's is a little tougher than most. But then, we were in second place last time so it is an easy acceleration. And the government has a lot of answering to do to members on the opposition benches; a lot of answering to do to the member for Sudbury East.

How is it that they have got a hospital crisis in Sudbury now, unmatched anywhere else in northern Ontario? What kind of planning is it for the north? How is it that in Sudbury there are 3,000 people on the waiting list for housing, with a zero vacancy rate in that city? And the cabinet does not a thing to alleviate the situation which is persistently damaging and demoralizing to many sections of the community, despite how much pressure and how much pleading comes from the member for Sudbury East to move the fossilized but friendly cabinet to some action. What about the matter of Cobalt refinery? Why was it not possible for the ingenuity of government to cope with it?

I understand that the former Minister of Trade and Development would not give a loan to Jack McClelland if he had asked for it. After all, Jack McClelland was a lousy businessman and the former minister would not extend money that way. Knowing his own illustrious past in General Steel Wares, I suppose that was the basis on which the decision was made.

What about the little Cobalt refinery? Why was it not possible at the testing laboratories to add whatever was required in order to provide a way of processing in the north? Why does the government have to grant more exemptions?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It is not possible.

Mr. Lewis: What is not possible? Cobalt refinery has operated, what, for 10 years?

An hon. member: More than that.

Mr. Lewis: More than 10 years. Have they been so charitable that they have operated at a loss throughout?

Mr. Randall: They lost money every year—

Mr. Lewis: Utter nonsense! The reality is—

Mr. Randall: Nationalize like Saskatchewan and we would all go down the drain.

Mr. Lewis: Look, the only thing—

Mr. Randall: Name me one company that was still in operation when Douglas went out of power. They all went down the drain.

Mr. Lewis: Will the member just stop it? Will he just stop it. In his case, of being a director of the Constellation Hotel, we will enter into an equity relationship. It will be a joint public-private venture. Cobalt refinery, Mr. Speaker, is another example—

Mr. Randall: Tell us about the unemployed.

Mr. Lewis:—of the way in which the government allowed the mine to close down in Geraldton without any appreciable response. It is exactly the same classic pattern for northern Ontario.

The government still has not made up its mind on Quetico. Sure, the volume agreement with Ontario-Minnesota is now under—what did they call it—a more or less permanent moratorium, but the logging still goes on in the northeast section of the park, the only section of the park where there is a Canadian entry point. The government has not tried to find an additional cutting licence, either with Great Lakes or one of the other pulp and paper companies, to provide the timber requirements which would keep the mill going and take the logging out of the park.

The government has played games with it and with the Quetico advisory committee. And what about land generally? It may be that we own land in northern Ontario, but the minister knows how much advertising there is of recreational land in northern Ontario. How frequent are the transactions which convey land to non-resident control? How much of the recreation land have we lost in the northwest, just as we have surrendered access to the beaches of Lake Eric? The minister knows that he is going to have to take an inventory of land requirements or he will deliver much of the best in the north to non-resident ownership within his period of the ministry.

What of Moosonee and Moose Factory in the minister's own riding? I have a confidential report which was submitted to the band council by Mr. Gerald Hodge, who is with the department of urban and regional planning at the University of Toronto. He makes the point that if the federal hospital closes down—and it is an entirely viable operation—the economy of the entire area will be so profoundly dislocated that they may never be able to recoup, and that years of conflict and pettiness have characterized this inability to sort it out.

What about the export of power in northwestern Ontario? Now there is a classic illustration of the way in which the government works. The government of Ontario enters into a little cabal with Ontario Hydro to export 37,000 kilowatts of power across the Rainy River to International Falls by the year 1976 for what purpose? It was undefined before the National Energy Board. Boise Cascade will build a kraft mill, a stud mill and a chipboard mill. There has even been some talk of the possibilities of a chemical plant, or at least much rumour of it. What happens in the final analysis? The export of our power, and the export of our jobs from northwestern Ontario to the United States, particularly to Minnesota.

What happens then to the "Design for Development: Northwestern Ontario Region" in which the government guarantees to maintain a certain increased job ratio? Does it go down the drain as well? How is it that the government has not yet publicly reversed its position and made the appropriate announcement?

What about the processing of ores in northern Ontario? How is it that we are continuing to export greater percentages of unprocessed ores each year, rather than lesser percentages, especially in the important ore areas like nickel and copper, which constitute at least for the last year for which there are figures—1968—some 47 per cent of the mineral production?

What about the secondary industry which is constantly denied to northern Ontario? The minister has surely seen the report, "Prospects for an Expanded Non-Ferrous Metals Industrial Complex for Northern Ontario", by Gerald Hodge and Cheuk Wong, in which it is suggested that there be a wire and cable plant, a copper and brass mill, a couple of non-ferrous foundries and a cement plant; all of which could be arrayed between Nipissing and Timmins? Where is it all? Why does the government deny economi-

cally viable industry to northeastern Ontario when there is documentation and a basis for which to give it?

Then the government ends up with the most gratuitous blow of all when the former Minister of Public Works (Mr. Simonett) is appointed as vice-chairman of the Ontario Northland Railway. Can one imagine a more cynical appointment for political patronage?

An hon. member: Unload the seller of hats.

Mr. Lewis: What in God's name was the point in putting the former minister on that commission except, in effect, as a favour for services rendered?

Mr. Ferrier: That committee is just a senate for the Tories.

Mr. Lewis: When did it need a vice-chairman before?

Mr. Ferrier: That was a payoff.

Mr. Lewis: Does it have a reputable chairman? Yes, it does. I travelled down from Timmins on the Ontario Northland Railway with three directors of the railway just a few weeks ago. They seemed quite competent to handle it without the expertise and omniscient sea of knowledge of the member for Frontenac-Addington. They will not need him to give weighty input to their deliberations. The government cannot treat the north that way. It cannot make southern appointments that way forever. What about the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers)? He still has a phone in his car waiting for his appointment, and it never came.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Now that is wrong. He took it out.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): He has not done it in this House.

Mr. Lewis: Well perhaps he will one day be moved to it. Let me draw this portion of my remarks quickly to a close, Mr. Speaker. What is true in the north is a sad and desolate array of governmental neglect—persistent, calculated neglect.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Watch the results!

Mr. Lewis: We will watch the results. We are positively enthused about the electoral prospects, but that does not satisfy the needs and requirements of the people of the region.

There is in this province, Mr. Speaker, no serious province-wide economic planning at all. All we have are these various individual

documents, that are occasionally supplemented by materials like the Haldimand-Norfolk studies, which add very little to what is available to us. The government cannot proceed in that fashion.

There must be a province-wide plan for development and land use; it is an absolute priority. We would establish a provincial economic secretariat in order to achieve it and, then, there must be a way of relating regional government to these plans and involving regions in them. The provincial government has already emasculated regional government in various areas by its refusal to give them the funding assistance they need in order to operate. It has driven a perfectly legitimate concept of regional government into a concept of disrepute, so that all of us in this party have now come to the conclusion that government should not be introducing regional government until it can give an iron-clad guarantee of the financial wherewithal to meet the expectations of the people in the region. We have always put the proposition—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. B. Newman: New policy.

Mr. Lewis: New policy. The member for—

Mr. MacDonald: Has the member heard of the foundation programme? We enunciated it along with regional government. His party repudiated it.

Mr. Lewis: The member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) talks about a one-tier system for the Sudbury basin and then his leader vaults up a day or two later and says a “freeze on regional government.”

We are not going to trifle with the issue in that contradictory fashion Mr. Speaker. We have always committed the Conservatives to the appropriate funding of these regional governments. Now we ask for a similar commitment in relationship to whatever economic plans the government has. Otherwise it will introduce a shambles.

There must be an end to the indiscriminate forgivable loans which bear little or no relation to the patterns of development. The government has not even begun to involve the cities in serious economic planning. If the development of growth points continues to be a problem, then measure all the appropriate indexes—labour costs, natural resources, transportation and above all environmental effects—and if industry is to be located outside of Metro, let us say so and relocate it. Then obviously, the government has to place a

limitation on certain areas where industry either would be moved from, or not allowed to move into, and incentives provided for others to locate in other parts of the province.

But the government has laid down none of the ground rules; not a one! Just vague, conceptual insubstantial designs, with the occasional regional variation. It has no sense of this province as an integrated, economic whole. It has no sense of the art of government required to order the future of Ontario. For that there will be a response a number of months hence.

That leads me, Mr. Speaker, to the second of three points I want to make of a major kind in this debate. The government has another singular failing and that involves the cost of services to the people of the Province of Ontario, both in the fields of education and health. Ironically enough, costs of government were never higher than under a Tory regime. Ironically enough, with all the managerial skills to which it pretends, there is, in fact, no capacity to arrange its finances in a way which would introduce efficiency or economy.

Everyone in this caucus, Mr. Speaker, concedes that there is a need to control the cost of education in the Province of Ontario. Obviously, that is so. But we question the context and the fashion of the present methods of cost-cutting.

For eight years, Mr. Speaker, we have pleaded for debates on the philosophy of education in the Legislature. We have never achieved it.

I remember my colleague from Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) and his efforts—unsuccessful efforts—to envisage the former Minister of Education some time ago. For eight years we have rejected the government's obsession with numbers and plant and all other related aspects. For eight years we have questioned this monolithic system, lacking in diversity and expensive in cost. Year after year we pleaded that the new educational philosophers—Goodman, Holt and Freidenberg and others—begin to infuse Ontario's system so that we could introduce economies, and year after year it is rejected.

We have pleaded for a justification of the numbers game. The former Minister of Education says “There will be 25 per cent of the young people between the ages of 18 and 25 in university, 25 per cent of the young people in community colleges, another five per cent in post secondary technical schools”—and then gives no basis whatsoever for the projection of the figures.

Year after year we have asked for an analysis of teacher training so we would not be in the present bind. If it is right, Mr. Speaker, we may have up to 3,000 graduating teachers unemployed in the next while. What kind of inspired planning principles have brought that to pass on the part of this government? How is it possible that that could possibly be achieved?

We have questioned the Robarts' stream. We have applauded the relevant parts of the Hall-Dennis report and wished for their implementation. We have asked for the long-term justification of the community colleges. We have raised the issue of the manner of imposition of the county school boards. We have talked incessantly of transferring the cost of education. We could never get any answer.

Now we have a crisis over which the former Minister of Education presided. He officiated over the crisis which the people of Ontario now inherit. And having destroyed the system and destroyed equitable taxation in the Province of Ontario in the process, he does not want to be responsible or, if responsible, purely in the sense of imposing arbitrary guidelines. The government lets things get out of hand and then it clamps down. It retreats behind the wall that it has erected for itself.

Incredibly enough, you know Mr. Speaker, this government never tried to establish priorities or programme budgeting. I learned with great interest—I did not know this until a few days ago—that over the last several summers in the Province of Ontario a small and select committee chaired by the former Treasurer, now Minister of Highways and Transport (Mr. MacNaughton) had been meeting very privately about the establishment of budgetary priorities for the province. I suppose it was probably held at Honey Harbour, at the Premier's cottage.

One of the main areas of contention was always that of the budgetary provisions for the cost of schooling, and it was required that five-year plans be submitted to this private cabinet committee which, curiously enough, is now enshrined in legislation. This is really quite interesting. Remember the Throne Speech, page 13 said:

To confer reason, flexibility upon its policy-making and management capacity, a number of committees of cabinet will be created to deal expeditiously with the co-ordination of policy in a number of related areas. Two major committees will be established by statute. One will deal with policy and priorities and will ensure by continual review that established policies and expenditures remain relevant to the needs and wishes of the people.

Well, it is not a new committee, Mr. Speaker. It is a committee that, as I say, has been meeting privately since at least 1967 either by note of cabinet, by minute of cabinet, or, indeed, by order-in-council, although I have not had the time to check back. That is the committee to which this Throne Speech material now refers.

It is a committee to which five-year projections of needs—in which Ian MacDonald participated to show how the expenditure curve would outstrip the revenue—were to be submitted to these cabinet ministers. And the extraordinary truth is, Mr. Speaker, that in the last three summer sessions the small cabinet committee was not able to arrive at priorities. As a result, individual budgets were presented to the Treasury Board on an annual basis and dealt with accordingly. And as a result they got themselves into this notorious financial straitjacket reflected largely in the area of services to people.

I do not know what happened in the last round of negotiation with this committee. Either The Department of Education would not conform and there was a rebellion and it was told to cut six per cent across the top, or it did conform and gave them a projection and the Treasury Board could not handle the selectivity so there was a flat cut.

Mr. Speaker, let me say on behalf of this party that we think the cuts are needed in the educational system in certain areas, but that those areas are rather different from the ones that are now receiving the effects of the ministerial order.

There is the area of administration. There is the area of plant and building. There is the area of educational television and duplicate computer devices. There are some cuts to be made at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, all of which would mean a reasonable—perhaps even a substantial—saving to the taxpayers of the Province of Ontario.

Let me say something about OISE. I do not share the views of the member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) who said to the OSSTF meeting recently:

The Metro school boards are being forced to cut \$13 million from the overall budget of \$370 million; why not cut out OISE and get the \$13 million that way.

You talk about a meat-axe approach—

An hon. member: Do not quote me.

Mr. Lewis:—which the Leader of the Opposition dissociated himself from, to his credit.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Totally irresponsible.

Mr. Lewis: I must present his view accurately. He indicated to the member for Scarborough East that he was not pleased with the proposal that had been made and dissociated himself from it during the course of his remarks.

But it does say something about the problem of OISE which has continued to create difficulties for government and for those of us in the opposition for a considerable period of time. OISE is not performing the function for which it was intended. That is the great pity about OISE. It has become a self-serving institution. It does not serve the people of the Province of Ontario.

It was designed largely to work through programmes which would be appropriate for the Province of Ontario and the school system. But there is very little to show for the money which we have put into OISE—which now exceeds something like \$100 million, Mr. Speaker, a very considerable investment.

It is not just that the departments of curriculum, and the departments of applied psychology, and the departments of educational administration are dominantly non-Canadian in character—we took exception to that at the time—it is just that OISE has forgotten its responsibility to the school system of Ontario and that its administrative leadership is preoccupied with the rarefied, esoteric activities of a number of various research experiments.

There are legitimate postgraduate activities at OISE which should be sustained by members of this House. There are extraordinary problems which OISE could analyse.

OISE should be doing the work on the cost of extending aid to the separate school system to the end of grade 13. OISE should be analysing the saving that might be introduced if grade 13 was eliminated from the school system. OISE should be looking at the way in which Hall-Dennis might be introduced to the school system. Instead, OISE is often fraught internally with irrelevant and fratricidal battles.

Do you know what is going on in OISE now, Mr. Speaker? Very briefly—there is now a battle within OISE over what amounts to a conflict of interest charge.

Eight hundred and forty-eight thousand dollars—that is a lot of money in the life of an institution—was dispensed for research grants in OISE. One hundred and fifty-eight proposals were submitted to a research review board and a development review board. Eighty-one of those 158 proposals were funded. Fifteen of the 17 proposals submitted by members of the two boards which sat in judgement were accepted to the tune of three-eighths of the total amount of money. The other 66 projects, coming apparently from lesser mortals, received something just beyond half of the money allocated.

I do not know what that means in the context of OISE internally, and I cannot pretend to say. I do know that there are memos from senior members of the educational staff at OISE expressing great concern over the way in which the review board works, expressing great concern over the way the decisions are made. Listen, Mr. Speaker, if you will—knowing your acute interest in OISE—to two of the projects which were funded. One of them goes by the title of “Developing a Test Item Bank for the Physical Sciences”; and another one goes by the title of “Completion of the Development Work on Self-Concept Scale.”

Listen to three of the titles which were refused funding: “Canadianization of the Earth Sciences Course”; “Communication Effectiveness, A Study of the Language Behaviour of the Northern Indian”; and, “Supplementary Native Language Aid to Immigrant Children.”

Those were the projects not funded. I have named a couple that were funded.

The general comparison holds true in an almost bewildering way; there is much mystification about it. What is happening internally in OISE? How is it that that institution with so much public money seems to behave in such an erratic fashion?

We are not asking for the kind of investigative apparatus which upsets an academic institution. We are asking only that OISE be called to account in the sense that it justifies its budgetting to government and to the Legislature more adequately and that it relate the projects which it undertakes far more directly to the school system, which it is designed to serve and which it does not now serve in a fashion which any of us can begin to understand.

I have indicated that in some of these areas there would obviously be room for cutting back, or at least for raising questions.

The pity of it all is—if I may point it out—that the cutbacks now are not in those areas.

As things now stand, Mr. Speaker—and I am going to try to make my case ironclad—the cost cutting in education in Ontario imposed by virtue of the ceiling. I repeat that there have to be limitations acceded to by all; but that they should be handled in this way suggests a degree of arbitrariness and insensitivity which is self-defeating. The Premier, one would think, had more pride in his system than to treat it in such a fashion.

Listen to where the cutting of costs comes. Even if it is only for certain boards in the province, these boards represent up to 40 per cent of the kids in the educational system. The Carleton board. Let me read to you from the report of the minutes of their meeting when they had to cut costs.

In order to meet these limitations, it has been necessary to conduct review after review of the proposed expenditures covering every facet of the board's operations, and has necessitated a reduction of over \$2 million in expenditures which would have enabled the board to continue and modestly expand the existing programmes. However, because of the severity of the limitations placed on this board, it has been necessary to curtail certain programmes, make no provision for increased staff to support a growing system, and again seriously restrict the amount of funds available for the maintenance and operation of the system.

To comply it has been necessary to make the following adjustments to our ordinary expenditure commitments in the 1971 budget to meet this ceiling.

What adjustments? Note:

Board's system-wide support of student councils and other student oriented projects withdrawn. Student aid fund eliminated. Teachers assigned to schools at reduced rate. Average class size to be increased at all levels of the system. Remedial teachers assigned to regular classroom duties and the programme discontinued.

Mr. Speaker, remedial teachers are involved usually with remedial reading in one of the most indispensable areas of educational concern in Ontario.

Specialist teachers of grade 1 to 6 music assigned to regular classroom duty and this very successful music programme discontinued. Board support for student involve-

ment with the National Art Centre withdrawn. Additional special education classes planned, cancelled.

Special education classes! One need only recall—it was in the Hall-Dennis report—one need only recall the report on a million children suffering learning disabilities, perceptual handicaps and emotional disturbance to know what folly it is to cut in the area of special education.

Beginning September, 1971, no board support for adult education. Free use of schools policy of the board to be amended.

And so it goes in the Carleton board, in areas which none would like to see cut and which suggests that there could at least have been some selectivity introduced.

When the OSSTF put out its pamphlet, it said: "Because of economy, the less experienced teacher may be hired before the more experienced, the less qualified before the more qualified."

I have before me, Mr. Speaker, a memo to the principals of two counties immediately to the east of Metropolitan Toronto. Item 3 on the memo to the principals, which comes from the director of education, reads as follows:

Many school jurisdictions have moved their staffing ratios for secondary schools sharply upward. We have found it necessary to make minor adjustments in individual staff numbers, but have been able to maintain our overall complement of secondary teachers for 1971-1972.

A number of jurisdictions are planning drastic reductions in consultative staff and in special education staff serving elementary schools. We have avoided these steps. In hiring, however, we are forced to give priority to low-category inexperienced teachers who are willing to upgrade themselves. There are going to be a great many experienced teachers who go without jobs in the current glut while our orders go out to hire inexperienced teachers.

North York, Mr. Speaker: The North York board found it impossible to reduce the 1971 operating budget by an amount sufficient to meet the ministerial request, so what was cut out?

The regular per-pupil allotment for supplies, texts and library books to the schools has been reduced by 10 per cent. The programme development in the function of instruction and educational services has been reduced by 50 per cent. The budget for

out-of-classroom activities has been deleted. The health service has been discontinued. The adult education salary cost has been reduced by five per cent and the night school fees have been increased by 50 per cent. Services under consideration for cost-cutting—community schools, prologue for performing arts, young people's theatre, music events, the elementary French programme.

What sense does all of that make?

Niagara South, Mr. Speaker. A great many of the courses will go as a result of attrition of teachers, classroom size increasing accordingly. "Eight consultants returned to teaching"—that is a very good idea, as a matter of fact. The consultants should return, perhaps not to full-time teaching, perhaps to part-time teaching. But it does raise a question of whether or not the consultative staff is important, because the day on which the cutbacks were made, there appeared in *The Globe and Mail* in Toronto an advertisement from the Ontario Department of Education to hire consultants.

Lincoln board. The elementary French programme, a librarian, two special education teachers, four assistant counsellors, four para-professionals—all of these people working in useful areas.

Peel board of education. No new programmes; deferred purchasing of any new library books; termination of drug education programme for teachers and pupils—now there is a cut one would have thought makes little sense—"elimination of evening counselling service for parents/students; reduced caretaking staff, elementary and secondary school"—that is where the physical jobs are often lost, Mr. Speaker, in the caretaking staff of these schools.

The Toronto board of education: That is reasonably well known to people here, but the areas which were cut again were odd: Driver training was cut, summer school programmes were cut, non-medical use of drugs inservice programme—cut significantly by 60 per cent. (And the cry goes up about the use of drugs in the school system and all the concern expressed on all sides of the House.) Seasonal cleaning was cut—which may not seem to be that important except that it loses several hundred students summer jobs. And the picture, Mr. Speaker, is not a pleasing one, and it is one which we think could have been altered drastically had the legacy of the Premier worked in other ways.

The fact of the matter is that these are the things which appear to have frustrated the teachers and driven them to actions, or to

threats of actions, which none of us would condone or wish. The OSSTF president, Geoffrey Wilkinson, put it this way at his meeting;

The spending limitations violate the local autonomy of school boards, attempt to provide a single remedy for a bewildering variety of economic ills and force school boards to spend less without forcing them to spend more sensibly or economically.

It is truly a difficult position for the teachers, Mr. Speaker. We understand their frustration. We appeal to them, through this forum if need be, not to carry their irritation to the point of strike, not to be the strawman for a desperate government, desperately seeking a public peg on which to hang an election. That is not what the teachers should now be roped into. The government waits, you know, taut as a coiled spring, ready to pounce.

One hopes the teachers will be rational and considered, even though provoked in their presentation. Be it over guidelines or the present salary negotiations, nothing is to be gained at this point by precipitate action. We are launched into a debate. A government having created an extraordinary crisis over years of unwieldy operation of the educational system is virtually on the ropes, and I say to the teachers: "Do not rescue them now. Demonstrate solidarity and firmness, but wage the battle at the ballot box because there is an election this year."

All of these things, Mr. Speaker, that I have enumerated really rest on one central proposition—one major proposition. That is, that the issue has been very easily diverted by the Premier and those who sit with him in the cabinet, and we in this province are not going to permit it to be diverted any longer. What has come to pass has come to pass as a result of government policy.

The crisis over the cost of education is essentially a struggle around the reform of taxes in Ontario. It can be seen in no other context, and that is the crucial issue on which the next election will be fought.

Our premise of taking up 80 per cent of the cost over the life of our first session in Parliament, the life of that Parliament—the four years or five years; however long it may be—is what is at the root of the entire analysis. And we will take this government on constituency by constituency across the province of Ontario on the basis of tax reform and on the basis of the property tax. The government will not be allowed to shift, divert, deflect, in such a fashionable and

expert way, the area of discussion to the question simply of costs of education. It will come back every time to shifting the burden of the property tax to provincial revenue, and to emerging provincially with 80 per cent of the costs after the first Parliament over which we preside.

Mr. Speaker, I have some rather lengthy economic remarks that I intend to make. It is an effort to deal rather seriously with the background and, in fact, with the costing factor, because too much of this has been left in an ephemeral way. If the members will bear with me, I am going to put it on the record because I think it is worth having before this House; because it finally has to be determined how we will fund it and what the precise cost will be.

Briefly, then, the background:

Since 1946, expenditure on elementary and secondary education in Ontario has risen by 25 times. Per capita expenditure has risen from four per cent of personal income in 1960 to six per cent in 1970. What is even more significant is that total school board spending has risen 109 per cent from 1965 to 1969, while equalized assessment in the same period rose by only 60 per cent. That is where the property taxpayer comes in. In the same four years, the provincial share of the load crept up from about 45 per cent to 48 per cent, so that most of the extra burden fell on the homeowner. In dollar terms, then, the local contribution to elementary and secondary education rose from \$394.5 million in 1965 to \$741.9 million in 1969. Obviously there were bound to be outcries.

Now you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the former Minister of Education compounded the situation by the major policy moves sprung on the electorate after the 1967 election. It is his legacy we are talking about; it is the Achilles heel of the government we are talking about. We shall remind everyone in the province every step of the way the reason for which we have inherited such a difficult situation.

The county school boards were introduced without consultation with local officials and without consideration of regional government development in the works. I am reminded that the Premier gave the municipalities a lecture last year about the usefulness of consulting with school boards on planning decisions. His own example hardly gave strength to his advice. There were inevitable cost increases as the boards struggled to equalize services, provide kindergartens, and make salary scales uniform across the board.

Other cost additions came from the buildup of expensive administrative structures as county boards vied with one another for prestige.

The Premier did nothing to discourage this empire building and provided no immediate assistance to boards with severe cost problems. His failure to anticipate the problem is a measure of his government's incapacity to govern.

A second government policy also instituted after the election aggravated the situation further. I refer to the decision to put assessment on a market value basis across the province. Hardest hit were the farmers, some of whose assessment shot up as much as 500 per cent, and their education taxes often rose correspondingly; but many other property owners fall precisely into the same category.

In some cases they were retired persons or low-income homeowners, whose little cottage had become surrounded by urban and suburban development. They were quite unable to bear the huge tax increases resulting from the reassessment, but were reluctant to move or were unable to cash in on the assessed value of their property.

School tax increases contributed to their problems, especially in the rural municipalities where they had received in some cases up to 100 per cent payment before the advent of county boards. The government's reaction was a sort of glacial-like paralysis. The provincial share of education revenue drifted up only a point or two.

The then Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) told taxpayers facing huge assessment increases to go to the courts of revision and we waited while the reports came down—the Smith committee, the Carter commission, the Benson white paper, while there was further futile and antagonistic skirmishing between Ontario and Ottawa.

Suddenly, in 1969, the government awoke to the fact that education costs were a serious issue. The pensioners were in danger of losing their homes because of school tax increases. The farmers were paying three or four times as much education tax as city doctors and lawyers who had six times the income.

Typically, the government reacted rather than acted. It put patches on the system. It produced in 1969 the education mill rate subsidy at an estimated cost of \$48.4 million. Then there was a Treasury Board authorization—which I note in the public accounts

and wish someone could explain to me, maybe the Attorney General or the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs—for a further \$43.5 million, through the legislative grant vote. How much of this went to the county school board additional subsidy?

In 1970, the government finally yielded to the proposal that the province must assume a greater share of the total cost of education and relieve the property tax of the burden. But it only undertook to go from the level of 46 per cent currently to about 60 per cent and that over a three-year period. Even before the 1967 election, Mr. Speaker, you will recall we hoped it would go to 80 per cent. The provincial share was expected to reach 51 per cent in 1970.

Mr. Singer: That was a great discovery. When we announced that three years ago, you said it was nonsense. Do you recall that? That was quite a discovery, particularly for the member for York South.

Mr. Lewis: Also in 1970, the government had another typical reaction to the mounting prices. It threw a bone to the pensioners who were hardest hit by the steady rise in education taxes and the failure of their incomes to keep pace. It offered all those on the federal means test guaranteed income supplement—a \$50 handout—and an additional sum based on property taxes or rent paid which would guarantee each household the total of \$100. Pensioners who were ineligible for the guaranteed income supplement did not get any tax relief, nor do the working poor. That was the second try after the first abortive try to provide tax relief for senior citizens. Then came the farmers, with the 25 per cent tax rebate classification.

Now, the Prime Minister has apparently ended his abortive efforts at tax reform, this dismantling of the system through tax credits and tax rebates. He is trying the newest approach, the imposition of the ceilings, which make sense in some areas because some boards can cope with them adequately, and unselective nonsense in others.

You recall that quiet amendment which slipped through the legislative session in the dying days of the 1969 session, Mr. Speaker? The explanatory note on the bill said the 23-word amendment “authorizes regulations to be made governing school board estimates and expenditures for any purpose.” Admittedly, the opposition did not discover it until after the event. It was on that basis that the Prime Minister took to himself, arrogated to himself, the authority

to move in and do whatever he, at that time and subsequently, wished to do with the system.

That is a serious step. It raises fundamental questions of the role of our school boards and the goals of our educational system. I am suggesting that one does not exercise that kind of power, but surely one exercises it in the glare of public discussion, particularly when a recent Gallup poll shows that 49 per cent of the people are concerned about education costs.

There have to be priorities struck, Mr. Speaker—measured, reasoned—dealing with the essential problem of tax reform. That is what we are discussing when we strip away all the rhetorical nonsense in which, alas, politicians engage.

We then look at the whole mechanism of the delivery of educational services and the methods of paying for them and the method that has paid for them, which is advocated by the Liberal Party and by ourselves, the NDP. I cannot recall who was first, except I am sure we were.

Mr. Singer: Yes, indeed, the member's party spent a year and a half telling us how wrong it was.

Mr. Lewis: The answer to all of this—you know, I would not have believed the member would interject at that point.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Was the member for Scarborough West here before the Lord?

Mr. Lewis: The answer to all of this is not an 11th-hour repentance on the part of government. The answer is the assumption of 80 per cent of the costs of education.

Mr. Singer: That is a very good idea.

Mr. Lewis: All right. Let me get to it. The Liberal Party said that they would do it through more progressive forms of taxation than the outmoded property tax. Provincial revenues, I think the Liberal leader said. They have adopted the policy, but so far they have failed to give us any details at all—

Mr. MacDonald: As always.

Mr. Lewis: —of how they expect to finance the extra cost to the province except to suggest that it would be done through personal income tax. Now I believe the Leader of the Opposition estimated in his speech the other day—I listened carefully—he gave an estimate of \$700 million for the cost of assuming 80 per cent right now.

Last year the personal income tax in Ontario yielded about \$31 million or \$32 million per point. This year it may yield as much as \$38 million per point if it grows at the rate it has in recent years. But even at that level it would require a surtax of 18.5 points to raise the \$700 million this year.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): That is the Liberals.

Mr. Lewis: Is that what the Leader of the Opposition is advocating?

Mr. MacDonald: They have never thought about it.

Mr. Lewis: A provincial income tax not of 28 points but over 46.5? Because that is the way it works out arithmetically. In fact, it just shows how preposterous it is to make a blanket statement forever without an effort to analyse it.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): What has the NDP done?

Mr. Lewis: What have we done? I am going to tell the House very precisely, very precisely. What we have done is to make—

Mr. Ruston: We have been listening for an hour and have not heard a thing yet!

Mr. Lewis: I still have not exceeded the member's leader in time. I will, but not by much. We have made a careful study of the trends in education costs over the next five years in order to assess how much it will cost the province to take over 80 per cent on a phased programme during our first four years in office, which is what we have always said.

We do not think it would be feasible to do it all in the first year, much as we would like to relieve the property taxpayer overnight—

Mr. Singer: That is about word for word what we said—just about exactly.

Mr. Lewis: Nonsense! Seven hundred million dollars is what would be absorbed now. As a matter of fact, it is worth pointing out that if that is what the Liberals meant then you do not talk about \$700 million, because over a four-year period you are talking about \$1,400 million. That is the sum of money which has to be dealt with. A sum of money which the Liberals may not have thought of.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): A typical Liberal attitude.

Mr. Lewis: New sources of revenues, like capital gains tax, and a greater return from our resource industries take time to develop. We think these are areas which can provide some of the additional revenue needed rather than trying to load it all on the personal income tax.

Now in our calculation, Mr. Speaker, we have assumed that education costs will continue to rise as enrolment grows and price increases have to be met. But we think that the rate of increase can be reduced from the 15 per cent to 20 per cent evident in the past few years, to 13 per cent or 12 per cent or less. We hope that it can be reduced even further when our planned re-direction of the ways in which education is provided begins to take effect.

We are assuming that the province is prepared to pay 54 per cent of education costs in 1971 on its way to the promised 60 per cent by 1972-1973. We expect that that is already in the provincial Treasurer's budget.

We assume that we will take office some time in 1971 and have therefore worked out a phased plan—

Mr. Ruston: Do not hold your breath!

Mr. Lewis: —for moving from 54 per cent in 1971 to 80 per cent in 1975. This means that we are prepared to take over an additional 6.5 per cent in each of our first four years of office to make up the 26 points needed to reach 80 per cent by 1975.

After allowing for the anticipated increases in total education costs—and I have taken them at 12 per cent to 13 per cent, which is surely generous in present circumstances—we estimate that our programme will require the province to put into education grants an additional \$276 million in 1972; \$330 million in 1973; \$385 million in 1974; and \$444 million in 1975.

We have also calculated how much additional revenue can be expected with no increase in present tax rates but just from the growth of our economy. The interesting fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the anticipated growth until 1975 exceeds each year, in dollar amounts, what we would require to make up the 80 per cent of the costs of education by 1975. It is useful to note that, although we would not resort to that strategy alone because obviously it would leave money for normal increases in other cost factors. It is reassuring to find that the growth of the economy would outstrip the additional costs of education even were we to assume the full 80 per cent by 1975.

Mr. Singer: That destroys the member's previous income tax percentages, does it not?

Mr. Pilkey: He missed the point.

Mr. Deans: Come on, listen!

Mr. Lewis: But because we do not want to rely on the natural growth rate of the economy, which we have worked out rather carefully, we have looked at other possible ways of financing the expected amounts required.

We think it is high time that a corporate capital gains tax was instituted, and can see no justification for taxing capital gains at anything less than full income-tax rates. As Carter said, "A buck is a buck," whether it is made on the stock market or on an assembly line at General Motors.

The federal government is moving toward some sort of capital gains tax and we believe that Ontario must press them to introduce a fair one, not the emasculated version advocated by the provincial Treasurer in his white paper on tax reform.

Even if the federal government fails to bring in our kind of capital gains tax, we think it would be feasible for the Province of Ontario to make an arrangement with them to collect capital gains tax on a different basis for us, once the information relating to capital gains is included in the tax reform.

Mr. Martel: Do the members opposite understand?

Mr. Lewis: Now the capital gains tax is not anything for which anyone in this party has any apologetics. Believe me, it should have been instituted a very long time ago.

Were it not for the federal and provincial governments it would have been introduced by now.

We also think, Mr. Speaker—this is equally important—that this province should find the time to get a greater return from our resource industries, which produce over \$2 billion of wealth, but which return to us only about two per cent of that wealth, in mining and logging taxes and stumpage. Even their contribution through the corporation tax seems much less than it should be.

A recent DBS study showed that metal mining companies in Canada, in 1966, had book profits of \$396 million but taxable profits of only \$15 million, or four per cent, compared to a 56 per cent figure for all corporations. Other mining companies, Mr. Speaker, had taxable profits of 28 per cent of book profits. You can see how far behind

the mining industry is in terms of paying its fair share of resource taxation to Ontario, yet the mining industry had the second highest rate of return on capital employed in 1969—eight per cent after taxes, compared to just under seven per cent for all industries.

The balance of the requirement should be financed through the corporation and personal income taxes, in our view, even in their present unreformed state.

These are much fairer taxes than the regressive property tax and we do not hesitate to advocate the substitution of income tax additions for property tax. Only by so doing will we convert our unprogressive tax system into a progressive one.

There are many possible packages. Let me throw out some examples for at least the first couple of years.

For instance, in the first year we estimated that we needed some \$276 million. That could be obtained by earmarking one quarter of the revenue yield from the growth of the economy, estimated at \$80 million. Our anticipation of the first year's yield of a new capital gains tax at full rates is estimated at \$150 million, and \$48 million from an additional three per cent of the value of mining production.

There is not a single suggestion there, Mr. Speaker, which is other than sound. It involves an adequate percentage of natural growth, leaving 75 per cent of growth for other services to be provided. It takes a little more from the resource industries, which they should surely be willing to pay, and it takes the additional money from the first year of a capital gains tax.

Incidentally, the full capital gains tax in Ontario, according to the extrapolation which Carter provided, would be \$460 million. So you can see that by asking for \$150 million in the first year we are being measured and responsible within the limits of introducing this kind of tax.

Let us take it to the second year. We would need \$330 million in the second year. That could be raised by again taking one quarter of the revenue from economic growth—\$88 million—getting another \$70 million from a second year of capital gains tax—conceivably a little more—and the contribution of 10 per cent of production of the mining industry—which would bring us to \$80 million—and an additional one point on the corporation and personal income tax, and we would have the total of \$330 million. Again, in view of the drastic reduction in property taxes and the new tax revenue sources, this is something

that would be acceptable, I am sure, to the people of Ontario.

At that point, Mr. Speaker, I could indicate how one would finance the third and fourth years by using the growth of the economy, by using the capital gains tax, by using a further increase of mining tax. We have not even touched the logging revenue, which would give an additional yield; and we certainly are not interested in stepping up unduly the points on personal income or corporate income tax. We have never advocated 18.5 points, for example.

However, I may say, Mr. Speaker, that after the second year our own feeling is that we will save so much money in related programmes that it will no longer be necessary to tap these sources beyond present production. We will have so realigned the educational system in areas of community schooling—rather than confining education to buildings—in areas of teacher-parent-student control of the schools, incorporating certain economies and efficiencies in terms of teacher aids and assistants rather than all the emphasis on professionals which is now the case, and in terms of dramatic savings in the field of health services, that in these areas we could draw on certain additional funds and it would no longer be necessary to introduce drastic alternative alterations.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, if I may say, is entirely plausible. It brings us, by 1975, to the point where 80 per cent of the costs of education are absorbed provincially in a way which would relieve people extraordinarily in terms of property taxes, year by year, in increasingly dramatic ways. It funds the costs in ways that are responsible and appropriate. It would allow us finally, Mr. Speaker, to come to the core of the entire educational debate, which is to relieve the frustration and irritation which people right across this province feel, not so much because of the educational system, but because of the inequities of taxation with which we have lived under this government for far too long and which we will transform.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the new-look government.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Do the members opposite want to join us?

Mr. Martel: Where?

Mr. Randall: Well, obviously over here, not there.

Mr. MacDonald: Even the Attorney General would agree secretly, I am sure.

Mr. Lewis: While the predictions are based on governmental figures, the political predictions we share.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to one other aspect of the high cost of government. I note that the member for Downsview is itching to get to his feet and I assure him that I will deal only with those matters which I regard as compelling, and then take my seat. The high cost of government—

Mr. Speaker: The member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Farquhar) is next.

Mr. Lewis: I am sorry—that relates especially to health services, and I have some things in this area that I want to say because it is surely the most inadequate department of government, and one where the possibility of savings is absolutely endless.

In fact, I am going to indicate that we could save, in relatively short order, up to \$300 million for the Province of Ontario, were we to change the distribution of health services in the province and begin to develop the community clinics and the patterns that are the experience of other jurisdictions.

We have tolerated in the Province of Ontario, Mr. Speaker, for far too long, a health system which is oppressive in its cost, and there is absolutely no reason for that to continue to obtain. We have had all kinds of promises from the members opposite that the health services system would alter, but it has not happened.

For years they have deliberately been resisting alternative methods of delivery. They have constructed wasteful, non-preventive, monolithic-building-centred, wildly costly systems. The government has hospitals in this province whose per diems are in excess of \$100 a day; chronic and convalescent care occupying active treatment beds; still no funding for nursing homes. It has to end.

Without giving all the quotes—although they are neatly set out in Harold Greer's article on "Team Clinics and Health Care," reproduced, I imagine, in many papers—I have the one from *The London Free Press*. The quotes from Justice Hall, from the federal task force on the cost of health services, from the committee on the healing arts, from the Economic Council of Canada—they all show demonstrably that we get a better quality care at reduced cost by changing the system.

What do I mean by changing the system? I mean shifting the hospital-centred acute treatment apparatus of Ontario to a community clinic focus. Now let me give some comparisons so that the Speaker knows exactly whereof I speak.

In the Sault Ste. Marie clinic, for the last year for which figures are available, patients who came from the clinic had 680 bed-days of hospital use per 1,000 population. The figure for non-clinic patients—1,400 bed-days—was reduced by half.

In the plan for United States government employees, health centre patients occupy 408 bed-days per 1,000; private doctors plans—876 bed-days per 1,000—again, fewer than half.

In the Saskatoon community clinic, clinic patients take 650 bed-days per 1,000; non-clinic patients, 1,650 bed-days—better than twice the saving.

The Kaiser plan in California, which has been carefully investigated by this government, although it has said very little about it to the Legislature for reasons I do not know, is a similar comparison. The Ontario Council of Health sent a study committee to the Kaiser plant in California. They have there a plan involving 2,000 beds, 11 hospitals and 14 clinics with 900 physicians for the care of approximately one million persons in circumstances analagous to Ontario. The Council's 1970 report to the government quoted in a *Medical Post* article reads as follows—and this is from the Ontario Council of Health:

It noted that under the Kaiser plan, hospital days per 1,000 subscribers dropped from 650 in 1966 to 500 by 1968. The Kaiser figures do not include convalescent, chronic, psychiatric, or rehabilitative beds.

In order to get a direct comparison between the two systems, the committee adjusted the Kaiser figures to include hypothetically all these categories of patients plus mental patients according to standards of care prevalent in Ontario. It found that the adjusted total of days of hospital care per 1,000 subscribers under the Kaiser programme would be 1,722, compared with 2,858 hospital days of care in Ontario under our system. In effect, the total days of hospital care required in the Kaiser system is equal to only 60 per cent of 1967 Ontario figures—and those figures improve as the years pass.

The manpower committee was so impressed with its finding that it recommended—

And I have not heard a word of it uttered in this Legislature—

—a technique of health care delivery management utilizing economic incentives for efficient use of hospitals similar to the Kaiser system be introduced on an experimental basis in Ontario.

What does it mean for Ontario? Based on the net allowable operating cost of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission for 1970, we would have saved \$278 million—and it is a transposition which is entirely legitimate. It is one of the plans that has been carefully studied by government. All the other parallels hold up if we applied it to the Province of Ontario, and perhaps that is what is hinted at in the Throne Speech—the savings would be incalculable.

During the budget debate, Mr. Speaker, I will give you the actual costs, except that now I point out that the per diem rate in the Ontario Hospital Services system is \$49 a day, and for the Kaiser system, \$30 a day. It is on that basis that we worked out the per diem decrease. In fact, we worked out the cost in thousands of dollars per bed—the overall operating budget. No matter how it is checked, it works out to the same saving.

If, in addition to that, I say to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, drug costs were channelled through a central purchasing agency, according to the figures submitted by the Ontario Pharmacists Association, in Ontario we could save up to \$37.5 million. And even if that was not done through a medical care insurance plan, even if that was only done on a private basis, we could save up to \$24 million a year.

There are potential savings of major amounts to be derived from an extension of the home care system in Ontario, with which my colleague from Cochrane South will deal further in the Throne Speech debate. He will deal with all these matters in greater detail.

The chronic and convalescent areas can equally be provided rather less expensively. The premium levels in the province are the highest in the country. The double billing is unacceptable. There is no collective bargaining with the Ontario Medical Association, although it should be another dimension of cost-cutting which would introduce very major savings. The entire health services apparatus in the province is unduly costly. That is true of the mental health system, as well as the acute treatment hospital system. There are many cumulative changes to be

made. Again, the capacity of the government to function is called into question, and we will try to make those enviable alterations in the delivery of health services when we take office in this province.

That, Mr. Speaker, brings me to the concluding point for this Throne Speech debate, and it relates to the third matter with which the government dealt so cavalierly in the Throne Speech. That is the matter of foreign investment and economic nationalism. It is a matter on which we in this caucus intend to join issue with the government. We welcome the Tories to the fold of economic nationalism. The recent conversion of all their candidates, the inspired observations of Eddie Goodman with whom the member for Don Mills debates from time to time—Eddie Goodman, the bagman of the Tory Party, one of the senior representatives of the party who indicated catastrophic consequences for Ontario unless there were regulatory controls.

Mr. Randall: Has the member got any provincial premiers or Mr. Trudeau?

Mr. Lewis: We used to spoof the—

Mr. Randall: He did not answer me. He has not got any.

Mr. Lewis: Well, does the member want to throw it out again?

Mr. Randall: Even Mr. Schreyer is not in the member's camp.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Schreyer is firmly in our camp.

Mr. Randall: No, no!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Schreyer went to borrow portfolio capital, not equity capital, and the member for Don Mills knows the difference. Equity capital—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Equity capital exerts control. Portfolio capital is entirely legitimate, just as if one were to borrow \$50 million from—

Mr. Randall: It is a phony money deal.

Mr. Lewis: As though one were to borrow \$50 million from Germany. The member may have heard that this is done from time to time by the Ontario government.

Mr. Randall: The mad professor will take the member down the drain if he does not.

Mr. Lewis: The problem, Mr. Speaker, will not disappear. I know the member chafes a trifle. It was more fun in the front benches.

Some of us used to spoof the present Premier on his addiction, or his predilection, for committees. He has a capacity to establish committees where no others would dare. But I must say that none of us expected the masterpiece of evasion and dilution that he contrived in the establishment of this conference. The problem will not disappear just because he has established the conference.

The Throne Speech asks for a rational and unemotional discussion. That is the special Tory virtue of antiseptic and dispassionate debate where nothing is invested with any feeling, lest it be invested with conviction.

It is not emotional, Mr. Speaker, to establish that our energy resources are being sold to the United States, that our natural resources—mining and forestry together are controlled by non-residents; that book-publishing in this province—as the Prime Minister well knows—is in the process of serious erosion of Canadian control, thanks to his stewardship.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: And the union movement?

Mr. Lewis: I think it was one of the former ministers who said, "Why not let Jack McClelland go down the drain? Nobody reads his books anyway." That is the cultural view of the government. The distortions which the EIO forgivable loan programme created in Ontario, with its imbalance of aid to multinational corporations, the effects on secondary manufacturing industry, the consequences of branch plant layoffs and shutdowns.

What is emotional—if the repetition of all that which is factual is not—what is emotional, irrational, *ad hominum*, self-serving, is this strident stuff from the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman) and his predecessor about losing jobs because we might want to curtail foreign investment. It is just so much nonsense to continue raising that bogey forever. We are not dependent on foreign capital; the member opposite knows it and the Minister of Trade and Development knows it.

Mr. Randall: Get rid of General Motors. There will be more UAW jobs. Remember saying that in St. Catharines?

Mr. Lewis: Was the member like this in cabinet meetings? Maybe that is why they removed him.

Mr. Randall: That really nailed him.

Mr. Lewis: It is the silliest piece of demogogy for the Minister of Trade and Development in his remarks yesterday on unemployment to say that the figures of the unemployed would go from 700,000 to two million if there were controls on foreign investment. The government will not make any marks on that posterous kind of nonsense.

Mr. Randall: The hon. member thinks they will not?

Mr. Lewis: They most certainly would not, because as people in this House recognize, including the minister himself, despite the efforts of the lobby of multi-national corporations in conjunction with charitable governments, bankers and others, this economy is not dependent on foreign investment. It has not been dependent on foreign investment since the early 1960s and it is a matter of gross distortion for anyone to pretend otherwise. Because we are assembling the material, the government will necessarily be put on the defensive on this issue over the next little while.

Mr. Randall: How about all the jobs you are exporting?

Mr. Lewis: The fact of the—

Mr. Randall: Does the hon. member want to bet?

Mr. Lewis: I most certainly do. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Randall: The party opposite would be wiped out like it was 1944 if it votes on economic nationalism.

Mr. Lewis: I suppose I should point out to the minister, sir,—

Mr. Randall: Look at the effect last night. Double the vote against the NDP.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The member is sitting there because of his stand.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Makarchuk: That is the first word the Deputy Speaker has uttered in the Legislature.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, will you move for that member to be ejected—will you have him named? I know your authority, Mr. Speaker, and the weight of your personality, sir, and the way you can galvanize this Legislature into control and I would ask you to assert your control.

Mr. Speaker: He was not the only member. The hon. member for Don Mills was not the only one. There were others.

Mr. Lewis: There were others? Oh well.

Mr. Speaker: The member will continue.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, go to work on him.

Mr. Lewis: The point is, Mr. Speaker—I will be a little circuitous—but the advocacy of controls and repatriating our economy from foreign control is no different from policies advocated by virtually every single other country in the western world and the members opposite know it. And in all those countries there continues to be stepped-up activity on the part of the subsidiaries.

The fact that there is a political party in this province which would take seriously the matter of developing our economy with our own money is something which terrifies many members of the government benches who have developed a dependency relationship on continentalism, who see their roles as subservient to foreign interests in a way which works against the value of economic development in Ontario.

The positions of the members opposite are just a mask for their homage and capitulation to the continental design. In fact, that is why the conference has been called—so that we can have a little chorus of continentalists in Ontario somewhere toward the end of May or early June—

Mr. Randall: Take out the emotionalism.

Mr. Lewis: —paying the occasional lip service toward the need to exercise our own autonomy.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that the government has embarked on a really seriously mistaken strategy. It just will not wash. The government drastically underestimated the extent of public feeling and nobody in the Conservative Party has answered the essential questions. They are very simple questions. How does anyone in the Conservative Party in the Province of Ontario explain that 94 per cent of the money which is generated for investment in this country—perhaps therefore even more of it in this province—is generated from the retained earnings and the depreciation and depletion allowances, and from borrowing in the Canadian market on the part of those subsidiaries operating in Canada?

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Randall: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. That statement is completely incorrect. It is completely incorrect. It is a statement by Tommy Douglas and it was proven—

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. Sit down!

Mr. Deans: What is the hon. member's point of order?

Mr. Randall: I rose on a point of order.

Mr. Deans: State your point of order.

Mr. Randall: It is a completely irresponsible statement.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Eddie Goodman made that statement last night.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker is on his feet.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will continue his speech.

Mr. Randall: It is completely irresponsible. I refute it.

Mr. Lewis: All right, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to ask—

Mr. Randall: The figure is 26 per cent if the member wants the facts.

Mr. Lewis: —for a retraction from the member. I am going to refer him to the United States Department of Commerce study by David Bell on—to give it the exact title—“The Sources of Funds of U.S. Subsidiaries in Canada Operating in the Year 1968, Calculated from the Figures Published in the Survey of Current Business, November, 1970, by the United States Department of Commerce.”

From retained earnings—25 per cent. From depreciation and depletion—41 per cent. From borrowing in Canada—24 per cent. From equity sales in Canada—two per cent. From other sources within Canada, including miscellaneous sales of assets—two per cent. From U.S. parents and other U.S. sources—six per cent.

Mr. Martel: How does that grab you?

Mr. Pilkey: How do you like that?

Mr. Lewis: It may be that some people have been so traumatized by their demotion that they cannot add.

Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Deans: No, sit down.

Mr. Makarchuk: The hon. member's problem is that he has not been weaned from the bosom of foreign investment.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: Do not argue with those guys. The hon. member has got to convince them that he should be back up there.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker is standing. Sit down.

Mr. Lewis: There are a number of Freudian barbs coming from our back-benchers directed at the member for Don Mills and he will not understand them. I want him to relax.

Mr. Randall: Speak English!

Mr. Lewis: Let me go on to the next point.

An hon. member: Would the member answer a question?

Mr. Lewis: No, I will not answer a question. The member can enter the debate at will.

Mr. Randall: May I suggest the member for Scarborough West is talking gross instead of net.

Mr. Deans: The member for Don Mills wants to mess up the Constellation the way he has messed up everything else.

Mr. Lewis: I am talking figures which are absolutely indisputable. Mr. Speaker, the next point—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Randall: The member lost that one.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, the six per cent which is money raised from U.S. parents and other U.S. sources—amounted for all of Canada to the sum total of \$127 million. It is a fairly substantial sum of money, but it is not a sum of money which reduces us to a position of subservience when 94 per cent of the rest of the money is generated by ourselves. As a matter of fact, even the report recognizes that the money earned by American subsidiaries in Canada is Canadian dollars; our money, with which we are bartered and purchased from abroad. Only some find that difficult to comprehend.

Let me make the other point. Most of the \$127 million, Mr. Speaker, is invested in the

resource sector. That is where our foreign investment goes, largely—such as it is, the six per cent. And in terms of the argument which people opposite have been making, let us take a look at that.

In 1967, the last year for which figures are available, 73 per cent of the direct investment from the United States went into mining, petroleum, natural gas and pulp and paper. These industries are not big employers of labour, Mr. Speaker; they are capital intensive industries. In October, 1970, there were only between 50,000 and 60,000 people employed in these industries in the province of Ontario.

Worse still, by letting capital in for the resource industries we are not really creating jobs, we are exporting them—because under Tory policy much of the money goes for the removal of unprocessed raw materials.

Mr. Lawlor: How about that? Exporting jobs!

Mr. Lewis: And in the manufacturing sector—

Mr. Randall: He will not accept a question so I cannot answer. He is afraid of questions.

Mr. Lewis: In the manufacturing sector the total investment was two per cent.

Now the second point which no one on those benches has yet answered, is that the net capital outflow from Canada in the decade of the 1960s was \$2.5 billion by way of royalties, licence fees, management fees, dividends, and so on—\$2.5 billion more out than we received. How can the government expect to exercise control over our economy with that kind of outflow of capital?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Easy. Those figures are not right.

Mr. Lewis: In the 1970s, Mr. Speaker, it will have mounted to \$3 billion or more. Further, Mr. Speaker, what none of the members opposite has been able to understand or to refute is that in many significant manufacturing areas our very trade balance has been shifted to a negative factor by virtue of the capital outflow.

I will not go into the specific report. It is on the record before. It would indulge too much on the House's pleasure so I will not put that report on the record, but it is there for those who wish to see it. It is part of that analysis of 326 multi-national subsidiaries, a report which was handled by The Department of Trade and Commerce, federally, as I recall in the year 1969 or 1970.

Further, no one on that side of the House, indeed not even the present Attorney General who was the previous Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs, has been able to explain why such an absurd percentage of our unprocessed and semi-processed ores leaves the Province of Ontario—depriving us of jobs; denying an economic infra-structure to northern Ontario—to be smelted, refined and processed abroad.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: We are changing it.

Mr. Lewis: And why is the minister granting exemptions?

Mr. Martel: What happened at Falconbridge?

Mr. Lewis: Why is the government granting exemptions with such enthusiasm?

Mr. Martel: They are in Quebec, are they not?

Mr. Ferrier: It should have been in Temiskaming.

Mr. Lewis: In fact, the way in which these little documents emerge from our research department, before which even ministers opposite have bowed because of its expertise—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Is Quebec not still in Canada?

Mr. Martel: Do not give me that crap!

Mr. Lewis: In our research department, the little 1968 report on The Department of Mines was discovered, in which it indicated that over the previous year exports of nickel and of copper in unprocessed and semi-processed form had increased despite the white knight who charged into the department on his way to slightly better things.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Right. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that when one looks at all of these areas we know that we can control our economy because we are generating the money. And if we exercise, by way of regulation and by way of particular economic policy, some of those controls we do not need a conference to demonstrate the obvious; we just need some measures to reverse the trend. Abraham Rotstein in the *Toronto Daily Star* of March 31 put it rather well when he ended an article and said:

We have become addicted to foreign investment in this country as an apparently painless and costless solution to our

economic problems. It is neither, and we must begin to confront our own problems by drawing increasingly on our own resources and skills.

So little do we now receive by way of net capital inflow that the argument my colleague made yesterday in the debate on unemployment, on the number of jobs that are lost by branch-plant shutdowns and layoffs, may indeed exceed at this point the number of jobs created by new capital inflow. I do not mean the number of jobs created by the recycling of Canadian money through branch plant subsidiaries. That is our own money, and the jobs would be there whether under this government or under an NDP government. The only difference is that we will have some control of investment capital for social purposes and for rather more useful ends. And to that end, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Randall: Now quote from Ramsay Cook.

Mr. MacDonald: There is a mindless simplicity about the member's errors.

Mr. Randall: Quote from Ramsay Cook.

Mr. Lewis: Well, Ramsay Cook and I canvassed in Winnipeg in 1959. I did agree with him then and I do not agree with him now.

Mr. Singer: There will be more and more in that party the member does not agree with.

Mr. Lewis: Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the way in which it will be achieved is the early implementation of an Ontario Development Corporation into which will be channelled by law—I put it on the record carefully—funds from the private sector, and from the loan and trust and financial institutions purchasing bonds, on which they will receive a return, a fair rate of return. The Ontario Development Corporation will then have a considerable revenue with which to develop the public sector as it sees fit in terms of public priorities; will join in private-public ventures; will purchase equity in secondary manufacturing in Ontario; will use some risk capital in areas which private enterprise will not touch.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, there will be a spinoff—a multiplier effect, which seems to be the phrase used in this Legislature latterly—of various Crown corporations; one in the mining industry; one in the pulp and paper industry; one in the automobile insurance area; one in the area of drug distribution, Crown corporations which will also be allied to the Ontario Development Corpora-

tion and for which there is immense public support in the Province of Ontario. There will be, as many have advocated for a considerable period of time, takeover review boards with the authority to prevent further acquisition of Canadian companies by foreign ownership.

And there will be a code of corporate behaviour—not one to genuflect before in that cavalier fashion which means nothing; so often have Tories opposite talked of codes of corporate behaviour—but a code which embodies in it complete financial disclosure, a code which embodies in it provisions for economic justification in the case of branch plant shutdown or layoff, retraining, and relocation for the workers involved.

In sum, the essential problem, I say to the Premier and those opposite, is that the government lacks faith in Ontario. We do not lack faith in this province. The difficulty is that after 28 years of power, faced now with insurmountable problems, the government turns to solutions which others have long ago discarded. But, on the question of economic nationalism, it is more than the immobilizing absence of policy or will, it is an absence of faith in the capacities of this province to order, independent of foreign control, our destiny. That is where we divide in emotional ways as well as pragmatic ways. Over there, there is no sense that there is the capacity of Ontario to order its own economic destiny.

And if we did exercise our own controls, Mr. Speaker, there would be no great economic upheavals in the process. Controls of foreign investment and the use of public investment are commonplace in almost every western nation. As a matter of fact, they tend to stabilize the economy, creating more jobs by not losing them to the branch plant. But in Canada, in Ontario, a dogmatic, doctrinaire ideology renders the government passive, subject to an increasingly client-state position, which we will then have to reverse. The government avoids the obvious economic realities. Its arguments fit the situation up to about 1956, but the last 15 years have changed all that. So the government is reduced to specious, not to say spurious, reasoning.

The evidence is on our side, Mr. Speaker. The documentation is on our side, Mr. Speaker. The record supporting our position mounts with every day that passes. The public is emotionally on our side. More and more the public has the knowledge and the substance to give weight to their emotional instincts. You ask for a rational and unemotional discussion. Time is running out, Mr.

Speaker, rational discussion for the Tories means waiting a decade.

We make no apologies for feeling emotion about the erosion of our economic sovereignty. We will debate with the government up and down Ontario in the next election on matters of economic independence and the public will be with us, as the government learned in its own leadership campaign. So, have conferences and little festivals of protocol and little pre-election rituals of public concern. They will serve the government not at all. That is the style of an old government, not a new one. The capacity to govern fails again.

If the Premier were here, Mr. Speaker, I would say to him, look to his flanks. For one week a government, supposedly novel, has been in office. It is actually the fourth year of the old regime. Its housing programme is discredited. Its unemployment policies are discredited. The Ontario Hospital school system looms yet again as a grim recollection of continuity with the old regime. The possibility of yet extra double billing in medical insurance raises its head. One of the regional governments is already in disarray: a sad augury for the rest. Nothing smacks of newness.

It is an ancient, failing, unimaginative, listless rump of a great party that once was and is now destined for defeat; and the Premier has accomplished it all in one week.

That is a considerable record. It might not have happened with the Attorney General had he achieved other office, but it has been a remarkable performance of failure in one week.

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): The member said that four years ago.

Mr. Lewis: It would never have happened under the man for London North (Mr. Robarts). He would not have tolerated it. The Premier's whole Throne Speech showed that. Ah, had we only drafted that document, Mr. Speaker, what worlds there would have been to conquer. The whole welter of social and economic change which is in our programme would have been introduced, piece by piece, point by point, in a way which wins public admiration and support, as is demonstrable in the Province of Manitoba.

I want to tell you—across the rows over there—we face this election in good spirits. We are anxious for it. Never again in the foreseeable future will the Tories form a majority government in this province; probably not for the rest of this century.

My suggestion—and it is offered in good faith—is that they should call an election sooner than later, because with every day that passes they handicap themselves ever more grievously. We are not sanguine about elections, Mr. Speaker. We know how tough they are, how difficult a road it is—

Mr. Villeneuve: The member will find out.

Mr. Lawlor: We will teach the government a lesson.

Mr. Lewis: —how much muscle has to be brought to bear. But I may say that we have profound hopes of forming the single largest party in this province after this election, and when we do, Mr. Speaker, we will deliver the promises to which we pledged ourselves.

And on that note I want to read a sub-amendment to the amendment placed before the House: I move, seconded by the member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman) that the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable, the Lieutenant Governor now before the House be amended—having accepted all the gestures in the Liberal amendment—by adding after the words “the rightful heritage of the people of Ontario” the following words—for obvious reasons:

9. the failure of the government to reassert Ontario's control over its own economy by refusing to:

(a) Establish or revamp the provincial development corporation actively to develop resources and secondary industry by planned channelling of a greater proportion of the capital available for investment in this province.

(b) Amend the corporation and securities laws to provide for full disclosure of the operations of foreign-controlled subsidiaries.

(c) Establish a takeover review board which would examine proposals for takeovers by foreign interests and work out methods for retaining Canadian control and protecting Canadian interests.

(d) Stop incentive grants to foreign-based corporations, giving them instead to Canadian enterprises in return for an equity interest so that the people share in any profits.

10. The failure of the government to spur in particular the processing of northern raw material and the development of secondary and tertiary industry in the north by refusing to:

(a) Establish a Crown corporation for mine exploration and development and to force the pace of expansion through public enter-

prise, and if appropriate, engaging in joint ventures with private enterprise already active in the mining sector.

(b) Establish a northern development fund purposefully to direct an equitable amount of investment to the region.

11. The failure of the government to establish a universal public automobile insurance programme at cost based on compensation regardless of fault.

12. The failure of the government to lower the eligible voting age to 18.

On those issues and on all others enumerated, we look forward to the hustings, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Moved by Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Pitman:

That the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech by the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor now before the House be amended by adding after the words "the righteous heritage of the people of Ontario" the following words:

9. The failure of the government to reassert Ontario's control over its own economy by refusing to:

(a) Establish a revamped provincial development corporation actively to develop resources in secondary industry by planned channelling of a greater proportion of the capital available for investment in this province;

(b) Amend the corporation and securities laws to provide for full disclosure of the operations of foreign-controlled subsidiaries;

(c) Establish a takeover review board which would examine proposals for takeovers by foreign interests and work out methods of retaining Canadian control and protecting Canadian interests;

(d) Stop incentive grants to foreign-based corporations, giving them instead to Canadian enterprises in return for an equity interest so that the people share in any profits.

10. The failure of the government to spur in particular the processing of northern raw materials and the development of secondary and tertiary industry in the north by refusing to:

(a) Establish a Crown corporation for mine exploration and development and to force the pace of expansion through public enterprise and, if appropriate, engaging in

joint ventures with private enterprises already active in the mining sector;

(b) Establish a northern development fund purposefully to direct an equitable amount of investment to the region.

11. The failure of the government to establish a universal public auto insurance plan at cost based on compensation regardless of fault.

12. The failure of the government to lower the eligible voting age to 18.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on that motion, could we ascertain just why the government has changed its mind, why the government cannot stick to an announced programme even through a period of 24 hours? I noticed, Mr. Speaker, that the next gentleman on the list, the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. R. G. Hodgson), left the House in a great dudgeon—if he had had a gun, I suspect he might have shot the House leader—when suddenly the government in its great wisdom suddenly decided to change the order of the day.

Surely we can expect—not that it makes any difference to us because we can proceed with either the Throne debate or with the unemployment debate—but surely we have a right to expect that this brave new government is going to be so able to order its affairs that it knows at least 24 hours in advance what the order of business is going to be in this Legislature.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I think that comment calls for no comment in reply. The government directs the business of the House. As the hon. member for Downsview admits, it makes no difference to him whether we go to the debate on the unemployment motion or no, and in our wisdom we felt this was a good time to do it. So I would ask for the second order.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The second order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion that this House expresses its great concern over the serious unemployment that is prevailing in Ontario and throughout Canada.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): They have probably lost another whip. We will not see him around too often.

NOTICE OF MOTION I
(Continued)

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, in this debate that is on-again, off-again, there is no particular amount of objection from me—we take the attitude on this side of the House, of course, that we are ready any time to do anything and if not, we will take our chances.

In any case, my compliments to the previous speaker on the other debate. It is a hard act to follow by a low-key member—

Mr. Singer: Not at all!

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Maybe we will hear some sense.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Ed Sullivan would bring in the dog act right now.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): He is honest. The rest of those Liberals are not.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Do not let them chastise you.

Mr. Farquhar: They probably did not hear what I said about appropriate emphasis on the word "act."

An hon. member: The hon. member for Don Mills is next.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin has the floor.

Mr. Farquhar: Mr. Speaker, this exercise that we are going through, this unemployment debate, has to be the most significant one in my experience here in the Legislature and one can only speculate on the reasons why the government would introduce a motion like this in an area in which it is so abysmally weak.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Farquhar: Whether strategy dictated the move in an effort to forestall, say, a want of confidence debate or motion or whether the cabinet ministers were prepared to suffer through a debate that might take the heat off or out from under the very serious problem, we will probably never know.

Mr. Nixon: It is supposed to be the beginning of the new wave.

Mr. Farquhar: In any case, it would seem to me that the turn of this debate would indicate that it will be some time before the government will put this Legislature in a position where all of their inadequacies with respect to unemployment policies can be trotted out and highlighted for the attention of the people of Ontario.

Mr. J. Morin (Ottawa East): Hear, hear!

Mr. Farquhar: One thing seems to be coming clear, and that is that the way for a new cabinet minister to make his mark and move up in the pecking order will entirely depend upon how loud he can shout at Ottawa. It is disturbing indeed that this government through its ministers seems to be taking a stance that is rapidly moving this province into a situation against the Dominion of Canada.

Let me highlight, if I can, two areas of government policy at both senior levels that are inadequate and, at the same time, offer a suggestion in each case as to a more positive approach to curing unemployment especially in the parts of the province where I have responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday there were, and there will be, many speakers who dwell on the situation created by high unemployment in urban centres, and the things that the three levels of government are or are not doing about it. I am concerned specifically, and it is my responsibility, to do something about the large number of unemployed in small communities, towns and villages and rural, semi-rural and northern municipalities in an area such as Manitoulin Island and along the north shore.

The direct and immediate results, of course, as has been said by other speakers, are the mushrooming costs of welfare and the many social and family disruptions. Anywhere we look today, of course, we can read about the approaches of the two senior levels of government in their several attacks on high unemployment and the shortcomings in the policies of these two levels with respect to this attack.

Most of what I have to say today, or have heard yesterday from the government benches, seems to be oriented to the problems in large urban centres. We hear elaborate statements from the provincial government regarding the infusion of funds into the building of government buildings, housing and related efforts to absorb unemployed people, and we read a lot these days about the federal government's approach to providing employment.

Some of us are even involved in the applications for the incentives available to potential industries. Both of these programmes no doubt have merit and, no doubt, in time will have the effect of reducing unemployment and making our metropolitan areas bigger and more affluent than ever, but neither one, unless real changes and real understanding take place, will have any effect on the rural or small community citizens with whom I am concerned.

The first area I want to speak about for the moment is the assistance being made, granted, or becoming available now to municipalities in the form of support for municipal public works in these small towns. In that regard, especially in areas like Algoma-Manitoulin, I have the feeling somehow that the senior levels of government have largely forgotten the third party in government in terms of efforts to reduce unemployment.

Oh, yes, I know about the subsidies branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs and their \$1 per capita offer which in a town like Webbwood or Massey or Gore Bay, will provide \$400 or \$500 toward a capital assistance programme, but I am convinced that the elected municipal local governments, if given the proper support, are the only level of government which know the needs of their communities, which recognize the abuses and wastes creeping into welfare programmes, and which would very quickly take care of the unemployment in their midst.

It is my hope that through the new Minister of Economics (Mr. McKeough) and through the new Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) that they would accept my suggestion and my opinion that this provincial government enter into a much more significant shared financial arrangement with the federal government which would offer to municipalities, with inadequate assessment bases, a much more lenient and a higher level of support in the way of per capita or additional or unconditional grants: a much higher percentage of every dollar the municipalities are prepared to put into approved municipal works, such as sewers, waterworks, streets and sidewalks, even housing.

Oh, I understand that the larger centres are going to get most of the bonanzas from both the federal and provincial governments, because of course that is where the votes are. It is my responsibility, however, to persuade this government and the federal government to look beyond those highly urban centres and look at the areas of what I consider real and important need.

The interesting part of this whole question, of course, is that most of the communities I have in mind have plans already formulated and cost studies on hand for various desired projects. I have even been instrumental in arranging that these studies be made at quite some significant administrative costs. But these studies have only proven that these municipalities cannot afford them and they will never get them without the kind of assistance I am suggesting. I am convinced that the municipal elected governments, under such a plan, would quickly and efficiently assume responsibility for the upgrading of services and the provision of amenities that semi-rural people are just as entitled to as urban dwellers.

I am convinced also that such projects would be administered by the municipalities in such a way as to decrease unemployment and curtail the welfare spending and with a positive result. Such a programme would supply the housing and other services without which small communities will never attract industry, but with which they would have a fighting chance for survival, perhaps even growth.

Those of us who are concerned with approaching industry and trying to attract industry and persuading industry and other entrepreneurs to move into these small areas—in other words trying to promote decentralization of the work force—have run into the situation many, many times where industries look at our low assessments but finally turn off their ambition and their enthusiasm because of the lack of services in these small areas.

It is indeed interesting to speculate on the advantages that would result from a higher level of co-operation with the municipalities by both levels of senior government. For instance, if there were guidelines attached in a more definite and more positive way to the spending of such funds, the municipalities would very quickly, as I have said, clean up the available work force in their midst.

They would be required, of course, to put to work local people as a priority on such projects. The citizens of these municipalities would be allowed to experience some of the pleasures and the advantages that are supposed to go with modern living. Those municipalities would be put in a position where they could attract industry and more employment. Last, but not least, every such project entered into would result in decreased pollution of our lakes and rivers. As I have suggested, the ideas stemming from the two

senior levels of government seem to ignore the fact that the people who could do the job are not being allowed and assisted to do it and are not even considered in most of the programmes. The programmes that we read about and hear about are programmes that are imposed on municipalities, not offered to the municipalities.

Let me tell you how the municipalities in my riding feel by reading only two or three of the pertinent parts from letters from mayors and reeves on Manitoulin and along the north shore. One is from Mayor Donald McMillan of the town Webbwood to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr).

In the town of Webbwood, the water and sewer project seems to have been completely engineered and from the standpoint of the municipality, ready to proceed. In correspondence, however, with the commission it seems that while the physical arrangements are complete, the Ontario Water Resources Commission is not prepared to proceed until 1972. It is my feeling that advancement of this project to 1971 would take care of some badly needed employment, as well as putting our town in a position where they could attract some interested industry.

It is our opinion that these projects are moving much too slow and are attacking the requested resolution of council.

Another one from the town of Gore Bay on Manitoulin Island; Mayor John Lane says—well, he details and I will not go through this. He details three projects that have priorities and they worked on them for years and finally concludes in this way:

The only way we could possibly do these projects is to receive unconditional grants or assistance from government departments. A per capita grant does not do much to alleviate the situation, because our total population in the town is less than 800 persons. However, we do supply goods and services for our farming populations of over 3,000 people in the surrounding countryside and so on. I am sure many small municipalities in northern Ontario are faced with much the same problem as we are here in Gore Bay.

Another one, again from the mayor of Gore Bay, and it is to the Prime Minister's (Mr. Davis) office:

I have read with interest your recent release from the department of the Prime Minister, regarding work programmes to

relieve the unemployment situation, and of particular interest to towns for grants and low interest loans for employment stimulating capital projects. Our town is now faced with the cost of installing a sewage treatment plant and there is no way that it is possible for the taxpayers to bear the cost of such a project.

I think that most of the municipalities in my riding have been acquainted with some of the statements that have taken place recently and of course they are doing their best to get involved in those programmes.

Mr. Speaker, the other concern that I have, and of course, it is an extension of some of the remarks that our leader made with respect to this province's approach to the federal government. What he was saying, of course, reflects the fact that this government of Ontario seems to refer to the federal government as those Liberals in Ottawa, instead of thinking of them as the government of Canada.

What the cabinet of this government seems to forget is that there are those of us who have taken the trouble to inquire into federal efforts and available assistance in the form of incentives to industry and, in fact, deal with them every day. I personally have been doing it for a long time and I would expect to do it further. I am quite prepared and have taken a fairly independent critical approach to solve the shortcomings of the federal government, and incidentally, I make no apologies—echoing what the new Treasurer said the other day. I make no apologies either for the fact that I will go to Ottawa or Timbuktu, or anywhere else to get the kind of things for my people that I cannot get here, and as I say, I am doing it every day. It might be interesting for the members to know that during the last six months I have been involved in nine successful applications for incentives in the Algoma-Manitoulin and Algoma area.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Do not see the Tories nominating anybody up there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: After years of representing it, one wonders.

Mr. Trotter: You are just jealous.

Mr. Farquhar: This is not to say that all of the efforts I have engaged in have been successful. I expect that there are many again that have not been successful, but certainly when you wander through all the levels of

authority at 950 Yonge Street and you assist in providing the details necessary to complete applications for provincial and federal incentives, you become fairly familiar with the roadblocks that are placed in the way of an entrepreneur at both the federal and provincial levels, and through the process of working those applications through to finalization, at whichever level, some very interesting information comes to the front.

Some very interesting comparisons can be pointed up between the initiative and the ambition and the sincerity of the provincial programme as opposed to the federal one. And it is my suggestion to the Minister of Treasury and Economics and to the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman), that those gentlemen take a very close look at the operation at 950 Yonge Street and if either one of them needs any more information with respect to the inadequacies over there, all he has to do is ask me.

Mr. Nixon: I think the member would make a good minister in that department.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Do what Bourassa did and appoint him.

Mr. Farquhar: Well, I hope that this government is sincere and really means the words in the Speech from the Throne—

Mr. Trotter: No chance, not a chance.

Mr. Farquhar: —that have to do with the incentives available to industry and the intentions of the government to update their efforts in that regard.

Mr. Trotter: No way will they ever update it.

Mr. Farquhar: I quote, for instance, from the Speech from the Throne:

Existing regulations and standards of the Ontario Development Corporation and the Northern Ontario Development Corporation are being revised so that assistance will be more readily available to small Canadian-owned businesses and to certain segments of our service industries. A programme of immediate assistance has been launched to improve or relocate tourist establishments.

Well, there certainly have to be some changes there to make that programme significant, because at the moment the municipal people and most of the citizens in Algoma-Manitoulin understand and have knowledge of the lengthy delays and are very much aware of these shortcomings. And no amount of flamboyant publicity by the department concerned with NODC is going to promote anything at this point up there but derision.

Mr. Nixon: They should have turfed out the old dead wood, as the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) said.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would find this an appropriate point at which to break his remarks, or if he has only a minute or two he could continue.

Mr. Farquhar: If I could take another minute or two I would appreciate it.

I just want to mention that too many of the entrepreneurs concerned about doing something in the way of self-employment and hiring other people, have made approaches to that department and wound up in utter frustration. I could go into some deep detail with respect to specific applications to ODC and now NODC, and the terrible time lag and the terrible frustration that is felt.

I do not want to place on the record a lot of detail with respect to the interminable delays when applications are made, but I get the feeling that the delays are not because of lack of administrative efforts, or ambition or initiative at 950 Yonge; the delays are made necessary because of the inertia right here. I just do not believe—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Farquhar: I just do not believe that the minister responsible really understands that when a young fellow on a payroll decides to leave that payroll and become an entrepreneur and make an investment in some industry that would provide him and others employment, he cannot afford to wait six months for a decision to be made, which so often turns out to be negative. And what do you think he does during those six months except stay at home and lose his initiative and his ambition to proceed.

In that regard, at least the department people responsible for provincial incentives to industry could take a leaf out of the Regional Economic Expansion programme's book.

I have several times assisted an entrepreneur to make his application, sent it to the Regional Economic Expansion office, waited for a week, demanded an interview, made a trip to Ottawa and in one day a decision is made, yes or no. That is the way to do business and that is what this government does not understand.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): A designated area is different.

Mr. Farquhar: It has nothing to do with designation; it has nothing to do with it. These incentives we are talking about now have no reference to designation—I think maybe the hon. minister had better go over to 950 Younge Street to—

Mr. Singer: Issue a writ! That will show them. Issue a writ!

Mr. Farquhar: Approaches being taken now with respect to incentives in our part of the country have worked for me and they have worked for a lot of people in Algoma-Manitoulin. And I expect that will continue to. I would certainly be delighted to promote a greater use of incentives from the Province of Ontario if I had not had several sad experiences.

The people in my riding are prepared to make use of any programme that is offered in seriousness by this government, they are prepared to put their life savings into small industries that will provide employment but they cannot wait six months for a decision from this government.

The members opposite will be quick to say, of course, that the provincial Liberals are once again crawling into bed with the federal Liberals. But there are at least two cabinet ministers among the members opposite who know that my approaches to the federal government have been significant.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member, I notice, is picking up another page and we have gone several minutes past the adjournment hour.

Mr. Farquhar: Actually, I think this is a pretty good spot. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Farquhar moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before moving adjournment of the House I would like to indicate that we will resume the debate on the reply to the Speech from the Throne tomorrow and possibly we will get into some second readings.

It is my understanding that all the bills on the order paper are now printed, so if we have an opportunity we will go to second reading.

Mr. MacDonald (York South): To any of them or all of them?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Possibly to all of them.

Mr. MacDonald: Can the minister give us any indication?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They will all be ready; they are all printed.

An hon. member: Are any of them very serious? Nothing very—

Mr. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): A morning session or an afternoon session?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There is no morning session.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:05 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Changes in regulations under Department of Correctional Services Act, statement by Mr. Apps	287
Meeting delegation from St. Catharines re regional government, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	288
Meeting with Chairman Campbell re Metro welfare budget, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Trotter	288
Study re foreign ownership of land north of Sault Ste. Marie, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer	289
Policing of government game regulations in Quetico Park, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Nixon	291
Investigation on operation of jug milk companies, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Deans, Mr. Trotter	291
Justification for price hike in gasoline sales, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis	292
National Energy Board's report re decrease of oil imports from Alberta, questions to Mr. Kerr and Mr. Bernier, Mr. Lewis	293
Government policy on public transit, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis	293
More monitoring stations in Windsor area to record air pollution index, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. B. Newman	293
Demolition contracts re Orchard House at Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital, question to Mr. Auld, Mr. Deans	294
Capital grants to greenhouse operators, question to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Paterson	295
Assistance to municipalities re phosphate removal from sewage, question to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Ruston	295
Approval of increase in fees for DeVry Institute of Technology, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Young	295
Limiting upper speed capability of motor cars, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Young, Mr. Shulman	296
Sales tax revenue lost on sale of securities by Ontario residents, questions to Mr. Winkler, Mr. Deacon	296
Use of Fifty-Point Park facilities by general public, question to Mr. Kerr, Mr. J. R. Smith	297
Price difference in quotations on German-made and Canadian-made chain saws, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Gisborn	297
Programme to install facilities for phosphorus from municipal sewage, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Burr	298

Feasibility of dispensing alcoholic beverages in plastic containers, question to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Sopha	299
Report from advisory committee on Algonquin Park, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. R. S. Smith	299
Welcoming parliamentary delegation from Italy, Mr. Yaremko, Mr. De Monte, Mr. Lewis	299
Presenting report, inspector of legal offices, Mr. A. F. Lawrence	300
Motion that procedural affairs committee consider possibility of House not sitting Wednesdays, Mr. Davis, agreed to	300
Landlord and Tenant Act, bill to amend, Mr. T. Reid, first reading	300
Public Utilities Act, bill to amend, Mr. T. Reid, first reading	300
Landlord and Tenant Act, bill to amend, Mr. Deans, first reading	301
Public Health Act, bill to amend, Mr. Deans, first reading	301
Administration of medicine in schools, bill to control, Mr. Ben, first reading	301
Regulation of driver training schools, bill to provide for, Mr. Burr, first reading	301
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Lewis	301
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, agreed to	331
On Notice of Motion No. 1, continued, Mr. Farquhar	332
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Farquhar, agreed to	336
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to	336



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, April 8, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

**THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971**



CONTENTS

**(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.
The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I announce to this House the establishment of three new wild river parks.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Wild river parks?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I know the Leader of the Opposition will welcome the news.

These important additions to our provincial park system will provide opportunities for wilderness recreation experiences which are so important to a growing number of people in Ontario.

The Mississagi Wild River Park, located northeast of Sault Ste. Marie, is the largest of the three parks, comprising some 120 miles of the rugged Mississagi River and connecting waters. The park runs from near Biscotasing on the CPR main line to Rocky Island Lake, north of Thessalon.

The Chapleau-Nemegosenda Wild River Park includes 75 miles of the Chapleau and Nemegosenda rivers in the area between the town of Chapleau and Kapuskasing Lake, adjacent to the main line of the CNR. This wild river park offers the canoeist an opportunity for a most interesting circle route through landscapes of wide variety.

The Lady Evelyn Wild River Park is the third of the new parks and comprises a 35-mile section of this river which empties into beautiful Lady Evelyn Lake in the Temagami country.

These three wild river parks augment the two previously established parks in this class—the Winisk River flowing into Hudson Bay and a segment of the historic Mattawa River. With the exception of the remote Winisk River, all of these parks are readily accessible to the canoeist who welcomes the challenge of travelling untamed rivers.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Trade and Development.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the March 31, 1971, issue of *The Globe and Mail*—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): It is probably all true.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —questioned a loan granted a Quebec firm known as Bio-Research Laboratories by the Ontario Development Corporation. It asked the question, "Was this an Ontario raid on Quebec?"

Mr. Speaker, there has been no change in Ontario's policy toward attracting industry from other provinces in Canada. If Bio-Research had removed its existing operation from Quebec, the government of Ontario would not have provided it with any financial assistance. Our policy is very clear, and I would like to enunciate it for the benefit of the members.

If a company wishes to remove its entire operations from another province into Ontario, no financial assistance of any kind will be given to it by this government. If a company located in another province of Canada wishes to leave its existing operation in that province to establish a branch plant in Ontario, either to better supply the Ontario market or for other good business reasons, then financial assistance will be given for the establishment of a branch plant operation only.

In the case of Bio-Research, financial assistance was given by the Ontario Development Corporation to enable the company to increase both its physical facilities and employment in the Province of Ontario and to allow further expansion in Quebec at the same time. Construction of the new facilities in Quebec is already under way.

If the circumstances had contravened our existing policies, no financial aid would have been given. Bio-Research Laboratories has two establishments, one in Gloucester township near Ottawa and the other in Montreal. It is engaged in biological and allied research and is an expanding organization.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): No; that is not what Etchen said.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In drawing up its expansion plan the company decided that it would be more efficient for it to relocate its toxicology division alongside its animal breeding activities in Gloucester township. There were two major reasons for this decision: 1. To guard the animals against the possibility of contamination in intercity shipment and thus preserve their virus-free status—

Mr. Sargent: The hon. minister is out of order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —2. To make the space which this division was occupying in Montreal available for other expansion. Twenty-nine new staff will be employed in Gloucester township, of which about 10 will be coming from Quebec and 19 will be recruited in Ontario. The loss of these 10 from Quebec will be more than made up by the creation of about 20 new jobs in Montreal.

I am advised that the company is already engaged in expanding its other divisions in Quebec as follows: Pollution research division, pharmacology division, microbiology division and a chemistry division. Expansion of these facilities in Montreal is already under way; and as I mentioned earlier, relocating the toxicology premises in Montreal will provide the company with additional space in Quebec for this expansion.

At the present time the company is employing 75 people in Quebec. When the expansion of existing facilities, which are already under way, is completed and, after the transfer of the toxicology division to Gloucester township, the existing work force of 75 people will be increased to 90 people immediately, with further increases probable in future years.

By these arrangements and with the assistance of an ODC performance loan, all interested parties to this transaction will benefit. The company will be enabled to expand its facilities in both Ontario and Quebec in the most efficient manner and in the company's best interest. These arrangements would give the operations in both Ontario and Quebec the best chance to succeed. Ontario will gain a new toxicology division and 29 jobs. Quebec will achieve expansions to the pollution research division—

Mr. Sargent: Twenty-nine jobs!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —chemistry division, microbiology division and pharmacology divi-

sion. In addition it will gain the space vacated by the toxicology division to accommodate part of this expansion. The existing work force in Montreal will grow from 75 to 90 immediately, with further increases in the future.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Social and Family Services.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I am happy today to announce that the Ontario Department of Social and Family Services is officially recognizing June 20 to 26 as Ontario Senior Citizens' Week in this province, with the theme, "Lot to live; lot to give". Ontario senior citizens, Mr. Speaker, have indeed a lot to live for; they also have a lot to give to other members of the community. This is why the Ontario Department of Social and Family Services is officially recognizing Ontario Senior Citizens' Week.

We would wish, Mr. Speaker, that each and every community in this province would take part in this special tribute to our elderly. Although the promotion of a province-wide senior citizens' week is new, the idea as such is not. Many groups of senior citizens' clubs across Ontario have been endorsing the week, beginning with the third Sunday in June, each year, as Senior Citizens' Week.

The hon. member for Durham (Mr. Caruthers) has in previous years, as you know, Mr. Speaker, introduced into this Legislature a bill to proclaim such a week—and it has been endorsed by members of all political parties in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I have set up an advisory committee for Ontario Senior Citizens' Week. This committee will be chaired by the member for Durham and will include representatives of senior citizens' associations in this province. I would, Mr. Speaker, encourage organizations and individuals to get involved in the planning and carrying out of this first province-wide Senior Citizens' Week.

During this time, we want to make as many people as possible aware of the contribution of the elderly, of the services for the elderly and what it means to grow old. Primary planning for the week will be at the local community level where—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): What about supplementing their income as a first start?

Hon. Mr. Wells: —municipal governments and voluntary associations are most involved with senior citizens' groups and elderly people in the area. Our department, Mr. Speaker,

particularly the homes for the aged branch, will give support—

Mr. Lewis: Just give a little monthly supplement to the old age security. It will be a lot better than a special week.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —to all endeavours and will encourage other departments, commissions and agencies of the government of Ontario to co-operate with other private groups concerned.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): What about the Treasury Board?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, an information kit with ideas and suggestions as to activities which can be planned for Senior Citizens' Week is this week being sent to all municipal councils and social service departments in Ontario—

Mr. Deans: How about raising their income to the poverty level?

Hon. Mr. Wells: —all social planning councils, newspapers and all members of this House.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): The minister remembers who said, "Let them live on cake," eh?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The member just does not have an interest in them.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Is the member for Scarborough West opposing it?

Mr. Lewis: No, no; but when he was Minister of Health he did not bring nursing homes under medical care insurance.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The member has no interest.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier if he has assumed the responsibilities of chairman of the Design for Development cabinet committee?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have not assumed the responsibilities of chairman of the Design for Development committee.

Mr. Lewis: Somebody should!

Mr. Nixon: Since he is not chairman, I wonder if he can report to the House if there

is any discussion at the cabinet level towards the application of the Toronto-centred region as it applies to Century City and the problems that have been brought forward, not only by those people who have purchased the lands, that is the developers—and I must say I am not so interested in their problems as the problems of the farmers who sold the land to the developers in the first place. Is the Premier aware that payments on these lands have in many cases been abandoned over many months since the Toronto-centred region was established? Is any action at the governmental level contemplated?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, all submissions relating to the Toronto-centred region have been transmitted, perhaps some are still in the process, to The Department of Treasury and Economics. The question of Century City, of course, is one of those areas under consideration. As further developments are determined with respect to the Toronto-centred region, the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) and myself will fully inform the House. I am quite aware of the difficulty with respect to the landowners, or perhaps they really are mortgagees in this instance, who sold their lands to Century City.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Can the Premier state to the House whether or not any of his colleagues or former colleagues entered into an undertaking with the developers that the plan for Century City could be and would be approved?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge there is no undertaking by this government that Century City would be approved.

Mr. Nixon: The question had to do with his colleagues, that is particularly the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough).

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for the former Minister of Municipal Affairs. As I say, there is no commitment to my knowledge from this government with respect to Century City.

SPEED LIMIT ON QEW

Mr. Nixon: A question of the Minister of Highways and Transportation.

Has he any plan to increase the speed limit on the Queen Elizabeth Way, where the six lanes have been completed, to 70 miles per hour?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): Did the hon. member get caught this morning?

Mr. Nixon: If I get caught once more—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Mr. Speaker, not quite in the categorical terms which constituted the question asked by the—

Mr. Nixon: It is urgent.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: To the hon. Leader of the Opposition I would say that the matter is under review. There is some merit in what he has proposed, the increase of those speed limits, but there are sections of the Queen Elizabeth Way where probably a lower speed limit should be retained.

Mr. Nixon: On the six-lane portion?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There are certain areas of the six-lane portion where the limitation of access has probably not as yet been completed.

Mr. Gisborn: It would be suicidal to raise the speed limit.

SECOND READING OF BILL 10

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Does he intend to present Bill 10 for second reading today?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Bill 10?

Mr. Nixon: That is The Farm Products Marketing Act, 1971.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, it is not my intention today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Has the minister been in consultation with his friend, I presume, the Minister of Agriculture in the province of Quebec over the serious problems that would be raised by the passage of this bill—in fact, leading almost to inter-provincial farm products trade wars?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that the question posed by the hon. member would be better delayed until the second reading of the bill.

Mr. Nixon: I cannot ask a question on second reading, I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The member cannot ask a question?

Mr. Nixon: No, I cannot ask a question on second reading.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader is anticipating something which may or may not happen, and normally those are not proper questions but—

Mr. Lewis: It is perfectly valid.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I may, on a point of order. Would you instruct me, sir, as to whether or not it would be within the rules, as you see them, for me to ask this question on second reading with expectation of an answer?

Mr. Speaker: Of course I am not sure how the hon. leader would propose to ask it in the debate on the second reading, but if he included it in his debate speech and the minister decided to answer it, then of course he could ask and the question could be answered.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact, if you will permit me, that the minister has said that the bill will not be under consideration today, can he inform the House as to what communications he has had with Ministers of Agriculture in other provinces pertaining to the growing and serious problem of the divisions among the provinces which tend to restrict trade in agricultural produce?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to answer that question. We have had considerable discussion with ministers across Canada and my position is well known regarding the Ontario position *vis-à-vis* the national marketing legislation proposed by the government of Canada. I frankly support that legislation publicly and privately. There is a public document covering my presentation on behalf of the province of Ontario on January 25 before the standing committee on agriculture for the government of Canada, who presented themselves in Ontario for any who wanted to appear before them; and I did just that. I took a very strong position supporting the legislation, with certain amendments, particularly the inclusion of appeal sections within the national marketing legislation.

Frankly, I feel that unless something like this is done on a national basis, whereby producers in various provinces can sit down and discuss these things—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Do those Tories in Ottawa agree with the minister?

Hon. Mr. Stewart:—and work these things out—I think that we can resolve these issues. But I must say, Mr. Speaker, with regard to what my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition suggests as being a trade war between provinces—

Mr. Nixon: That is what is coming.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It may be interpreted that way, but let me point out that there is nothing new about restrictions of trade between provinces. The federal government of 1935 introduced and passed in the House of Commons The Canadian Wheat Board Act which very effectively precluded the possibility of trading within provinces on the matter of grain.

Mr. Nixon: We do not grow spring wheat down here.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh well, that is all right, but it precludes the sale of barley, of oats, of wheat, in the provinces of Canada. That has been in effect since 1935. What is so new about the egg producers of Quebec wishing to say to other egg producers in Canada, "We are willing to accept eggs from other provinces into our province but at prices at which our producers can afford to live"? What is so wrong with the province of British Columbia saying, "We will only accept broilers into this province to be sold in the province of British Columbia under a marketing permit so that the producers of broiler chickens in British Columbia can live"? This was the first province to introduce that type of legislation affecting broilers. Most other provinces did the same thing.

As a matter of fact, the provinces of British Columbia and New Brunswick have included in their marketing legislation the right to seize a product that is shipped in and marketed without a permit for the marketing of that product.

This is, essentially Mr. Speaker, the same type of legislation as we now have as far as margarine is concerned in the Province of Ontario. We can and do seize margarine that is shipped here under the margarine Act—The Oleomargarine Act—so that all I have done in the introduction of this amendment to The Farm Products Marketing Act, on behalf of the government which is now known as Bill 10, as I mentioned, is simply provide a commodity board with the right by the Farm Products Marketing Board to seize a

commodity that is being marketed illegally according to the regulations of that particular commodity board.

Mr. Speaker: Has the Leader of the Opposition a supplementary?

Mr. Nixon: I do not know what he said that called for that. However, a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: To return to the question, Mr. Speaker: Will the Minister of Agriculture and Food tell the House what discussions he has had on this matter with the Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Quebec?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the minister of Quebec speaks very little English and I speak no French. We cannot communicate well, but I will say this, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Will my hon. friends just wait a moment to hear the answer? My deputy minister has communicated with the deputy minister in Quebec and explained to him exactly what we had in mind.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Explained or discussed?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Discussed with him what we have had in mind; and what we have told him is just essentially what I have told this House today. We have discussed on many occasions with the deputy and the minister of Quebec, here in Ontario and in Montreal and in Ottawa, these matters of mutual concern regarding poultry products.

We feel that there has to be a resolution to these things, quite frankly; and I can say that as far as I know there has been no thought on behalf of the government of Quebec of trying to violate the plan of any broiler board across Canada, but there may be individuals within the province who might attempt to violate those plans and this is why we introduced the legislation.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary, if you will permit, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister of Agriculture and Food aware that the Quebec Minister of Agriculture is quoted as saying that Quebec will resort to reprisals if Ontario introduces further hindrances to entry of Quebec agricultural products into this province?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I am not aware of that. I would hope that the conversations that have been held with the deputy minister in Quebec would relieve his concern, if indeed he has expressed such concern, of which I am not aware. He has assured me that they are quite willing to continue to accept Ontario eggs, marketed legally through FEDCO, which is their egg marketing board. On behalf of the broiler board of Ontario I have assured him that we are quite willing to continue to accept into the Province of Ontario the normal shipment of broilers that had been going on for many months, but we cannot absorb into the Province of Ontario the incredible number of broilers that were poured in at a time when our broiler industry was definitely threatened. And by this I mean the normal production of broilers in Ontario is about 1.4 million a week—and we can market them fine and dandy. We were also marketing up to 250,300 broilers a week from outside of Ontario, but when that figure of imports reached 700,000 and 800,000 birds a week, we had a backup on the broiler production farms of this province of up to 900,000 birds. We just had to take some effective action. As a result we have been able to gradually work our way out of that incredible surplus and backup in this province.

By the same token, I pay tribute and express appreciation to the federal government for having introduced an export-subsidized programme to get broilers out of Canada. I believe that they have purchased a number from the Province of Quebec and have moved them out at some degree of subsidy—I am not sure at how much cost, but at least they are out of the country. That will help greatly to relieve the pressure that certainly was building up.

I think we have to recognize in these particular types of commodities that there has to be some degree of supply management, and I do not say that supply management should apply to all agricultural commodities by any means, but I think it should apply—

Mr. Lewis: Be careful; it sounds like planning!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —to those commodities that can be produced almost without limit.

Mr. Lewis: What about the freedom of the marketplace?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, in view of—

Mr. Speaker: I think this should be the last supplementary. There are other members who wish supplementaries.

Mr. Nixon: In view of the public threat of reprisals made by the Minister of Agriculture in Quebec, will this minister undertake further contact and negotiation with the Province of Quebec before proceeding with this bill?

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister have any senior civil servants who are advising him—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. minister is addressed only by the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I would say that the deputy minister of—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. minister is answering the Leader of the Opposition, not the leader of the New Democratic Party.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am terribly sorry, sir. May I answer my hon. friend, the Leader of the—

Mr. Speaker: No, just the Leader of the Opposition or we lose control of the debate in this House unless the question is answered.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I assumed that the Leader of the Liberal Party was the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, I thought the minister was looking in the other direction.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, I will have to look at him?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does that mean, Mr. Speaker, that when they are looking up at the gallery—Oh, well, never mind!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of any threat of reprisals.

Mr. Nixon: I give the minister knowledge of it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well this is fine. That is his word for it. I can assure my hon. friend, through you, Mr. Speaker, that we have had discussions within the last 48 hours with the Deputy Minister of Agriculture of the Province of Quebec, through my deputy minister. The matter has been thoroughly explained and I would assume that there is no difficulty; but I have no hesitancy what—

ever in discussing these matters with my friend the minister in Quebec through our deputies, who can converse quite easily and through whom we have to discuss because my deputy minister, Mr. Speaker, is fluently bilingual and he can do this.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex South has a supplementary.

Mr. D. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, would the minister undertake to answer my enquiry of the ministry that stands as No. 11 on the bill prior to the second reading if Bill 10 in this House, which concerns this matter?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will take that under consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Middlesex South has a supplementary.

Mr. K. Bolton (Middlesex South): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question of the minister.

Mr. Speaker: This will be the last supplementary on this question.

Mr. Bolton: Will the minister indicate when this bill will be presented; and will he indicate at that time if he will give us the comparative figures of the export of farm products from Quebec; and will he, at the same time, assure us that the Balkanization that is threatened is not valid?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, when my hon. friend from Middlesex South refers to Balkanization of this province I can only assume that he is mouthing the concern of the New Democratic Party of Manitoba who are far more interested in uninhibited production than anything else.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: And let me say that the New Democratic Party government of Manitoba, through their Minister of Agriculture has been the only Minister of Agriculture who has taken, to my knowledge, strong exception to the national marketing legislation which we hope will resolve the problem that we are discussing now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Perhaps the hon. member would complete his answer.

Mr. J. Renwick: It is a long way from Manitoba to Middlesex.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Indeed it is, but the same principle is being mouthed by these socialists over here.

Mr. J. Renwick: And there are no electors in Manitoba who—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: He might not have noticed it, but the question was asked of the minister: when would the bill be called for second reading?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think the hon. member should ask that of the House leader, Mr. Speaker. I am just the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Speaker: The supplementaries on this question have been completed.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Well, you allowed the hon. member from Scarborough to ask another supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: No, the hon. member from Scarborough did not.

Mr. Singer: He certainly did.

Mr. Speaker: No.

Mr. Singer: He rose on a point of order and then turned it into a question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West was out of order, I think, but nevertheless he did not ask a supplementary. He was merely repeating a question that had previously been asked by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

OWNERSHIP AND SALE OF FORMER CROWN LANDS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests: Is he now able to table the report on the ownership and the sale of former Crown lands in the northern recreational areas of the province?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): I hope to be able to do so in the near future.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

TEACHER UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Education: Can the minister give us an idea of the number of teachers graduating this year—primary and secondary school teachers—who will be unemployed in the next academic year?

Hon. R. S. Welch (Minister of Education): Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very early to produce these figures.

I am sure the hon. member recognizes during these weeks, and in fact any time up until the end of May, teachers can decide to change their place of employment. So it would be very difficult at this stage to give the hon. member an answer to this question that would in any way be accurate.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, how is it that the teachers' federation can project figures of between 2,000 and 3,000 with some degree of accuracy? Has the minister no evidence before him now of the likely figures?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think the first part of that question should be directed to the teachers' federation.

As to the second part of the question, I am not able to give the member accurate information this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East has a supplementary?

Mr. T. Reid: Can the minister inform the House how many vacancies there will be in the primary school system and the secondary school system; how many people there will be graduating from the teachers' colleges and colleges of education; and how many teachers will be retiring—so we will know what crisis we are faced with?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, that question could be directed to the order paper—I hope without the editorial comment using the word "crisis."

Mr. Lewis: Oh!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East has a supplementary.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Yes, a similar question to last year: How many of the teachers who graduated last year are still unemployed?

An hon. member: Order paper!

Hon. Mr. Welch: I will take that as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough has a supplementary?

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): A supplementary as to whether The Department of Education has indicated to The Department of University Affairs whether more places will be necessary at university level because of the fact that so many of those graduating will not have jobs and will thus go on to university to carry out the qualifications for an elementary teacher, which the minister announced as 1975.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): Is that a speech or a statement?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Question or statement?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, that is a very reasonable question on the basis that those elementary school teachers graduating this year who—

Mr. W. Ferrer (Cochrane South): Unreasonable man!

Hon. Mr. Welch: —who may not be able to obtain employment may well be encouraged to take their qualifying year at university as part of their programme in keeping with the new academic requirements.

I must say I have not had discussions with my colleague the Minister of University Affairs (Mr. White) as yet on this subject, but that is a very reasonable question and certainly one which I intend to follow through.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question.

Mr. Pitman: A further supplementary: Is the minister aware that the universities will have to know exactly how many places they will be expected to increase in terms of their first year input in order to take up the numbers of teachers who will be unemployed, and they must have this information, really within the next few weeks?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: With the looming problem of a surplus of trained teachers evident, is the minister going to continue with the original teachers' summer short course qualification this year?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes Mr. Speaker, the course, both at McArthur and the Lakehead, has been scheduled for some time. The course at McArthur though is restricted to those areas for which there was an apparent shortage by virtue of letters of permission which had been issued last year.

I cannot be held to the actual courses; they involve about five programme areas which will be the subject matter, and that is the mature students' course which is organized and ready at McArthur College, and then, of course, at the Lakehead as well.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary: Would it be true to say that only those people who have applied for special permission of the minister and supported that application with a signed contract with the board, even though they are not qualified teachers, would be permitted to attend those courses?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, about a week ago, after I had a meeting with the executive of the OSSTF, we did send a bulletin to all boards reminding them about the procedures with respect to accepting or entering into contracts with unqualified people in this particular area, and reminding them of course of their obligation to hire qualified people first.

I repeat that the mature student course at McArthur is restricted to certain problem areas on the basis of our survey of the staff needs in those particular areas. As members know, the student submits a contract to the department as part of the procedure of application, and of course we are as concerned as the Leader of the Opposition would be to satisfy ourselves that boards are in fact giving first priority to qualified staff people for these positions.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister indicate whether a decision has been reached in regard to teachers teaching on a letter of permission to permit them to complete the summer school course even though they have not reached the age of 26?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, a good many programmes have a series of qualifications, there is really no difference between this and the problem faced by hundreds of parents whose children will not be five or six until the day after the qualifying date. In order to regulate this programme the mature student has to be 26. There are 1,200 people who

will be 26 either a month after the closing date or two months after the closing date. It is difficult to make any exceptions in this programme for mature students.

Mr. Deans: One final supplementary: Does the minister not believe that people who were able to enter the programme prior to the introduction of the age 26 limit should be permitted to continue and complete it?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the question is not worded correctly because the student—

Mr. Deans: I worded it and it is okay for me.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the people who are teaching on letters of permission at the moment are not necessarily in the summer programme. These are people who have been hired by boards to do a job on the basis of the regulations dealing with letters of permission. There is nothing to preclude a teacher now teaching on a letter of permission going to the fall course at one of the colleges of education, or seeking an opportunity to qualify at the Lakehead where the age requirement is not in effect, subject to the conditions of admission there.

Mr. Deans: I do not buy it.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Scarborough West completed his questions?

SURPLUS OF TEACHERS

Mr. Lewis: I have not. I have what amounts to a supplementary. I will ask it as a new question.

Where did the planning go so completely askew that we are now faced with such a surplus of teachers in this given year? Where was the mistake made?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the question presumes a mistake and I think—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I suppose if one was to examine the supply of other professional people in this province, I am sure he would find there is a surplus—

Mr. Lewis: One would find a shortage of doctors!

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member for Scarborough West would allow the minister to answer the question he asked.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: There may be an excessive supply of other professions. I think there are many factors. Perhaps when I have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to see what the situation actually is, at that time, I could make some comments with respect to the full situation.

Mr. Lewis: The minister had projected a surplus of teachers at least five years ago.

Mr. Pitman: May I ask the minister a question? In his previous role as Provincial Secretary did he hand on the number of children born in the Province of Ontario to the Minister of Education?

Mr. Speaker: That is not a supplementary question.

The member for Scarborough West has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Welch: It is public knowledge.

Mr. Pitman: It is public knowledge? The hon. minister did. He had all the figures.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Scarborough West has the floor.

GASOLINE PRICE INCREASES

Mr. Lewis: I have a question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

Now that the Premier of Nova Scotia and the Minister of Financial Institutions in Quebec have both indicated they are going to ask for a justification of the gas price increases in their provinces, would the Premier reconsider the position of the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this government is not contemplating a reconsideration of the answer I gave yesterday.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, am I then to take from the Premier that his government simply accepts the price increases as imposed without any sense that where gasoline costs are concerned the public has a right to know the financial position of these companies?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it gets down to a very basic principle. I am as concerned as the hon. member opposite with respect to price increases, wage increases and all those matters which affect the increase in cost of living. I think, Mr. Speaker, to be completely consistent one must recognize that if we are going to investigate one area of price increase, it also relates to the prin-

ciple of investigating other areas of price increase.

Mr. Lewis: So they are being investigated?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is not the policy of this government, at this moment, to investigate the question of price increases as it relates to the private sector.

Mr. J. Renwick: What is the policy of this government?

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): The government is not going to do anything?

An hon. member: It is good for the stomach muscles anyway.

QUETICO PARK LOGGING BAN

Mr. Lewis: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Lands and Forests. How is it that Ontario-Minnesota Pulp and Paper Company through their woods production manager, Mr. Bruno Sapala; apparently are not assured of the permanent moratorium on the volume agreement because they are now asking again, before the Quetico advisory committee, for the right to cut in those areas?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, about two months or so ago I announced a moratorium—a recommendation to the Quetico advisory committee that there would be a moratorium on cutting in the western end of Quetico Park, the area under volume agreement where there had been no cutting for at least 15 years. The advisory committee met yesterday at Thunder Bay and are meeting here next week on April 14 and 15. They are dealing with this matter and that puts it in very capable hands.

I do not think at this time that it is necessary to say more. They will be submitting their report to me within the next few months. We will act upon their recommendations as well as our own.

Mr. Lewis: I will not pursue it. Last question—I am sorry.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition has a supplementary?

Mr. Nixon: Yes. Pertaining to that moratorium, yesterday the minister said it was more or less a permanent moratorium. Surely there is something more definite that could be said, rather than the minister's statement today that he has nothing further to say. Is it a permanent moratorium or not?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again I would repeat, this matter is being very actively considered and the report will be submitted to me within the next few months. We will make our views known shortly afterward. There is no cutting at the present time and there has not been any for at least 15 years.

Mr. Singer: More or less.

STUDENT UNREST AT LAKEHEAD

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a question of the Premier? In view of his previous post, has he been in contact with the current Minister of University Affairs to see if an avenue of appeal can be provided at Lakehead University on the apparent firing of three professors without tenure, which appeal has been requested by senate, by the students, by a group of academics, by the faculty association, but not agreed to by the president or board?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am in constant communication with the new Minister of University Affairs. The question of faculty firings—going back to my own involvement in that particular department—is one where, as a matter of general principle, the department of the government has not interfered. There was a single situation, as I recall it, of the member for Scarborough West encouraging the students to the barricades as they relate to a certain institution down the street from us, at which time, because of the dislocation to the institution—

Mr. Lewis: As I recall it, the Premier consented to their request. Does that mean he was on the barricades himself?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, not at all. Nor was I urging them to the barricades.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The Premier was on the fence as usual.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Nor was I urging them to the barricades. I will save that dialogue for another occasion.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not at all. I will save that for another occasion. I really did not want to be provocative.

Mr. Speaker, it does involve a very real question of principle as to whether or not the government should become involved in the matter of faculty firings. I will be delighted to discuss it with the new Minister

of University Affairs and determine whether or not the government or his department should be involved.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary!

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I could ask the Prime Minister whether he would be willing to ask the president to call a meeting of the board of governors so that this matter might be brought before the board of governors in view of the fact that the senate and the faculty association have agreed to his principle of an appeal board? Indeed, the young people are now in the buildings and may be locked in those buildings all during the Easter period until this matter is resolved.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong this. I question whether you can, in fact, lock a group of young students in at the Lakehead University over the weekend if they do not desire to be locked in themselves.

As I said to the leader of that particular party, Mr. Speaker, I will discuss this with the Minister of University Affairs and any communication that might resolve I think, rather obviously, would be from him to the president at Lakehead.

Mr. Pitman: I have a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware of the fact that the Minister of University Affairs told them to go back and fight their own battles?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if I had been the Minister of University Affairs it would have been my inclination to endeavour to have them resolve it as best they can, which I think is quite consistent—

An hon. member: That is a dictatorial board.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —with the attitude and the philosophy expressed here on many occasions by the member for Peterborough himself, who more than any single member of this House has indicated to me time and time again—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say that if this is, in fact, what the Minister of University Affairs said, it probably was very good advice.

Mr. Pitman: Just call a meeting.

Mr. Lewis: Tell them to save it for dramatic moments.

Mr. Pitman: The senate has asked for a meeting of the board.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Humber has risen on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, I am sorry.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I was trying to listen to what the Premier had to say. Would he be kind enough to repeat that part of his statement which was drowned out by the applause beside me?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member really has no point of order.

Mr. Ben: No, I did not hear.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that I was asked by the member for Scarborough West to have my colleagues here restrain their enthusiastic response to my answers until there were more dramatic moments, I would only point out to him that we in this party are not really involved in drama, nor do I pretend to be on the stage and this has not been my inclination—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —so that it is completely impossible for me to ask my colleagues to restrain their enthusiastic response.

Mr. J. Renwick: Tape it for his act in the theatre!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now, where did I leave off?

For the benefit of the member for Humber, I was endeavouring to say, in answer to the question from the member for Peterborough, no member of this House has more clearly indicated to me from time to time the need to have the universities develop this autonomous approach as far as it relates to internal administration, and that if I had been the Minister of University Affairs I would have used every effort I could to see if this matter could not be resolved internally within the institution, which, I think, is highly desirable if it can be done.

Mr. Martel: That is what the member for Peterborough asked for.

Mr. Pitman: That is what I asked for; a meeting of the board of governors.

Mr. Speaker: Order. A supplementary question?

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question of the Premier: Would the Premier consider changing the legislation of The Lakehead University Act to incorporate a clause including the concept of "due process" in areas of dismissal which would ensure that there was at least an appeal system possible within the institution?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, an answer to this question would involve not only consideration of an amendment to the Act as it relates to due process for dismissal; it gets into the whole concept of tenure; what is involved in this aspect of it. With great respect I am not sure the member for Scarborough East wants to raise this particular question at this precise moment.

Mr. Lewis: That is right; that is exactly right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would only say to him through you, Mr. Speaker, that the question of internal administration as it relates to dismissal, hirings or firings, should be, and can be, accomplished within the bylaws of the institution without necessarily resorting to the statute.

Mr. Lewis: Not when you have a board like Lakehead.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This has been done by other institutions. With respect, I think it can be developed at Lakehead University without resorting to an amendment.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview has finally—

Interjections by hon. members.

FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a three-part question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Did the Minister of Agriculture and Food obtain a legal opinion from the law officers of the Crown prior to submitting Bill 10, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act, in relation to its constitutionality, particularly in view of the recent unanimous decision of the Court of Appeal of Manitoba which said that similar legislation in the province was in fact, unconstitutional?

The second question is if there is such an opinion available will the minister table it?

The third question: Does the Province of Ontario intend to intervene in the appeal presently pending before the Supreme Court of Canada questioning the decision of the Supreme Court of Manitoba to which I just referred?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the first question, the answer is no. For the simple reason, as I explained earlier to a question from the Leader of the Opposition, we already have similar legislation in the Oleomargarine Act. It has been on the statutes for many, many years. It is there, and a known fact. We have not in any way ceased to permit entry to come into Ontario, in fact a product may come into the province but it cannot—

Mr. J. Renwick: It is ever challenged.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): That way it is valid.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —be sold in the province without a permit, from the broiler board in this particular case; so that I find it not unconstitutional in this regard.

My hon. friend refers in the second question to the unanimous opinion expressed by the Appeal Court of the Province of Manitoba. I would direct his attention to the unanimous opinion expressed by the Appeal Court of Quebec what found exactly opposite to the Appeal Court of Manitoba.

Mr. Singer: All the more reason why the minister should intervene.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Exactly opposite!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Does the minister not want to resolve it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think my hon. friend is using this as an illustration to prove his point as far as the Manitoba Appeal Court is concerned.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Get the people in Ottawa to work.

Mr. Breithaupt: The minister has missed the whole point.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: One could ask why we do not support the Appeal Court of the Province of Quebec which found exactly opposite, as I mentioned.

So to me the question is irrelevant. With regard to tabling of the report, I do not have such an answer and so I have not—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the minister did not answer the third part. Is the province going to intervene in the hearings presently pending before the Supreme Court of Canada?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, Mr. Speaker, we have no intention to intervene.

Mr. Singer: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: In view of the doubt about the constitutionality, would it not be worthwhile for the minister before he proceeds any further to obtain the opinion of the law officers of the Crown in Ontario and table that opinion?

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Give him your opinion.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, we have not any reason to believe that we are in violation whatever. I have discussed with other ministers, and in fact with the federal minister, the constitutionality of the action that was taken by other provinces, and in fact who have the legislation on the books that we seek to put on the books. It is there now; no one has questioned it.

Mr. Nixon: Does the minister agree with Quebec?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We agree with the situation that pertains in those other provinces. We are simply doing the same thing as they are doing.

Mr. Singer: The minister will not seek an opinion of the law?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have an opinion now, because we already have the legislation. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend seems to be more interested in the constitutionality of a particular question, and I expect that represents the thinking of his party.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister is not now answering the question.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It would seem to me that he is more interested in that than he is in doing something to protect the stability—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —of producer marketing in the Province of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order!

The minister has broken one of the rules of the House in attributing motives to me. My motives certainly are concerned with whether or not the government of the Province of Ontario acts in a legal and constitutional manner and the minister should be aware of that.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Just a moment. I think that the member for Downsview has no complaint because the minister was attributing motives—but they were not improper motives, they were merely motives. The member for York South has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: He certainly was.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food: In view of the conflict between the unanimous decision of the Quebec Supreme Court and the Manitoba Appeal Court on this issue, would the minister not agree that the initial action of the Manitoba government in trying to have this resolved by the highest court of the land was the appropriate way to do it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, not necessarily at all. They chose to do it that way because, as I mentioned earlier, the NDP government of Manitoba wishes no restraints whatever on the movement of commodities between provinces; they want no restrictions on production. They want to produce all they can to snow under all other agricultural producers in Canada.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Order, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Lewis: It is so much nonsense.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister of Agriculture and Food is imputing motives to the Manitoba government which are completely erroneous.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: If the minister wants to resolve this, get it resolved instead of dangling on.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: By way of a supplementary question to the minister, would the minister not agree with the statement of—

Mr. Pilkey: Where are the free enterprise boys?

Mr. J. Renwick:—the Minister of Agriculture for the Province of Manitoba, where he stated, on appealing the Manitoba Court of Appeal's judgement, that

We are able to keep well within the legal bounds of precedence; all we seek is a judgement. Should the Supreme Court not uphold the Manitoba Court of Appeal's judgement then it will mean that we are free to take all counter-measures we deem necessary to protect our industry and our agriculture.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the constructive approach.

An hon. member: Oh no!

Mr. J. Renwick: Still quoting:

At least we will finally know exactly where we stand and be able to act accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Agriculture and Food withdraw the remark which he made in reply to the supplementary question for the member for York South; and does he agree with the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture for Manitoba?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How come the NDP members are always ready with that stuff from Manitoba? Are they apologists for Manitoba, apologists for the federal government, apologists for the NDP government? Why do they not stick up for Ontario?

Mr. Pilkey: The minister's colleague raised Manitoba. He raised it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Stick up for Ontario.

An hon. member: Who apologizes for the minister?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No one apologizes for me.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Agriculture and Food gets into—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps in the minute remaining in the question period we will hear the minister's answer.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: A minute. I do not think I can answer that question in a minute, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. Renwick: Withdraw!

Mr. Lewis: Resign!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am afraid my friend over there will be resigning before I do.

Mr. MacDonald: Resign!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, might I suggest in reply to my friend's remark concerning the government of Manitoba, I find it interesting that the government of Manitoba is appealing to the Supreme Court on a matter pertaining to poultry products marketing, but the Manitoba government has not seen fit at any time to appeal the restrictions under The Wheat Board Act, which are identical with what we are doing in commodities other than grains.

Mr. J. Renwick: Does the minister agree with their statement or not?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have not read the statement.

Mr. Speaker: This completes today's oral question period.

Mr. Lewis: What is wrong with the members back there?

Mr. Pitman: They figure the best way to make a noise—

Mr. MacDonald: It is therapeutic sound-making.

Mr. Pilkey: Trained seals.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Meen, from the standing procedural affairs committee, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following applications for private Acts and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient:

The City of Brantford;
 Protestant Children's Homes;
 To incorporate the Thunder Bay Foundation;
 Huntington University;
 The Town of St. Marys;
 Reliable Plastering Limited;
 The Borough of Scarborough;
 Brock University;

The Society of Industrial Accountants of Ontario;

Zurich Life Insurance Company of Canada;

The Town of Mississauga;

The City of Ottawa;

Abbey Life Insurance Company of Canada;

To revive Kedar Mines Limited;

The City of Hamilton;

The City of Woodstock;

Timothy Investments Limited;

The City of Sudbury;

The City of Cornwall;

Hillbrook Investments Limited;

The City of Toronto.

Mr. Sargent: I cannot hear the report.

Mr. Speaker: I share the same disability as the member for Grey-Bruce and I would ask that the Clerk read the opening portion of that report so that Mr. Speaker, at least, can hear what is being put to the House.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Meen, from the standing procedural affairs committee, presented the committee's report, which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following applications for private Acts and finds notices as published in each case sufficient:

The City of Brantford—

Mr. Speaker: I think that will be sufficient as we now know what the motion is.

Clerk of the House: I did not finish reading the report originally.

Mr. Speaker: Oh, I am sorry.

Clerk of the House: It concludes:

Your committee recommends that copies of the "Canadian Parliamentary Guide" be purchased for distribution to the members of the assembly and that stationery and publications allowance to members for the current session of the assembly be fixed at \$400.

Your committee recommends that until further order, the House will not sit on Wednesdays in order to provide a full day each week for committee meetings.

Mr. Speaker: We now have the second portion of the report so perhaps we can consider the report in total; first, the private bills; second, the stationery allowance; third, the recommendation with respect to Wednesdays.

Is there any discussion?

Mr. Nixon: Just to make a comment on the Wednesday committee day. I recall when this experiment was attempted on a previous occasion it was an unmitigated flop because it was just considered a "weekend" in the middle of the week. Even the hon. Minister of Justice, who was then a private member, was notable by his lack of support.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): That is not true.

Mr. Nixon: We, on this side—and, I trust, all members—hope that this attempt will be more successful.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a brief comment or two. Following through on my plea for greater flexibility and interchange of members between those four major committees, plus the estimates committee, the Prime Minister interjected and said that "the government members would be there." That, we could be assured of. He was worried about the opposition members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not say I was worried.

Mr. MacDonald: Since the government members were going to be there, implied in your statement was a worry that the opposition members would not be there.

Mr. Nixon: But he is not worried about that.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not want to heat this issue up—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: But.

Mr. MacDonald: —but we are going to examine attendance records very, very carefully, because Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Nixon: We might as well have an election now.

Mr. MacDonald: Right, and on the basis of the past record we have the best record, the official opposition has the second best and the government has the worst.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Oh come off it. That is not true and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. MacDonald: On the basis of past experience—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The NDP only troop in when the roll call is made. Just hold up a mirror, that is all we ask.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Nixon: The fellows opposite have the worst record.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the Minister of Justice want the floor?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, but do not forget to hold up a mirror.

Mr. MacDonald: No, okay.

On the basis of past experience the Leader of the Opposition is correct that it was a flop. There was so little attendance that in effect midweek became a weekend. If everybody is going to be there the Premier will have no problems.

But I come back to a brief reiteration of my earlier plea. I think everybody will be there if he is certain that each committee is dealing with something that he personally is interested in because of his riding's concern. That is where flexibility comes in to assist in having the kind of attendance the Prime Minister feels confident he is going to have.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisbom: Of course, the committee's decision was unanimous and I fail to recognize the lack of communication in the Liberal caucus, because the three Liberal members were independent and did not oppose the committee's decision—

Mr. Nixon: We are not opposing it, smarten up! Look, will the hon. member let the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) speak for that row?

Mr. Gisbom: —to have Wednesday set aside for committee business.

Second, we all realize that this is a new thing. The committee structure has been changed. The committee felt thoroughly that we can make it more effective in carrying on the business of the House and, as the notice reads, it will be until further notice a recommendation from the committee.

Mr. Speaker: Any further discussion?

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

TOWN OF MISSISSAUGA

Mr. Kennedy moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Town of Mississauga.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, I—

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member wish to—

Mr. Kennedy: I have a second bill.

ZURICH LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY
OF CANADA

Mr. Kennedy moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Zurich Life Insurance Company of Canada.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

HILLBROOK INVESTMENTS LIMITED

Mr. Deans moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Hillbrook Investments Limited.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF BRANTFORD

Mr. Makarchuk moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Brantford.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

RELIABLE PLASTERING LIMITED

Mr. Meen moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Reliable Plastering Limited.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

ABBEY LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY
OF CANADA

Mr. J. R. Smith moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Abbey Life Insurance Company of Canada.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for

an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my brief remarks, sir, I would extend once again my congratulations to you on the manner in which you continue to discharge your duties to this House.

Your task may be particularly onerous at this time, since we are entering the season when partisanship will be in full bloom as hon. members opposite begin their election campaigns. Like them, however, I have no special knowledge of either the date, the season, or the year, for such an eventuality, but I want to say, sir, that until that time, I am sure you will continue to command the respect and goodwill of all the members of the House, on both sides of the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Tell us about the deadwood.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I do want to congratulate the mover and seconder for their contribution to the address in reply. Their remarks fully justify the honour accorded them. My hon. friend, the member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly)—

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): That is a forecast of things to come.

Mr. Nixon: Right. The Premier is going back to the law practice.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): The member for Humber (Mr. Ben) is now sitting behind the minister. This is the first stage of the coalition.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The hon. member for Humber is going to be the enlightened one. He will never receive a compliment again.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: In any event, sir—it is easy to see there is a long weekend coming up—I do want to congratulate the mover and the seconder. Their remarks fully justified the honour accorded them by the Prime Minister. My hon. friend, the member for Eglinton, who is my constituency neighbour as well as a friend of all of us here, is a man whose views on taxation are shared by many on both sides, if not by all of the

House. Similarly, may I commend the seconder, the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson), on his remarks.

Mr. Nixon: He is not here either.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Now sir, I hope hon. members will allow me some remarks of a rather personal nature in regard to recent events which were admittedly political—

Mr. J. Renwick: Going to paper the cracks now, eh?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —and certainly personal—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Do not be so self-conscious.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —but which were of widespread interest and significance to the people of Ontario, and even to my hon. friends opposite, because as a result of those events, there have been substantial changes on this side of the House—

Mr. Lewis: Indeed, there was.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —especially in the area where I am now standing—

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Musical chairs.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —and some of us, as a matter of fact many of us, have been called upon to assume new responsibilities.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I would not always say the change is for the better.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I might say this was forcibly impressed upon me, when I first entered the boardroom of the Attorney General and Minister of Justice and saw on the wall of one of the rooms the photographs of my distinguished predecessors, including such luminaries, sir, as Mowat, as Roebuck, as Blackwell, as Porter, as Roberts and of course, sir, Mr. Speaker Cass.

Mr. Nixon: What is the sign on Queen Victoria's bust? Is it true that there is a "Vote Lawrence" sign on Queen Victoria?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Those are very substantial shoes to fill, sir, and I would not want to omit from such consideration my immediate predecessor, the hon. minister from Sault Ste. Marie whose task it has been to serve in that office in these times when its scope has come to encompass a vast and still growing range of social problems in which law enforcement and proceedings are vitally involved.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): The minister will make it grow even bigger.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: However long I might be here, sir—and that is surely a matter of both my leader's discretion and other opinion—I will hope that my tenure will be found to be suitable to the exemplary legacy and tradition of those who preceded me. I know that my hon. friends opposite will do their utmost to spur me on in that regard, and I invite them to do so.

But as we all would admit, Mr. Speaker, with all of the changes that we have seen, none of us has assumed a greater burden of responsibility than my broad-shouldered friend, the new Prime Minister of Ontario.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): He is broad all the way down.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Our political parties have the responsibility, which is rather unique, to select our leaders, as does the electorate to choose among them to determine which shall govern. Leadership races, as they are called—and I for one do not believe that is too strenuous a description of the process—create natural stresses and natural strains. There are, sir, more than just a few hon. gentlemen opposite who know about that, as they know how difficult they are to correct and to heal after the event.

Mr. T. Reid: Heel!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: In that matter, sir, my leader, I believe, will be an example to all in the matter of restoring cohesion, in restoring harmony and unity within the ranks of his government and his party. His tolerance and understanding of the feelings of those who become deeply involved in the political processes might well be the model for party leaders, present and future.

The experience of those of us who had the privilege—

Mr. Lewis: The Premier is flushed with pride.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —of being candidates for the leadership of this party have, as a result of that experience, a far greater understanding and a far better appreciation of the validity of our political processes which we so often take for granted and sometimes come to doubt.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): They never even made their meetings open to the public. They are just for Tories.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: But more than that, sir, we are given an insight into the attitudes and the aspirations of our fellow-citizens, our constituents and those whom we seek to lead.

Certainly anyone with any experience in politics, becoming involved in such a contest as that, will realize that there can be only one winner. But, in fact, I think I can speak for all those involved in that campaign by saying that such an experience broadened our understanding of people, our knowledge of Ontario and our very deep respect for all of our colleagues.

Mr. MacDonald: There is no evidence as yet in the government's programme.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am not going to give to you, sir, or to the House this afternoon a recitation of the joys of coming in second. After all, one obviously would rather win than lose, but faced with the reality of that situation in the final cliffhanging moment, while wishing that somehow another 40 or 50 Conservatives might have been as persuaded as some others as to my qualifications—

Mr. Nixon: It would have taken only 23.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —I recognized, as did the entire convention, that the government of Ontario and the Conservative Party of Ontario were in good hands, the hands of a gentleman whose abilities and experience and vigour uniquely qualified him for his task.

Mr. T. Reid: Did the minister say "weakly"?

Mr. MacDonald: Is this all really necessary?

Mr. Lewis: Did the minister say "obliquely" or "uniquely"?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The hon. members opposite often speak of change as though it were their discovery when in fact change is the essence of politics, and indeed the essence of life itself, sir. On this fine spring day, we all sense the presence of renewal, and in this Legislature we are aware of the presence of a new government and a new leader. For it is a new government, and one which I believe, as do my colleagues and our supporters, will be one to meet the exacting standards of the people of this province.

Mr. Lewis: There are 12 of them in the House now.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The fact that this is a new government is borne out in the Throne Speech. If I may echo a phrase which may be familiar to some of you, it is only the beginning, for we shall continue in the process of developing new processes, new responses and new policies to meet the challenge and the demands of what is, after all, a very new society.

In that regard, sir, none of us on this side of the House, nor any substantial opinion outside, would be reluctant, I hope, to admit to the very substantial accomplishments by the government led by the former Premier (Mr. Robarts) in the 1960s. It is a proud record and every one of us here on this side is proud of our association with it, but no one knows better than I, or better than my hon. friend the Prime Minister, that we need to surpass those achievements if we are to master the challenges of the 1970s. For a new decade, sir, there must be new policies. These new policies will come from this new government and its new leadership.

I would direct the attention of the hon. members to the passage in the Throne Speech which indicates the very clear intention of this government to be more responsive to the needs of its constituents.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: We are not talking here about material needs alone. After eight intensive weeks of campaigning in this province, I know something of what people expect of their new government and of this Legislature, and of those on both sides of the House, whom they elect to serve them.

Mr. Speaker, it is a truism to say it but we need to tell ourselves that the larger governments become and the greater their involvement in the daily lives of their people, the more distant they feel they are from them. Many of them sense that their elected representatives—not of this party alone, but of all parties, and certainly not of this government alone but of all governments—are either not listening or not able to hear.

Ways must be found, and ways will be found, for us to bridge the gulf between people who have a lively concern and interest in public policies and those who are responsible for devising and implementing them. They want more than rhetoric, more than a mere shallow commitment; they want to become a meaningful part of the process of consultation.

I have found in those travels and in other travels a far greater measure of interest and a far greater concern over what we do here than many of us might believe or want to believe. While people expect the government to be a necessary factor in their lives, I believe, sir, most sincerely, that they want a government which creates avenues of opportunity along which they can go and chart the way themselves.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Like regional government.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: They do not expect the government to be a vehicle of opportunity which carts them along the way. They would like a government which, while a partner in a number of endeavours, is nevertheless a partner in the full sense of that word. They want to be led, they do not want to be driven. They want a society in which they can fulfil themselves, and enjoy the profit of their own initiative and energies. Just as they want a government they can respect, and a Legislature they can respect, they want to be governed by those who respect them.

That, sir, is why I believe the people of Ontario will continue to place their confidence in this new government and in this party because we in this party welcome and encourage their involvement.

Now while we value tradition, while we respect our institutions, and while we are very deservedly proud of our party's record, we are determined to make our own way to welcome this new era of the Seventies and to offer the people of Ontario a working partnership in our mutual endeavour to make this province an example in social justice and an opportunity to all in Canada.

I believe the new leader of this government and of my party is a man who holds these views as firmly and as sincerely and as strongly as I do. I know this same spirit is shared by my colleagues, and that, sir, is one reason among many why I am proud to be part of this new administration.

In regard to the Throne Speech I might mention one or two of its proposals in passing and say that they reflect my own views as these were expressed in that recent leadership campaign. It is more than gratifying to know that such policy will soon be implemented.

Special consideration is given, and is being given, to the real needs of the people of northern Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Anyone who knows that area will realize the special virtues, the special problems and the special values of life in that part of our province. Nevertheless, we as a government must do more to offset the very real disadvantages inherent in the economic circumstances of life in our North. Not everyone can live in the centre; not everyone can live in the major cities or in the south, and I must add—

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): The government would certainly have it that way.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —and I must add that certainly not everyone wants to do so. But it is clearly in the provincial interest, as well as in the national interest, that we do more to establish a greater equality of living standards and government services if we are to encourage development and the continued growth and the prosperity of that very vital region of our province.

Mr. Martel: This government has had 28 years to do that.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I know that many people in Ontario fully share our concern with regard to the preservation and conservation of Crown land, and I think they will welcome the intention of this new government that these lands will be employed first of all for the recreation purposes of Canadians who must have first claim upon their use.

Mr. Sargent: That was the Leader of the Opposition's idea.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech represents a getting-under-way of a new administration, in a new era, with a new team. It represents a number of very substantial commitments—

Mr. Lawlor: Why can the minister not find a new word?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —re-allocation of priorities, a number of new directions; but, as I have said, it is only the beginning. It is our task to lead and inspire the people of this province to reach new levels of productivity and prosperity in this decade. I believe we have the will to do it. We have the leadership and we have the way. I am confident the people of Ontario will, when the occasion rises, give us their mandate to proceed.

Mr. Sargent: No, never!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: As well, sir, one of the many matters that I feel strongly about—and I am happy to follow along the tradition of a man like the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Wishart)—is the question of civil rights and civil liberties in this province. This Legislature as well has indicated a very full understanding of the rights of the individual within our society in the various legislative programmes over the past few years. The former government demonstrated its ability to develop and institute programmes for the continuing preservation of these human rights which are so important in our complicated society.

Mr. Lawlor: Take a look at Bill 10, for instance.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The report of Mr. Justice McRuer on civil rights in Ontario has of course been reviewed by all of the hon. members, I hope, and the principles inherent in that report have provided the guidelines for many of the programmes.

Mr. Justice McRuer's first report contained approximately 559 recommendations that touched upon virtually all areas of the administration of justice and the legislative practices reflected in our body of statutory law. The administrative practices related to these areas were also analyzed in substantial detail by the thrust of these recommendations.

Since the publication of the report early in 1968, the former government introduced legislation which has been acted upon by this Legislature, with the net result that legislative and administrative actions have implemented almost 300 of those recommendations.

It must be recognized upon reflection that a very substantial number of the recommendations that have been made were not capable of any immediate legislative or administrative action, but rather were of a directory nature that provided an approach for the consideration of all persons who must deal in the area of legislative and administrative action in their application to the sensitive area of human rights.

These recommendations have been of immeasurable assistance to those who must administer to many programmes of government, and I know that these principles have been of very recognized value to all members of the Legislature in the development of the proposals which they have brought forward for consideration.

It has been indicated in the Speech from the Throne that this Legislature will be asked

by this government to consider new proposals which will be directed toward not only the creation of some civil rights, but also the further recognition and preservation of many of these rights as they relate to the administrative processes of those areas coming within the jurisdiction of this House, sir. Already much has been accomplished in the area of expropriation; already much has been accomplished in the question of compensation to victims of crime, the administration of justice and even to the constitution of a committee of this House to consider subordinate legislation in all its forms.

I now look forward to bringing before this Legislature a series of bills that will provide for the equitable and orderly process before administrative tribunals throughout the whole province. The Statutory Powers Procedure Act, which was introduced for discussion purposes on an earlier occasion, will provide for the rights of individuals whose affairs bring them before these administrative tribunals, while the same statute will provide the framework for an administrative law process that will be the first of its kind in Canada.

The Judicial Review Act, which has also been published for discussion purposes in first reading, sir, will be a companion proposal that will materially improve the process of judicial review as it relates to the administrative law in Ontario.

While it would not be appropriate for me to go into the details of these proposals at this time, they will be brought before this House for consideration in due course.

The essential feature which this government considers to be most important in this whole area is that this legislative programme is designed to ensure that the individual has all the benefits that we make available to him for the protection of his interests at the earliest stage possible in his contact with the process, so that the preservation of these rights will not be dependent upon pursuing the matter through a series of courts, with all of the delay and all of the expense attendant upon expensive judicial review.

Our purpose is directed toward the very clear expression of these rules for the purposes of all those who administer our laws, so that the rights will be extended and recognized at the very initial stages of the process without the necessity of review at the higher judicial level except, of course, sir, those remedies that will be available to ensure the adequate enforcement of all these procedures.

At the same time, we hope to have available for the consideration of the House a completely revised statute to deal with public inquiries in a manner consistent with the principles we have recognized in these recent legislative programmes.

The legislation in this area, which will be utilized by cross-reference in many other statutes, will provide practical and pragmatic protection for the rights of the individual from his very earliest involvement with the processes of administrative law. In the same vein, a substantial bill is under consideration which will provide for the revision of a great number of statutes, so they will be in general accord with the whole approach to the administrative process contemplated by the government in developing this extensive programme for individual rights in this province.

All of these programmes will be brought forward with full recognition that there will always be more work to be done in this area, and perhaps to the bills themselves, and in our continuing contemplation of that which we must provide to the citizens we are here to serve.

I cannot leave this particular subject, sir, without drawing to the attention of the hon. members that there are many recommendations which we have had, not only from Dr. McRuer but from others, that relate to areas presently under consideration.

In some of these areas we are not yet convinced as to the proper solution and consequently we have established various processes by which we may get further public participation as well as further constructive comments. In the matter of bail reform, we are awaiting the implementation of the legislation which is being enacted by Parliament and this, of course, will deal with many areas in which we share a responsibility with the Parliament of Canada.

Several areas dealt with by the McRuer report, such as the function of juries within our system, the court reporting facilities and the area of responsibility for coroners, are still before us, and may be recognized in the continuing work which is being done at our direction by the Ontario Law Reform Commission as well as by a committee made up of the judiciary, the bar, and my department, with court reporting facilities as its prime consideration. Approximately 80 recommendations fall within the purview of this type of consideration and these are being pursued with all of the advice that can be made available to refine the proposals into effective solutions which, if necessary, will

be dealt with by this Legislature in the future.

If the objectives of this government are achieved with the full application and the full understanding of this Legislature, I think we will all share in the ultimate achievement of over 450 of the recommendations which have been put forward by Dr. McRuer, although, sir, as I have indicated, the form may have been adapted to the particular needs as we have seen them in the passage of the proposals through this House.

In conclusion, sir, I merely do want to emphasize once more the purposeful thrust of this government, the unity in the leadership of this party and the very real emphasis that this government will be placing and has placed in the past on the civil liberties and the civil rights of the citizens of this province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, before I launch into the main burden of my remarks, let me comment briefly on a matter that arose this afternoon in relation to the questions addressed by various members of this House, initiated by my leader, to the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart).

We were concerned and still are concerned about the provisions of Bill 10, which the Minister of Agriculture brought before this House a few days ago. Let me say at the beginning of this portion of my remarks, certainly my colleagues and I have no greater concern than anyone else in the Province of Ontario. In fact, we are more concerned about the future welfare of the farmers in the Province of Ontario and the maintenance of that important industry.

We are concerned, Mr. Speaker—a concern that certainly takes no second place to that of the Minister of Agriculture or anyone else—about whether or not the gentlemen who are engaged in the chicken industry, in the broiler industry, in producing eggs, in producing bacon and other products, are able to earn a reasonable living and get ample compensation for their hard labour.

I say, however, sir, that there certainly must lie with any minister of this House a most serious and important responsibility, that notwithstanding his desire to put on a good show for the rural constituents, he must equally accept the responsibility of bringing before this House bills which he has reason to believe are valid bills; bills which he has

reason to believe are in accordance with the provisions of the constitution of Canada; bills which he has reason to believe will be upheld by the courts. Surely no minister has any lesser duty than that?

The Minister of Agriculture today suggested, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding the fact that there was one unanimous decision of the court of appeal of one of the provinces of Canada which said similar legislation enacted by another province was unconstitutional—the minister refused earlier and refused again today to take the preliminary precaution of seeking out at least an opinion of the law officers of the Crown of the Province of Ontario.

I suggest to you, sir, that this is absolutely inexcusable. Because if this legislation is going to be helpful to the farmers of the Province of Ontario surely the government of Ontario would take every step and every precaution before it is introduced to seek out the best legal opinions available. When the minister had to admit this afternoon he has never asked the law officers of the Crown, nor ever even thought about asking them nor will he now ask them, then I say he has acted in substantial derogation of his duty to all of the people of Ontario, and especially to the farmers, whom we all want to protect.

Now then sir, let me turn to the main thrust of my remarks in this debate.

We have watched with great interest and rapt attention the activities that began to take place in this province after the night of the long vote. Something apparently happened that night, Mr. Speaker. Certain ladies and gentlemen gathered in convention made a certain decision; it ran through a great, great number of hours until they could make up their minds.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): No difficulty in making the decision.

Mr. Singer: They had some machinery that did not seem to work very well and they learned at least one thing, Mr. Speaker. I noticed in the Speech from the Throne that the government is going to allow Ryerson degree-granting privileges. Now I have been investigating that and I have been told, sir, that there is one new degree that this particularly is directed at—the BVP. That means bachelor of voting procedures. That degree is about to be granted by Ryerson and I understand, Mr. Speaker, further, that there is great competition among the pages in this House as to which one is going to be appointed as head of the course. It has been

ascertained very quickly that a youngster can easily figure out how to make voting machines work even though it was somewhat beyond the competence of the people who are now running the government of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member knows who will get the first one?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, as we watched that night, into the long hours of the morning to see what was going to happen, one began to wonder—the symbol was a new wave. Now what does a new wave indicate? The new wave, I suppose, was designed to indicate something along the lines that the hon. Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) was introducing into his speech this afternoon, something new and vibrant and different, competent, exciting and so on; and in face of what happened with the voting machines one had to begin to question whether the start was most auspicious.

Then, as we have watched a little further, Mr. Speaker, we have begun to wonder. We knew what the old government was like; it was quiet, it was cautious, it was conservative, it was directed, it was careful, it knew where it was going and it went very slowly, but at least when its leader and its various ministers got up in the House to speak they knew which direction they wanted to move into; they knew what kind of a plan they were putting forward, they knew what kind of a programme they were going to espouse. Whether we agreed or not that government seemed to have a direction.

As we watched since the night of the long vote what has happened here, we have begun to wonder whether the manoeuvres have been very cleverly imagined; whether they are suave and sophisticated; whether they are the very competent political manoeuvres moving in some direction. But I think, Mr. Speaker, all we can conclude out of what the various activities are is that this government is probably the most incompetent that the Province of Ontario has seen in 40 years. Incompetent, Mr. Speaker, in such a long and broad variety of ways that it almost surpasses the imagination. Incompetent to the extent that all of the news media in Ontario have begun to have a go at them—every one.

The Globe and Mail the other morning had this to say about the housing programme as espoused by the hon. Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman):

The entire programme has turned into a public relations disaster for Mr. Davis'

new government. This programme confused the public and alienated those reporters at Queen's Park who took Tuesday's Throne Speech at face value and wrote headline stories about the housing programme.

Well, that was one of the indications of incompetence. *The Globe* the other day had an editorial talking about some of the new performances of the new Minister of Education (Mr. Welch). I suppose in keeping with some of the pronouncements of the Attorney General some time ago when he told us we had no right to know, the Minister of Education told my colleague from Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid), in effect, who does he think he is—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): The hon. member is back on that quote!

Mr. Singer: —who does he think he is to try and find out about educational expenses. The people only sent him here to inquire about those once a year. Incompetence—there could not be a better example.

The *Toronto Daily Star*, Mr. Speaker, had this to say in an editorial headed, "Say when, Bert"—Bert, I think, is another one of the ministers who inhabits the front benches there. The concluding paragraph says, relating a great deal of history of what Bert has done, and Bert is one of their better people:

This will not do. The need has been proven long ago, the insurance machinery exists, coverage must be provided, whatever Ottawa says. Ontario is not bankrupt, but if it cannot provide protection to those who are most in need its priorities are badly twisted. When Mr. Lawrence and his colleagues have got that straight, when they have put an early date on the start of extended coverage—that is for nursing care protection—then we will all have something to cheer about.

Well again, Mr. Speaker, where is the brave new way? Where is the competence? Where is the efficiency? It is just missing. Even *The Toronto Telegram*, Mr. Speaker, even *The Toronto Telegram*—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: (Leader of the Opposition): Even *The Toronto Telegram*?

Mr. Singer: —the great friend of the government of Ontario, had something to say about lowering taxes.

We have had a very fascinating few days in the Legislature—disastrous days for the

government; never a more disastrous period of eight days has been seen, certainly in the time that I have been here; disastrous days for the government.

They start off with a Throne debate full of sound and fury that has a housing programme that collapses, that talks about all the grand things they are going to do without one solid bit of progressive legislation indicated in it. Shortly after that, they switch gears and let us have a debate on unemployment. And in the middle of that—that debate is not going so well—the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough)—

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not going so well for the Liberals in Ottawa.

Mr. Singer: The provincial Treasurer has messed it all up; so he gets up, having had his hour in the debate and having fallen very flat—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now do not talk about people falling flat.

Mr. Singer: He then gets up and reads in a long statement about taxation improvements and new taxation methods.

Interestingly enough—and I am glad the Prime Minister has risen to this; I listened during the campaign to one of his remarks, and it reflects on the whole position of this government—if something is not going well in Ontario, it is all the fault of those guys up in Ottawa. One of the terrible things that has been happening, according to the Prime Minister and according to his inept parrots, is that we cannot control levels of taxation, and everything would be just fine if those guys up in Ottawa would do something.

Not a word in the Throne debate from the Prime Minister, not a word from the provincial Treasurer about what they are going to do. This was too much even for *The Toronto Telegram*, which in an editorial the other day which said:

While Mr. McKeough cannot do anything to change the monetary policy other than to persuade Ottawa to ease it, there are a number of things that he and his government can do.

And they talk about the immediate removal of the five per cent sales tax on building materials; they talk about the reform of the tax on tax, since the cost of these is already included in the federal tax of 11 per cent on building materials and how substantial an effect that might be able to have.

They talk about the removal of the portion which Queens' Park has the authority to abolish—that it would not only reduce the very high cost of housing to needy purchasers but would also reduce raw material costs to industries involved in homeowning.

They go on to suggest that the Treasurer should consider remitting all, or a large portion, of the province's very high share of corporation tax. "The two tax reductions together could represent the kind of fiscal relief that the people of Ontario urgently need."

There we have a not quite impartial observer who bothers to comment in this line and who obviously asks why the government, somewhere along the line, has not indicated that it is going to take this kind of a step. The sphinx, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman who sits opposite. He sits, he smiles and he says nothing.

I think it is remarkable to note that to date he has not taken part in any of the major debates that have proceeded in the Legislature up to the present time. This again moved a columnist in the *Telegram* today to write a very interesting column—I found it interesting, at least—and it appears at the bottom of the editorial page. It is headed, "Bill Davis, Master of the If, But or Maybe." Well, that is the government. The Prime Minister is the master of the "if," "but" or "maybe," and that attitude reflects throughout his incompetent, unlearned and inefficient front bench.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): He is the Prime Minister!

Mr. Singer: And it is sad, Mr. Speaker, that the great Tory party has fallen to this, because one would have expected that in keeping with the symbol of the new wave there would have been something that is new and something that is different. But in fact we have had nothing. We have had no indication of any concrete and viable proposals that would be enacted into legislation on behalf of the people that will make Ontario a place where you want to stay.

This is the sort of thing, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member contemplating moving?

Mr. Singer: We will have to put up with this government for a short time yet. Whenever it wants to call the election, we are going to solve that problem. So we will put up with it for a little time yet—two months.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I had particularly looked for some kind of reference to municipal tax reform. We have heard an awful lot in recent months and years about the problems of the urban municipalities. There have been all sorts of studies, plans, pictures, maps and schemes announced, and everyone says it is a great thing, that there has to be something done for the urban municipalities—everyone, that is, Mr. Speaker, apparently but the government of the Province of Ontario, who seem to take hope that the problems in the large urban municipalities are going to go away.

The most recent and, I think, authoritative and well-researched document that has been produced along this line is a report called "Urban Canada, Problems and Prospects," prepared by Professor M. H. Lithwick, for the hon. R. K. Andras. It was tabled in the House of Commons a few weeks ago, and has been available to this government and to anyone else who is interested, as I say, for a period of several weeks. It has been commented on, Mr. Speaker, in the press very favourably and at substantial length.

Mr. Lithwick comes up with a major conclusion that really is not new. It is significant, I suppose, to the effect that he corners in on this major conclusion. That is, that the pattern of urban life can no longer be allowed to develop solely on the base of urban financial resources. There has to be within our urban municipalities—because more and more of our people are moving into urban municipalities—there has to be a provincial and a federal presence.

For far too long have we had an assessment-oriented municipal system of administration. For far too long has a municipal council had to determine its course of action only on the basis of what kind of assessment new development is going to bring.

For far too long, Mr. Speaker, have municipalities been unable to embark on a system of providing homes for people of lower income; adequate park systems; adequate road systems; adequate transport systems. They have had to insist on items that will provide higher assessment and higher taxes. Higher buildings—less people on less area, less services to run, more taxes; better for the municipality.

The financial inability of municipalities to think in the broad social sense has begun so seriously to affect the character of our urban life that one would have thought that the great new wave would have had some idea, or inclination, or thought, or plan which

would begin to deal with this matter. The problem that has presently raised its head in the borough of North York is not untypical of the kind of problem that is almost beyond the municipal ability to solve. That problem relates to a golf course called the York Downs golf course.

On North Bathurst Street, in the riding represented by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Carton) in the riding of Armourdale, just across the road from the riding of Downsview—

Mr. Nixon: He will not last there.

Mr. Singer: —are 163 acres of golf-course land. The shareholders of the golf course, a few months ago, sold this land for a price that, I understand, exceeds some \$6 million, and they sold it to a developer. The developer, I would imagine, laid out that large sum of money because he believed that, in keeping with the unplanned and unrealistic and unimaginative programme of the present government, there was no way that anybody was going to interfere with his plan to build a multiplicity of high-rise apartments on that land, and to turn what heretofore had been a 163-acre park area into another jungle of highrise apartments.

I do not blame the developer, particularly. He was going by the ground rules as they existed. It had happened in all other areas. There had been St. Andrews golf course in North York several years ago. Some of us tried to stop that being turned into a housing development. We were unsuccessful; we ran out of money; nobody would help us in buying that kind of land to maintain it as a green area and eventually, houses and apartments were built on it. It is a very attractive residential area, very highly populated, very densely occupied. It serves a useful purpose, certainly, but it has resulted in the disappearance, Mr. Speaker, of the acres that were formerly that golf course and the turning of them into a residential area.

The 163 acres that involved the York Downs golf course consist of approximately 95 acres of table land, and 63 acres of valley land. There is no question that the 63 acres of valley land will, in course of time, devolve on to the ownership of the conservation authority, probably the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, and/or some other public body. Whether or not it comes into the ownership of Metropolitan Toronto really does not matter, but by reason of the provisions to The Conservation Authorities Act there is not much doubt those 63

acres—or 65 acres—cannot be built on. There are plans available which will result in the acquisition of those acres, the valley acres, by public ownership. But it is the other 95 acres, the table land Mr. Speaker. What is going to happen to that?

The other evening I was present at a meeting at Adath Israel synagogue in the borough of North York in the riding of my hon. friend from Armourdale. There were some 600 people there who had come to protest against the proposed plans of the developer to get a rezoning which would allow him to begin the construction of highrise apartments.

Fascinatingly enough the objecting residents were represented by a gentleman who many of us know and many of us have been able to watch perform over the years—one Robert Macaulay. Robert Macaulay was at his inimitable best that evening as he presented 100 different reasons as to why this land should not be allowed to be turned into an apartment development.

Macaulay at his best is very good and he certainly told a convincing story that night. Well, Macaulay is a lawyer and he has accepted a brief and he is going to do, I am certain, a very good job on this. What Macaulay's philosophy is, insofar as preserving parkland is concerned, I do not know and is really not an issue. But significantly, Mr. Speaker, more than 600 people came there to protest this rape of open land in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. The objecting ratepayers have been able to convince now the councillors and the council of the borough of North York that this land should not be used for any purpose other than public open space.

They have equally been able to convince the parks committee of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. However, the difficulty, Mr. Speaker, is where does the money come from, because it is impossible under the present state of our laws to say that land which was previously golf course must continue to be golf course.

Our assistance to municipal planners and municipal government on this line is to have a bunch of people in the office of the Minister of Municipal Affairs who shuffle around pieces of paper and who determine if an official plan is drawn in the correct language; and if the lines run in the right direction; and then if a zoning bylaw later complies with the official plan. As paper shufflers, they are beyond compare. As original thinkers, as guiders of development, as people who are dedicated to preserving public open space in

our urban areas—it does not even enter their minds, Mr. Speaker.

So where can we look for help? One of the people who spoke at that meeting was a gentleman called Tommy Thompson, and Tommy Thompson is the parks commissioner for Metropolitan Toronto. He is a most competent man—one of the most highly qualified civil servants in his field that I know of in the Province of Ontario. Certainly his record of achievement since he assumed that job at the commencement of the operations of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto has been outstanding. As you look at the park system within Metropolitan Toronto, you can recognize where Tommy Thompson has had his hand and the things that he has been able to achieve and I am not going to delineate the various park systems.

Whatever they are, they are not enough and whatever particular criteria, Mr. Speaker, are applied insofar as relating areas of open space to numbers of people, Metropolitan Toronto, North York and particularly this most crowded area of North York in the general vicinity of Bathurst and Wilson Avenue, is away down below anything that could be imagined as reasonable park or open space area.

What happens, Mr. Speaker? The council of North York is valiantly trying to wrestle with this problem. They say, "We do not want any development." I notice their planning board met yesterday and they were trying to work out some compromises. The developer only wants three apartment buildings at the moment and they are only going to have 900 suites in them. Fascinatingly, there is a 300-foot strip in front of them and on the 2,100 feet of Bathurst Street frontage, which has no immediate plan. And one would think that in the normal course of events when the three behind are built, there will be another six built in front and the process will go on.

And what will happen Mr. Speaker if no one is prepared to step in and no one is able to step in? Within a year, or two years, or five years, York Downs Golf Course is going to be a thing of the past and we will have another concentrated apartment development which will take away from urban living the kind of benefit that the government has to concern itself with providing for the people who live in the urban centres of this province.

Mr. Speaker, surely there can be no better or more obvious case. I do not need to bring

to the attention of the government Mr. Lithwick's report. Surely the government, the "new wave," has to turn its mind to improving the quality of urban living? Surely the government is not going to sit idly by and let this 165 acres of York Downs disappear into another apartment development? And to do that, Mr. Speaker, there is going to have to be the presence of the government of Ontario in assisting municipalities when this sort of problem arises.

Tommy Thompson said, and his words are just so obvious, "The decision has to be made now." It is not a question of whether or not there is going to be a compromise. Either the people in command—the politicians—are going to be able to say, "This will be preserved as open land for the people of North York, Metropolitan Toronto and Ontario as a park," or else they are going to give up.

The arguments about density and how high an apartment should be; how many people are going to live in a unit; and whether or not there will be a couple of low-rise buildings; or whether or not there will be semi-detached or rowhousing to sort of offset it; whether or not there will be nice gardening surrounding it; whether or not there will be some facilities like a swimming pool or sauna bath within the apartments to let the new apartment-dwellers enjoy a little luxury in a better fashion—these are not the issue. The issue is simply: Are the municipal councillors in North York, the people who represent Metropolitan Toronto and the government of Ontario, going to sit idly by and let this land go?

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): They will. They will do nothing.

Mr. Singer: The counter argument, Mr. Speaker, is that if we do something for North York; if we concern ourselves about the problems of York Downs which, after all, is a municipal problem, we will put it back to the paper-pushers in The Department of Municipal Affairs. They will shuffle their pieces of paper around. They will make sure that the lines are correctly lined up on the maps.

Mr. Trotter: They are good at that.

Mr. Singer: In due course the bylaws will be passed and the arguments will be over. If we do it for North York—and we should not, because after all it is a municipal problem—think of how many other problems of similar magnitude and importance we are going to have to face. Why not, Mr. Speaker, why not?

Mr. Nixon: What does the Minister of Labour say about that?

Mr. Singer: Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is what governments are for, to face problems. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the government of Ontario has to begin to consider whether or not it is important to have the provincial presence in urban development. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is of the utmost importance that at this time, the brave new wave seizes the initiative and inserts itself into the problem of keeping York Downs dry and York Downs golf course green.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): And dry?

Mr. Singer: I am wearing a badge—The hon. minister of Labour is wearing a similar badge. I sent one over to the Prime Minister; he has it in his pocket.

Hon. Mr. Davis: For good luck.

Mr. Singer: I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this matter will receive the utmost and immediate attention of the government.

Mr. Nixon: They have not got anything else to think about.

Mr. Singer: This is a chance to see whether or not the idle speeches, apparently idle, that we heard during pre-convention time and after convention, and the remarks in the Speech from The Throne in fact, mean anything at all. This is a chance to see, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the government of Ontario is concerned about the character of urban life.

An hon. member: What about chances?

Mr. Singer: This is a chance to see whether or not the government is going to enter into this problem. Now how do they enter into it?

Somewhere along the line there must be a way, whether by bargaining, by gift, by loan, by grant, that North York, Metropolitan Toronto and the Province of Ontario, in some form of partnership, acquire this land and let it continue in public ownership for ever. That is the problem.

I am certain that the people who are in charge of spending money over there could do nothing better than to immediately enter into this kind of an inquiry—not wait until they are going to get new plans—not wait until the paper-pushers in The Department of Municipal Affairs begin to shuffle their papers around to determine whether a particular kind of a bylaw is a good one or

bad one. But right now, to enter into a series of discussions with the owners of the property and with the two municipal authorities, North York and Metropolitan Toronto, to acquire this land now and to put it in public ownership now and forever so that it can be used by all of the people of Ontario.

In saying this, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that I have the support of all of the members of this House who come from the borough of North York.

The hon. Minister of Labour, in whose riding this park area exists, was present at the meeting. While I am certain he would not want to break any cabinet confidence, I would think the fact that he came here, and greeted 500 or 600 of his constituents, indicated that he is in support of keeping York Downs golf course green. That is why he is wearing the badge.

Mr. Nixon: We will see what he does about it in the meantime.

Mr. Singer: I would think that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales), who represents the riding of York Mills, feels exactly the same. In fact, I have had conversations with him and again I would not want him to tell me anything that would breach his oath of secrecy insofar as cabinet matters are concerned but I have satisfied myself, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs feels exactly the same.

I have not been able to catch up with the hon member for Don Mills (Mr. Randall). I would think he would agree.

Let us go over to the other side. The hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young)—he and I have talked this over and he is in absolute and complete agreement with me.

So here we are. All the members from North York think this is a great idea. All the people who represent Metropolitan Toronto, I would think, would think this is a great idea.

People who are concerned about the preservation of a reasonable standard of urban living want and require a provincial presence in making this decision as quickly as possible. And the provincial presence simply means that the province has to come with its check-book and make this possible. What the details are, I do not know, but I am sure they can be worked out.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, as I recite the list of people in support, I find it almost unexplainable that a story in the *North York Mirror*—it came out on a Wednesday—containing a

few comments about my approach to this, quotes a fellow named Chusid. Chusid, I think, is the NDP candidate who is opposing me now. He opposed me in the last election.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): He is the next member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Only Chusid, out of that whole group, says Mr. Speaker, that he believes the thought of asking the government of Ontario for assistance in this matter is unrealistic.

Mr. Peacock: Right!

Mr. Singer: He thinks the matter of asking the government of Ontario for provincial assistance in a matter of this importance is unrealistic.

It is unfortunate that he did not bring along with him the member for Yorkview. The member for Yorkview has more sense and the member for Yorkview, I know, joins with me in the plea that I am now making to the Prime Minister to get this participation.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): The Premier had better listen to him. It is the member's swan song.

Mr. Singer: I would say this, sir—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Did the member for Downsview hear what they said? He does not believe that, does he?

An hon. member: Chusid had 60 out to his nomination.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Did they quote the member for Downsview accurately in that article?

Mr. Singer: Yes, they did.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Did they? I did not think the member would mention it otherwise.

Mr. Nixon: Perhaps the hon. member should read the headlines.

Mr. Singer: All right. Perhaps I should read the headline, my leader suggests: "Provincial Park Plan for York Downs: Vernon Singer to Ask Ontario for Finances." That is exactly what it says.

Mr. Nixon: Action.

Mr. Singer: And underneath it, it says: "But Chusid Says the Proposal is Unrealistic."

There you are. There is what the NDP in the area of North York thinks about the reasonableness of it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, it is a pity that while they are so worried about disposing of Steven Penner who had to go—oh, the member from Beaches is with us, is that not nice? Where has he been? I thought he had quit. That is nice. I am glad he is here.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): I am with the hon. member when I am not even here.

Mr. Singer: It is very interesting that the candidate they proposed—this fellow Penner—has run on through three nomination meetings. They have not been able to get a nomination meeting for him yet; he does not seem to quite be able to agree with many of the things that are said there.

I suspect that his persistence will pay off and that he and Stephen Lewis will be able to agree on all of the new policies—Do we nationalize more industries? Do we spend more money without collecting more money?—all these things are very, very important. It is going to be fascinating to watch.

At least, Mr. Speaker, one can see from the public and angry and foolish remarks of the candidate nominated by the NDP in Downsview that they do not know what they are talking about and that really their desire is not to preserve a park area for public purposes. Their desire is only to try and gain some apparent political advantage out of an issue that they do not properly understand.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me turn to the second point and I am sorry that my friend, the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) is not here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He is coming back shortly.

Mr. Singer: Is he coming back?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Shortly.

Mr. Singer: That is good.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the hon. member want to go on to his other point first?

Mr. Singer: No, I wanted the Attorney General here for both of them actually so I will start without him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the hon. member going to start on Dow?

Mr. Singer: No, Dow is the third one.

Mr. Speaker: I sent to the Attorney General yesterday an outline of the three points I was

going to make—the first one dealing with York Downs park; the second one dealing with the Attorney General and some of his particular relationship to the disciplinary proceedings that are now being taken against certain senior Ontario Provincial Police officers; and the third one will be Dow. We may get to Dow later today or if not we will get to it on another day.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister of Justice did not sleep last night.

Mr. Singer: Let us start to talk about the new Attorney General, part of the brave new wave. He is the fellow you remember, Mr. Speaker, who told the delegates at a meeting: "If these unemployed would only get off their butts and stop drawing welfare, things in the province would be better." That certainly is representative of the brave new wave.

He is the fellow who stood in his place, Mr. Speaker, not too many months ago and told us that we had no right to know what kind of considerations came in the budget reduction. We had no right to know. It was none of our business.

He is the fellow, Mr. Speaker, who very recently has described himself as "the enforcer." Are you familiar, Mr. Speaker, with the recent very popular novel called "The Grandfather"?

An hon. member: "The Godfather."

Mr. Singer: "The Godfather"! It is a very fascinating story; a novel about organized crime. There are certain characters who are described and entitled "enforcers." They go around doing all sorts of nasty things like shooting other people, beating them up and this sort of thing and the word "enforcer" seems to have—to me at least, and I would think to most people in the province—that kind of a connotation. There was a gentleman—the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) has referred to him once or twice—well known in this province not necessarily for his good deeds, who comes from Hamilton, who has been described as Johnny, the Enforcer and with his last name coming later.

This gentleman has come into public prominence in this province over a number of years because of his apparent responsibility to enforce some kind of illegal activity. On one occasion, at least, he was convicted by the courts for beating up a man, almost killing him, in a pub here in the city of Toronto.

That is the connotation that "enforcer" has to me and if that is the understanding that the new Attorney General has about his job then I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the smiling and happy Premier of Ontario look for someone who has a better understanding of what the problem of administration of justice is all about. Because surely the last thing we need in this province of Ontario, Mr. Speaker, is an enforcer.

What does enforcing mean? Is that his job? The provinces are charged with the problem of administration of justice and that does not mean enforcing. But good old Al, when he got the appointment—he did not get the number one job—he quickly announced he is certainly second in command (the seating arrangements do not quite indicate that but he is certainly second in command). He envisaged himself, Mr. Speaker, as one of the sheriffs who used to parade across the west; you know, gun on each hip, two guns, quick draw, shoot from the hip. I think that Al Lawrence can be best described not only as the enforcer but "shoot-from-the-mouth" Al Lawrence.

Because that is what he does. He shoots from the mouth without knowing, without thinking, and without having any real understanding, Mr. Speaker, about what his responsibilities are in connection with one of the most important jobs in the Province of Ontario; being the chief law officer of the Crown and the administrator of justice. He is not an enforcer.

When challenged with the story that appeared in the *Toronto Daily Star* on April 1, 1971, he said: Oh, well, I guess—I do not know why that should in fact be in the paper because it was an informal gathering." It was an informal gathering of 300 or 400 people who had gathered to help the campaign of one of their struggling cabinet ministers. He said: "I was asked to make a few remarks and informally I got up and did it." Informally, there were reporters there, and informally in public, the Attorney General of Ontario gets up and says, "I am the enforcer." Good old "shoot-from-the-mouth" Al, he is the enforcer. Then he says—and it was very interesting too—he has concern about the enforcement of our drug laws.

We asked him in the House, "What are you going to do, Mr. Attorney General? Are you suggesting that the Metropolitan Toronto police or the provincial police or the RCMP are not doing something that the law prescribes that they should do?"

He gets up and he says, "The Metropolitan Toronto police are all right and, certainly, I am not critical about the RCMP." And, at that point, he stops.

It was a most significant stop, Mr. Speaker, because one would have to imply that he is very critical of the OPP. I do not know if it is anything more than rumour that some years ago he and the present commissioner of the OPP had a serious falling-out, but I would think it is incumbent on the Attorney General, since, in answering that series of questions he deliberately left out in the minds of the people of Ontario a comment as to the efficiency of the Ontario Provincial Police force, that he has a responsibility to come into this House and say why he has that doubt and what he is, in fact, going to do about it.

Now he has not done that. I think it was most fortuitous that he had the occasion to speak this afternoon in this debate and that his remarks, in fact, preceded mine. I was listening very carefully to see if he was going to do anything more than make a motherhood speech, and that is all he did.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They made much more sense.

Mr. Singer: He is in favour of all things that are good and against all things that are bad.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Including the Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right.

Mr. Singer: But insofar as his remarks indicating that he has acquired since his appointment any real grasp of the responsibilities of that office, his speech was entirely lacking. There was no indication from him as to a follow-up about his concern about the course of administration of justice insofar as looking after our narcotic laws are concerned.

If he has a plan, if he feels that a crack-down is necessary, I wish he would tell us how he is going to do it.

The heading on this story is Lawrence Promises Crackdown on Drug Traffic. Well, what is it? Where is it and how is he going to do it?

The other significant thing in connection with the particular story, Mr. Speaker, is this: When questioned in the House, the Attorney General said, "I have some doubt in my mind as to whether or not I can tell the police what to do." Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, for a member who has sat in

this House for 12 or 14 years, that he has still some doubt in his mind? The man who has now achieved the great height of becoming the Attorney General and the Minister of Justice has some doubt in his mind as to who controls police forces? Can you really imagine that, Mr. Speaker?

The man who is the Attorney General and Minister of Justice has doubt in his mind, notwithstanding the times that we have debated this, the old Bill 99, and the arguments that have gone on in here until 4 o'clock in the morning to assert elected control over police forces. The Attorney General of Ontario, the member of the new wave in 1971, stands in this House and says, "I have doubt in my mind as to who controls the police forces." Here comes the former Attorney General into the House. I am sorry that he did not have the opportunity to take his successor out into the woodshed and tell him a few facts of life. I am sorry he did not tell him such basics as who controls police forces.

Mr. MacDonald: He is a gentleman.

Mr. Singer: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie was not able to get the message to the hon. member for St. George, that even as recently as public opinion and opposition forced something into the legislation about control of Mace and other weapons, that after great argument that went on hour after hour, and even had resistance from the former Attorney General, the words at the top of that section are, "with the approval of the Attorney General, such and such shall happen." Again there was the assertion of elected control over police forces. And the present Attorney General of Ontario does not even know that, Mr. Speaker. I think it is just ludicrous that that man can be in that position and be unknowledgeable about the things that are going on.

An hon. member: He almost became the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The only control that went in was with regard to weaponry.

An hon. member: Think of what he would not know in that job!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I want to deal for a few moments with some questions that arise from the investigations done by the committee that dealt with the Attorney General's estimates last June and the subsequent investigation done by the hon. Mr. Justice

Campbell Grant. Certainly there were many obvious things that came forward as a result of both of those activities. The estimates debate in committee on the Attorney General's estimates was long and arduous. It produced a lot of glaring errors in government system, and by progression many things have followed from that. Just one of them was the commission of inquiry re the Ontario Provincial Police carried out by the hon. Mr. Justice Campbell Grant.

One thing I was expecting, and I would have hoped this afternoon we could have heard a little about, would have been some details as to central purchasing by the OPP, because all of the trouble that was complained about insofar as the Duke affair was concerned related apparently to the purchasing of 12 lawnmowers over a period of five years and the expenditure of maybe \$10,000, and the visits of many, many policemen to a certain place where there was some doubt as to whether or not they should have been present.

One would have thought that one of the most obvious results of all of these discussions and all of this debate would have been that the new Attorney General, first crack out of the gun, would have said, "We have decided to regularize the purchasing procedures of the Ontario Provincial Police. We have decided if it is necessary that the Ontario Provincial Police have lawnmowers that they go to a central purchasing agency of the government of Ontario and they buy their lawnmowers." Even as obvious a step as that, Mr. Speaker, was not taken.

Somebody asked the Attorney General what steps he was going to take insofar as the recommendations were concerned, or so far as the comments were concerned, and he said, "Well, it is a long and complicated matter," and in keeping with the comments of his leader, "We are looking into it and we will think about it and in due course we will make some announcement." Well, when did the announcement come forward?

I wanted to talk particularly about the unusual method of disciplining police officers and the inequities that exist in that system throughout the Province of Ontario. As a result of the inquiries made by the committee examining the Attorney General's estimates for last June, charges were laid against two senior Ontario Provincial Police officers in relation to various disciplinary matters. Those charges against at least one of those officers are being heard presently by His Honour Judge Steen, a judge of the county court

of the county of York, and the charges against the other officer are going to come up at a later time.

Fascinatingly, Mr. Speaker, in his report, Mr. Justice Grant referred to one or possibly two other senior police officers and referred to them in a manner which, at least in my opinion, indicated that he believed they had committed equally serious misdemeanors, breaches of provincial police discipline, failure to carry out orders and that sort of thing, and interestingly enough the Attorney General said, "We are not going to lay any new charges because we don't believe there are enough facts available."

I asked the Attorney General whether he was concerned at all about the question of the limitation period and he said, "Oh, the limitation period has nothing to do with it." Well, I wonder—and he has had several days to think about it—I wonder now whether the Attorney General has informed himself about limitation periods, whether in fact he is at all aware of the provisions of The Public Authorities Protection Act and particularly section 11 of that Act, which says that:

No action, prosecution or other proceeding lies or shall be instituted against any person for an act done in pursuance or execution or intended execution, of any statutory or other public duty or authority, or in respect of any neglect or default in the execution of any such duty or authority, unless it is commenced within six months next after the act, neglect or default complained of, or in the case of continuance of injury or damage, within six months within the ceasing thereof.

Now that would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, to provide a limitation period of six months for proceeding against police officers, both in criminal matters and in civil matters, and in disciplinary matters. In fact, there is a recent decision given by Mr. Justice Osler, in the Supreme Court of Ontario, which said that a disciplinary charge brought against a particular constable of the Metropolitan Toronto police force more than six months after the event in fact took place was a bad charge, and he granted the appropriate order which stopped the hearing of that charge.

Now I also accept the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there is certain law in connection with the interpretation of this section, and so that the Attorney General will not be caught unawares I will read into the record the citation of the two cases which seem to be the leading cases.

One is a case of Scammell and Nephew Limited vs. Hurley and others, which is an English case reported in 1929, King's Bench Division, volume one, at page 419. In that case, and in relation to a similar limitation section in an English statute, the Court of Appeal in England decided that there were certain cases in which the limitation period would not, in fact, apply, and there was a somewhat similar decision, Mr. Speaker, given in Ontario in the case of Kennedy and Tomlinson by Mr. Justice Ferguson of the Supreme Court, and that case is reported in volume 13, Dominion Law Reports 2, at page 734.

So it may be that in certain circumstances the limitation period would not apply. It is interesting to note about the English case and the Ontario case that the case decided by Mr. Justice Ferguson related to criminal and civil actions against a police officer, not the disciplinary ones; and the case that Mr. Justice Osler decided, in fact, related to a disciplinary matter. I do not know whether or not the cases presently before His Honour Judge Steen would be decided in the same manner as Mr. Justice Osler decided. I would think they would. That remains yet for judicial interpretation.

But the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that there is such substantial doubt about the state of the law, which is dependent upon the interpretation of section 11 of The Public Authorities Protection Act, that one would have thought—and I am glad to see he is here now—that the Attorney General would have bothered, as the result of the questioning, to have informed himself of these problems and to have told us, frankly and clearly, what the position of the law officers of the Crown were in connection with these limitation period problems; and whether or not Rodger and Wilson, in fact, were protected by the limitation section; and whether or not the other gentlemen who were mentioned in Mr. Justice Grant's report were protected by the limitation section; and whether or not, in fact, Mr. Speaker, the decision not to proceed against the other two gentlemen mentioned by Mr. Justice Grant had a great deal to do with the doubt about the validity or the application of disciplinary charges at this stage in time.

Because, let us go back to what happened insofar as Wilson and Rodger were concerned. They are charged with committing offences some time in the year 1968. Charges were laid against them in June, 1970, clearly beyond the six months period. The delay in

the proceedings again is something I am going to come back to, something almost inexcusable, but it has two parts to it. By the time you get down to April, 1971, then certainly in light of the limitation section I just wonder if the Attorney General was being either something less than frank with us or something less than understanding about the problem when he said no consideration of the limitations period went into the decision not to lay disciplinary charges against the other two gentlemen who are mentioned in the report by Mr. Justice Grant. If it did not, then it should have.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I never said that.

Mr. Singer: And I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Attorney General just never bothered to inform himself about this.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I never said that.

Mr. Singer: Never said what? Never said that the limitations period did not apply?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I never said that no consideration—

Mr. Singer: That is exactly what the Attorney General said. He said it had no relationship to it—and it is there and it is in *Hansard*. If he wants the exact quotation, I will find it for him.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Please do.

Mr. Singer: Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many other unusual and peculiar things that arise out of this series of events. Heretofore, disciplinary proceedings—

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Ignore him.

Mr. Singer: —laid against a policeman—

Mr. Brown: The member should do his homework!

Mr. Singer: —would be dealt with by a senior officer of the police force concerned, subsequently by the—I think there were three stages—the senior officer, the head of the particular police force, local police commission if one existed, and then was appealed on through the Ontario Police Commission. This was the established procedure. Charges, again remember, against Wilson and Rodger were delayed, and I think the former Attorney General was quite right in saying he was not going to allow the charges to be proceeded with until Mr. Justice Grant had finished his deliberation and had brought

in his report. So those charges sat until—well, December 15 was the date of the report, but nothing was done about them really in fact until April.

Then, some time in January, the government decided to change the rules—and maybe again with some reason. A new regulation, order-in-council 38/71, was passed on November 30—I thought it was much later than that; oh, I am sorry, it was dated November 30 and His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council approved of this on December 23—and they inaugurated it into the system whereby, at the instigation of a number of people including the Attorney General, a matter such as this could be referred to a county court or district court judge.

In due course, His Honour Judge Steen had the matter referred to him. I wonder if the depth to which this whole question of consideration of these matters by someone other than senior police officials was in fact thoroughly brought out. My friend the Attorney General was patting himself on the back and saying, "My what a good government are we. We have implemented 979 recommendations by Mr. Justice McRuer."

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Nine hundred and eighty.

Mr Singer: I wonder if he recalls the one which deals with questions of police discipline and the manner of hearing these cases? I wonder if he recalls the shock with which Mr. Justice McRuer commented upon the ability of a police officer to get impartial judgement, and whether or not the built-in appeals system merely meant an appeal from Caesar to Caesar? If my friend the Attorney General will look at the report of Mr. Justice McRuer, he will find those sections there.

However, in this particular case, they did bring in the regulations and they allowed the appointment of the county court judge but they neglected to provide equal ability, not only to the Attorney General, but to an accused police officer to remove himself from the police stream of discipline and let the police officer who was charged with a disciplinary offence himself ask for adjudication by a county court judge.

One would have thought that if they were concerned about equal administration of justice, the order-in-council to which I have referred would have given equal opportunities not only to the authorities, not only to the enforcer, but would have given equal authority to a person accused to seek private and independent adjudication by a county

court judge. But they did not bother to make that provision. All right; be that as it may.

The procedure fascinatingly still continues and His Honour, Judge Steen is hearing these charges and in due course he will give his decision. After he has given his decision, the fascinating anomaly continues, that an appeal from his decision can go to the Ontario Police Commission. So there we have a situation where a police officer is going to be charged, and the charge is going to be heard in this case by His Honour, Judge Steen. If someone disagrees with the decision of His Honour, Judge Steen, from there they can go to that august body, the Ontario Police Commission, which will in fact sit in review of the decision of the county court judge.

My conclusion is obvious, Mr. Speaker. If the Attorney General's Department—and I do not know whether it was the member for Sault Ste. Marie or the member for St. George who made these particular decisions. Whichever one of them it was, surely he should have sat down and thought the whole matter through.

First, there was nothing wrong with saying, "Let the matter go before a county court judge." But having made that decision, surely they should have made an equitable provision to allow an accused officer to have his choice if he wanted to.

Second, having allowed the insertion of a county court judge into the picture, surely it is the height of idiocy to allow an appeal in the matter of this sort to proceed from a person like a county court judge or district court judge to that august body, the Ontario Police Commission. Who makes up the Ontario Police Commission? The Ontario Police Commission consists of a retired general, a former member of this House with no legal training at all, and one lawyer. Those gentlemen are expected by the law, as the law presently stands, to be able to sit in review of the decision that now can be made by a county court judge. What I say, Mr. Speaker, is that the brave new wave, when faced with a problem of updating ancient and useless legislation and bringing it into focus with present-day problems, just has not the faintest idea as to how to proceed. It just has not the first concern about providing for matters of equity. Let me deal with another phase of this whole series of charges against police officers.

Why did it take so long? Why did it take so long to have these charges dealt with? All right. The former Attorney General, the

member for Sault Ste. Marie, says it would not have been proper to bring them on while Mr. Justice Grant was inquiring. Perhaps that is a point. But that inquiry ended and the report was tabled on December 15 and it is now April 8. Why did it take so long to get those charges on? Why did it take so long to readjust the machinery?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, when they were re-drafting all these regulations and setting up a whole new ball game, why were they in such doubt as to whether or not these hearings should be in public or private? We asked the Attorney General two, three, four times as to whether or not the hearings would be in public or the hearings would be in private. He did not have the faintest idea. Finally, he said he thought they would be in public, but it would depend on the decision of the county court judge who was hearing them, and then when we asked him what criteria the county court judge would use, the Attorney General had to throw up his hands and say he did not know.

One would have thought the people who drafted the regulation would have had these matters in mind. One would have thought they would have looked at the pertinent sections of the Criminal Code that deal as a matter of law with when hearings can be made private and when, by and large, they should be public. One would have thought that an alert Attorney General would have recognized that this was a problem and would have had an opinion about it. But he is so busy being an enforcer that he has not had time to sit down and study the law in relation to matters which are presently of the utmost importance.

There is a further point, Mr. Speaker, in relation to this whole question of dealing with police officers that there seem to be two systems. These gentlemen, Rodger and Wilson, during the course of their suspension, which occurred last June and continues up to the present time, I would presume have not been required to report to work, but on the other hand I am advised by the Attorney General, they have been receiving their full pay. An unusual situation. Perhaps they should receive that pay. I do not know.

But the point that bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is the inconsistency of the system as it is applied to police officers throughout the Province of Ontario. There are cases—two have come to my particular attention—involving constables in the Metropolitan Toronto police force who were charged with disciplinary offences, found guilty and then

embarked on the appeal procedure. From the time of their first suspension until their trial—this happened reasonably quickly afterward—they did receive their pay.

During the time of the pending of the appeal procedure—and it goes very, very slowly; another problem about the Ontario Police Commission—it took them nine months, on one occasion to deal with an appeal to them—during that time, Mr. Speaker, these two constables were denied their pay.

In a case that happened recently—indicative of their competence—where the Ontario Police Commission reversed the decisions of the earlier people adjudicating, the commission came to the conclusion that the constable, who was a second-class constable, should be reduced in rank to a second-class constable. That is how efficient they are in proceeding to hear these appeals. They started with a second-class constable. They said, "We are going to punish you terribly. We are going to reduce you in rank to a second-class constable." That is some indication, perhaps, of their efficiency.

Nevertheless, during the course of the time that had to pass pending the appeal, this particular constable did not get any money. And his lawyer took it to the court of appeals—and I have the decisions here if the Attorney General wants to see them. He does not think these remarks are important enough to sit here, but hopefully he will read them in *Hansard*. I have the decisions here and I can refer to them. The court of appeals said, "That is too bad. There is no need to pay them."

Why? Is there a different rule for a police constable in Metropolitan Toronto who is being dealt with in a disciplinary procedure and a senior official of the Ontario Provincial Police?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: New regulations were passed.

Mr. Singer: Is there a different rule? Oh, there is a new regulation. These cases were decided quite recently.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Under the new regulations.

Mr. Singer: All right. Why should Wilson and Rodger be in a different position than these two constables in the Metropolitan Toronto police situation? Why should these two fellows—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Present regulations.

Mr. Singer: Yes, because of regulations. What kind of an excuse is that? What kind of an excuse is that? Do the regulations allow the system of justice in the Province of Ontario to discriminate against one police officer and in favour of another one? Two constables were treated in this way and two senior officers of the OPP are treated in another way. That is the point, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Can the hon. member not realize that regulations have been changed; that new regulations have been passed since the first instance that the hon. member is talking about? They have been changed.

Mr. Singer: What are the present provisions?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The ones under which Wilson and Rodger are being dealt with.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the former Attorney General, in fact, is not aware of these cases.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh yes I am.

Mr. Singer: Oh, is the hon. minister? And he is not aware of the decision of the court of appeal?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Very much aware.

Mr. Singer: And is not aware of the fact that the court of appeal—and including, fascinatingly, Mr. Justice Grant somewhere along the line—on the lower level said it was fine, it was fine, and he said, "If those constables want to get their money back, let them go and sue for it," even though the judicial procedures had not, in fact, been exhausted?

In fact, Mr. Speaker, when a person loses his licence because of having been convicted either of a driving offence under the Criminal Code or The Highway Traffic Act and his licence is suspended as a result of that kind of a conviction, if he enters an appeal the pertinent legislation allows for the reinstatement of his licence pending the determination of the appeal.

That is there and that is part of the law insofar as it concerned the handling of driving licences. It is not there and it is not part of the law insofar as it concerned those two constables who went beyond the original conviction stage and up to the appeal stage. They were told, quite bluntly, "If you want some more money, go and sue for it." It makes no sense.

My point simply is this, Mr. Speaker, that having gotten into this, one would have thought that the new Attorney General would have bothered to look at the law books, would have bothered to begin to question and to examine some of these problems having concerned himself of the recommendation of Dr. McRuer—I do not know when we started to call him Dr. McRuer, I guess he got an honorary degree recently—Dr. McRuer, Mr. Justice McRuer, Chief Justice. One would have thought he would have looked at the recommendations regarding the handling of police disciplinary matters. One would have thought he would have looked at the provisions of the limitations section of The Public Authorities Protection Act. One would have thought that the brave new wave would have begun to modernize procedures, regularize them and make them equitable for all police officers in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the House leader indicated to me that it was his desire to adjourn at 5 o'clock. I am finished with that subject, and I am going to embark upon a third one which I will be at some length about, of some interest again to the Attorney General. So if it meets with the House leader's approval, at this point I will move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the intention of the House leader to adjourn at this time?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, we are getting very close to the hour of 5 o'clock, and I would move that the House adjourn to resume again on Tuesday next. I would like to say in addition, that on Tuesday—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker having been told at last what the order of business is for today, the member might put the motion that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Singer moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): I think on Tuesday we might continue the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne. There is a possibility that we might seek to have some second readings if the occasion permits.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Just before the motion is put, can the House leader tell us whether it is the intention of the government to return to the unemployment debate next week?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I cannot say definitely not next week, but I think it would not likely be next week. That is as definite as I can be.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is good.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): May I ask, Mr. Speaker, if the House will sit Tuesday evening next week?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I believe it is the intention that the House sit Tuesday evening.

Mr. Singer: The minister believes, but he is not sure?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Members can prepare for that.

Mr. Peacock: We are always prepared.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4:55 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 8, 1971

Establishment of three new wild river parks, statement by Mr. Brunelle	341
Policy re attracting industry from other provinces, statement by Mr. Grossman	341
Recognition of June 20 to 26 as Senior citizens' week, statement by Mr. Wells	342
Chairmanship of Design for Development cabinet committee, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	343
Increasing speed limit on Queen Elizabeth Way, question to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Nixon	343
Bill 10, Farm Products Marketing Act, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Bolton	344
Tabling report on ownership and sale of former Crown lands, question to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Nixon	347
Teachers graduating who will be unemployed in next academic year, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Lewis, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Martel, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Deans	348
Surplus of teachers and departmental planning, question to Mr Welch, Mr. Lewis	349
Position of Ontario re increases in gasoline prices, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis	350
Permanent moratorium on cutting in western end of Quetico Park, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon	350
Appeal to Lakehead University re apparent firing of three professors, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Pitman, Mr. T. Reid	351
Bill 10, Farm Products Marketing Act, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Singer, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. J. Renwick	352
Report, standing procedural affairs committee	355
Town of Mississauga, bill respecting, Mr. Kennedy, first reading	357
Zurich Life Insurance Company of Canada, bill respecting, Mr. Kennedy, first reading	357
Hillbrook Investments Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Deans, first reading	357
City of Brantford, bill respecting, Mr. Makarchuk, first reading	357
Reliable Plastering Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Meen, first reading	357
Abbey Life Insurance Company of Canada, bill respecting, Mr. J. R. Smith, first reading	357
Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Singer	357
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Singer, agreed to	376
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to	377



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, April 13, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 13, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon our guests in the galleries are students from Main Street School, Toronto, in the east gallery; and in the west gallery from Burlington Central High School in Burlington.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the document relating to national tax reform, which I announced last week would be ready for presentation today. It is "Ontario Studies in Tax Reform No. 4—Tax Reform and Revenue Growth to 1980."

This is one of the series of tax analyses undertaken in The Department of Treasury and Economics. These analyses have used the most up-to-date techniques and the best available data to measure the impact of various methods for reforming the national tax system.

This recent study examines the possible economic and revenue effects of three alternative tax structures: the existing income tax system, the proposed federal white paper system and the Ontario tax reform proposals within the context of full potential economic growth to 1980. Estimates of the effects of various proposals have become a crucial part of the tax reform process. In particular, estimates of this kind are important in four areas of public sector planning in Canada.

First, the revenue estimates provide a measure for the control of the growth of Canada's public sector. In presenting the revenue implications of alternative tax systems, a basis is provided for anticipating and preventing undesirable revenue growth and inflationary expansion of the public sector in the decade ahead. Specifically, this study reveals that the federal white paper system as originally proposed would generate an enormous revenue increase over the existing income tax system by 1980, in the order of 4.5 billion in 1980. The study also reveals that even the present tax system has the

capacity to generate enormous fiscal dividends. The revenue estimates of the study measure the scope available for future tax reductions rather than automatic increases in government spending.

Second, estimates of revenue growth demonstrate the scope for continuing tax reform. The results of the study serve as a guide to the revenue increases which will become available in future years. We have, as a consequence, a better idea of the amount of additional tax relief which may be provided to low-income groups, while at the same time eliminating tax increases on middle- and upper-income groups. The results also act as a guide to the most appropriate timing of continuing tax reform.

Third, revenue estimates help to promote public awareness of the need to examine proposals for tax reform in the context of other proposals for restructuring the social security system. It is important to be aware of how changes in our tax laws and changes in our social security system will jointly affect the disposable income of Canadians. As far as possible, all government tax and spending policies should be examined for their effects on disposable income. This study emphasizes the need for the examination of the combined effects of tax reform and social security reform.

Fourth, the revenue estimates of this study are essential to calculating the pool of revenues which would become available to federal, provincial and municipal governments in future years under each alternative tax system. This information will, we hope, contribute to the more rational division of these tax resources among the three levels of government. The projections set out in this study will, I feel confident, assist in the improvement of the forward projections undertaken by the tax structure committee.

The principal quantitative results of this study are as follows: Under the present income tax system revenues would grow from \$10 billion in 1969 to \$29.3 billion by 1980, marking an increased share in gross national product of from about 13 per cent in 1969 to about 16 per cent by 1980.

Under the Ontario tax reform proposals, revenues would grow from \$10.1 billion in 1969 to \$30.8 billion in 1980. The study shows that the Ontario tax reform proposals would provide more tax relief to low-income groups than either the existing tax system or the federal white paper tax reform proposals. In its earlier proposals for tax reform in Canada, Ontario has emphasized the need to devote future revenue gains to finance continued tax relief.

Under the federal white paper proposals, revenues would grow from \$11.6 billion in 1969 to \$33.8 billion by 1980, revenue increase over the existing tax system of \$1.45 billion in 1969, rising to an increase in 1980 of \$4.5 billion.

This study, which I commend to the House's attention, places in a dynamic context the tax analyses which have been undertaken in The Department of Treasury and Economics in the last 10 months.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

SECOND READING OF BILL 10

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food. Since The National Farm Products Marketing Act has now been passed by the House of Commons committee on agriculture and is now before Parliament for third reading, will the minister undertake to retain his Bill 10 and not present it as second reading until the federal legislation is enacted?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I would like to give an affirmative answer to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Unfortunately, I do not feel inclined to do so for the simple reason that we have no idea how long it will take to obtain third reading. I gather it will come back to the House now for Committee of the Whole as well as for third reading. Frankly, I think the way to resolve the problems that relate to poultry products marketing, within Canada particularly, should be dealt with through The National Farm Products Marketing Act. We hoped for several months that this would become a reality, but it has not as yet. In the meantime, unless something is done to control what can conceivably happen, there can be very drastic losses sustained by a good many agriculture producers across Canada.

AIR POLLUTION IN TORONTO

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. The first one is, will he table the names of those industries which by his order were either shut down or reduced their activities in the air pollution difficulties over the last two days?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member requires them.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): By way of supplementary, is the minister prepared to launch one of his magnificent lawsuits against those industries in Toronto which he knows are polluting the air?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any comparison or analogy that can be drawn here between what happened in Toronto over the weekend as far as air pollution is concerned and any other industries with which we are involved in litigation.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, what permanent steps, if any, is the hon. minister prepared to take against the known polluters in the Toronto area who caused the index of pollution to rise as high as 52?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member knows that the industries themselves are not completely responsible for a high index reading. It was because of certain atmospheric conditions and stagnation. The sources that we feel would contribute toward the high index reading, of course, are such known sources as our hydro-generating stations, our incinerators within the city, and the Toronto General Hospital. Those are all under order to clean up.

The hon. member knows for example that the Hearn generating station is converting to gas. The new Toronto hospital stack and heating system is not in complete operation at this time, therefore the condition of that hospital contributed toward a high index reading.

All these matters are being looked into and corrected wherever possible.

Mr. Singer: By way of a further supplementary, is the minister not prepared to do anything to avoid the future danger of high pollution indexes in Toronto such as exist today?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Those known sources, as well as a lot of small sources, are requested to comply with our regulations to install abatement equipment and correct whatever deficiency exists in their operation contributing toward high index readings. They are all under order to do this.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, how many prosecutions have been launched by the air management branch within the last year?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I have not got that figure in my head but I think it is around 40. I can get the accurate figure for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

EXPORT OF POWER

Mr. Nixon: I have another question of the same minister. Has he completed his review of the former government policy affecting the export of power from northwestern Ontario to the United States through International Falls?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, Mr. Speaker, that review is not complete as yet.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Is the minister aware that the Energy Board requested if there was any change in the policy of the Ontario government in this regard, that it be transmitted to the Energy Board one week before the hearings resume, which is April 20?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, I was not aware of that, Mr. Speaker. Certainly it was the intention of this government to let our position be known before any hearings resume.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Will the minister give us some indication when that will be?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It will be some time this month, I would think.

Mr. Lewis: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister inform the Legislature of the position of the government on the export of power from northwestern Ontario before informing the National Energy Board?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I do not see any reason why this could not be done as far as that particular event is concerned.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

REVIEW OF WAGE SETTLEMENT

Mr. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Labour. Has he undertaken a review of the wage settlement between the Sheetmetal Contractors Association of London, Ontario, and Local 473 providing for a 40 per cent increase in wages over two years?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Labour): Yes, we have studied this problem, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Leader of the Opposition. Also, the Prices and Incomes Commission were in London last week and we have their report. We are watching this very closely.

Mr. Nixon: I have a supplementary. According to reports there are 200 additional settlements of this nature that will be before the people of Ontario and particularly this minister. Has he got any programme to keep these matters under constant review and, in the public interest, influence them so that they will not be so inflationary?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, we have a continuing review on this particular topic. As a matter of fact, this matter has been gone into every morning.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Is there anything the minister is prepared to do about it? Does the minister enter into the negotiations on behalf of the public interest to maintain a level that is something less than 20 per cent a year?

Hon. Mr. Carton: We are continually having negotiations with both sides, Mr. Speaker.

OFF-TRACK BETTING

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Justice and Attorney General. Has the hon. minister any further information to report to the House on his negotiations with the government of Canada through the Minister of Justice on off-track betting procedures as they may develop in this province?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): No, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to report at this time.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister say that the government, through him or his predecessor, has

recommended to the government of Canada that legislation be brought forward permitting off-track betting in this province?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not able to say that.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

BAIL PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General and Minister of Justice: Does the Attorney General intend to announce to the Legislature a change in the bail proceedings which would prohibit the occurrence of the incident at the Don Jail, in the appearance before Judge Foster, that occupied public attention over the last 48 hours?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned, as I am sure most of the members of this House have been, over certain press reports yesterday in the Toronto media about an occurrence which at this stage, I can only claim to be very, very highly unfortunate.

I have been tied up all morning in a very important meeting. I have not been able to get the other side of this story, if indeed there is another side to that story. But this afternoon, as soon as I am free from the question period here in the House, I have scheduled a meeting for the senior judge of the county of York, the senior Crown attorney for Metro Toronto—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): A summit conference!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —the director of public prosecutions and the assistant deputy minister of The Department of Justice under whose general jurisdiction this whole question falls—

Mr. Sopha: How about the treasurer of the Law Society?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I intend finding out just what the problem is in respect of this matter and a few other matters that have taken place along this line over the last year or so. As soon as I am in a position to report to the House, I shall do so.

I did have the opportunity this morning, very briefly, to speak to the Minister of Justice for the federal government to find out where the new bail provisions are in

their legislative mill, which hopefully are designed to alleviate some of these problems. He informed me it is presently before the Senate. I am not falling back on that as an excuse or an alibi here at all, but I am trying to get to the bottom of it. As soon as I can—hopefully tomorrow, but I may not be in a position tomorrow; if not, certainly this week—I shall be reporting back to the House.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I have two supplementaries, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister had time to consider the comments of Judge Taylor that persons of this type are kept in jail as an economy measure? Judge Foster; I beg your pardon!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No. Just on my way into the House I saw headlines in one of the Toronto afternoon papers respecting some reputed comment by Judge Foster, but I have not had the opportunity of reading any further than the headlines.

Mr. Shulman: My second supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: Has the minister considered the possibility of having a full-time bail bondsman so people need not sit in jail overnight awaiting the arrival of someone at the jail who can get these people out?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am as concerned—as I think the hon. member is reported to have been concerned—regarding the absence of a justice of the peace on Saturday. Why there was no justice of the peace available on Saturday I do not know, but I intend to find out.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Dovercourt has a supplementary?

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary: Did duty counsel appear on behalf of the accused, in that trial before the judge, to explain the situation to Judge Foster?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is another of the very many matters I am going to be asking a little later on.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if the observations as reputed to have been uttered by Judge Foster are in fact accurate, is the minister prepared to submit that to the judicial council of Ontario for review?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I have not seen those comments, so I think it would be very unfair of me to comment on that.

Mr. Sopha: Does the minister know the last one the member for High Park bailed out skipped town?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for Scarborough West has the floor.

Mr. Sopha: He was from Sudbury, to our eternal shame.

ODC LOAN PROGRAMME

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Development? On what authority does Mr. Etchen, head of the Ontario Development Corporation, dispense \$26 million of taxpayers' money by way of forgivable loans without paying any attention at all, as he said, to the growth centre priorities as established in the government's Design for Development plans?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Economics): Mr. Speaker, the authority which is given to the Ontario Development Corporation does not, of course, make any reference to any plan. The authority given to the ODC is contained in the legislation setting up the ODC.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, does the minister feel it proper that his major loan programme should violate all existing patterns of economic development which the government, in its other departments, has established?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it must be obvious to the hon. member who is asking the question, and to all members of this House, that this plan has been and is being developed over a period of years. I am sure he would not suggest that the minute those people who are charged with the responsibility of developing such a plan were beginning to write a report, or even brought in a report which has not as yet been adopted as official policy, we should have stopped helping municipalities in obtaining jobs for their people, and so on.

Mr. Lewis: Nobody said that. But why should the minister's plans violate his proposed reports—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well I am asking the hon. member whether he feels we should not have granted any loans in the last three years.

Mr. Lewis: It should have been directed to his department's own growth centres.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What should they have done? Should they have waited?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister and the member are getting into a debate. All the minister should do, please, is to answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure many of the hon. members in the NDP as well as the Liberal opposition would agree, that it would have been unwise not to do anything for some of these communities while we were awaiting a report.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, on what basis will the minister be giving preference to Canadian-based companies?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That, Mr. Speaker, is a policy the details of which I said would be announced in a few days, and probably this week. We will spell out the details.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth has a supplementary?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): In what way will this policy differ from the policy that is presently in existence, whereby the government is putting up the risk capital for companies?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is asking a policy question which is not allowed.

Mr. Deans: It is not a policy question; they are doing it now.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A supplementary question: If ODC is going to continue its grants, why cannot it do it in keeping with the guidelines laid down by Design for Development and direct them to the growth centres rather than scatter them all over the province?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I thought I had answered that previously.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, no, he avoided it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not avoid it; I am saying to the hon. member that there would have been a considerable number of people in municipalities in difficulty had they been required to carry out the recommendations as laid down in some of these reports to date.

Mr. Lewis: In other words, to hell with the reports.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I did not say that, Mr. Speaker. What I am saying is that if the hon. member would like me to read out the municipalities represented by members of his party which have been helped, I will ask them whether—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on. Maybe that is important to the minister's party.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Is that the only way the minister thinks?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, does the hon. member suggest that it is not important to his backbenchers? Would the hon. member like me to read a list of those members representative of his party who have asked for assistance in spite of Design for Development?

Mr. Lewis: Well, is that the way the government distributes a loan? What a silly business.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Those people were in difficulty in those municipalities—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And nobody has whined more than the hon. member has about Peterborough.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it would have been—

Mr. Pitman: The provincial Treasurer really got taken apart, did he not? He sure got clobbered that night.

Mr. Lewis: The civil service is sabotaging the minister. They are undermining his good image.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It would have been completely callous of this government to have ignored the hardships that were going on in some of the municipalities, had we awaited official policy on Design and Development before helping those municipalities in creating jobs, and many of those municipalities are represented by members in the NDP who press the government to do something for the people in those areas.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brantford has the floor for a supplementary, and this will be the last supplementary.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: If the minister states that ODC is going to en-

courage the growth of Canadian companies, is he aware that about 95 per cent of these companies are located in centres which currently do not come under ODC designation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not aware of that, Mr. Speaker. I just tell the hon. member that the whole policy is being reviewed, particularly in the light of the policies which we declared in the Throne Speech. If you look into all of these matters—the only thing I am objecting to, obviously, while I am on my feet, is the fact that members of this House who pressed the government to do something about people in these municipalities being out of work, are now getting up and complaining that it was not in accordance with a plan which is being put together by planning. That is all I am saying to the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West has the floor to ask further questions.

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX INCREASE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have one question for, I guess, the provincial Treasurer, under the circumstances of the Premier's absence. Will the provincial Treasurer now launch an inquiry into the gas price increases, the proposed beer price increases, the problems of food price increases, given the astonishing jump of the consumer price index?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, will the Ontario food council be requested to look into the food costs in Ontario in view of their large share of the rise in the consumer price index?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As I recall, Mr. Speaker, the food council looked into that situation some months ago when food prices were falling. I think we are satisfied with what they found, and I would think that the answer to the question again would be no.

FARM COMMODITY PRICES

Mr. Speaker: The member for Renfrew South.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. I am sure that the minister is aware of the very low prices in

certain farm commodities and I am wondering if he could enlighten the House as to the main contributors to the low prices, especially eggs and pork?

Mr. Sopha: Times are so tough he carries his lunch with him.

Mr. Yakabuski: That is right. A delightful lunch it is.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question regarding the unsatisfactory price of eggs and pork at the moment and the reasons which might be attributed as the cause for this, I would suggest that perhaps in the last few years there have been substantially high prices, particularly with hog prices—good prices, I would say—which have contributed to the over-production of hogs, bearing in mind, of course, the enormous surplus of grain that we had in western Canada that apparently could not be marketed.

As a matter of fact, in the year 1970 hog production increased in the Province of Saskatchewan by 75 per cent and in the Province of Manitoba by 35 per cent and in the Province of Alberta by 33 per cent. This, coupled with a substantial increase in hog production in eastern Canada—about 11 per cent in Ontario in 1970—led to the production of a great many more hogs than could actually be used in Canada.

The result was that we had to look for export markets. Fortunately, through efforts of The Department of Trade and Commerce, the Ontario Food Council, the Canadian Swine Council and the Ontario Hog Producers' Marketing Board, export markets were found. Working with the packing industry, we stepped up exports last year by 68 per cent over the previous year, which I think is a substantial increase in export products. But, by the same token, in the export market, the world price for hogs was greatly lower than the previous two-year prices for pork but it was the means of the western farmer converting a good deal of that unsold grain into cash.

The consequent result has been this build-up of pork supplies, but, by the same token, there has been a substantial increase, Mr. Speaker, in the consumer consumption of pork products within Canada at greatly reduced prices, not only at wholesale but also at retail level. So I believe in the fall of 1970 we had the highest per capita consumption of pork products in the history of Canada, if memory serves me correctly.

The matter of low prices today is definitely associated with the fact that there is a weak market for pork products. The result has been a backup of this on the market. The price is reflected in that condition of over-supply. How long this will pertain, nobody knows, and I wish I could provide the hon. member with a more satisfactory answer. However I think the stepped-up sales of western grain on the export market will discourage many of the western farmers continuing in excessive pork production and we look for much better things to come, probably by the fall of this year.

With regard to egg prices, the same thing is virtually true. Egg production and egg prices have been on a cyclical basis for as long as I can remember, with peaks and valleys. At the present time there exists a state of peak production, generated to some degree again by western producers, particularly in Manitoba, producing far in excess of that province's ability to consume.

There just has generally been vast over-production of eggs, not only in western Canada but in Ontario as well. The result has been a greatly deteriorated price to producers, Mr. Speaker. It is deplorable, there is no question about it. I should think with the action taken by some egg producers in Canada to try to bring some order and stability into the production patterns and pricing structures within their own provinces, that we might look for better things ahead.

Mr. Nixon: As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker; I wonder if the minister can indicate whether the food council or his economics branch has assessed the role played by the price war among the supermarkets in depressing these prices unnaturally in recent months?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I cannot give the hon. leader a specific answer on that one way or the other. There was a report published some time ago by the food council and I believe a report was published not long ago by a private firm indicating comparative pricing between the supermarkets in Ontario.

I would say this; that I think the supermarkets have co-operated magnificently in moving the enormous surplus of pork products—particularly up until the fowl hit the market before Christmas. Had it not been for that kind of co-operation, I am afraid the answer to my friend, the member for Renfrew South, is that the price would have been much, much worse than it really was.

Members will note that the price on pork held up to around the \$25 to \$26 level just the last few weeks, when it slipped to about \$22 to \$23 on the dressed weight market. It is just the buildup of products; that is all that dropped it, really.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. Sopha: Thank you. I have a three-part question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Would the minister tell the House whether he has under active consideration the establishment of a single-tier system of regional government for the Sudbury basin?

Secondly, would he inform the House whether any steps have been taken to fill the void in the proposal that he announced a short while ago in reference to participation of the regional government in hospital expansion in the area?

Thirdly, what report can he make to the House of his deliberations with three representatives of the town of Copper Cliff today?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, dealing with the questions in the order in which the hon. member placed them:

I made proposals on March 15 in Sudbury on a two-tier system. That was the general arrangement we felt best for the area for regional government in the future. I suggested at that time that the intermunicipal committee under Mayor Solski of Coniston should consider the proposals that I put before them and make submissions to me and to the department by an early date.

In reference to the matters that were not covered in that brief, it was not meant to be all-inclusive. Certainly the hon. member raised several matters, including the hospitals, on the occasion when I was in Sudbury. Since that time we have had a group within the department studying the matter further and we will deal with that matter, also the submissions that come to us.

Today I met a delegation from Copper Cliff which included the mayor of that municipality; I had a meeting outside with a number of them and then they presented a brief to me in my office. That brief will be considered, along with a number of others which I am sure I will receive in the next week or so.

I have had some communications from various people in the Sudbury area and they will receive due consideration and certainly the Copper Cliff one will receive consideration. They made some good points in their brief, but the department and myself carefully considered the whole project and felt the proposals we put forward on March 15 had much merit for that area.

Mr. Sopha: As a supplementary, is the minister able to predict with any fair degree of accuracy the date on which the Sudbury basin might expect the implementation of regional government?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I asked that the opinions of the people in the area should be submitted by June 1, so that we could move on as quickly as possible after that. So I would say that in the interim, as I said before, I have a committee working on the whole project.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: The minister stated in Sudbury that he would not entertain any discussion in regard to the maintenance of Copper Cliff's individual identity. Is that still the policy of the department in regard to the establishment of regional government?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I do not recall that I made that particular statement.

Mr. Deans: Well, those are not the words but that was the intent.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I said that the regional form was the one that we felt should be implemented in the area, but that there could be discussion in reference to details within that framework.

Mr. Deans: By way of supplementary, would that also include discussion as to maintaining Copper Cliff's individual identity? Or would it not?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The people in Copper Cliff have today made submissions in reference to that and they have had discussions with me. I think it is only right and proper that people in the area should be able to make submissions on these matters if they so wish.

Mr. Speaker: Any further supplementaries? Then the Minister of Trade and Development has the answer to a question asked last week.

SENIOR CITIZENS' RENTS

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, on April 6 the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman) asked the following question:

Will senior citizens receiving the guaranteed income supplement and living in Ontario Housing, be permitted to keep all of their increased supplement or will some portion of it be taken away by way of rent increases?

Mr. Speaker, senior citizens in family housing units administered by Ontario Housing Corporation, are rented on a scale which has national application, and is set in co-ordination with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Persons in receipt of a gross income of \$190 a month or less pay a basic fully serviced rent of \$32 a month.

A senior citizen in receipt of guaranteed income supplement, together with a pension, had an income increase from \$113.61 to \$135. This means his or her fully serviced rent remains at \$32 a month.

A senior-citizen couple, in receipt of pension and the maximum guaranteed income supplement, had a change in income from \$227.22 to \$255 a month. On the scale, the percentage that goes for rent changes from approximately 19.2 per cent to 20.8 per cent. This means their rent will increase from \$44 a month to \$53 a month at the end of their present lease. All leases are on a one-year fixed-rent basis for increases so this change would not be effective until that time.

Mr. Speaker: Any further supplementaries? If not, the member for York South has the floor.

EFFICIENCY REPORT ON
GOVERNMENT PROGRAMMES

Mr. MacDonald: A question of the provincial Treasurer: Would the provincial Treasurer table in this House the study that was conducted under the auspices of the Treasury Board last year in reviewing the effectiveness and efficiency of the government's various programmes and grants, loans and subsidies?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It was probably done a couple of years ago, a year and a half ago anyway, and I would suspect that the answer would be no, that that was prepared for the use of the government and I do not think it would be a particularly appropriate document to table here.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question: In a speech of a few weeks ago, I believe his first speech in his new portfolio, the minister stated that the report was completed in 1970, therefore approximately one year ago, and that as a result of the steering committee's implementation of its recommendations there was a saving of \$5.3 million. Is this House not entitled to know how the government saved \$5.3 million; what the recommendations were upon which it was operating?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would be glad to give the member the details of the saving of \$5.3 million.

Mr. MacDonald: A final supplementary question: Is the minister saying that he will give us a copy of the recommendations upon which the steering committee was operating when it saved the \$5.3 million?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, the member wanted to know how we had saved \$5.3 million and I will be glad to supply that information to the member.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, by way of a final supplementary question: I do not want a breakdown of the \$5.3 million; is the minister saying he will give us a copy of the recommendations that were implemented in achieving that \$5.3 million?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member has now reverted to his original question as opposed to the supplementaries, and I said the answer was no. How many times does the hon. member have to be told? The answer is no, n-o.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, may I ask as a final supplementary: Why cannot this House have information when public moneys are—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: When public moneys are spent by the Treasury Board by way of achieving greater efficiency, why is this House not entitled to the information?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we have been over this ground a number of times. I have reason to believe that there are documents which I would love to see which have been prepared with the benefit of public money in the office of the New Democratic Party. I am not about to demand—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ontario South.

SUGGESTED ABOLITION OF FISHING LICENCES

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): A question of the Minister of Lands and Forests: Due to the limited revenue from fishing licences in the Province of Ontario, would the minister consider abolishing the fishing licence? It also shows discrimination against the male sex.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to take that question under consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale.

SALE OF FORMER SITE OF MERCER REFORMATORY

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Public Works. Could the minister inform the House if the property on which the Mercer Reformatory once was—on King Street West in Toronto—has been sold, and if so, to whom?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I do not recall that it has been sold since I have been the minister. I will get the information for the hon. member when I return to the office this afternoon.

Mr. Trotter: By way of a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, would the minister also inquire if this property had ever been considered for the use of public housing?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East.

SCHOOLING OF WARDS OF CHILDREN'S AID

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): I have a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services.

1. Why does the government maintain legislation which "discriminates against children who are in the care of Children's Aid Societies, and which could effectively prevent them from attending any school at all?"

2. Why has the Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies not received a reply for a period of 12 months concerning this issue?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has not made it very clear exactly what issue he wishes an answer on. I will check and find out what letter he was talking about that has not been replied to and see if I can find out the answer.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question, if I might, Mr. Speaker: Will the minister recommend to cabinet that section 6 of The Public Schools Act, section 22 of The Separate Schools Act, and section 71 of The Secondary Schools Act, be revised so that it is not possible for school boards to exclude children who are wards of the Children's Aid Society or in foster homes?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I will be happy to take that under consideration, Mr. Speaker. That, of course, is a matter of policy.

Mr. T. Reid: The minister has had it for 12 months.

Mr. Speaker: Any further supplementaries? The member for Brantford.

ONTARIO CREDIT UNION LEAGUE

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. Can the minister indicate if he is planning to take any action regarding the Ontario Credit Union League's stabilization fund?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I met with certain members of the executive of the Credit Union League shortly after my appointment to this portfolio and we examined the report brought forward by a committee of this House. We are studying it now for possible implementation. I cannot say further than that in answer to the hon. member.

Mr. Makarchuk: By way of supplementary, can the minister say when the final decision will be made?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: One of the recommendations, Mr. Speaker, was about the administration of the bond fund. I cannot, I think be more accurate or more close in my estimate than I have stated, that we are studying it, and I hope we will be coming forth with a recommendation in legislation, though I cannot say when.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Revenue has the reply to a question asked last week.

SALE TAX LOSSES

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I have a further reply to the member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon) and I have investigated the implications of his question as thoroughly as possible.

The department does, in fact, tax the seller of securities and I might say that if there is any loss of revenue the only sale that we could locate was, in fact, a government sale, or an Ontario Hydro sale, that was made in the province of Quebec, and of course such sales are tax exempt. If there are other avenues of which the hon. member is aware I would be glad to hear of them and take necessary action.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: What steps does the ministry propose to take to place the responsibilities for the payment of tax on the seller of the securities, so that Ontario residents, corporations or individuals who sell securities have the obligation of paying the tax; so it is not just the broker who may have no obligation to pay the tax who has the obligation to pay the tax? We are missing revenue, and I want to know what steps the minister is taking to collect revenue in this case.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am not aware of any tax or any revenue that is being lost, but I will further examine the question of the hon. member and determine if there is revenue being lost in this regard.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex South has the floor for a question.

EXEMPTION FROM SALES TAX

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Revenue. Will the hon. minister consider removing the five per cent sales tax on the flower-growing industry in relation to its equipment and its repairs?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, the present method of taxing is that greenhouse operators who, in fact, are involved in the growth of produce related to the agricultural industry are exempt from this tax, whereas in the reference made by the hon. member in those particular cases, they are subject to the tax. Where an operator has a divided operation we allow the exemption on the portion that is considered agriculture. However, in regard to his suggestion, I will certainly take it under consideration.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary. In view of the Minister of Agriculture and Food's statement on April 7, that he looks upon the production of flowers as being an agricultural industry, would this not enhance his particular line of thinking?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: For the second time, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly be pleased to take the hon. member's suggestion under consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton Mountain.

GRADE 13 PROGRAMME AT SIR WILFRID LAURIER

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Education: Would the minister indicate what action he intends to take regarding the representations made to him by citizens and the member for Hamilton Mountain regarding the controversy surrounding Sir Wilfrid Laurier Secondary School and its grade 13 programme for next season?

Mr. Lewis: The member has not said anything about it yet.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): He is a front for the Liberal candidate in Hamilton Mountain.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, under the terms of The Schools Administration Act, matters such as that referred to by the hon. member fall within the jurisdiction of the Hamilton Board of Education. The department itself has not been asked by the board of education with respect to any approvals to construct a school specially for grade 13 pupils.

The latest application for school accommodation we have goes back into the early part of 1969 and deals with a school, the Sir Wilfrid Laurier Secondary School. But I hasten to point out to the hon. member, I appreciate very much the fact that he brought this matter to my attention over the weekend, expressing as he did the concern of those whom he represents in Hamilton Mountain with respect to this decision, but it falls within the jurisdiction of the Hamilton Board of Education.

Mr. Lewis: That is putting him in his place.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has a supplementary.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary question of the minister: Is it a legal privilege of a board of education to exclude from its committee meeting, or from a caucus meeting, representations by ratepayers who wish to appear before that said committee and express their views? Such was the case regarding this controversy when these citizens were not allowed to appear before the meeting.

Mr. Speaker: The member has asked his question.

Mr. Deans: The member did not even go to the meeting.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think the question of the bylaws which govern any particular board are a matter which the board itself will decide. I think, however, all regular meetings of the board are open meetings, at which time committee reports are discussed and, no doubt, at which time the public will be able to make its representations known to the board.

Mr. Singer: All open meetings are open, yes?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I want to reiterate that this particular matter, which concerns a number of people in Hamilton, rests with the Hamilton Board of Education and that board is accountable to those who have elected them to be there.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: I wonder if the minister might answer whether the Hamilton board had asked for permission or for grants to build a school solely for grade 13?

Mr. Speaker: This is a theoretical question.

Mr. Deans: That is exactly to the point.

Mr. Speaker: This is a theoretical question and is not in accordance with the rules.

Mr. Deans: All right. I will ask a new question.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. T. Reid: Is the Minister of Education in a position to reply to my question of approximately a week ago concerning his

committee which is examining the feasibility of the elimination of grade 13 in the Province of Ontario—

Mr. Deans: I asked that last week.

Mr. Speaker: This is not supplementary.

Mr. T. Reid: —which would make that school obsolete?

Mr. Speaker: This is not supplementary. The hon. member for Wentworth has the floor for a new question.

SCHOOL FOR GRADE 13

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether it is possible for a municipal board of education to receive grants for the building of a school solely for the purpose of grade 13 students.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to answer that question, but I do not want there to be any misunderstanding. The matter referred to in Hamilton has nothing to do with a school built exclusively for grade 13. The 1969 approval with respect to the Laurier school had reference to the need for school accommodation generally. What the board does in re-arranging—I think, for instance, in that city the Delta Secondary School is now closed down for renovations and so on—

Mr. Deans: That has nothing to do with this.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Does the hon. member want an answer?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, but he is waiting for it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: No, he does not want an answer he wants to blether. He would not know a right answer if he did hear it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Now what was the question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You think that is esoteric? Look behind you.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The point is this, that the department itself—and this is a hypothetical question—if the department itself got a request for a school exclusively for the accommodation of grade 13, it would not

look favourably upon such a request simply for that reason. It would have to be satisfied with respect to the overall need for school accommodation.

Mr. Deans: May I, by way of final supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has now expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

PROTESTANT CHILDREN'S HOMES

Mr. Meen moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act respecting Protestant Children's Homes.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member be good enough to indicate what is the principle of the bill?

Mr. Speaker: It is normal that private bills are introduced merely to the House, because they have all been before a bills committee and it is not the usual custom to speak on the introduction of such a bill.

Mr. Lewis: It is a private bill?

Mr. Speaker: A private bill, yes.

HUNTINGTON UNIVERSITY

Mr. Sopha moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act respecting Huntington University.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The House leader has preference.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I thought it might be as well to inform the hon. members of the House something as to the order of business, particularly since, when the House rose on Thursday last I indicated there might be a possibility of night sittings this week. I should like to inform the House at the earliest moment there will be no night sitting today. Also, Mr. Speaker, I think the members of the House anticipate that tomorrow will be committee day and that the House

will not be sitting. Committees will be sitting and the House should be aware of that.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order or a comment, Mr. Speaker, if that is permissible: Can the House leader give us some guarantee of night sittings commencing Thursday, or there will be no time left of the Throne debate in this House and the rights of private members will be truncated totally.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, there is legislation on the order paper; there are second readings. There is also order number two which is the continuation of the unemployment debate—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Why do we not do that tonight?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —and I have no doubt there will be other legislation introduced. I am not prepared, at this moment, to say that there will be a night sitting this Thursday.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, if I may, sir, to the House leader: The rules of the House now require that the Throne Speech terminate prior to the introduction of the budget, which means Thursday next or Friday next. This means that the members of this House will be confined to the shortest period of Throne debate, probably in the last several years, certainly in my recollection. I think, therefore, that greater opportunities should be given by night sittings, presumably. We thought tonight, but at least Thursday, and Tuesday and Thursday of the following week.

Hon. E. A. Dunlop (Minister without Portfolio): Not Thursday next.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the point made by the hon. member. The whips have been keeping me informed of the number of speakers wishing to take part and I am sure that there will be ample opportunity for participation before the closing of the Throne debate.

Mr. Lewis: They are debating—

Mr. Shulman: May I ask a question?

Mr. Speaker: Sir, these questions are quite proper because they have to do with the order of business in the House and if the member for High Park wishes to, he may.

Mr. Shulman: I am not sure whether the question should go to you or to the minister, sir. Will every member of the House who wishes to participate in the Throne debate not be given such an opportunity?

Mr. Speaker: I think the House leader had already said that before he sat down.

Mr. Shulman: Is the answer yes?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, what I said was that I felt there would be opportunity for those wishing to participate to take part, but I did not change the rules.

Mr. Lewis: Too much time at the Masters' golf tournament; too much time at the PGA.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The government, Mr. Speaker, has responsibilities and duties which perhaps the hon. member does not probably have.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Sudbury East a remark with respect to the order of business?

Mr. Martel: I would like to ask the minister when we are going to get on with the emergency debate. In view of the fact that time is going to be allocated for Throne debate, what time is going to be left for this supposed emergency debate on unemployment?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the hon. member a definite day, but we had quite an extended debate on that. I am sure it will be resumed and he will have an opportunity to take part before long.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the hon. member for Sudbury East that the unemployment debate was an ordinary resolution on the order paper and was not an emergency debate. The member for Essex South.

Mr. Martel: That is what it was billed as last week.

An hon. member: The hon. member does not know how to read.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, if I might draw to your attention and that of the other members of the House, the basket of freshly picked cucumbers and tomatoes from the riding of Essex South.

The riding I represent has approximately 90 per cent of the greenhouse production in the Dominion of Canada and these two products have been on the market for several weeks now. The cucumbers, in particular, are just reaching the peak of production.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): The tomatoes are a little too soft.

Mr. Paterson: It is interesting to note that this produce is now being shipped southward into the United States, which I think may be a first in our production.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paterson: The prices were excellent. The tomatoes will be at the peak of production in approximately three weeks and they, too, are enjoying very good prices on an excellent market. I am sure it is the wish of the greenhouse producers and all the members that this holds true for all the other products that are produced by our agriculturists in our province this coming year.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to express my appreciation through you, sir, to the hon. member for Essex South for the presentation of this delightful basket of cucumbers and greenhouse tomatoes. It is indicative of the quality of produce grown in that great sun-parlour area of the Province of Ontario, famous for its production of hothouse vegetables. I should like, through you, Mr. Speaker, to advise our friends from the news media—some of whom have departed the gallery I am afraid—but I trust who have been listening to these words of wisdom, that they may advertise the quality of Ontario products so that Ontario consumers may continue to enjoy the tremendous quality of our hothouse fruit and vegetables. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, to resume the debate in reply to the address from the Throne, I want to stray off course just for a moment and to speak very briefly about the Francottie incident which was raised by the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) over the weekend and alluded to in the question period by the leader of the NDP (Mr. Lewis).

The Francottie incident is a very surprising incident in light of the many discussions

and debates that we have had here in the House about bail procedures, judicial proceedings and administration of jails and that sort of thing.

You will recall with me, Mr. Speaker, the case of one John Bennett. John Bennett was a gentleman who was arrested as a common drunk and when he arrived at the Don Jail some policeman said, "Oh, John Bennett, you are just the fellow we are looking for. You are charged with a driving offence and there is a warrant out for your arrest."

Insist as he might, John Bennett was not able to convince the various authorities with whom he came in contact at that time that not only was he not the John Bennett who was being sought for the driving offence but that he, that John Bennett, has never owned an automobile; could not, in fact, drive and could not possibly have been guilty of the offence which the warrant has been issued for.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): He was never sober enough to drive.

Mr. Singer: The very fascinating explanation from the Attorney General was, "John Bennett was not very important in the scheme of things in the Province of Ontario after all, he was a drifter." It was unfortunate that this kind of incident happened and, hopefully, it would not happen again. Perhaps the policemen who were responsible were going to be disciplined and perhaps the system at the Don Jail was, in fact, going to be improved so it could not happen again.

At that point the Minister of Correctional Institutions entered—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Services!

Mr. Singer:—Services entered the lists. I am sure you can recall with me, Mr. Speaker, how seriously the Minister of Correctional Services, (Mr. Grossman) as he then was, takes himself on occasions such as this. He read us, at great length, two brand new directives that he had instructed go forward to the staff of correctional institutions, and in particular the Don Jail, because he was concerned. He showed much more concern about John Bennett than did his colleague, the then Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). He was going to make sure—

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): On a question of privilege or a matter of order: The hon. member said the Attorney General was not concerned because he felt that this man

was not very important, he was a drifter. He almost put words in my mouth to that effect. Such words he will not find where I disparaged the importance of this individual in *Hansard*.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Shame!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I raise that as a matter of privilege.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, it is a question of interpretation; the Attorney General certainly used the word "drifter." Certainly, from the tone of his remarks which are recorded from pages 7303 through to 7306 in the 1969 *Hansard*, to my mind, he disparaged the importance of the case, disparaged the importance of Bennett whom he described as a drifter and a man of no great importance, and disparaged the importance of disciplining the police officers at that time.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Again, on a point of order, to give a fact, in a matter of bail, as to the character of a person, or the fact that he is not known or that he is a drifter, is not to disparage his character in any way but to give a reason why bail might be refused. In no way, no matter how the hon. member decides to twist and interpret it to suit his purposes, I did not disparage the individual, except to describe that he was drifting about the country and was not known.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General can put whatever interpretation he likes on his remarks and I can put whatever interpretation I like on his remarks. I say those words in *Hansard* speak for themselves and the Attorney General even now has missed the point, because it was not a question of whether John Bennett should get bail or not; it was a question of whether or not he was wrongly identified. And nobody, least of all the Attorney General, showed any great concern about whether or not he had been properly identified and charged improperly, except for the Minister of Correctional Services, who produced—and it is reported on the same pages of *Hansard*, two long memoranda of instructions that he had given to the people in the employ of his department, particularly, I would imagine, directed to the Don Jail, because the Minister of Correctional Services mentioned the Don Jail.

I am not going to read the whole of these memoranda but just the question about bail—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are pretty good; read them all.

Mr. Singer: All right, Mr. Speaker, let me read what the hon. minister said about bail:

Prompt and courteous assistance in contacting a bailing magistrate or justice of the peace shall be provided to any person who comes to post bail at any time of the day or night.

Now those were the directions given by this minister apparently to the staff at the Don Jail, and if the member for High Park is in fact correct—and I presume he is—that he went there on Saturday, and said, “I want to post bail,” and the bail magistrate could not be found until Sunday, I wonder what happened to the “prompt and courteous assistance in contacting a bailing magistrate or justice of the peace” that should be provided “to any person who comes to post bail at any time of the day or night.” I would presume “any time of the day or night” includes Saturdays, Sundays and even the time when the hon. member for High Park arrived at the Don Jail.

Again, Mr. Speaker, in the same memorandum, the hon. minister said, “Legal Aid: Every effort shall be made to ensure that a prisoner is aware of all his rights with respect to legal aid.” Obviously something was lacking in this case; obviously this prisoner was not made aware of his rights or not given the opportunity to take sufficient advantage of them, and obviously this gentleman suffered.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How does the hon. member know that?

Mr. Singer: Now the additional fact—and the former Attorney General was quite concerned; there is an exact quotation from his remarks as recorded on page 7305:

The very fact that Bennett was a drifter made it very difficult for these police officers to get any information that was coherent or satisfactory from him. True, he was of the same name as the man they were pursuing. It was a case of mistaken identity. Someone who could give little help to the police goes to jail; he does not say anything about it, he does not ask for any help, he does not report that he is the wrong man, he is that type of fellow, and when they hold an inquiry he says: “I am not going to be bothered, I am on my way.”

Now if that is not the height of unconcern, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is. Those are the words of the former Attorney General. The former Attorney General also indicated to us, as we debated bail on many occasions, that he had revised the system; he, along with his colleague the Minister of Correctional Services, had revised all of these systems so that the unfortunate incident, even though it happened to a drifter, presumably was not going to happen again. We had that

perambulatory bail magistrate that we have talked about in the House on many occasions—the one who drives backward and forward on Highway 401, always going in the wrong direction, who was supposed to be on duty around the clock.

Where was he over the past weekend? Where was he when this gentleman, Francottie, was in fact being held in jail? Where were the officials at the Don Jail, who had received all of these instructions about courtesy and care and concern from the former Minister of Correctional Services? Why did it take such a great length of time until the incident was, in fact, uncovered? It was not uncovered, fascinating enough by any of the employees of this government; it was not uncovered by any of the people who received these instructions from the former Minister of Correctional Services. It was not uncovered until somebody brought some information to a member of this House, who then went down and made the fact public.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How does the member know that?

Mr. Singer: Where were the inquiries that were made? Why did someone who was in charge of the jail, some kind of an official, not try to ascertain why in fact Francottie had been arrested; why, in fact, he was in jail, how long he was there for, and what the charge was?

Surely, Mr. Speaker, one would have thought after all the fuss that we have had in this House about this very kind of incident, after those important instructions that the Minister of Correctional Services put forward, saying he has great concern, that some of the civil servants, who are supposedly bound to heed these words of wisdom and these instructions, would have taken some action.

Where were the wandering bail magistrates, that the former Attorney General told us about, who were on duty any hour of the day or night? His colleague, the Minister of Correctional Services, said “Yes, any time of the day or night.” Where were all these people? Is there no possible administrative system that can check on those people who are held in the various jails around the province, and make sure that people are advised of all of their rights and are given the opportunity to take full advantage of them?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Singer: Can there be anything more ludicrous, Mr. Speaker, than this kind of an incident? What is the purpose now of holding this great high-level meeting that the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) tells us about today? It is going to be about as effective as the memorandum put forward by the former Minister of Correctional Services and the promises given to this House by the former Attorney General. No effect at all; just another lapse of time and there will be another incident brought to light!

In view of the incidents that are, in fact, brought to light, Mr. Speaker, one has to wonder how many incidents are never really brought to light and how many injustices are carried out in this province by reason of the fact that the ministers, who are representative of this government, are not able to see that their instructions and their orders are carried out, or that their expressions of concern which they make in this House have some more meaning than just being another inscription in the pages of *Hansard*.

I say that this is just absolutely inexcusable and I say that there has to be something far better emerge from the government insofar as the administration of justice is concerned. I see little hope from the new Attorney General who wants to enforce. He calls himself "the enforcer." He is not particularly concerned about administration of justice. His predecessor pretended he was, but perhaps was not very effective at it at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with another matter. I want to deal with the question of the law suit involving Dow Chemical. I suppose it is not untypical of the new Attorney General, shoot-from-the-mouth Lawrence, that we are really going to show the people of Ontario that we mean business. This probably was his phrase originally—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is unparliamentary—

Mr. Singer: It later came forward from the Premier (Mr. Davis). I have got some quotations here about it: "\$35 million Dow suit is just the beginning, says Davis." That was reported in the *Telegram* on March 16, 1971. We are going to be real tough; we are going to sue Dow for \$35 million.

Mr. Speaker, you are aware with me that for the sum of \$35 one can approach the registrar of the Supreme Court and issue a writ. For the sum of \$35 it does not matter whether you claim \$35 million or \$50 million or \$100 million or even \$1 million.

I do not know whether it was a new touch of colour emanating from the new Attorney General that the government seized on the interesting figure of \$35 million, but what in fact was done was one of the biggest frauds, I think, that has ever attempted to be perpetrated on the people of the Province of Ontario. For the first time, sir, I charge with much regret that the government has begun to use the office of the Attorney General and its law enforcement responsibility for strictly political purposes.

I question seriously the motives that lay behind the bringing of this suit. I think the evidence is abundant that there is no business at all in bringing this matter forward in the way it was done. I am surprised that the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr), who has tried to put forward the idea that anyone who does not like this kind of a lawsuit is, in fact, in favour of pollution and that discussion about the pollution of our lakes and rivers, insofar as mercury is concerned, should lie fallow until the election has come and gone.

It is the old gimmick of trying to issue a writ and still the criticism over an election period, and that is what they have done again. All the more, Mr. Speaker, should they be criticized because they are misusing their duty and responsibility to administer justice in the Province of Ontario and should not use their justice powers of obvious and blatant political purposes.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Let the pollution go on.

Mr. Singer: Now, Mr. Speaker—all right, the minister says, "Let the pollution go on." There are two parts to this action—three parts in fact.

One is that they want an injunction restraining Dow Chemical from dumping mercury into the river. The fact is—and the fact was established before no less a jurisdiction than the Supreme Court of the United States, a pretty eminent legal body, Mr. Speaker—that Dow Chemical had established, at least to the satisfaction of Mr. Justice Harlan who gave a majority opinion on behalf of eight of the nine justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, that they had stopped dumping chemicals into the water; that they were in weekly consultation with the Ontario Water Resources Commission; that in fact they were under executive order to stop dumping mercury into the water and they had, in fact, stopped.

Now, whose word does one take? Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to accept the word of Mr. Justice Harlan. I see no reason why Mr. Justice Harlan should have said in his judgement in the case of Ohio versus Wyandotte Chemicals, in the judgement given on March 23, 1971, the words that I have attributed to them if he did not, in fact, believe them.

Now, all we have been able to get from the Minister of Energy and Resources Management is, "It was *obiter*." I just do not understand what the minister is talking about. The fact is that a responsible judicial body, the most senior responsible judicial body in the United States, said in a majority judgement that this was, in fact true.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Take it to the state court.

Mr. Singer: Surely, Mr. Speaker, that should have some influence on the thinking, or apparent thinking, that should lie in the minds of those hon. gentlemen who occupy the front seats of government. That is, in fact, what Mr. Justice Harlan said.

The second point, Mr. Speaker, is this. Of the \$35 million the government asks for—either a mandatory order directed at Dow Chemical to take the mercury out of the river, or for the reward of \$10 million so the Province of Ontario can take the material out of the river—we had asked within the House whether there is any known procedure whereby this, in fact, can be done and the minister said, "Yes, there is, but it is too complicated. It is too technical and you peasants in the Legislature probably would not understand it. But there is a system that can do it."

Hon. Mr. Kerr: My words exactly.

Mr. Singer: Let us accept the minister at his word. The facts are far too complicated for us to understand. Even if the minister could explain them to us we could never make head nor tail out of them, but there is a system. Let me then ask the minister, either the rhetorical question or the specific question, if he wants to answer me now, if there is a process which can, in fact, extract mercury from the beds of rivers, why does the province not use it? Why does the province not do as the minister announced the other day, in connection with the removal of phosphorus?

The province has discovered there is a method of removing phosphorus from polluted water areas and the minister issued a press release under his name dated April 4, 1971, saying: "Phosphorus is a terrible

thing. We have got to take it out of the water and we are going to spend dollars to do it." Quite logical. Quite sensible. Quite obvious, is it not? There you had a process and there you felt it should be done and there you went and did it. You embarked on a programme and you are spending a lot of government money for this purpose. Fine.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, as a point of clarification if the—

Mr. Singer: Clarification. That is a good point.

Hon. Mr. Kerr:—hon. member will allow me. Really, there is no connection or analogy between taking mercury out of a river and dealing with phosphorus. We are not taking phosphorus out of the water. It is the matter of proper treatment at the treatment plant level.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): The member for Downsview would not know anyway.

Mr. Singer: Certainly the matter is thoroughly clarified now, Mr. Speaker. It just removes my whole argument.

I say, Mr. Speaker, if there was a system whereby mercury could, in fact, be removed from the water and it was known in the scientific writings anywhere in North America, then the minister should have taken the pains to bring that system before the House. Whether the two systems, removing phosphorus and removing mercury, are the same or different, it does not matter one whit. What, in fact, does matter is, I say, the absolutely incorrect statement from the minister that there is a method of doing this. Because all of the scientific evidence that I have been able to gather, all of the writings, the work of the Federal Research Laboratory in Winnipeg, the comments of such people as—what is his name—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): The hon. member cannot find it.

Mr. Singer:—the gentleman who first discovered mercury pollution—I have his name here somewhere—all of these writings and studies—

An hon. member: Fimreite.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Fimreite, that is the one—indicate that there is no known system. So what does the government do? They say, "Courts, adjudicate against Dow Chemical and instruct them either to remove the

mercury from the water—and there is no known system to do it—or give us \$10 million to show that we can do it.”

Mr. Speaker, I think that if there is a known system, certainly there is an obligation on government to indicate how this can be done and it is, in fact, practical. The minister should not embark upon the obviously phoney ploy that the system is so complicated he cannot explain it here in the House. That is number two, Mr. Speaker.

Number three is the claim of \$25 million. I do not know where they got the figure. A nice round figure, \$10 and \$25 make \$35 and they had to spend \$35 for the issue of a writ, so you multiply 35 by \$1 million and there is the figure. What would they do if they got the \$25 million? Would they give that money to the fishermen who have lost their livelihood? To the tourist operators who have lost their livelihood? To the people who are in the bait business who have lost their livelihood? If that is their intention, Mr. Speaker, most laudable, but not a word, not a word has come from the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: They are getting money now.

Mr. Singer: Not a word has come from the shoot-from-the-mouth Attorney General about what, in fact, is going to happen if they are successful.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): I know better.

Mr. Singer: Yes, the Attorney General knows better. He knows he is not going to succeed, that is the point. He knows that he has not got a chance of succeeding in this thing.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I do not think it is inevitable.

Mr. Singer: The second very interesting question has to be, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Better save it for the commission. The member will need it.

Mr. Singer: —is, just how long is it going to take before this matter is really decided? Two years was the figure that was thrown out over there.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): The hon. member for Downsview will not be here.

Mr. Singer: Some of us are familiar with the activities of a certain gentleman who is being defended by probably one of the foremost counsel in the Province of Ontario on charges of income tax evasion. My colleague from Sudbury, on several occasions, has wondered aloud when that trial was going to come up. The first little effort that is taking them to the Supreme Court of Canada and back again is whether or not there is a right to proceed by indictment rather than summarily. I am quite certain that it is not beyond the ingenuity of Mr. John Robinette to discover three or four more things that will take him again up and down to the Supreme Court of Canada before that matter ever gets on for trial.

Unless I miss my guess, Mr. Speaker, that particular trial will take many, many, many years until finally it is resolved. There is a parallel. Surely the people who are going to look after Dow Chemical's interests, whether it be Dow Chemical or their insurers—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The member will do that.

Mr. Singer: —are not, Mr. Speaker, going to just put their hands in their pockets and take out \$35 million and send it across to my friend, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We might negotiate.

Mr. Singer: Surely they are going to fight at least as seriously as the people who are defending the particular gentleman who is being charged with income tax evasion, which is their right and which is their duty. Fine. Now what is wrong with that? The thing that obviously comes out of that is that it will take, not two years, it will take five to seven to 10 years before any resolution can possibly come out of that lawsuit if, in fact, there is any intention on government's part of pursuing the lawsuit after the election has really taken place.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Disposed of within two years.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask another series of questions, and hopefully we can get the Minister of Energy into this debate at a later stage. Why did he concentrate only on Dow? It again appears in the judgement of Mr. Justice Harlan that if there is pollution it has gone on for a considerable period of time and that there are half a dozen different known possible or probable pollutants.

My colleague from Sarnia has talked about the Wyandotte Chemical Company. Why did the Attorney General limit himself in this claim to suing only Dow, because he knows, or he should know full well that when Dow gets into court and if they can say, "Maybe we did a little bit of it, but there are other people did a lot more," the lawsuit is, in fact, going to fail on the grounds on which it was fought.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Is the member saying we should not have sued Dow?

Mr. Singer: Exactly what I am saying, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the Attorney General brings me to my penultimate point, and that is this—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Then he is saying we should not sue anybody.

Mr. Singer: Why did this government not bring in legislation if in fact they really were concerned about it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Legislation would be retroactive.

Mr. Singer: Ah, I am glad the minister mentioned the fact. The Minister of Energy and Resources Management says the legislation would in fact be retroactive.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Do not bring in the consumer bill.

Mr. Singer: Retroactivity, you know, Mr. Speaker, is something that has never in fact occurred to this government—a brand-new idea. Retroactivity is a fact that has never occurred to this government in its long history. You will recall, Mr. Speaker—I have a little note here.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: The member should have brought his speech writer in with him.

Mr. Singer: Here it is. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, the incident involving Earl McKie and the KVP Company on the Spanish River, and you will recall that Earl McKie in fact obtained, through court action, an injunction restraining the KVP Company from dumping pollution into the river above McKie's property. You will also recall the great difficulty that apparently existed in the minds of KVP and you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding all the concern about retroactive legislation, the government brought into the House a retroactive bill which dissolved the injunction and which took away McKie's rights.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Tory government.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Supported by the Liberals, too.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the concern of the government about retroactive legislation lies as hollow words in the mouths of—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That is ancient history.

Mr. Singer: Oh, ancient history? It is still the same government.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It is not.

Mr. Singer: And you will recall, Mr. Speaker, the concern that Mr. Justice McRuer expressed about that. Certainly my friend the Attorney General, who obviously has read all those volumes and was referring to them the other day, will recall Mr. McRuer's great concern about this kind of retroactive legislation.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I have not read all the volumes yet.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Better get busy.

Mr. Singer: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I would commend it to the Attorney General because he did make a long speech praising Mr. McRuer, as is proper, and I would think that before he gets on completely with all of this praise that he should in fact know what he is talking about. It is indicative again of the fact that the Attorney General does not know what he is talking about.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: He is reading Hellyer's housing report.

Mr. Trotter: That would make good reading. That is good reading.

Mr. Singer: Certainly there is available to this government all of the legislative authority of this body, and through it some form of statutory enactment which could be entered into immediately—the government has the majority of votes—and which could do what they are apparently pretending to do in the lawsuit. There is no reason, Mr. Speaker, why they should tie themselves up in a losing lawsuit unless it is for the reason that I originally enunciated, that it is a fraud and a contempt exercised on the people of Ontario, using the judicial process solely for political purposes. It is a grandstand effort.

The Premier says this is going to show them we mean business. Poppycock and claptrap, Mr. Speaker! It is not going to show anybody anything. It is never going to get through the courts, and if it does get through the courts to final decision they have not got a chance of winning.

In addition to that, sir, I have listened, and I have got copies here of all of the speeches the Minister of Energy and Resources Management has been making around the province. He has denied the exact form of his comments. Fascinatingly enough, the stuff that hits the press is not in his written text. But I have got a news clipping here from the *Toronto Daily Star* dated March 29 where the minister is speaking from Ottawa—the head on the story is, "International Action Against Pollution is Urged."

International planning must be the first step toward saving the world from pollution—

Oh, I am sorry, that is not the minister. I was reading the wrong one. That was Maurice Strong at the same conference.

The other one is.

SOME SOVEREIGNTY MUST GO IN
POLLUTION FIGHT, KERR SAYS.

George Kerr, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, said today that Canada might have to give up some of its constitutional sovereignty if it is to win the war against pollution of the Great Lakes.

And he goes on to talk about what the role of the International Joint Commission should be.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the government would make much more sense in connection with this particular problem, where they have focused in on Dow, in trying to promote the kind of international co-operation that the minister was talking about, because it is not a problem exclusive to Dow or to Wyandotte; or a problem for which the government has any solution at this moment. All I say is this: Let the government be honest with the people of Ontario, which it is not now. Let the government not make a sham out of the judicial process and let the government go about cleaning up this pollution in the best way that is known on a scientific basis.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: At the government's expense?

Mr. Singer: If this government is prepared to do it insofar as the phosphates are con-

cerned, why cannot it do it here if it knew how to do it? And if it feels that its case is so sure and so certain and it lies only against Dow, it should have the courage of its convictions and bring in a bill that says that.

This Legislature can do it; it is within its constitutional power. Bring in a bill that says it. Do not tie the thing up for an interminable period in court; be honest with the people of Ontario and do something more than make idle speeches.

I say finally, Mr. Speaker, that the government's record since the night of the long ballot has been deplorable. Not only do they not know how to operate voting machines, not only does the new Minister of Trade and Development not know anything about housing programmes, not only is the new Attorney General not the enforcer that he would like to think of himself or the enforcer that he talks about—he is the shoot-from-the-mouth Attorney General who gets involved in these things because they are going to make a grandstand play. There is no substance in his approaches.

Not only that Mr. Speaker, The Minister of Energy and Resources Management embarks upon a lawsuit—or, partially on his advice a lawsuit is undertaken—for which there appears to be no reasonable basis at all, and it presents no help or assistance to anybody in the Province of Ontario. There is no programme for the fishermen; there is no programme for the tourist operators; there is no programme for the bait sellers—all of these things are sort of nibbled at on the way by, and "it is tough, tough, tough for you fellows; the thing is out of control." And—he has not even said this—"maybe if we collect \$25 million in 10 years' time we are going to give you a few dribbles out of that, if you are still around and if you are still starving to death."

Hon. Mr. Kerr: They are getting it now.

Mr. Singer: Not only that, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) has embarked upon the same programme. He has been caught two or three times in the last year. He sees a problem and his solution is, "Come and write a bill for me." It does not matter whether it is within our constitutional power or not, there are two or three bills—the auctioneers bill, for one, comes to mind; there was another one about milk marketing. He has this Bill 10 drafted and on a serious constitutional question he does not even bother to get opinion of the law officers of the Crown in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the advent of this new government has been filled with disaster, and hopefully they will remove this disaster from the people of the Province of Ontario by calling an election at the earliest possible opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, as is customary, I would like to congratulate you, sir, and your second-in-command, upon your re-election to this high post in this Legislature.

I also would wish well those ministers who have been the subject of musical chairs in recent days. They have in many cases moved a notch up the ladder, and in some cases stayed where they were. I suppose for the few brief weeks or months that they remain in those positions, we hope they will administer their ministerial responsibilities in the best interests of the people of Ontario.

Only a few weeks ago, the subject of public auto insurance exploded dramatically in Ontario and I want to deal with that for some time today. The automobile insurance agents' association launched an all-out campaign to defeat the New Democratic Party in the coming election and thereby prevent a public automobile insurance plan in this province.

Twenty-five years ago, the Douglas government of Saskatchewan carried out its election pledge and introduced a public insurance plan there. So successful has it been that when Liberal Ross Thatcher was elected, he did not dare scuttle it, even though he had fought it tooth and nail in a bitter battle against it up to that time. Thatcher knew that if he threw the plan out, the people would throw him out. He has been chipping away at it, but the plan remains to the great benefit of the people of that province.

Last year, the New Democrats were elected in Manitoba. They too introduced a public plan for car insurance. The legislation was fought right down the line by the opposition in the House and they were joined in the battle by the insurance industry. The plan goes into effect this coming November. Car owners in Manitoba will save at least 15 per cent on premiums now paid to the private insurance industry and the government fully expects that those savings will be even greater as the plan develops.

When the New Democratic Party is elected in Ontario it will also introduce a public car insurance plan. All the surveys taken so far indicate that the people want such a plan and the New Democrats can win the next election.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Oh, come on now!

Mr. Young: That is why the insurance industry is embarking upon its strident campaign to defeat us.

Mr. Trotter: Really! Really! This is Mary Poppins hour.

Mr. Young: If they did not think we were close to power, they would not bother. The Insurance Agents' Association has placed a \$50 per capita levy on its members, and it is going out to raise more.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): How many will put up the 50 bucks, that is what I would like to know?

Mr. Young: They do not do that in the face of something they do not consider a real possibility.

According to *The Financial Post* of April 3, 1971, they expect to raise \$135,000 from this source alone. The industry is supplementing this from our premium payments to run a widespread advertising campaign in the media. A kit has been distributed to all the agents with full instructions in the fine art of political action. In the kit are the names and addresses of all Tory and Liberal riding presidents—they are in the instructions: "Go and see them and join them." Arguments against public insurance are there; bumper stickers to blossom when the election is called. All this and more to assist the agents in their desperate battle against progress.

This is part of the democratic process. Anyone or any group with a point of view in a democracy is free to express it and to mobilize it into votes. So we have no objection to the campaign of the insurance industry; as a matter of fact, we welcome it. It is highlighting one of those planks in our platform and it is focusing public opinion on it.

The slogan used by the industry is "freedom of choice" and that is exactly what we want. We are giving the people of Ontario freedom of choice between the present system of private car insurance, with all its failures and frustrations, and a system of

public insurance similar to that which has proved so successful for so long in Saskatchewan. The campaign of the insurance companies and their agents will give the people of this province an opportunity to assess the issue, to hear both sides, and to vote on it when the time comes.

There is no doubt that there is wide-spread dissatisfaction with the present system of car insurance in Ontario. People are fed up with the way rates have been soaring in recent years and a new rate increase is just now being implemented. People are impatient with delays in settlement, often with attendant legal costs, and they are angry at the way premiums are jacked up following traffic accidents or minor violations of the law. They are asking if there is not a better way to achieve protection against the hazards of running a motor car.

Increasing rates, of course, hit every car owner. Many never have an accident, and go many years free of one but, accident or no accident, every owner has to meet rising rates. These rates depend on many factors and among them are these:

1. The frequency of accidents.
2. The damage done to people and property in accident situations.
3. The cost of repairs and spare parts.
4. The cost of treating accident victims.
5. The post-accident speed in rescue and the salvage of damaged vehicles.
6. The speed and efficiency in the settlement of claims.

All these factors and more have played some part in the upward trend of premiums lately. DBS figures show that in Canada, from 1961 to October, 1970, the auto insurance index has risen from a base of 100 to 172.6. This, according to Mr. E. D. MacKay of the Canadian Underwriters' Association, will go up another 12 per cent in Ontario this year. The increase has exceeded, during the years mentioned, the increase in every other component in the consumers' price index except theatre admissions. It is interesting to note here that during the past four years the public plan in Saskatchewan, even under a Liberal government, has not raised rates at all, but has added substantially to its reserve fund.

The insurance industry here is currently running a series of TV ads to try to explain the rising premiums. They show a series of low-speed collisions and point out that rates must rise because cars are so easily damaged

and because labour is so expensive. This is diverting attention from the real issues and offering an excuse when an explanation is really needed.

Take a look at the car insurance industry in Ontario and at some of the factors which drive up the costs. First of all, the need to establish fault in an accident. Often this is difficult if not impossible. No one, unless he is intent on suicide, deliberately causes an accident. It is generally a split-second misjudgment or a mechanical failure and the damage is done.

If two insurance companies are involved, they want to know which driver is to blame so that they can decide who is to pay. If the situation is not clear, it may mean court action and serious delay in settlement, with the victim suffering severe financial hardship in the meantime. It can also mean legal bills eating up resources.

A survey undertaken for the *Toronto Daily Star* by Martin Goldfarb Consultants—in whom this government, I understand, has a great deal of confidence—published on January 23, 1971, shows that 37 per cent of those involved in automobile accidents waited three months or longer for settlement, and 25 per cent waited more than six months. The much-quoted Linden report pointed out that just where there is the greatest need for swift reparation, there is the greatest tendency for delay. In fatal cases, 22.7 per cent of payments were not made within a year and 12 per cent were not settled before a 2-to-2½-year time lag had taken place.

These cases, of course, jam our courts until 40 per cent of all the cases in our county courts and one-third of the cases in our Supreme Court are dealing with insurance claims. This means we need more judges, and that these as well as other cases are delayed. The whole process of justice is slowed down.

Then, too, benefits are uncertain. The Linden report pointed out that 57 per cent of the people injured in automobile accidents get nothing from insurance, while only 37 per cent of the economic loss is paid. These figures may have changed a bit since the report was published, but not substantially.

Insurance coverage under private plans is only partial, and at best it often takes a long tough trip through the courts to get even that. There is just too much frustration, financial hardship and delay involved.

A very large factor in driving up costs of private insurance is, of course, duplication of services. We have 200 companies in Ontario

all competing for business. These have staffs of agents, all needing commissions. They have offices to maintain, separate bookkeeping systems and computers. Each carries on extensive advertising, and each must have profits to stay in business. All this duplication of services must be paid for in premiums, and the cost must be reflected in the rates that are charged.

Then, premium dollars go into reserve funds set aside to meet future claims. These funds earn interest. But the interest on reserves is never calculated as income in the setting of rates.

What this reserve interest amounts to in Ontario alone is not easy to determine. But conservative estimates are that it is at least 5.5 per cent of premiums. We do know that the investment income of the Saskatchewan plan, the public plan, averaged 5.8 per cent since its inception, and that rose to 8.6 per cent in 1970 with the higher general interest rates. This, of course, has been ploughed back into the public plans to lower the premiums.

These, then, are some of the drawbacks of private car insurance—the need to establish fault, legal and court costs, delays, the built-in selling expenses, and the failure to plough back interest on premium reserves to cut rates. Add to this the very high rates for accident-free young people and the larger amounts added to premiums after accidents. All these features mean high premium costs which keep escalating year by year.

In Ontario, during the period from 1965 to 1969, car insurance premiums collected by all companies amounted to \$1,368,969,100. Of this amount, \$878,305,403 was paid out in claims. That is 64.1 per cent. This means that 35.9 per cent of all premium dollars went to pay expenses, profits and costs of the insurance companies.

One of the reasons the New Democratic Party advocates public car insurance is to meet some of these difficulties. The Saskatchewan experience has demonstrated for 25 years that it can do just that and the reasons are simple.

First of all, public insurance is sold with the licence. This cuts out duplication of services. There is one operation for licence and insurance—no commissions, no profit, no advertising, and no licensed car on the road without insurance. In Ontario, this would mean an end to the expensive and unsatisfactory motor vehicle accident claims fund.

Second, since one authority pays all claims there is no need to establish fault. The police may be interested in the cause of the accident as they are today, but there is no need to go to court to establish blame. This will not only cut costs but it will make for prompt settlement. It will also have the added advantage of getting insurance claims out of the courts with the result that they can operate more effectively.

Third, interest earned on reserve funds will be returned to the insurance fund to be used in lowering premiums. With the higher interest rates of recent years this can be a significant factor in cutting insurance costs.

Fourth, service centres will be established where necessary to process claims. These will be manned by trained adjusters and estimators. Private garages will be used for repair but enough public repair shops will be set up to make sure costs are not out of line. A salvage department will be responsible for recovery and sale of good parts from vehicles damaged beyond repair.

It is interesting to note that the Saskatchewan salvage division has made a profit of close to \$1 million, which has been applied to reduce rates.

Through these methods the one province with experience in public insurance—that is, Saskatchewan—has drastically lowered insurance premiums and provided top quality service.

When it comes to comparing costs of specific policies in similar locations, it is extremely difficult. The private insurance industry is careful not to offer a policy anywhere which exactly corresponds with the basic Saskatchewan one. But the significant fact is that while the private plans must have two-thirds of the premium dollars to meet their costs, the public plan in Saskatchewan has been operating for 25 years with less than half that amount going to expenses.

Private insurance companies say that whenever more than two-thirds of their premium dollars go to meet claims then their rates must go up. That is what is happening now. Over the past four years private insurance companies in Ontario spent 64 per cent of their premium dollars for claims and 36 per cent for profit, commissions and administration.

Contrast this with the Saskatchewan experience where under the public plan the cost of administration has been 15.8 per cent.

A couple of years ago the Thatcher government, which would like to get rid of the

plan but does not dare, levied an unjustified management fee against it. This brought the present percentage of expenses up to 16.39 per cent. But that still leaves 83.61 per cent going to meet claims, this in contrast to 64.1 per cent in Ontario—about a 20 per cent difference.

The figure for 1970 is 67 per cent for all companies doing business in Canada, but in 1969 Ontario companies started including indirect adjustment expenses—that is office overhead—as well as direct expenses in their figures for claims paid. In 1969, these indirect expenses amounted to 3.7 per cent of premiums collected. Direct expenses, such as claims adjusting and legal fees, have always been included in Ontario's claim figures but never in Saskatchewan's. This makes the saving on a public plan still greater.

No matter how the apologists of private insurance try to juggle the figures, no matter how they try to pick specific costs of policies in specific towns, the fact is unanswerable. The policy holder is assessed at least 36 per cent of his premium dollar to cover private insurance overhead and he pays only 16 per cent for the public plan. Even in Manitoba where private agents are going to participate in selling the public insurance if they wish, and where they will be allowed reasonable commissions and assisted financially to make necessary adjustments, the difference will still be 15 per cent between the present plans and the upcoming public one. That is a real saving for the motorists of that province.

Let it be clear, the public plan in Saskatchewan, as it will in Manitoba, pays full municipal grants in lieu of taxes, pays federal taxes on all purchases, the two per cent provincial premium tax, and the fire prevention tax.

In addition, it sets aside and uses one per cent for driver education. It does not pay federal income tax because it makes no profit to pay it on. A further advantage of a public plan is that resources now being invested by private firms for their own profit can be used by government for social purposes just as the Canada Pension funds are now used. Today, 58 per cent of the car insurance sold in Ontario is controlled outside Canada. Public insurance would bring this control back to Ontario and reserve funds could go into areas like housing where there is a great social need.

The *Globe and Mail*, on April 5, 1971, said this editorially:

A compulsory public automobile insurance plan partially unveiled last week by Premier

Edward Schreyer of Manitoba—if it measures up to the preview—is going to be difficult for the critics to criticize. The compulsory part of this plan will provide \$50,000 third-party liability insurance, \$200 deductible all-peril, no-fault insurance; death benefits to a maximum of \$10,000, no fault; benefits up to \$6,000 for dismemberment, disfigurement or impairment, no fault; medical benefits to a maximum of \$2,000, no fault; and finally—which Mr. Schreyer claimed to be far in excess of benefits offered by the private industry—a lifetime disability payment of up to \$50 a week.

The government will also offer optional protections to motorists; reduction of the deductible all-peril amount to \$100 or to \$50, and increase of the third-party liability to \$100,000 or \$200,000. Private companies will be able to compete with the government in offering these and other additional benefits.

The government claims that the public plan will offer a 15 per cent across-the-board saving for motorists on all forms of coverage in the first year, rising to a possible 20 to 30 per cent saving in subsequent years. Licence fees for drivers will increase sharply for those with bad records; a sensible measure.

It sounds as though Mr. Schreyer will be offering more benefits for less money; a very difficult sort of bargain to beat. Nor do the figures spell out all the benefits.

Most of these benefits, whether for damage, injury or death, are to be paid on a no-fault basis; that is, to those guilty of causing an accident as well as to those not guilty. This means two important gains. Those who need help will get it immediately, when they need it, instead of having to wait months or years to have a court determine who should get what, if anything. And the benefits can be collected without the services of a lawyer; a saving to the victims of motor accidents that could far exceed the saving in premiums promised by the government.

The insurance lobby in Manitoba will have its work cut out to convince the people of Manitoba that they should reject Mr. Schreyer's plan.

So says *The Globe and Mail*.

But public insurance is only part of the New Democratic plan to reduce car insurance costs. To do a comprehensive job in this field other things must be done. We

must reduce the frequency of accidents, cut down the damage during accidents, and institute proper salvage operations following the accidents.

First then, let us take a look at the problem of reducing the frequency of accidents. Several factors need attention here. Better highways stand high on the list. It is a well-established fact that modern highways, properly built, generate less accidents per mile travelled than do older roads. Much still needs to be done to bring our highway system up to date, but to give credit where credit is due, Ontario is working to do just that. We still have a long way to go, however, and the process should be speeded up to incorporate known improvements into our highway system.

Improved driver education is long overdue. We allow drivers on the road with a minimum of knowledge and skill. Young people from 16 to 24, while representing only 19 per cent of the motoring population, are involved in 30 per cent of all accidents and 32.5 per cent of all auto deaths. It is true that Ontario is stepping up its driver instruction in the high schools, although that has recently been cut drastically on the orders of the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) to cut budgets.

Much more needs to be done. Research carried out at Queen's University recently indicates that in addition to instruction before the licence is granted, the young person should be required to take more intensive training after a year or so of driving experience. That is the time when over-confidence and carelessness begin to appear and the time when the young person will profit more from training.

Better car design could cut the accident rate considerably. Protruding sharp-edged hubcaps, sharp snouts and points and knife edges of various kinds add to the pedestrian and bicycle hazard. Dr. William Haddon, Jr., president of the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety in Washington, in recent testimony before a congressional subcommittee said this:

Weaponry design throughout the ages has been based on the principle that impact surfaces that are hard, pointed, rigid, jagged or otherwise hurtful on contact with people will aggravate human injury and suffering. In view of this it can hardly be maintained that using the same lethal shapes for the surface of vehicles that can and regularly do impact pedestrians, bicyclists and other defenceless road users,

may be excused as an act of ignorance. Eliminating such expensive and needless costume jewellery and substituting design and executive decisions that reflect concern for people will reduce needless human and social as well as property damage.

There are, of course, many structural improvements in cars which can cut insurance rates. Steering columns which lock when the ignition is off to prevent theft, anti-skidding disc brakes, 360-degree rearview mirrors, rear-window defrosters, different coloured running and stop lights, standard positioning of controls on the dash—these and other items come to mind as features which can cut down the likelihood of accidents.

Apart from design, more care is needed to make sure the car comes to the customer in good condition. We all know the history of recalls in recent years because of defective cars. From the time the recall legislation was passed in Washington in 1966 until July 1, 1970, over 14 million vehicles were recalled in the United States alone. We hope that most of those recalls applied to Canada as well, but since we have not had similar legislation we have no way of knowing how many defective cars Canadians are driving.

Just recently all Pintos manufactured since they were first put on the market were recalled because of fires occurring in the carburetor area. On April 12, 1971, our newspapers announced that all Vegas made before the recent strike by General Motors were recalled. Twenty-three thousand, three hundred Vegas were recalled to correct five possible defects, including one which could cause the choke to jam and one which could lead to fuel spillage.

Consumers' Union reported that their tests of 1969 cars showed an average defect of 26 per car—some of them serious. Certainly more care is needed and more testing—particularly of new models and new techniques—to cut defects and thus prevent accidents. And accidents are reflected in insurance premiums.

Then there is speed. Too often the industry, in its advertising, emphasizes speed—completely ignoring the fact that speed does kill. Fatalities and the severity of damage increase markedly with increasing speed. From 85 to 95 miles an hour the G forces increase by 25 per cent. The question is now being widely discussed as to whether we really need to travel at speeds built into modern cars. Speed standards, when set—and they will be eventually—will cut the

likelihood of accidents as well as the damage done if and when accidents do occur. The speed standards could eventually be lowered somewhat, but as a start we might do this:

1. Decree that no car should be able to attain speeds of more than 90 miles an hour.

2. Speedometers should not show speeds over 85 miles an hour.

3. When a vehicle goes over 80 miles an hour, the horn should begin to blow and the flasher lights should automatically turn on. This would serve as a warning to both the driver, who would slow down to stop the confusion; and to other road users, who would thus be warned of impending danger.

Police cars used for pursuit could be exempt from the rule and specially marked.

Another device which can reduce frequency of accidents and so lower insurance rates is regular inspection of all motor vehicles. This should be done every six months and appropriate windshield stickers supplied. The cost can be met through a small increase in the licence fees and this will far more than pay for itself in damage saved.

Let me read a few items from papers in areas where safety lanes were operated last year in Ontario. In St. Catharines, 503 vehicles went through the lane and 69 were ordered off the road. Of the remaining 434, only 19 received safety stickers the first time around; 25 failed on the re-test.

In Chatham, only 94 vehicles of 506 inspected were passed as road safe. In Sault Ste Marie, of 477 checked, only 18 got clearance on the first try, and in Stratford only five of 166 tested were given a safety sticker while 18 had their licence plates removed. In Niagara Falls, 736 vehicles were examined and 76 were taken off the road as unsafe. Only 31 got stickers the first time, and another 227 were given stickers after being repaired.

The State of Texas claims that 15 per cent of its accidents were due to unsafe vehicles before regular inspections got started there. That figure was reduced to five per cent—one-third—after the programme got under way.

In New Jersey, the first year of inspection brought a traffic fatality drop of 32 per cent, and since then the trend has been steadily downward. In 1966, the death rate for New Jersey was 3.5 per million vehicle-miles. In Ontario, it was 7.6. In 1969, the latest year for which we have figures, it had dropped to 5.9.

Some years ago New Jersey did an exhaustive study on the subject of regular inspections. They found that for the year 1961, states having state-owned and-operated testing stations had the lowest mileage death rate—2.8 per million miles of travel. They found too that states not requiring regular vehicle inspection had the highest mileage death rate—6.7 or more than double.

Two Harvard professors, Dr. Robert Buxbaum and Dr. Theodore Colton, did a thorough study in this field in 1966. They found that inspection exerts a preventive effect upon mechanical failure. They, too, say that states with regular inspection have considerably lower death rates, and they back it up with figures. They also prove that the death rate is even lower in states with two inspections a year.

Ontario is doing some inspection work, but it is pretty hit and miss. Owners of old cars steer clear of voluntary inspection lanes and many people driving unsafe cars are completely unaware of it until disaster strikes. With regular inspections, people will keep their vehicles in better repair and wrecks will be banned from the road. This helps to keep insurance rates down.

Then there is alcohol—alcohol in the driver that is. H. David Archibald of the Alcohol and Drug Addiction Foundation tells us that drinking drivers cause up to 40 per cent of fatalities and 30 per cent or more of the collisions caused were of the serious multiple fatality kind.

John Volpe, U.S. Secretary of Transportation, said on January 12 of this year that alcohol is involved in 50 to 60 per cent of highway fatalities, and that problem drinkers, not social drinkers, cause at least two-thirds of these deaths.

These problem drinkers, who constitute about seven per cent of the drivers on the road, cause 50 per cent of the deaths in vehicle accidents.

These people can be identified and they can be treated and controlled. These drivers destroyed six times as much property last year as was lost in all robberies, arsons and burglaries put together.

The Stanford Research Institute has said in a study paper that if only 20 per cent of the drivers on the road lost their licences, the accident rate would go down by 80 per cent.

That is a pretty big order, and I do not suppose in a democracy we would ever achieve the 20 per cent even if we wanted to. But there are measures we could take. It

is likely the 0.08 standard for blood alcohol is too high, especially when convictions seldom take place unless the blood count is at least 0.1.

All research in this field points to the fact that the driver becomes progressively more and more dangerous with each blood level point above 0.04. To quote Mr. Volpe again:

In Sweden, only 10 per cent rather than 50 per cent of all fatally injured drivers are impaired by alcohol at the time of their accidents. In Britain, fatalities and injuries are down 35 per cent in the hours between 10 p.m. and 4 a.m. when most alcohol-related crashes occur.

How did they do it? The answer is simplicity itself. If you are caught drunk while behind the wheel—and breathalyser tests are taken to prove it—there is mandatory loss, suspension, or restriction of your licence. In Sweden and England, there is no licence to kill and the law is backed up by severe social penalties. The drunken driver is bad news in his community. Period. People ignore him. He is ostracized. He is not glorified by nightclub comedians. He is known for what he is—a potential killer.

In addition to reducing the frequency of accidents in ways I have just outlined, insurance rates can be dropped still more drastically by cutting down the extent of the damage done in accident situations.

This means, first of all, safer cars. It is an interesting fact of life that when we ship goods and we find them damaged, we do not shrug and keep sending more goods in the same old package. We redesign the package so it will withstand the forces it encounters in the mail or in the freight car. We want the contents to arrive in good condition.

Until a few years ago we did not even start to apply this commonsense philosophy to motor vehicles and the builders of the motor car are not yet willing to accept it. They are moving slowly, and reluctantly, toward it as they are forced to do so by government.

Engineers tell us that we can build cars that can crash head-on at 50 miles an hour, roll over at 80 miles an hour, and sustain side impacts at 40 miles an hour, without serious damage to their occupants. In fact, engineers at the Connaught Aeronautical Laboratory now say that cars can be made which can crash at 60 miles per hour without serious damage to those inside. The package can be built to protect the human

contents. Yet no car for general use is being built to anything like this degree of safety. The United States has set standards to come into effect in 1973 for passive restraint systems to protect occupants at up to 30 miles per hour.

It has just now been announced that the motor car industry has been successful in its lobby to postpone those safe restraints being built into motor cars until the 1976 models—a sad delay. They have also set standards for withstanding side impacts, and those are being fought. Today side impact accidents make up 14 per cent of the total, and the fatality rate for these is 21 per cent. Cars built really to protect the passengers will cut down death and injury. This will cut medical and dental bills; it will save untold man-hours lost from work. All this, too, will save on insurance premiums.

Will such cars cost more? Not significantly. But if they do, how do you balance life and suffering against dollars? And if there is added cost, this can be more than made up by skipping yearly models to pay for them. New models cost \$700 per car per year to produce. New models could be brought out every four or five years, or when genuine improvements demand it. The tremendous savings in this move alone—and they would be tremendous—would not only pay for better design and proper safety features, but could also be applied to lower prices to the consumer.

Improvement in the highway system will also cut down on severity of accidents. Rapid replacement of present guard wires with the new ones now beginning to appear on our roads, breakaway signposts and lamp standards, proper design and placing of guard rails, elimination of deep ditches, these and other measures will cut down highway casualties and help to reduce insurance rates.

Modern bumpers, or lack of them, are the scourge of the insurance-paying motorist. The car manufacturers are engaged here in a modern version of highway robbery which puts the old-time highwayman to absolute and utter shame. Many of today's cars do not have bumpers at all; and most of them do not have functional ones, except to carve up whatever they touch to the greater glory and profit of the manufacturers. Bumpers themselves are extremely sensitive, many of them suffering damage if they hit anything at two miles an hour or up—or even less. Bumper repair alone accounts for 15 per cent of all damage claims today, and in and around the bumpers is a startling array of

expensive chrome, lights, filigree work, protruding nose cones and upper lip snouts, all of which collapse at the slightest provocation and all of which the bumper is designed to damage, rather than protect.

For the past few years, I have placed on record here the results of tests conducted by running sample motor cars into fixed barriers or into each other at speeds at which a man walks or runs. The 1971 results are in and they are startling. The 1971 cars suffer 50 per cent more damage than the 1970 models. Of the small cars tested at five miles an hour, the AMC Gremlin came out best. It cost \$121.30 to repair. The Chevy Vega sustained the most damage at \$181.30. That is at five miles an hour. These are United States figures.

Canadian repair figures for the 1970 tests as reported in *The Financial Post* of April 3, 1971, came out 30 per cent higher than in the United States. Allowing for the higher value of the Canadian dollar since that time, the repair costs in Canada will run about 25 per cent higher than the United States figures that I am using here.

In the intermediate class of those tested the Plymouth Satellite showed up the best with only \$98 damage. That is a front-end bump at five miles an hour—I am using round figures now—while the Buick Skylark topped the list at \$427. Four sedans were tested—the Impala, the Fury, the Galaxy and the Ambassador. Of these, the Plymouth Fury cost least to repair—\$202—and the AMC Ambassador the most at \$415. I repeat, this is the damage done in a five-mile-an-hour crash into a fixed barrier. That is the speed at which you hit the floor if you drop 10 inches.

Backing into a barrier at five miles an hour was still more expensive for most cars, but not for all. This is significant in view of the fact that the motor industry is now claiming that the five-mile-an-hour standard for rear bumpers is too high and that it should be set at 2.5 miles an hour.

You can back a Volkswagen into a wall at five miles an hour for only \$59, but a Plymouth Satellite will cost you \$256 as against only \$98 head-on. If you have a 1971 Impala, do not try it. Backing at five miles an hour will cost you \$447 in the United States and \$560 in Canada.

Just a year ago, on April 2, 1970, I attended the hearings in Washington on bumper standards. Both General Motors and Ford maintained in their testimony that governments should not interfere with private

enterprise by setting bumper standards. These words appear in the Ford brief:

We do not believe that federal standards are necessary or appropriate to the development of bumper systems aimed at the reduction of collision costs. . . Clearly, automobile manufacturers and insurers have every motivation to improve the satisfaction of their respective customers. . . I believe the private sector should itself work out the present situation without the need for governmental action. . . Plans and programmes under way at Ford will, we believe, result in significant improvements in bumper performance. We intend to implement these programmes on an expeditious but orderly basis. It should be recognized, however, that major vehicle changes may be involved and hence, adequate lead time will be required.

That is from the Ford brief.

Granted that lead time may be required; but how much? The industry has known for a decade that its bumpers were progressively creating more and more damage with each successive model. Lead time has been used up to now to make bumpers more expensive for the motorist and more profitable for the manufacturer. Now the consumer is bristling and how long will it take the automobile industry to reverse that trend? How much lead time will it need? It is several years now since the public outcry against bumper damage and fragile car construction began. Already 30 states have introduced bumper standard legislation—the figure now, I think, is 33—which is being bitterly fought by the car manufacturers.

At the time of the Washington hearings last April, at the very time the industry warned against government bumper standards, it was preparing to bring out its most lethal bumpers in the history of the industry.

The 1970 Ford Galaxie cost \$185 to repair after the five-mile-an-hour crash. The 1971 Galaxie cost \$341—almost twice as much. The Impala five-mile-an-hour crash cost \$196 in 1970 and in 1971, \$170 more. The average cost of crashing the sedans at five miles an hour in 1970 was \$216. In 1971 this had risen to \$332 or \$116 more.

The average rear-end damage at that speed will \$111 more in 1971 cars than in 1970 cars. The average damage in a two-car crash when the front of one car rammed the side of another at 10 miles an hour—the running speed of a man—was \$499.36 in 1970 and \$638 in 1971, or \$138 more. To compensate a bit, the front-to-rear crash tests

at 10 miles an hour were \$40 cheaper this year than last.

William Haddon Jr. says this:

The 1971 automobile designs guarantee huge sales in crash replacement parts that are available only from those who possess the specially designed equipment which fabricated the costly, delicate, original equipment parts in the first place.

And the sad part of this is that even if we had properly constructed bumpers and surrounding structures next year—which we are not going to have—it will take at least 10 years for the recent crop of damage-prone cars to disappear—and during that time they will continue to levy their toll for the manufacturers at the expense of a long-suffering public.

The result of all this for the motorist is, of course, disastrous. The average cost of insurance claims has almost doubled since 1963. Property damage has more than doubled. And to add insult to injury, the car manufacturers have been jacking up the price of spare parts—the very parts their bumpers are designed to damage. As a matter of fact, prices on replacement parts are increasing 3½ times as fast as prices on new cars.

Add to all this the fact that the vast bulk of damage claims are for damage which would not occur if bumpers and the bumper areas were properly designed. Forty-two per cent of all property damage claims are for less than \$100, 84 per cent are for less than \$400, and 91 per cent of all dollar claims are for less than \$1,000. Seventy per cent of all dollar payouts by insurance firms go for property damage, with only 30 per cent for compensation to people—a complete reversal of the situation a decade ago.

The incredible thing is that people of North America have allowed themselves to be robbed in this bare-faced way for so long. But now, at long last, the public is demanding government action to end the tribute being levied by the industry through the insurance pipeline.

Roy Lovell of the Nationwide Mutual Insurance Co. of Columbus, Ohio, says:

An energy-absorbing bumper would reduce damage in all but the most severe accidents. This being so, it seems well within the realm of reason that damage repair costs could be reduced by 25 per cent overall.

As a matter of fact, Allstate Insurance is offering a 20 per cent discount on collision

insurance coverage for cars which can sustain front- and rear-end impacts up to five miles an hour without damage—surely, a commentary on the whole motor-car manufacturing and insurance industry.

The setting of bumper standards by government, then, can be the greatest single factor, next to public insurance, in bringing down the cost of premiums. Standards must demand uniform heights, including trucks, so bumpers will meet, resilient surfaces which will not damage easily, and hydraulic construction to absorb shock.

Bumpers incorporating these features are already built. They have been tested and can take cars through collisions up to 30 miles an hour without damage. Water bumpers are being used successfully by the Toronto Transit Commission. Others are built on the same principle as the landing gear of aircraft which absorbs terrific shock, and no damage done. But so far the industry will not use them. It is too profitable to keep manufacturing the flimsies which decorate present cars and which mangle what they touch. With the 1971 rise in premiums caused almost solely by bumper damage, there should be an increased public outcry for bumper standards.

What is happening is simple. Each year the car manufacturers are building higher-cost damage right into their cars and the insurance firms are collecting that increase and handing it on to them.

Canada-wide standards should be set. But since there is no action in Ottawa, Ontario, where almost all Canadian cars are built, should act and act immediately to cut this intolerable tribute being levied by the industry. It should set bumper standards and set them now.

The final technique which I want to discuss for getting insurance rates down might be termed "post-accident action." Part of it is getting injured people to hospital with all possible dispatch, and part is salvage by the public insurance plan of parts from damaged cars which cannot be made roadworthy. The Saskatchewan salvage department, as I pointed out, since its inception, has ploughed back almost \$1 million to reduce premiums. The Swedish insurance companies have developed an assembly-line repair system in co-operation with the tool and equipment manufacturers of the country. They are saving large amounts on repair bills.

But more important is using the records of cars involved in accidents and setting rates according to these records. The Swedes have

pointed the way here. They assess the cost of repairs on each make as well as the frequency of claims on each make and model. Insurance rates are based on this experience. Manufacturers then begin to examine their cars with a view to cutting insurance claims, since getting into lower premium classes would mean a real sales advantage. As a result of this move, General Motors cut parts prices by 25 per cent in Sweden, Renault by 20 per cent and Peugeot by 10 per cent. Manufacturers began to make design changes as well to lower repair costs.

The result is that there has been an annual reduction of damage repair costs for the Swedish insurance companies of 15 per cent. Contrast this with the dramatic increase here in repair costs, which I outlined earlier. Part of this increase is due to the fact that replacement parts have been soaring in price. During the period from 1965 to 1969, Ford parts went up by 35 per cent, GM by 20 per cent and Chrysler by 23 per cent. And they have been going up since that time.

Our insurance companies have records similar to the Swedish ones. These records can be used to force rates down here. But it is not being done. A public insurance plan in a large and powerful province like Ontario could follow Sweden's techniques and could lower repair costs—and so insurance premiums.

These are some of the methods then, through which lower rates can be achieved for our car insurance. The forthcoming election will tell whether the people of Ontario are sufficiently aware of the possibilities or whether they must suffer through another period of high cost and frustration. Certainly the automobile manufacturers and insurance combination are fighting desperately to hold their power to levy the high tribute they are collecting today. No establishment gives up without a struggle and this one certainly will not.

It is extremely interesting to note that the insurance fight against the New Democrats is based on the old battle cry, "socialism versus free enterprise."

Mr. Trotter: That is a dead issue.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): That is deader than a dodo bird.

Mr. Young: This cry—or one similar to it—has been used in every single struggle of the people to achieve freer institutions or to advance the community—

Mr. Pilkey: It is deader than a dodo bird.

Mr. Young:—good against vested interest.

Mr. Pilkey: They tried that in Manitoba. What happened in Manitoba? Tell us what happened in Manitoba?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): A new year; a new Throne Speech.

Mr. Young: Well, socialism versus free enterprise was the cry of the private schools against universal education.

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. Young: It was used by the toll-gate operators against public highways. It is still being used in some places in the United States where citizens want to establish a public water supply to replace the private water companies.

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. Young: During the past few years we have heard it repeated against the public Medicare plan and agricultural marketing boards. It is a curious fact that almost every single cabinet minister of this government is administering an undertaking which a few years ago was looked upon as socialism and, in fact, is socialism—

Mr. Pilkey: How does the government like that? Would it agree with that?

Mr. Young:—and opposed, steadily opposed during those years by the free-enterprise establishment.

Mr. Yakabuski: Free enterprise developed it.

Mr. Pilkey: Is that not nice?

Mr. Young: I have mentioned education which used to be the prerogative of the private schools. That fight is finished. The highways used to be maintained by private landowners through whose territory they ran, and they did it by—

Mr. Yakabuski: How long ago was that?

Mr. Young:—levying tolls on the travelling public at toll gates stationed on their land.

Mr. Yakabuski: The opposition is living in the past.

Mr. Young: This government right now is in the process of completing the transfer of Medicare from the private to the public sector, of socializing it—

Mr. Pilkey: Oh, socialism!

Mr. Young:—while at the same time they profess horror at the thought of doing the same thing with car insurance.

Mr. Pilkey: How do they rationalize that?

Mr. Young: In Ontario, marketing boards are taking the place of the private trader. The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) is proud of this. Legal aid has brought justice within the reach of all the people, and the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) is proud of this.

Mr. Yakabuski: We just use the goodies, not the bad parts of socialism.

Mr. Young: Ontario Hydro, OWRC, the Workmen's Compensation Board—

Mr. Yakabuski: Just the goodies, never the bad parts.

Mr. Young:—the Ontario Northland Railway, most municipal services—all these are socialism.

An hon. member: Sure, the goodies! Right, right!

Mr. Pilkey: Never the bad parts.

Mr. Young: And they were fought against with the same fervour that the insurance industry is now fighting against public car insurance.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): They will take over the member's hardware store if he does not watch out.

Mr. Pilkey: They are not going to win this one either.

Mr. Young: But they were gradually accepted as an integral part of our society. In fact—

Mr. Yakabuski: Dreamer boy!

Mr. Pilkey: The member for Renfrew South will come around.

Mr. Young: In fact, present Tory ministers in this government have constantly boasted how these socialist enterprises, under their administration, are effectively serving the people of Ontario; and well they might.

Mr. Peacock: Except for Medicare; except for workmen's compensation.

Mr. Young: These same ministers now shake in their shoes, terrified by the word

socialism as it is now applied to public automobile insurance; the back-benchers in the same way.

Mr. Yakabuski: That Waffle socialism is what the member's leader, the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis), is trying to avoid, but he is really part of it. He is trying to change his image.

Mr. Young: You will recall that when the Hon. J. J. Greene, federal Minister of Energy, was asked if the proposed takeover of Home Oil was not socialism, he shrugged and replied: "Socialism? That is just a word." He was no longer afraid of it.

Mr. Trotter: Fine man, good man. That is right; Liberal policy.

Mr. Young: The battle is joined. Over the next few weeks car insurance will be very much in the public mind.

Mr. Pilkey: Yes, they will come around.

Mr. Young: I believe the people of Ontario want the public insurance plan.

Mr. Pilkey: Sure they do.

Mr. Young: The cries of socialism will not scare them any more than they did the people of Manitoba.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Young: When the smoke has cleared and the people's verdict is in, car insurance will take its place in the public domain along with the other measures that I have mentioned.

Mr. Pilkey: What happened to the Tories by the way?

Mr. Young: The skies will not fall, and the argument will still continue in other fields where new lines will be drawn between socialism and free enterprise, between the public and the private sector of our economy.

Mr. Trotter: What about the Waffle group?

Mr. Pilkey: What about those elections in Manitoba? What happened there anyway? Who won there?

Mr. Young: Meantime, I direct the attention of the House to the steps I have outlined—

Mr. Pilkey: Where did the Tories finish in Manitoba? Where are they now anyway? Where is Mr. Weir now?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): What happened in British Columbia?

Mr. Yakabuski: The member has not been around long enough.

Mr. Makarchuk: What happened in Middlesex South?

Mr. Pilkey: Where is Mr. Weir, director of a funeral parlour?

Mr. Yakabuski: That is the school the member went to—Hoffa tactics; that is his school—union brutality.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, meantime I direct the attention of the House to the steps I have outlined which can drastically cut the cost of car insurance in this province as well as bring other distinctive values which I have outlined:

1. The public car insurance plan.
2. Positive steps to reduce the frequency of accidents through better highways, improved driver education, better car design standards, more care to prevent safety defects in new cars, regular inspection of all vehicles, regulating speed and moving in on the alcoholic driver.

Mr. Yakabuski: All-Canadian unions!

Mr. Young: To continue:

Cutting the extent of damage in accident situations through safer cars, bumper standards and removing highway hazards.

4. Post-accident action through speedier transfer of injured to the hospital, salvage depots to recover spare parts and capitalizing on accident records to set premiums according to the accident experience of various models.

I respectfully ask the support of this House for these measures.

An hon. member: Now you will hear the truth!

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, even though there are few in attendance and the debate seems rather quiet, I realize that considering what will probably happen in this province within the next few months is just the quiet before the storm that is going to break.

But I did want to congratulate you on the manner in which you have conducted this House. I understand from reading the news-

papers that this is going to be your last term in this House, so probably with even less feeling of competition than usual I can say that I congratulate you, not only in what you are doing now but for your work as you have sat in that chair over the past three years. I think you are most fortunate, considering the unruly lot we are, that things have gone as well as they have.

I do want to congratulate, through you, Mr. Speaker, the various members of the so-called administration. I particularly want to congratulate the new members of the administration. I really do doubt all this talk about the new administration. I know technically it is so—

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Where are they?

Mr. Trotter:—that at some future date, when they carve their names on the marble walls out here, it will be under the Davis ministry; therefore it is a new administration. But I am very biased, Mr. Speaker; in truth and in reality it is the same old Tory gang.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Hear, hear!

Mr. Trotter: And you know, that group over there that is called a government at the present time is existing really under—it is really a shotgun wedding. If there ever was a shotgun wedding this administration is it, with the hon. Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) one of the leading lights of the Davis ministry. One can hardly conceive how the two of them get along, how they are going to form any type of ministry, particularly when you read what the hon. Attorney General said when he was seeking to be the number one man in what he had hoped would be the Lawrence administration.

Mr. Makarchuk: The Lawrence of Ontario administration.

Mr. Trotter: I would like to give you a few examples. Mr. Speaker, of some of the interesting comments that were made by the present Attorney General. I must admit it confirms a lot of what many of us on this side of the House have been thinking and have been saying. I rather suspect not only the hon. Attorney General was thinking these things, maybe over the past two or three years, but some of the back-benchers on the government side have been thinking a number of rather uncomplimentary things about the present administration and its predecessor.

If the government members are thinking this way, you can well imagine what the people of this province are thinking of the present Conservative administration. I just want to give you a few short examples. I will not belabour this point, Mr. Speaker, because a lot of us realize how bad it has been. I just would like to underline a few things.

For example, here is a report from *The Windsor Star*—we Torontonians do not always just quote Toronto papers but we like to improve our mind and we read other newspapers throughout the province. This is from *The Windsor Star* of January 30, 1971; the report is from Barrie, written by a man named Bill Prager from *The Windsor Star's* Queen's Park bureau. Here are a few choice quotes:

Lawrence, who got some support from a Tory back-bencher—

And I am glad he is in the House right now. —for his attack on the cabinet, also indicated that he does not think much of some of his fellow ministers. He did not name them.

Of course, we would be glad to help him on that score over here because we rather suspect who he might be thinking about.

Mr. Lawrence went on to say, "Do not hold me responsible for the makeup of that cabinet."

Well, mind you, here is a minister of that cabinet and supporting that government, and now he is out telling the country what he really thinks.

William Hodgson, a member for a nearby riding, said too many ministers are lawyers who think along one train. He complained ministers do not listen to the back-benchers who have the feel of the local people.

An hon. member: The member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) agrees with that.

Mr. Trotter: I may inject here, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. R. G. Hodgson) may think that there are too many lawyers, but I noticed that when five ministers either were dropped or resigned they did not drop a single lawyer. So, in essence, the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton is stuck with the same old gang.

Hodgson also agreed with Lawrence that the Tory caucus—

Now this is interesting; this shows really into what a state government in this province has fallen.

Hodgson also agreed with Lawrence that the Tory caucus of members of the Legislature do not get enough time to consider the government's proposed legislation before it is sent to the Legislature.

Then the Attorney General went on to complain about civil servants giving weighted opinions. In other words, not only in Ottawa but in the city of Toronto, our capital city, it is the same old problem—that the politicians have allowed the civil servants to take control. A lot of us have been aware of it. I am glad to see that some of the Conservatives are now admitting this publicly.

On another occasion—I am reading from the same article, and I am sure I am not taking this out of context—the man who is now our present Attorney General and Minister of Justice went on to say: "A great wealth of talent and information in the party is not being used." Then:

He suggested people from industry, commerce, agriculture, "and even unions" should be brought into government temporarily so it could benefit from their experience and advice.

None of the three back-benchers present at the meeting—

I do not know who the other two were. I know a Mr. Hodgson with whom we are all familiar was there; I do not know who the other two were. But the article says:

None of the three area back-benchers present at the meeting disagreed with the minister. Hodgson said the caucus gets only 10 to 15 minutes to decide on government bills.

When you stop and think of it, Mr. Speaker, that is a very shocking admission to be made by a government member, that the government members get 10 to 15 minutes to decide on government bills.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): That is more than they get in Ottawa.

Mr. Trotter: When you think of the hundreds of millions of dollars that are involved in the spending of money through this Legislature—

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): How much time do the

member's federal counterparts give the Parliament in Ottawa?

Mr. Trotter: —it shows how little time is being spent as it should be spent.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The member ought to ask his federal counterparts in Ottawa.

Mr. Trotter: And I might ask the shouting Tories in this House, Mr. Speaker, how are we to preserve a democratic government if the members do not have an opportunity to make a decision on the legislation that is taking place?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: I want to deal with this problem at some length Mr. Speaker, because this is what is wrong with our society today—the individual is being neglected by government and one can easily expect the individual to be neglected by government when the government will not pay attention to its own members. This is a sickness in our society today.

If it makes my friends across the floor feel any better by yelling about Ottawa, it is an excuse, I would agree; I am not arguing about that. I do not approve of a lot of things that go on in government today. In fact the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton and myself could agree on many things, and I could make the same criticisms about Ottawa as he makes about Ontario, and I am glad he speaks out.

But I want to say this: what they do in Ottawa, or in San Salvador, or Costa Rica, or anywhere else does not solve the problems of what they do in the Province of Ontario. This is what we are elected for; to decide the issues as they should be fought in this province. I am getting fed up with this red herring of these people who cannot think for themselves and keep talking about Ottawa all the time.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Trotter: I will deal with the Minister of Agriculture and Food very shortly. He cannot even shout from his own seat, Mr. Speaker. I have something to say about the Minister of Agriculture and Food and maladministration, and how the farmers are treated in this province; but again the issue is what is to be done in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Henderson: It had better be good.

Mr. Trotter: Now if we want to know something about the tax problems in this province, let us ask the Attorney General, because in this case he is right. Mind you, while he was in the old administration he did nothing about it, and if they are going to judge the new administration by the Speech from the Throne, well he obviously has not the slightest intention of doing anything about the tax situation in this province whatsoever.

For example, this is from the *Toronto Daily Star* of February 2, 1971:

ALLAN LAWRENCE SAYS REBATE SHOWS
ONTARIO OVERTAXES

The Minister of Mines, Allan Lawrence, speaking in Ottawa, said while meeting Ottawa Valley leadership convention delegates that the fact that the present Ontario government—

Not Ottawa, but—

—the fact that the present Ontario government—

Mr. Henderson: That shows the members have no opposition when he speaks that way.

Mr. Trotter: I continue: has introduced several tax rebate schemes means we should not be taxing that much in the first place.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): He took that idea from our party a year ago.

Mr. Henderson: The hon. member has to quote a Tory member.

Mr. Trotter: And again:

Collecting taxes, then paying the money out again, involves administrative costs that waste the taxpayers' money, Lawrence said at Rockland, 22 miles east of Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, he has been reading Liberal speeches in order to get the truth. We have been trying to tell him that for some considerable time. But it is the truth that, if it is necessary to give tax rebates, this province is being overtaxed by this government. Again I say the regrettable thing is—the major regrettable thing is, Mr. Speaker—that the Attorney General is a member of both governments, the old and the new, and still nothing is done about it.

Then one other item, again from the Minister of Justice—and this is from the *Woodstock Sentinel-Review* of February 2, 1971, when he told Halton area delegates to the leadership convention that the civil servants are the only people who have the chance to study

alternative solutions to problems. The minister, who was then Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs said:

The civil servants present huge amounts of information to the cabinet, but the members are not given time to study it fully before having to make a decision.

Well he is right there, and the unfortunate part of it is that no changes are suggested by this administration. I do not expect any will be, but before I am finished I have a few suggestions I want to make in the hope of some improvement.

There is one other promise that the Minister of Justice was making that just galls me, and it is this. "Pay nursing care," he says. Of course, Mr. Speaker, this government should introduce legislation to cover people who are in nursing homes. It is an absolute disgrace that we have permitted hundreds, nay thousands, of people who languish in nursing homes throughout this province, to see what little earnings they have dwindle away.

The hon. member for Quinte (Mr. Potter), who is now in the cabinet, agrees with this. Evidently the Attorney General agrees with this, and yet the government does nothing. The only possibility that this government will ever come to the aid of those people who are in nursing homes is that it will read the polls and see what a desperate situation it is in. Then the government will probably come out with either part-payment or, I hope, all.

I hope it happens, but this government is so afraid to rock the boat, simply because it has won elections over the years living on the husks of tradition—that is all it does, Mr. Speaker—that there is not going to be very much hope for people in nursing homes; unless, of course Mr. Goldfarb has found again, by his marvellous treatment of Madison Avenue methods, that this is what is needed.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): We have a new fellow, "Goldfinger;" we got rid of Goldfarb.

Mr. Trotter: In fact, Mr. Speaker, if you want to know if they really do use Madison Avenue techniques, again I would like to refer you to the hon. Attorney General. I do not know if I have that quote just handy—oh yes, I have it here. This is so true, if you have ever watched how this government moves, particularly in election years. Again I am quoting from the *Windsor Star*.

Lawrence says senior civil servants bring weighted material to cabinet meetings which, the Mines Minister said, are like a slick ad-agency promotion.

Now those words are in quotation marks, Mr. Speaker, "a slick ad-agency promotion."

He said the cabinet finally is forced to the conclusion it has no other alternative but to go along with the civil servants.

Now there we are quoting a man who has been a cabinet minister in this Tory administration, and this is the state of government in the province of Ontario today.

It does not speak very highly for a democratic society at a day and age, really, when our way of life is being challenged all over the world. Unless we succeed in this province regardless of Ottawa—sure Ottawa is very important but unless we succeed in the province, I hold very little hope for the future of free society any place in the world. That statement, Mr. Speaker—and I hope to use a few practical examples in trying to illustrate my point—is not an exaggeration.

Ontario, where it is placed geographically, where it is placed with water supply and how it is placed with financial resources, is one of the most fortunate places in all the world, and it is also at a very key centre of world activity. Literally the United States cannot exist without the fresh water; if we keep it fresh, if we have some half-decent policies that do not pollute, we possess one of the major assets of any place in the world.

Because of what we have in this province in natural assets, because of our economic importance in Canada and the influence we can obviously have on the federal policy, what we do and what we say and how we act in this province will have tremendous reverberations on whether this is going to be a prosperous country, or whether it is going to remain a Canadian nation. That will depend on what the government does in this province and what we do in this Legislature. That is why it is highly important in this day and age that we again emphasize some of our old traditions, and that is that the individual is the centre of our life. It is also important that we adapt ourselves to the major problems that we have to face in a rapidly changing society.

This government, I feel, ignores some of the main principles of democratic government, which are old but about which we have to be eternally vigilant in order to protect them. The government has ignored, in my view, some of the major problems with which we must come to grips.

The other day in the unemployment debate the government here went through the usual routine of "Let us blame Ottawa." Well Ottawa is not blameless—

Mr. Henderson: That is where the blame belongs; no denying that.

Mr. Trotter: I am not trying here to defend it, but I again emphasize the administration must be positive, and if this administration continues to do what it has been doing over the last many months, just sitting back and blaming Ottawa, it is not only betraying the interests of the people of this province, but it is betraying the interests of the people of Canada.

What can this province do to harm Canada by its own policies, and harm itself? If you listen to the government, you think here we are, we sit back, we are helpless because of what they do in Ottawa; we cannot do a thing. But we can do a number of things. There are some things through which we can harm ourselves and harm the country as a whole, and there are many things that we can do to help ourselves and help the country as a whole.

I do not intend to go into detail in this, Mr. Speaker, because this was touched on in the debate earlier and it is still before the House. Also, we emphasized, when my leader brought our amendment before this House, the number-one thing that we had in our amendment was this, "the failure of the government to come to grips with the grave problems of unemployment and inflation." We are going to hear this again and again.

Mr. Speaker, when our government in the Province of Ontario goes out and borrows money abroad in essence to build public buildings at a time when we should not have built them, it means that the federal government must put up our own money to buy U.S. Treasury bills. They must keep up the balance of payments. If we go out and borrow money by the millions it means that federally that must be covered one way or another. When the former Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) goes out and brings in American money—and brags about bringing in American money—it means once again that in an inflationary period we must buy, in a federal capacity, United States Treasury bills.

The pressure got so bad that the federal government broke an international agreement, in that we would not try to take the

lid off our dollar. But this happened. Ontario was not the only one at fault. I am not saying that. But I am saying that because of its tremendous wealth and because of influence on the Canadian money market when it goes abroad, it was one of the major culprits when we had to resort to what is now called a floating dollar.

When you have a floating dollar and when the value of our dollar increases, as it did, the people that are hurt the most are the Ontario businessmen. They are the ones who lose the export markets, and so this is why the Minister of Trade and Development—or the predecessor of the present man we have now—in many cases regardless of the nationalist issue, did this province a tremendous amount of harm in the way he attempted to bring foreign capital into the Province of Ontario.

Besides the businessmen our municipalities suffer when money becomes expensive. Those municipalities that have bonds out at 5.5 per cent must refloat the issue at 9.5 per cent. Again I want to emphasize that one of the main culprits, not only for Ontario but for Canada, was the former Treasurer of this province (Mr. MacNaughton) and the former Minister of Trade and Development, because their policies led head-on into this very major problem that we have had, which causes inflation and which has affected our foreign reserves.

Here is one instance in which a provincial government can do a tremendous amount of harm. In this issue what can the Province of Ontario do? Where can they do a lot of good? Any provincial government can, I suppose, affect a money market one way or another, but what Prince Edward Island can do or Newfoundland can do, even though they operate under the same constitution, does not amount to too much. But when you know that 40 per cent of all tax dollars in this country come from the area almost between Oshawa and Niagara Falls, it is pretty obvious that this jurisdiction can do quite a bit if it wants to, if it intends to take any action.

This is why I have even suggested to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Wishart), or his predecessor (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) that whenever he wants to bring a change in the improvement of the marketing of goods such as the matter of frozen foods, they should be marked, they should have a date on them, for after a certain date they could be a risk to health.

Of course our then Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs said, "Well, we will let Ottawa worry about it. Let us see what Ottawa does." But the truth of it is that because of the strength of the Ontario economic market, if we said—and it is quite within The British North America Act—that frozen foods must have a date on them, the country would have to follow for the simple reason the market is in Ontario and you cannot really operate at a profit unless you sell in Ontario.

There may be one exception to that. I think if you sell patent medicines, Quebec is the big market. Patent medicines still go over big in Quebec. But for almost any other item on the market, if Ontario said you must have a date on it or you must do this or you must do that, Ontario could lead. Again I emphasize it is because of our economic strength.

The Minister of Trade and Development gave us a great speech about what he was going to do about housing because this would help the unemployment situation in this province, and he mentioned—it is in the Throne Speech—about 132,000 jobs. Well, they backed off that a bit now. Whatever it was, it was a lot of window dressing. It really was, Mr. Speaker, window dressing. There is really no guts in what they said could be done in putting up houses to fight unemployment. But there are some things that this province can do in affecting employment, in affecting the economy, that they did not even mention.

For example, in Canada there are approximately \$14 billion in pension funds. Not all of that \$14 billion is in the Province of Ontario. Most of it is. I do not know the exact proportion. Of those pension funds only nine per cent is invested in mortgages that can be used for housing.

There are two pension funds in Ontario, one operated by Canada Packers—and I believe Paul Hellyer in his report on housing pointed this out—that have 60 per cent of their pension fund money in housing. Air Canada has nearly 40 per cent. I am not asking that a pension fund go as high as 60 per cent, but suppose they went from their nine or 10 per cent to 25 per cent. Think of the tremendous amount of money that would be in the housing market.

I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that that is a matter for provincial jurisdiction and you can give Ottawa a real argument on that on any day of the week, and believe me those of us on this side of the House would be

more than willing to support any argument. In fact, Ottawa has never objected, but here in this administration they have made no effort in order to use those funds.

On one occasion I mentioned this situation in this House and the former Minister of Trade and Development got up and gave us a long speech about building-society loans in England, and how you could not have them here because the federal government would not change the income tax. Well, I do not think it was ever seriously discussed between this province and Ottawa. Regardless of that, building-society loans have never taken root in this province or in this country, but we do know that there are literally billions of dollars in pension funds that can be used. This is the type of thing that, if this administration had any drive or interest or any intention really to come to grips with building houses and with solving unemployment, here is a practical situation where it could actually do something.

One more thing, Mr. Speaker, that is well within the realm of control of this province to solve unemployment and again to help the housing crisis that we have in this province. We have a provincial bank. I have often wondered why this administration, if it wants to pour capital funds from general revenues into that bank for mortgage loans, could not do so. Why do they not go out and compete in the market for deposits? Why do they not go out and get some deposit money? We have permitted the building interests to run roughshod over the federal administration and the provincial administration. Most of all, the banking interests have run roughshod over the general public and they do not give a damn.

We have that provincial bank. I know there are some lawyers who will give one the constitutional argument that we should not have a provincial bank, but we have had it here for years, and I would just dare the banking industry to challenge the constitutionality of the Ontario provincial bank. But here is a source of getting funds and going out into the market and getting this money to use, whether you want loans for municipalities, or more particularly whether you want to create employment through housing. There is a source that can be used.

Do not ever let this administration tell you, Mr. Speaker, or anybody else, it is just the fault of the federal government, because it just is not so. With all the things that might be wrong, there is no question that

with the powers that we have in this province—both constitutionally, but even more so, economically—it is the buck that counts and this is where the money is and this is where this province has a tremendous amount of influence. If the federal government will not go after the banks, then, for heaven's sake, use the provincial bank.

The government is going to have to re-allocate how money is lent. The banks go out and encourage people to buy red Cadillacs, because there is more money in consumer loans. Let us give them some competition and get the money and put it into housing where it belongs, or in helping the municipality where it should be; and let us have fewer loans for red Cadillacs and more for houses.

This basically is what banking policy is today, and it is stupid for the Province of Ontario to sit back and literally do nothing about it if the government is going to fulfil some of the promises we read in the Speech from the Throne or some of the wondrous statements made by the Attorney General throughout his campaign about helping small businesses. I could not agree with him more, but what in actual fact is happening in this province and throughout the country is loans of under \$100,000 are decreasing in numbers.

We are talking through our hats when we say we are going to encourage small business, because the actual number of loans is decreasing, so the only place this government is going to get that money is by using something like the provincial bank where the apparatus already is, and by seeing to it that small business does get the loans it should get.

While the Attorney General was campaigning, while he was Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs and had a bleeding heart for small business, why in the world did the provincial government not cut its Ontario corporation tax of 12 per cent? They levy that tax irrespective, on these small companies, no matter what their level of income. When they collect that 12 per cent one of the main beneficiaries is the government in Ottawa. This is why it seemed so ridiculous when I had to sit here and listen the other day and hear the government blame Ottawa, because if it ever wanted to go after Ottawa, why does the government not cut the 12 per cent corporation tax that is in the province? All the government is doing is helping Ottawa.

We still have the five per cent on machinery and equipment used for production purposes. The government does not make a move on that—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Building materials too!

Mr. Trotter: Whatever fault Ottawa may have, it certainly does not make this decrepit and infirm government look any better. In essence, that is what is wrong with this administration. It is feeble of purpose and over the years it has become too self-satisfied.

Mr. Speaker, I have two items I want to touch on and in essence they all come back to this point that I feel, in this day and age, the individual has been neglected and we are not protecting what is traditionally democratic government. We always want to be modern and do the up-to-date thing, to be tuned in; but there is nothing old or outdated about democratic government, about the right of private ballot or the ballot box. These things get forgotten from the old debates.

But these are part of our tradition, and we are going to lose them if we do not repeat and remind ourselves of their importance. One of the main reasons we do not hear so much about these old traditions today is because of modern economics, where we still have to measure up to the challenges of a changing economy. So many millions of people have become alienated from the system which we treasure and which I for one believe is of the utmost importance.

For example, it still holds true in this society that an individual can develop to the best of his ability and exertions—and note I add that term, “and exertions”—and we have been able to do it for the average person in our society better than anywhere else. And yet, despite all the virtues that we might have, we have to face up to the fact that we have got a number of things wrong with us to the extent that we must ask why is it in the world today we have a Communist bloc; we have in the United States a military-industrial bloc; we have black power, Panther power, red power, labour power, corporation power—society seems to be breaking up into little groups.

I think one of the main reasons is that we, as governments, have failed to measure up to the modern demands of our society; we have failed to come to grips with what people need. There is no question that the rich are becoming richer and the poor are becoming poorer. In large part, it is because

of government policy; also in large part, it is because government has ignored the individual.

I just want to give you what, in my mind, are practical examples, because we can have all the theory in the world, but unless we are practical, our democratic system will not work and we, being a pretty practical people, have to be pretty determined that our theories will work.

Just for an example, Mr. Speaker, let us look at how this administration has abused local government. Local government—particularly in the Province of Ontario—has been the keystone of our free society. Local government is sort of the mechanism for the average person to get close to those people who are governing him and where the person who is being governed can remind that person that the governed are those who have the right to decide what are the priorities of government.

In other words, the individual can feel a close kinship to local government and the people who are involved. In fact, the average person himself can become involved in the government that has the power over him. This has been one of the great strengths of Ontario's society. There have been very few countries—and in relation, if you go into the history of this country, Mr. Speaker, there really have been very few provinces in Canada itself except those provinces that have copied themselves from Ontario—that have had the strong local government that we have had. I again repeat that this is one of the great keystones of our society.

Even though we have had approximately 993 municipalities that in many ways had become outdated, they had managed to keep going in a jet age simply because they did have traditional boundaries, geographical boundaries, historical boundaries. They were able to work, even in the last few years, even though not always as efficiently as they might have done. They have still been able to work because of this tradition that they have had.

Now changes are bound to come. Regional government was bound to come, and I have been in favour of regional government. I have been appalled with the way it has been imposed; I repeat, Mr. Speaker, how it has been imposed by this administration. I feel—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Like Grey South.

Mr. Trotter: I feel this administration has neglected to carry out one of the first principles of a successful democratic government, and that is to consult the people involved and to listen to what they want. This Tory administration has had such a holier-than-thou attitude toward the communities of this province that it has gone a long way to contribute to the possible destruction of the foundation of this society.

The only thing that has really saved us—and will in the long run save us, I am not that pessimistic—is that basically the spirit of the self-reliance of our people runs so deep that not even over a five- or six-year period can this Tory administration destroy the foundations of our society. But if we permit it to continue as it has gone on in the last few years, this is what is going to happen to this province; we will destroy many of the basic freedoms that we have had.

It is mainly the government's manner or attitude. The other day, in the debate on unemployment, when the hon. Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) of this province got up and interjected, while discussing political parties, he referred to his own as "the" party. We are getting in this province aristocratic democracy. It is not democracy of the people; it is becoming aristocratic democracy, and if you look at the history of other civilizations, even those that have been democratic, it is usually the beginning of the end.

Those of us on this side of the House are not going to see that happen because there is a Liberal Party in his province and this gives the people of this province a viable alternative. We are imbued with those principles that will protect the individual and will protect the local government. But if regional governments in this province are going to serve the people in practice as well as in form, then it is about time the provincial government here remembered four basic principles.

Number one is the consent and co-operation of the citizens within each region. I do not believe that has taken place; I think Thunder Bay was imposed on the people. I read things about St. Catharines, and it does not sound to me as if there was much co-operation from "Big Brother" at Queen's Park, or if there was very much—

Mr. Nixon: Closing all the hospitals in Grey county.

Mr. Trotter: —interest in what was going on.

Secondly, you know, we succeeded in this province, in our history, because basically we have been a very practical people. But we are not practical in the way the Tories treat almost any municipal government because they do not give them a sound financial base.

How in the world can people operate a regional government, a city government, or almost any type of municipality in this modern society when the Tories try to base everything on the assessment of a house? It is just stupid and it is completely out of date.

The government is running this province on an Act that was passed in about 1849—I think it was the Baldwin Act—and when you think of the changes that have taken place in the last 25 years never mind the last 125 years, can you see how stupidly municipal government is being treated in this province today?

The government is impractical, as well as being completely undemocratic. How can it expect a municipality, no matter what its size, to operate on the basis on which they operated the little red schoolhouse? That is exactly what the government is doing now.

I admit the little red schoolhouse is the cornerstone of a good educational system. Despite all the things that are wrong with it, despite all the high spending, we have a reasonably good educational system in this province. But how can we expect the municipalities to pay for it? And how can the Tories expect local government to succeed, given the way they have treated them in a financial way?

How can the government expect the township of Vaughan, for an example, to build houses? Here we, in a great urban area like Toronto, need land for houses and so we look to the township of Vaughan, but the councillors up there say: "No, not unless you build a house that has a market value of \$40,000." How many working men are going to move there?

I do not blame the councillors of the township of Vaughan. It is wrong to fault the local councillors of any municipality. Just what does the government expect them to do? They cannot afford to carry the educational costs that they must carry; they simply cannot afford to pay for the expensive trunk sewers that must be built. Yet this government, year in, year out, has utterly and completely ignored the councillors, the people and the whole system of local government,

Again I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that unless this province comes to the rescue of local government, the keystone of a free society, we will, in the long run, contribute to the destruction of a free society. Yet these Tories have continually ignored this issue and it has been brought up time and time again.

You can go into great lengths about the financial base of it, but in essence you have got to see that they get money to be used—I would in many ways prefer—for unconditional grants rather than have a myriad of tax systems. I do not want to see that. No one wants to see that. It is inefficient and uneconomic. But you have perhaps got to use that system of unconditional grants and they will say, "Well those people have not raised the taxes"—meaning the local councillors. I say, trust the local councillors who have been elected by the people, because in essence you are trusting the people and it is their money anyway. But you have simply got to face up to this issue, because it is a shocking situation the way we have treated the various communities in this province no matter what their size.

I want to say a third thing. It is that the regional government must be given the freedom of action to assume some of the necessary duties and to make decisions of its own, because today there is too much of a "Big Brother" attitude from Queen's Park, looking over the shoulder of every move a local councillor makes. And let us remember this, that most of the decisions that have made this province have come from hundreds of thousands of people working on councils, or taking an interest in councils that have served this province well over the years. Unless we encourage these communities we will destroy their individuality and eventually we will destroy the individuality and the dignity of the individual himself.

You know, when you think of what the Highways Department has done to some of the communities in this area, in this province—I give you the example of King City, a pleasant community that many people in Toronto would like to live in. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if they would build a decent transit system and have a decent transportation system in this province, King City could become a very important segment of a great metropolitan community without destroying its individuality. But what did the Highways Department do? It was in a hurry to get from point A to point B, so it ripped out the main street, virtually, of King City and

cut down these lovely trees which were almost the atmosphere of the community. Mind you, all they had to do was move the highway half a mile north or south. There was room to do it without destroying the centre of that community.

But this is what is important to remember—that we must preserve these communities not just because they are there but because they have a very important role to serve in a modern society. And this government does not realize that. It is destroying, in many respects, what I would say is the very best of rural Ontario. I can say this from someone who represents a big city—the government will destroy rural Ontario and the government is going to destroy this province.

It is a surprising thing that a Tory government is utterly and completely blind to the importance of these communities. Of course, they are going to be more than just a farmer's store supplying the local farmer. This may have changed, but if you can have proper transit systems—look at other parts of the world; even, in fact, look at what we have done here—many hundreds of these communities can become very important.

I was amazed, Mr. Speaker, when looking into this problem when I was down in New York. The Americans, in many cases—except the investors—do not know very much about us in this province or in this country. And yet when I got talking about transportation they started to point out the importance of Toronto and how other communities fit in and they knew all about Guelph and Galt and how it was so easy that they all were in one section and how these communities were all viable communities around the hub of a tremendous centre.

I do not think that it ever occurred to those people over on the Tory benches, Mr. Speaker; all they do is think of going from A to B and ripping out a lot of trees and destroying these communities. And yet, if you look into King City—and this is what I want to emphasize—they were just not consulted. What hope has King City got against “Big Brother” up here at Queen's Park? What hope has Waterdown got? What hope has Pickering got? They have not got a prayer against “Big Brother” at Queen's Park. These Tories just do not care and they just do not know. I point out to you that it is not only a tragedy what we are doing to highways; but philosophically, basically we are contributing to ruining one of the finest societies in the world today, right here in the Province of Ontario. This is a tremendous

weakness in this government and a prime reason why it must be turfed out.

Fourth—the last of them—is local government, whether regional or not. There are going to be a lot of governments in certain areas where regions may not quite become set up for some years—this week we do not know; we are in the dark on that—but whether the local government is regional or not we should see to it that they have every opportunity to look after the physical things that are local—the local roads, the sewage, the hydro distribution. Also we should see to it—and this is a major reversal of what has been going on in Ontario—they should administer the social services, such as health and education, which perhaps to some extent they have been doing—but health and the welfare services because when we get too centralized the average person just does not have a clue as to what is going on.

Let me give you again a practical example of where I think a regional government or a local government is most important. Take even a relatively inexpensive thing like a well-baby centre that is set up. In my area, they opened up a few but they closed them down when OHSIP came in. They said, “Well, you can go to your doctor. You are all insured, so go to your doctor.”

Well what is wrong with that is that there are a lot of people, particularly new Canadians and maybe anybody else, who might not have any contact with a doctor. But when we had the well-baby clinic, the people in charge of that clinic not only saw the babies, they were talking with the people who brought their children to that clinic. It was a personal contact that no “Big Brother” government can give to anybody.

This is why, I emphasize again, that even though the provincial government may set down the guidelines, it must see to it that these policies are administered on a local level where the people have contact with the actual administration of the services that they are receiving. It is just not good enough to continue the “Big Brother” attitude that we have had here from this Conservative government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other thing I think that this government is doing that is going a long way to destroying individual choice and to destroying the sanctity of the individual, is through its housing policies. It is all very well and good to say we are going to produce 132,000 jobs.

Suppose that was even true—I do not believe it, but suppose it was true—there is still

one thing basically wrong with the way we treat housing. The only answer we seem to have is to put more and more people into bigger and bigger buildings, and in essence we are destroying the pride of ownership. And whether it is a small shack or a fancy house, if you destroy ownership you again are going to destroy one of the basic tenets of our society.

We have permitted the economy and the housing situation to go to such an extent that by about 1990, 60 per cent of the people of the city of Toronto are going to qualify for subsidized housing. Can you imagine that? Sixty per cent of the people in Toronto will qualify for subsidized housing because the cost of housing is getting completely out of hand. This comes from the Patterson report; it is not a figure just pulled out of the air.

If we let the situation go on in the Toronto community, or any community in Ontario, we again are going to just sit back and almost let dry rot destroy the foundations of our society.

It is a matter—they are all worried about density—of seeing how many people can be piled into these great buildings. I know they are spending money on research to see if these highrises are bad for family life. Yugoslavia has got something going, and they have come up with the conclusion it is bad for family life. Without doing research, without being able to employ a lot of well-informed people to go into the subject, Mr. Speaker, I will venture that piling family after family into highrises is absolutely disastrous for the family and for the community.

Yet we sit back and we seem to have no answers. Surely there must be some answers. It is more than spending \$72 million a year, as this government does, on housing. We are going to have to remember that housing is a utility and it is going to have to be produced and used almost like hydro except you have got to give people the opportunity of ownership. I believe—and I may be old-fashioned in this—that unless you give people the pride of ownership and opportunity to have something for themselves, then you lose one of the basic elements in this society, but this is what is going on today.

We have 1,700 acres in Scarborough called Malvern. We have heard that name kicked around so much in this Legislature. We are told that we cannot build houses because the land is too expensive. The land in Malvern of 1,700 acres was bought when land cost peanuts and yet they have all sat back—and

I will tell you right now it is the cost of education, it is the cost of sewage, it is not the federal government. It is right over there, it is this Tory administration—that is where it is.

There are many plans right now. I could take the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman) and show him models and plans set out where you can still, in various areas, get high-density housing which is needed in some places in downtown Toronto without destroying all the old houses, without destroying all the old buildings, and without building all those highrise apartments.

Highrise apartments are wonderful for those people who want to live in them; for the older people who like them; for the bachelors; for the happy spinsters; for the newlyweds they are fine, and they serve a purpose. But I say if we are going to have a strong society we must supply the proper housing for our families and this we are not doing and this we can do.

It is just ridiculous that a province with our resources, with our assets, with the ability and the personnel that we have in our people, can sit there and let 1,700 acres at Malvern just sit there for nearly 20 years until we cannot do anything. It is just a shocking situation.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Shame.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): It has all been looked after.

Mr. Trotter. Oh, nonsense!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: You see, Mr. Speaker, this is the type of crap we get from this administration!

They will not change. They are like that concrete they pour. They are always pouring concrete into these highrise apartments. They are all mixed up and permanently set. That is the concrete mind of so many people in this Tory administration. And it is about time some radical changes were made.

On another occasion I will go into more detail in the housing situation because it is a very, very major problem in this province. But I want to use it as an illustration that unless we have proper housing policies in this province, and for that matter in this country, we are going to go a long way to destroying society as we know it.

One last item, Mr. Speaker, and again it comes back to the basic conception of the

individual. It applies to nations as well. This is why it is important that we in Ontario make every effort we can to express our individuality as Canadians.

It has always annoyed me—the policies of government both federally and provincially—that this very basic idea of being a Canadian has really been ignored. I do not want to be a member of the Communist bloc; I do not want to be a member of the industrial military group that is now becoming so powerful in the United States.

What is happening in the United States is a tremendous tragedy. There has never been any nation in all the world, Mr. Speaker, in the democratic process, that has been able to get together and start from scratch and accomplish so much. When you look at the founders of the American union, there has never been such an example as theirs in all the history of the world. But the United States is literally going to pot the way they are carrying on at the present time.

Many of the great traditions that they started—their best chance of growing and becoming of any importance—are in Canadian society. And this is why it is important for us to be Canadian. I am not saying be anti-American; I am not saying ignore all the American money—that would be wrong. But I am saying we should lay down the ground rules and see to it who is controlling what is going on within the province. It has just been a shocking situation—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): That is what you call belated enlightenment.

Mr. Trotter: —that our Minister of Trade and Development almost thought it was a big joke. The former Premier (Mr. Robarts) of this province said it was a phoney issue. It is not a phoney issue. It is a very vital issue, because if the Canadian identity were lost and submerged by the Americans, there are hardly any nations, you might say, of a middle group of any stature or of any economic power, that can stand up and at least provide a podium for people like ourselves who, as I say, do not either want to be a member of the Communist bloc or part of a group that is now controlling the United States of America.

So it is of vital importance that our government avoid doing what they did just last January—dole out over \$300,000 to Pfizer Corporation in order to put a plant up in Cornwall. Surely there must be people in Canada who can help out Cornwall? Cornwall

needs new industries, I do not question that. But why should we give forgivable loans to a drug company that, according to the American Senate, is one of the worst drug profiteers in all the world? That is what we did last January. How stupid can we get? This is what this administration does. It is a practical example that it simply does not care.

Now I feel that—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the member want to ask the member for Sarnia about American companies in his area?

Mr. Trotter: It is going to take more than a change of ministers. It will be more than just playing musical chairs to put some real guts into policy in this province, so that we can say not only to ourselves but to all of Canada that we are Canadians because—as I began I want to finish, Mr. Speaker—because the strength of the economy in this province, the fact that a thousand people a week come to live in the city of Toronto, shows that we are a viable economic community.

There is wealth here, there is training; and this is why it is important that it have proper direction, not only to serve ourselves but to serve Canada as a whole. I think that if we have a strong democratic country in Canada, we literally serve the free world as a whole everywhere. This is why Ontario is so vitally important because if governments, and more particularly the men in that government, were inspired with proper ideals they could legislate the practical policies that would be of tremendous help to every man, woman and child in the province of Ontario. But what do we get? We get wisecracks; we get almost complete indifference from the present administration that we have here—

Mr. Nixon: And it has got to go.

Mr. Trotter: And it is time that we advance—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Is there any other place you would rather be?

Mr. Trotter: It is an aristocratic democracy at best, but even that is getting infirm and decrepit. What we want here is democracy for the people and not for a particular group of aristocrats or a little close group—

Mr. Nixon: The uppercrust of Chatham.

Mr. Trotter: —which has been running this province for a long, long time and so—

Mr. Nixon: Time is running out.

Mr. Trotter: —we are all overdue for change. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I ask this House to support the amendment as put forward by my leader, because it is Liberal policies that are going to deliver this province and give it the leadership that it needs and all this country needs. We are the one party in this province that can go into any community and advocate the same platform and preach to them the same political philosophy that they need in order to give them and give this province the proper future that it deserves.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): The member has been preaching like that for 25 years.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: He must have just found out!

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): It is 28 years now.

Mr. Trotter: The time of wasting our resources, of poor leadership, has got to come to an end. This is why I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all the members of this House—and I hope to the people of the Province of Ontario—that to support the Liberal Party means supporting the party

that is going to give them a government that they need.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Amen!

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member for Cochrane South would move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Ferrier moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, are we to understand that there is work on tap for the committees to undertake tomorrow or will, in fact, tomorrow just be a day in which the Legislature does not continue?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): There is the organization of the committees. I do not know that the committees have a great deal of work before them but they will need some time to organize. The House will not be sitting.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.55 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 13, 1971

Tabling document relating to national tax reform, statement by Mr. McKeough	381
Retaining Bill 10, Farm Products Marketing Act, till federal legislation enacted, question to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Nixon	382
Tabling names of industries involved in air pollution difficulties, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Singer, Mr. Lewis	382
Review re export of hydro power through International Falls, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Nixon, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Lewis	383
Review of wage settlement between Sheetmetal Contractors Association and Local 473, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Nixon	383
Negotiations with federal government on off-track betting procedures, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon	383
Announcing bail proceedings to prohibit occurrence of incident at Don Jail, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Shulman, Mr. De Monte	384
Giving forgivable loans without paying attention to growth centre priorities, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Makarchuk	385
Investigations into price increases of gasoline, beer and food, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Lewis	386
Main contributors to low prices of farm commodities, especially eggs and pork, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Yakabuski, Mr. Nixon	386
Regional government system for Sudbury basin, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Sopha, Mr. Deans	388
Senior citizens receiving guaranteed income supplement and living in Ontario housing, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. B. Newman	389
Tabling study re effectiveness and efficiency of government programmes, grants, loans and subsidies, questions to Mr. McKeough Mr. MacDonald	389
Abolishing fishing licenses in Ontario, question to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. W. Newman	390
Sale of former site of Mercer Reformatory, questions to Mr. Auld, Mr. Trotter	390
School attendance by children in care of Children's Aid Societies, questions to Mr. Wells, Mr. T. Reid	390
Stabilization fund of Ontario Credit Union League, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Makarchuk	390
Sales tax revenue lost on sale of securities by Ontario residents, questions to Mr. Winkler, Mr. Deacon	391
Removing five per cent sales tax on flower-growing industry re equipment and repairs, question to Mr. Winkler, Mr. Paterson	391
Action re representatives re Sir Wilfrid Laurier Secondary School Controversy, question to Mr. Welch, Mr. J. R. Smith, Mr. T. Reid	391
Municipal board of education receiving grants for building school for grade 13 students, question to Mr. Welch, Mr. Deans	392
Protestant children's homes, bill respecting, Mr. Meen, first reading	393
Huntington University, bill respecting, Mr. Sopha, first reading	393
Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. Singer, Mr. Young, Mr. Trotter	394
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Ferrier, agreed to	425
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to	425



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, April 15, 1971
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon in the east gallery as our guests we have students from the East Mersea Public School in Wheatley, and Hillside Public School in Clarkson, and in the west gallery from the Adult Day School in Toronto. This evening we shall be having with us at our night session, the Young Christian Workers from Toronto.

Statements by the ministry.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition):
No statements!

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Revenue then has a statement?

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of University Affairs): The Minister of University Affairs has a statement.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to announce that the provincial government will provide financial support for the preparation of a series of historical biographies of the prime ministers of Ontario since Confederation. This series will record the historical developments of Ontario and the achievements of the men who have given leadership to the people of this province from the time of the Confederation Premier, John Sandfield MacDonald, up to the present.

The biographies will be written by recognized scholars in Ontario history with general direction from an independent board of trustees under the chairmanship of Dr. Murray Ross, former president of York University. Dr. Ross has solicited ideas and advice from university presidents and history department chairmen throughout the province and has received enthusiastic support for the scope and aims of the project.

The other members of the board of trustees are: Mrs. Margaret Angus, president, Ontario Historical Society; Dr. Floyd Chalmers, chancellor, York University; Dr. R. E. G. Davis, founder of the Canadian Institute on Public Affairs; Dr. Raymond Labarge, deputy minister, customs and excise division, Department of National Revenue, Ottawa; Dr. J. K. Reynolds, secretary to the cabinet of Ontario;

Dr. E. E. Stewart, deputy minister, Department of University Affairs; Dr. James Talman, department of history, University of Western Ontario.

Additional historians will be invited to join the board of trustees and a senior editor will be appointed by the board in the near future.

Formal approval of the project and the appointment of board members has been approved through order-in-council. The research funds for the preparation of the biographies are to be included in the regular budget of The Department of University Affairs.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have three reports to table and in that I am going to make a statement with them and perhaps in that the hon. members opposite might like to ask some questions I propose to table the reports and make the statements at this time, rather than under "Reports."

The first one, Mr. Speaker, relates to tabling of the third report of the McRuer royal commission on civil rights. It is my privilege to table the third report of the inquiry into civil rights conducted by the hon. James C. McRuer.

As you know, the inquiry has submitted two previous reports to the Legislature. This third report, which is volume five of the documents prepared by Mr. McRuer, concludes the activities of the commission. The report, which is now being placed on the desks of all hon. members deals with the application of the general principles recommended for adoption in the earlier reports.

As the government has only just received this report and has not had an opportunity to study it in great detail, I cannot indicate to the House to what degree action will be taken at this session to deal specifically with the suggestions put forward in this volume. However, as was indicated in the Speech from the Throne, measures which grew out of the earlier reports by Mr. McRuer will be put forward to further enshrine civil rights in the statutes of Ontario and may well in fact meet some of the suggestions contained in this report.

I should like to take this opportunity, on behalf of all hon. members of the Legislature, to express our appreciation to Mr. James Chalmers McRuer. Since May, 1964, he has devoted his considerable energies and intellect to a most complete review of the application of fundamental civil and human rights in this province. His work has already borne considerable fruit and, I am confident, will have a continuing and salutary influence on the work of this Legislature and the conditions of living in our province.

The people of Ontario owe Mr. McRuer a very large debt of gratitude and, I know, will come to realize this more and more as the years pass by. His understanding of the need to preserve and protect the basic principles of civil liberties and freedoms will be applied to the daily activities of each and every person in Ontario and substantially influence governments in many other jurisdictions in Canada and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure—and not just a pleasure; a matter of some concern—that I present to the Legislature the first report of the royal commission on book publishing. You will recall that this commission was appointed on December 23, 1970, to examine fully the publishing industry and inquire into its position within the business community and the effect of this contribution on the cultural life and education of the people of Ontario and Canada. The commission was also asked to study the economic, cultural, social and other consequences of substantial ownership or control of publishing firms by foreign, foreign-owned or foreign-controlled corporations or non-Canadians.

The report I am tabling today deals specifically with the financial difficulties faced by McClelland and Stewart Limited, one of the largest book publishing houses in Ontario and Canada. The members will recall that the owner of this firm, Mr. Jack McClelland, has announced his intention to sell his shares in the company because of an inability to obtain sufficient capital in Canada to remain in business. He recently opened negotiations with United States sources.

This report indicates that an independent analysis of the company's financial statements by Clarkson, Gordon and Company reveals that approximately \$1 million is required to overcome the difficulties faced by McClelland and Stewart. The commission concurs with statements by Clarkson, Gordon and Company that these funds could not be obtained in Canada without the assistance of the government.

The government of Ontario agrees with the royal commission that the creative momentum in original Canadian publishing undertaken by this company should not be lost or permitted to be transferred to non-Canadian ownership.

The commission has recommended that as an emergency measure this government, through the Ontario Development Corporation, offer to acquire from McClelland and Stewart Limited 10-year term convertible debentures for one-third of the company's assets—\$961,000. It is suggested that the debentures should bear no interest during the first five years and low interest rates thereafter. In turn, the Ontario Development Corporation would appoint members to the board of directors of the company, along with other safeguards of public funds.

Further, the royal commission suggests that McClelland and Stewart is a national asset worthy of all reasonable public encouragement and support, and therefore the government of Canada should be invited to participate to a substantial extent in the acquisition of the proposed debentures.

Mr. Speaker, the government of Ontario accepts the principles put forward in this interim report by the royal commission on book publishing to maintain McClelland and Stewart as a Canadian-owned company. The Ontario Development Corporation will pursue the recommendation of the commission. The government will also undertake to request that the government of Canada enter into a joint venture with this government to assist McClelland and Stewart Limited.

Mr. Speaker, this government is concerned that there be a sound, Canadian publishing industry. We are especially concerned that the cultural integrity of our educational system be protected. The importance of maintaining a Canadian textbook industry was emphasized yesterday in testimony before the royal commission and reported fully in today's press.

Because of our interest, the Deputy Minister of Education, Dr. J. R. McCarthy, will be seconded to the royal commission as a special consultant on textbook publishing. His extensive experience in all phases of education will greatly expand the capacity of the commission to consider this important aspect of the publishing industry.

Mr. Speaker, as a continuation of this aspect of it, as you are aware, over the period of the last 25 years, there has been a great emphasis on development in education in Ontario, involving the provision of

more accommodation, more equipment, more transportation, more teachers and additional other staff.

In recent times there has been a deceleration of the increase in enrolments. Beginning in September of this year the elementary school enrolment will decrease in absolute numbers and continue to do so throughout the 1970s. These developments have implications of considerable significance for all those associated either directly or indirectly with education.

This diminishing emphasis on quantitative factors will release time and energy which become available to be utilized in other ways. It also means that resources, in terms of personnel and finance, may not be required to the same extent or in the same manner.

The challenge exists in terms of planning ahead, establishing priorities which have regard for the aims and objectives we hold in education and which take into account the hard realities of the economic and other relevant factors in our society, and in making those decisions which will not always be easy but which will be essential in the light of the considerations to which I have referred.

If this job is well done we will be able to place a new emphasis on quality in education and will make the system responsive and accountable to the people of our province.

Therefore, it is the intention to examine fully the financing of education in Ontario. This will be done in relation to the aims and objectives, goals and philosophy of the elementary and secondary school system. We shall relate the financing to our priorities and programmes and to the resources available at the various levels of government.

In addition to his role as consultant to the royal commission on the publishing industry, Mr. McCarthy will undertake the proposed study for The Department of Education. He will devote his full time to these two important areas. Dr. McCarthy's experience in the areas of curriculum, textbooks, school administration and education finance will be helpful in the proposed study.

A further and more detailed statement on the terms of reference and procedures for the study will be made by the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) at an early date.

Mr. Speaker, the third report that I would like to table and refer to in the statement relates to the second interim report of the committee on government productivity.

The House will recall that the first report of the committee was released several weeks ago.

The second report is based upon further analysis of the functioning of cabinet and the multitude of roles a minister is required to fulfil. The recommendations are designed to increase the capacity of the cabinet to deal with change, to add both precision and speed to the decision-making process, to ensure the flow of current information to cabinet and to reduce the amount of routine work required by ministers so that they may concentrate their time and energy on broad policy questions.

The cabinet has given approval in principle to all six recommendations in this report and is moving quickly to implement them. I am confident these will have a positive influence on the ability of the cabinet and individual ministers to fulfil both their public and executive responsibilities.

As a first step in implementing the recommendations, legislation is being prepared and will be introduced in the near future to establish two senior cabinet committees. The committee on policy and priorities will replace the present cabinet committee on policy development. The function of the Treasury Board will be substantially altered to reflect a new emphasis on its role in the management of government programmes. It will be renamed, at this point at least, the management committee. Both committees will have assigned to them additional duties and responsibilities.

The committee on government productivity recommends that a legislation committee be established to review legislation before discussion by full cabinet and to schedule the introduction of government legislation into the House. This recommendation has been accepted and the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Wishart) has been appointed chairman.

To co-ordinate the work of departments with similar responsibilities, the committee on government productivity recommends that ministers whose departments are allied in function should be grouped together in co-ordinating committees. Thus, policies relating to a given area, such as the environment, will be fully discussed before arriving at cabinet. Programmes will be co-ordinated and gaps in service identified. This type of cabinet organization will result in more inter-departmental co-ordination at the highest level, in more precise policy definition—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The Premier has got to try something.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and clearer, more consistent policy decisions.

These recommendations, taken with those related to a strengthened cabinet secretariat and more formalized procedures for the channelling of cabinet business, will allow cabinet to achieve more within the limited time available. The ability of ministers and cabinet to process a large volume of decisions on the basis of thoroughly researched and complete information will be increased substantially.

These new recommendations by the committee on government productivity herald a new management style being introduced by this government to match the new demands placed on it as we deal with the needs and requirements of the people of Ontario in the 1970s.

As further support of the recommendations of the committee on government productivity, I should like to announce the restructuring and strengthening of The Department of the Prime Minister and the cabinet secretariat and, as well, a number of changes in senior government personnel. All will become effective on May 1.

As the House is aware, The Department of the Prime Minister is a relatively small department, serving the administrative needs of the executive council and what has developed into a rather large undertaking, the staff functions related to the fulfilment of the office and, of course, of the leader of the government. From 1964 to 1969, Dr. J. Keith Reynolds served as the chief executive officer of The Department of the Prime Minister. In early 1969, he undertook the dual responsibilities of secretary to the cabinet and deputy minister of the department. During this period, The Department of the Prime Minister has developed in its role as the co-ordinating office for government activities and began to increase its capacity to assist cabinet in its work.

In concert with the expanded activities of the cabinet committee system it is imperative that The Department of the Prime Minister also evolve so that it can undertake a far larger role in the co-ordination and direction of government activity.

We shall bring into the department a number of additional responsibilities including the possible transfer to the department of a number of activities now performed in other departments. Dr. Reynolds will assume

what I foresee to be a significant and onerous role as deputy minister of The Department of the Prime Minister. Additionally, he will serve as my chief executive officer and undertake a number of special assignments on behalf of myself and the government.

Mr. Clare Westcott, who was my special assistant in The Department of Education, will continue in this capacity in The Department of the Prime Minister.

Mr. Carl E. Brannan, who is secretary of the Treasury Board, will become secretary to the cabinet which carries with it the rank and status of deputy minister. As part of the reorganization of the cabinet secretariat, Mr. Thomas I. Campbell will become secretary to the cabinet committee on policy and priorities.

Mr. Brannan will be succeeded as secretary of the management committee of cabinet by Mr. G. H. U. Bayly, deputy minister of The Department of Lands and Forests. Mr. Bayly will be secretary of the management committee of cabinet when it is established.

Mr. Walter Q. Macnee, who is now Deputy Minister of Transport, will become Deputy Minister of Lands and Forests.

Dr. Edward E. Stewart, Deputy Minister of University Affairs, will become deputy minister of The Department of Education. Dr. Stewart will be succeeded by Mr. H. H. Walker, Deputy Minister of Revenue.

The deputy minister of The Department of Trade and Development, Mr. Stuart W. Clarkson, will succeed Mr. Walker as Deputy Minister of Revenue.

The chairman of the Ontario Water Resources Commission Mr. Donald J. Collins, will become Deputy Minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. Robert D. Johnston, deputy minister for The Department of Civil Service, will become acting chairman of the Ontario Water Resources Commission. I would add at this point that both The Department of Civil Service and the Civil Service Commission are to become part of the new management committee of cabinet, with Mr. W. A. B. Anderson directing both The Department of Civil Service and the Civil Service Commission. It is expected that further recommendations in this general area will be forthcoming from the committee on government productivity.

I should also at this time, Mr. Speaker, like to designate the appointment of Mr. A. T. C. McNab as deputy minister of the planned new Department of Transportation

and Communications and Mr. John C. Thatcher as deputy minister of the Ontario Department of the Environment. Legislation to effect these new departments is in the course of preparation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce these appointments. The people of Ontario may take pride in the high calibre of the men and women who are their civil servants. These men, along with the senior officers of our other departments, are among the most skilled and dedicated people one could wish to work with. On behalf of the people of our province, I wish to extend to them my congratulations on the excellence of their work and appreciation of their service on our behalf.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Energy and Resources Management has a statement.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Yes, Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. leader of the Opposition's question of April 13 last, I would like to table a list of the sources ordered to curtail operations on April 12, 1971, under The Air Pollution Control Act.

I would like again, Mr. Speaker, to make it clear to the members of the House that this list is made up of industries and sources which were called by air management branch last weekend and which co-operated with my department's officials. They are not necessarily all the sources which may have contributed to a high index reading.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: I think the question period is the appropriate time for that.

Mr. Nixon: He was answering my question.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but he was answering by way of statement rather than taking up the question period for it.

The Attorney General has a statement.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Yes, Mr. Speaker!

Similarly, I have a matter that was raised in the House by question, but rather than take up the time of the question period I would like to make a statement on it. It involves the case of Regina vs. Francottie. You will recall, sir, that I undertook to review the circumstances relative to this case when certain questions arose in the House as to Mr. Francottie's inability to raise the

\$20 cash bail after he had been taken into custody by the Metropolitan Toronto police.

Hon. members are already aware that this case arises out of a charge which has been laid pursuant to section 280 of the Criminal Code of Canada which creates an indictable offence of theft, including theft of an article under the value of \$50. Since the matter is before the courts it is obvious that I am not in a position to make comment on the facts that led up to the laying of the charge, although it already has been noted that it involved an allegation by a newspaper vendor as to the removal of money from his box through which he distributes newspapers.

Mr. Francottie was arrested on Thursday, April 1, and taken into custody by the Metropolitan Toronto Police.

He appeared for the first time before the provincial court on Friday, April 2, the next morning. He saw duty counsel—that is duty counsel under the legal aid plan—before his appearance in that court on Friday, April 2, since deputy counsel is present in the cell area from 8 o'clock in the morning and is available to the men who are in custody.

Mr. Francottie provided to the duty counsel the information relative to his person only, not in relation to the charge. This information was in turn conveyed to the Crown attorney who provided it to the court on that Friday morning at the appropriate time. The matter of bail was raised by the Crown attorney, who did not make any specific recommendation on this first appearance; nor did the duty counsel make any specific recommendations.

The judge, after considering the matter and in the light of the fact that the man did not have any fixed place of address and did not have any means which were readily apparent, felt that the bail of \$20 would be reasonable in the circumstances; and he so directed.

At this point Mr. Speaker, I feel I should make the observation that the purpose of the recognizance is to ensure the attendance of the accused person at his trial, this is the whole essence of the bail system. However, in association with that position, the evidence must be considered by the court as to what the circumstances will be that will in fact ensure the attendance of that person at his trial.

In the present case, I think we are doing an injustice to the system if we do not recognize that the information provided by the accused person himself through the duty

counsel of the legal aid system to the courts and the Crown attorney was not such as to indicate with certainty that the man has a position in the community or indeed even family connections that would ensure his attendance at his trial.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): But \$20 would.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The judge, in these circumstances, obviously felt that some amount of money—

Mr. Sargent: Some places have an honour system. Why not try it here?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The judge, in these circumstances, obviously felt that some amount of money might provide that incentive.

Sir, I am of the opinion, however, that when the duty counsel and the accused himself did not raise any question about the bail which has been fixed, then the Crown attorney should have raised the question. Since the Crown attorney is the agent of the Attorney General, I feel that it is incumbent upon him in all cases to do everything possible to further the administration of justice. I have now given instructions that all Crown attorneys in the province are to be advised that if neither the accused nor his counsel make any indication with respect to the bail which has been fixed by the court, the Crown attorney should raise the matter before the court so that consideration may be given to the circumstances of the accused, particularly when these are not made readily apparent to the court or to the judge.

If I can continue with the review of the particular case, this was remanded to Wednesday, April 7, and the accused was returned to the Don Jail—that is he was returned to the Don Jail on the Friday afternoon, when he then asked to see duty counsel. Duty counsel at that hour was not available in the Don Jail. He was not available on the whole of that Friday afternoon; and because it was Friday, the next day was Saturday and the day after that was Sunday. We do not have duty counsel available in the Don Jail on the Saturday or the Sunday either.

So Mr. Francottie saw duty counsel on Monday, April 5, and he then named a lawyer whom he wanted to appear.

Mr. Sargent: So justice takes a holiday.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: He named the lawyer whom he then wanted to appear on his behalf. He did not name any alterna-

tives. When asked to do so he declined, and indicated that there was only one particular lawyer whom he wanted and that no alternative would be requested by him.

Mr. Lewis: They were asking a lot of him there, but little before.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: On the next day, Tuesday, April 6, a legal aid certificate of eligibility was issued; but the lawyer who had been named by the prisoner was not available and could not be contacted by the legal aid officials. On Wednesday, April 7, when the man appeared in court his lawyer was still not available, indeed had not even been informed yet that the accused wanted him because no one had been able to reach him. The man, therefore, was not represented. Duty counsel again was present in the courtroom but in the circumstances the duty counsel was not entirely certain as to whether he should speak on behalf of the man who had already selected his own lawyer. The man was once again remanded in custody until Wednesday, April 14.

Here again, sir, I am not satisfied with the way in which all of the responsibilities of the officials were discharged and I feel it certainly would have been appropriate for the assistant Crown attorney to have raised the matter of bail again if neither the counsel for the accused nor the court raised the question first.

In considering the various aspects of the Ontario legal aid plan, I think we may all take pride in the service which is being provided continually throughout our courts, both by the duty counsel involved and by those who are participating in the continuing provision of legal aid. In the present case it will be noted that the duty counsel spoke of the matter on the first appearance on April 2 although the matter of bail was not dealt with in the manner which I feel was completely satisfactory or appropriate.

However, on April 5, when the accused saw duty counsel he selected one lawyer only and the very next day his certificate of eligibility was issued but they were unable to contact that single lawyer who had been picked out by the accused. On April 7, therefore, the man was not represented.

The question immediately arises as to whether or not we should require the accused to select alternative lawyers. If we do that, sir, we are then, of course, subject to the criticism that one of the essential features of legal aid will be aborted, because

the man will then not be having the lawyer of his first choice. However, there are obvious considerations that may be extended to this matter and the Ontario legal aid plan director and his officials are developing an arrangement so that alternative counsel will be requested—will have to be requested—and obtained to prevent the recurrence of this type of unfortunate situation.

As far as I can ascertain, the time lags were minimal in the provision of legal aid but even so, I am asking the officials of the Ontario legal aid plan to review these time factors so that they may be kept to an absolute minimum, particularly where the custody of an individual is concerned.

On April 7, therefore, the man was not represented and the case again was remanded until April 14. At that time he was advised by the court to contact duty counsel in view of the difficulty which he had encountered, but the accused did not do so. He made no attempt to contact the duty counsel, though this seemed to be the most effective manner by which he could pursue his own lawyer.

On April 10—that is, on the Saturday—the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) attended at the Don Jail at approximately 5:45 in the afternoon to inquire about Mr. Francottie's bail. While I gather he was willing to put up the cash necessary for bail, the justice of the peace had left the premises and therefore was not then available.

Unfortunately, no person advised the hon. member for High Park that he could contact the local senior officer at the police station and a justice of the peace could then be notified so that an appointment could be made to accommodate this particular bail arrangement at the Don Jail.

However, advice was given to the effect that the justice of the peace would return on the following day. I believe that some discussion was had as to the leaving of the money, so that the matter could be arranged expeditiously on the following day, but the hon. member felt he would really prefer to re-attend the next day, which was the Sunday.

This brings me to one of the other areas of concern which I have and that is with respect to the provision of justices of the peace within Toronto. We are all aware that there have been other cases when there has been difficulty in obtaining this service. As a result of the review which was made by my predecessor, further justices of the peace

were made available for this night service in all areas of Metropolitan Toronto.

However, one of the factors which has not been dealt with is the period from 4 o'clock in the afternoon until 8 o'clock in the evening, when a justice of the peace is not ordinarily available, even by special request through the police station. I have now taken steps to ensure that additional justices of the peace will be obtained so this special service after 4 o'clock will be available continually through until the resumption of the ordinary service of the JPs and the courts in the following morning.

In this way, hopefully, any person wishing to have the service of a JP to arrange bail from 4 in the afternoon until 6 the following morning may contact the senior officer in charge of any police station in Metropolitan Toronto who will then provide the telephone number of the most available justice of the peace. The individual may then arrange an appointment with that JP to attend at whatever location may be appropriate for the bail arrangement.

It has been suggested that some central location would be preferable to the existing system, but I would point out that such a central system would involve the transportation of the individuals from all points of Metro Toronto to one location, and this could lead to a great deal of difficulty, not only for the individual himself but for those persons who are interested in assisting him.

At the same time, it would involve a tremendous amount of police time if the persons were to be transported expeditiously after their arrest to such a central location. Under our existing arrangement, the individual, who may be in any one of a dozen police stations or who may be at the Don Jail, will be able to make the arrangement to have the attendance of the justice of the peace at the place where he specifically needs the help. We feel that this has worked well in the past for those who are working within the system, and that it will be even more effective when we fill this four-hour gap that has existed.

One other feature through this whole process which has caused me concern is the communication of all these services to the people who need them. It is fine for us to talk about the rights of the individual but it is rather frustrating, sir, if they do not know what those rights are. This must of its very nature be difficult when there are so many people involved in this process.

We have now made arrangements with both the Metropolitan Police force and The Department of Correctional Services so that informative material will be provided to the people who are taken into custody and to those who may make inquiries.

This material will inform them as to the manner in which they may contact the JP. In this way, any person who is pursuing a bail arrangement will get this advice from either the police or the institutional officials. Here again, I fully realize that there may be isolated cases where such a system may not get the information to an individual at the precise point of time at which he wants to have it. We will do everything possible to provide the broadest possible communication of the service and will revise it as our experience indicates where improvements may be made.

I have taken considerable time both to review the situation with my officials and to relate the results to this Legislature. In doing so, sir, I think mention should be made of the fact that the matter of the custody of an accused person is important not only to that individual but also to the whole of the society in which he and we live.

It is not without importance that, at the same time there was controversy over this particular case, the recent report of a grand jury in the county of York expressed grave concern that bail had been extended on too lenient terms in too many cases with subsequent depredations upon the public. This is not the first grand jury comment that we have had to that effect. It must be borne in mind that these comments are made by the citizens of this community who have had the advantage of going through the Don Jail and reviewing specific cases and reviewing the particular circumstances as they relate to those cases.

I mention this, sir, merely to illustrate the fact that in all matters relative to the administration of justice there is balance, and there must be balance, between the right of the individual and the right of the public and our courts and our officials really do their best to provide this balance in the best interests of all concerned. As long as we have human beings involved in the process, there are bound to be human mistakes. I do not anticipate that these will ever be eliminated 100 per cent because our system must always depend on human beings. But insofar as it is within my power and our power to do so, we will be mitigating against human error and will do all that is possible to provide

appropriate assurance for both the individual and for the public whom we all serve.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

REPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION ON PUBLISHING

Mr. Nixon: I have a question of the Premier further to his announcement with regard to the report of the royal commission on publishing.

Can he clarify for me, and perhaps for other members of the House, as to what might be the involvement he is requesting of the federal government? Is it in addition to the \$900,000-plus that he announced would be a part of the assistance that would be provided for McClelland and Stewart?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is contemplated that the request to the federal government would be, say, for an equal participation. The \$961,000 represents what the commission thinks is the total required, so it will be 50 per cent of that if they involve themselves.

Mr. Nixon: A further question: I wonder if the Premier can indicate to the House if this decision could be applied to other somewhat similar circumstances in the publishing industry and elsewhere? I refer particularly to the request that evidently has been made on behalf of Maclean-Hunter to representatives of the government for a 50 per cent involvement in their publishing expansion.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I expect there will be a number of other specific items discussed by the commission that is presently sitting, and I really do not think I can comment at this moment as it relates to their activities. This is the first report we have received and, as I said in my statement, the government accepts the principles in it and we have asked the Ontario Development Corporation to see if they cannot move in this direction. I cannot comment as to other suggestions that may flow from the royal commission at this point.

Mr. Nixon: A final supplementary as far as I am concerned: Has the government received assurances from the management of McClelland and Stewart that they are withdrawing their offers to American concerns to buy into the management of that company?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there have been any assurances from

McClelland and Stewart. This proposal has been discussed with them and, of course, this is a part of the on-going negotiations.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West has a supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, am I to understand from the statement that the Premier has in fact made a governmental guarantee that it will meet the recommendation of the royal commission exclusive of any federal involvement?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think the statement was quite clear. We hope to involve the federal government in that we feel this is a matter of national interest. I think it is also quite clear from the statement that we intend to accept the principle of the report and will make every effort to see that this matter is brought to a form of solution.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of—

Hon. Mr. Davis: With or without the federal government.

Mr. Lewis: With or without? Fine.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview has a supplementary?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, would it be reasonable to assume that since the government has accepted this report in principle, the government thereby repudiates the recent statement of the hon. member for Don Mills (Mr. Randall) who indicated the faults of McClelland and Stewart has arisen because of bad management?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would read the report itself—I am not fully familiar with what the hon. member said—I think it is fair to state that one of the difficulties of McClelland and Stewart does relate to management.

Mr. J. R. Simonett (Frontenac-Addington): He would not understand it anyway.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, does the Prime Minister agree with the statement, whoever made it, that McClelland and Stewart has had bad management to date?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to get into an analysis of McClelland and Stewart. The hon. member is quite free to read the royal commission's report. There was a report made by Clarkson, Gordon related to the financial situation. The policy

and the intent of this administration is to resolve the problem and that is what we are attempting to do.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brantford has a supplementary?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): A supplementary question of the Prime Minister: Can the Prime Minister indicate whether any directive will be issued to school boards regarding the purchasing of books?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this would more appropriately be addressed to the Minister of Education, but in that I know something about it, I will endeavour to answer it. There have already been directives over the years relating to Circular 14, where are very clearly indicated the numbers and the books that are printed by Canadian publishers and written by Canadian authors. There has been a very clear indication that we wish them to use Circular 14 and to use the textbooks printed in this country to the fullest possible extent.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) has a supplementary? The Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

STANDING COMMITTEE DECISION TO DEAL WITH EDUCATION

Mr. Nixon: A question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker: Does he intend to take any particular action in light of the decision taken yesterday by the standing committee dealing with education matters, in view of the fact that his minister, the Provincial Secretary, has said those actions are "improper and undemocratic"?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, just before the hon. Prime Minister replies to—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Unless the minister has risen on a point of order or personal privilege—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: On a point of order!

That is a transliteration or paraphrasing of remarks I used. The remarks, as I recall them, were as follows—

Mr. Speaker: This is not a point of order. It may be a point of personal privilege.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): It is a point of personal privilege.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: A point of personal privilege; thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I took the position that whatever the merits of the resolution were, a standing committee could not take unto itself powers other than those assigned to it by this Legislature that our—

Mr. Singer: Is this a point of personal privilege?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —our democratic way, the democratic way in which—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

If the hon. minister wishes to make a speech, he will do it by way of a statement before the orders of the day or at an appropriate time in a debate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I did not use the—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has asked a question of the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister may answer it or not as he wishes.

Mr. Singer: If he can get a word in.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that I now have a more accurate quotation of what the hon. Provincial Secretary said than what was transmitted by the Leader of the Opposition in the question that he asked me, my answer to that question is very simply this; that the standing committees, as constituted by this House, are set up legally with very specific terms of reference and these specific terms of reference will be followed by the members of this House.

Mr. Lewis: Is that a veiled threat? Is that what it is?

Mr. Nixon: A further question, Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the Premier then would interpret his own answer. Is he going to stop the investigation from proceeding or does he think it falls within the specific terms of reference of the constitution of the committee?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I recall the constitution of the committee and the debate that ensued in this House and the decision that was made, the standing committee can deal with those matters referred to it by the members of this House.

I expect there will be a number of motions emanating from the government benches related to the activities of the committee. One of them, of course, will deal with the matters of education and I anticipate that either the Minister of Education or I will have a resolution or motion relating to the question of cost and how it might be assessed by the standing committee, which is the proper way to do it.

Mr. Nixon: Well, I—

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I think it is essential that we be perfectly clear about this, if you will permit a further question, sir. We are to understand then that the resolution of the standing committee would have no effect until a representative of the government, either the Premier or the Minister of Education, presented a resolution in similar terms or different terms to this House.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am very anxious to follow the rules of this House. I think the rules are quite specific; that is the standing committees may deal with those matters referred to them specifically by the members of this Legislature.

I intend, or the Minister of Education intends, to introduce a motion that will relate to this matter. The members opposite will have full opportunity to discuss whether or not this can resolve the problem and how the standing committee can function on, say, the assessment of educational costs or many other matters. As I say, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Nixon: So the Premier is rejecting the independence—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I am not rejecting it at all. I am trying to operate the standing committees as set down by the rules of this House, which have been agreed to by all members.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier is trying to manipulate the committee system.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: I would like to ask the minister about the decision he has stated. Would it in any way affect the decision of that committee to call before it the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and the Ontario Secondary School Teachers Federation next

Wednesday? I wonder whether that decision will remain on the books of that committee or whether, indeed, what the minister has said today simply wipes the whole proceedings clear?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for the Minister of Education. I can just say as a matter of principle, as it relates—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —to the functioning of that particular committee—

Mr. Singer: Why can he not speak for him? He is the Premier?

Hon. Mr. Davis: In my view, there would be great merit in having the institute, the teachers' federation, the trustees' council and the organization that is related to and interested in educational matters—it would be quite proper for the committee to meet and discuss issues with them.

An hon. member: And the taxpayers.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I am saying, Mr. Speaker—I want to repeat it for the benefit of the hon. members opposite—I have read the rules very carefully, as they have, and if we wish the standing committees to function in a meaningful way I suggest, with respect, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Nixon: He means in a more controlled way.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —we should do it according to the rules.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: A further supplementary?

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The hon. Leader of the Opposition has a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: The new democratic centralism of William Davis!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary: May I ask the Premier if he is going to proceed in a similar manner to reject the decision made by the committee on natural and physical resources to call before it the Ontario Food Council?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it abundantly clear I have not rejected anything. What I have said, and I hope I do not have to repeat it again—

An hon. member: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —is that I shall be, or particular ministers will be, introducing motions or resolutions, whichever is most appropriate, to have matters referred before the standing committee. The resolution could be so all-embracing that they do not have to come back to the Legislature as it relates to particular organizations or institutions. To me this is a very logical and relevant way of resolving the problem.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Scarborough West a supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, dealing not with the generality but with the specific, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier: The committee yesterday passed a specific resolution, with the support of government members, to look at the costs of education—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, to look at a particular—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: I hope the Speaker will extend the question period appropriately.

Mr. Speaker: No, the hon. member and his party were equally vociferous a short time ago.

Mr. Lewis: The committee passed a resolution, with government support, asking for an inquiry into education costs along certain lines, a committee constituted of members of this Legislature. Is the Premier saying that that resolution of yesterday is, today, invalid?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am saying, Mr. Speaker, I want to be as helpful and as constructive as I can.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is fine. The resolution that was passed yesterday by the standing committee was out of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it may come as a bit of a surprise to the member for Scarborough East and the leader of the socialist party that the resolution—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I guess it was something of a Freudian slip, although I do make this general observation—I have yet to hear the leader of the New Democratic Party refer to any member on this side as a member of the Progressive Conservative Party. I usually hear the term Tory; for which we do not apologize incidentally, we do not apologize for that term.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now to get back to the answer to the question.

Mr. Lewis: Right. The Premier is muzzling the committees.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not at all.

Mr. Lewis: A little twitch of autonomy was a little too much for him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the government will, as I am sure the members opposite like us to do, administer the affairs of this House relative to the standing orders of this House. There will be a motion related to those matters which should be assessed by the committees, and we will have every opportunity to debate it here in this House, every opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

I continually point out that the question period is the time for the members and if they are going to use it in the way we have been doing, they are going to lose much valuable time. Now the hon. member for York South has risen on a point of order. We will hear it, and thereafter the member for Scarborough East has a supplementary.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I ask for your ruling on a point.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. MacDonald: Is there any precedent or is it within the powers of the government to come into this Legislature and unilaterally declare that something that has been done in a committee of this Legislature is out of order?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I have no hesitation in giving my view at the moment and I will be glad to take it under advisement; but at the moment, so far as Mr. Speaker is concerned, he is not advised of anything that happened in the committee. There has been no report here and therefore so far as I am concerned it is a question of oral question and answer. There can be no ruling from me because I have nothing upon which to base it.

I do recollect very distinctly the wording of the motions which established these committees; I think most of us recollect it because of certain events in another session. There is very definite wording to these resolutions and I think all members of the House would do well to look at the wording before this particular discussion goes too much further because the answer may be there.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to put my question to you again.

As the Speaker of this House, who therefore guides the destinies of our actions here, has the government the right to come in and unilaterally rule out of order something that took place in a committee of the Legislature?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is asking me a theoretical question because, as I have pointed out, there is nothing before this House for the government to rule out of order or for the Speaker to rule upon.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, it is not theoretical. The Prime Minister has come in and said he has declared it out of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is out of order. He has asked me to rule on a point of order. I have done so. He may appeal my ruling if he wishes.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. You declared this to be theoretical. I draw your attention to the fact that the Prime Minister has ruled—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is out of order. If he wishes to appeal my ruling—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, with respect, you are out of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member wish to appeal my ruling? If he does, he has the opportunity. If not, the member for Scarborough East has the floor.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, it is your obligation to rule—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is out of order and he will resume his seat. I will suspend the hon. member for the rest of this session if he does not resume his seat.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, what was that again?

Mr. Speaker: I said if the hon. member does not wish to observe the rules of this House and the rulings of the Chair by proper means, which is by appealing them, then of course he is not a proper person to be in the House at this time.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have no alternative but to appeal your ruling and my reason is this: It is not possible for you to say that there is a theoretical proposition before this House, because the Prime Minister has come in and declared out of order something that took place which you say theoretically does not exist. I suggest to you that you have a responsibility to exercise your responsibilities as Speaker of this House, and if you are going to walk out from under those responsibilities and in effect stick with the government, let us have it clearly stated.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I may.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege if I may.

Mr. Nixon: Does that take precedence, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Oh I think it could.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, for the edification of the member for York South, I have ruled nothing. This is not properly before the House. It should come in under "Reports." I passed a personal point of view and I said that it was our intention—

Mr. MacDonald: If the Premier was out of order, why did he not—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York South knows me well enough—I hate to interrupt him when he is in full flight, so I let him carry on. I hate to interrupt him, Mr. Speaker, but I am just repeating once again that I do not think this whole discussion is in order, but that it is the intention of the government to make the committees of this House meaningful, related to the rules that are set down and we shall do so.

Mr. Nixon: Surely the hon. member for York South is entirely right when he says we must look to you, sir, to order our affairs. With this in mind, may I ask you, before we simply have a partisan division in the House on something of this importance—which is the dependence on the usefulness of the whole standing committee system—that you consider what has been said here, the wording of the resolutions and the statements made by the representatives of the government when they brought forward the committee motion which emphasized the autonomy and the approved usefulness of the committee. Give us your considered opinion at a time when we are not going to be deciding it in the heat of this particular moment.

I ask you, sir, to reserve your judgement in this particular matter, and certainly we would be very glad to hear it and then to consider it at that time.

Mr. Speaker: One thing is quite certain from experience in other sessions of this House: Unless some control can be maintained of what goes on in the House, we might just as well not have sessions. This afternoon is an indication of the resurgence of the view that the Speaker's rulings and the orders of the House and the normal proceedings of the House are not to be observed.

I would point out to the hon. members that this is the oral question period and in my experience in this House since we have had a question period, either written or oral, there has been no determination made in the oral question period of any policy or any order of the House. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, there has been no binding statement, nothing that will affect the operation of a committee or of the House, and in my opinion it cannot be done in the question period because the House is run by its own particular resolutions which come before it.

At the appropriate time, if there is a resolution brought in by the committee—if you wish, by the chairman—or by the Prime Minister or by the member for York South, then that is the time that these matters would be debated. They certainly cannot be settled in the oral question period.

I think that the Leader of the Opposition has a fair proposition which he has placed to me this afternoon. I will be glad, subject to the agreement of the member for York South.

Mr. Nixon: The member was out of order.

Mr. Speaker: I realized that. There cannot be anything except questions in the oral question period.

Mr. Sargent: We cannot even get them, sometimes.

Mr. Speaker: The questions you can get; it is the answers that you have trouble with sometimes, is it not?

If the member for York South is agreeable, we will consider that particular matter closed for the moment. I would take it under advisement, but I would point out that the oral question period is not a period when orders of the House and of the committees are determined. It just could not be.

Mr. MacDonald: I am agreeable, Mr. Speaker, subject to this one reservation; that we have your ruling before 6 o'clock tonight so that we have it for guidance for the committee meetings tomorrow. Surely we are entitled to have the Speaker's ruling in advance of the committee meetings tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are next Wednesday.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): A supplementary question of the Premier: Did the Premier, the Minister of Education or any member of the cabinet or one of their staff people contact the Clerk of the House, who acts as secretary of the standing committee on human resources, to request that he withdraw his invitation to the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation to appear before the committee next Wednesday morning and to withdraw his invitation to the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education to appear before the standing committee on human resources next Wednesday afternoon?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can only answer personally. Until this afternoon—perhaps I did not read the press reports that carefully, and I should have—I really did not know that the OSSTF or the institute had been invited, so there have been no instructions.

Mr. Pitman: It was by a motion of the committee.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not talking about that. I was asked by the member for Scarborough East whether there had been any contact from me or one of the ministers to have this invitation revoked. All I am saying is that until I arrived here this afternoon I did not know that an invitation had been extended; so, Mr. Speaker, quite obviously

I have not contacted anyone to do away with any invitation that has been made.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary—

Mr. T. Reid: I have the floor still!

Does the Prime Minister consider his remarks in the House this afternoon to be in effect an instruction to the chairman and the secretary of that committee to tell the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation, who are already preparing a brief for the committee, not to come next Wednesday and the same thing to the Ontario institute?

Mr. MacDonald: Of course they are.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would like to think I was relatively specific. There was nothing in what I said this afternoon that would in any way instruct the chairman—because I would not instruct the chairman or the secretary of the committee—not to extend the invitation to the OSSTF or to the institute or any other body.

Mr. Nixon: Both sides of the question at the same time.

Mr. Lewis: It is a bad way to start.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no. We are trying to start the right way.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

A supplementary question? The member for Sudbury East has the floor for a supplementary question.

Mr. Lewis: Not dictating the activities of the committee? Look at the Premier's announcement this afternoon.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): In view of the fact that it states; "which said committee shall be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as deemed by this House," may I ask what, specifically, the committee on natural resources was to discuss on instruction from this House?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I talked to no chairman nor any of the standing committees of this House.

Mr. Martel: Then what was the purpose of meeting yesterday if all the powers must come from the House before we can discuss anything?

Hon. Mr. Davis: To establish the committees.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The whole day off.

Mr. Nixon: A waste of a whole day.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Will the Prime Minister give consideration—

Mr. Singer: What a place to play politics—in the Legislature. A terrible place!

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Singer: Look at the Minister of Energy—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: Will the Prime Minister give consideration to amending the resolution which established the standing committees to give to the standing committees powers, in his discretion, to call before them any persons or groups they desire in the absence of any specific direction from this House?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I really am not sure that this entire discussion is in order. It is not my intention to alter the resolution at this precise moment, no.

As I said—and I hope for the last time this afternoon—there will be resolutions introduced referring work to the committee, and I think in a way that even the members opposite, in a very objective way, will agree to.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Now do not try to placate us.

Mr. Ben: In the absence of any direction from this House—in other words in a vacuum—will this House empower these committees to call before them groups or individuals at their discretion?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it is there now.

Mr. Ben: It would be great if it is not.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question?

Mr. K. C. Bolton (Middlesex South): A supplementary, please: May I ask what were the specific instructions given to the committees for next Wednesday, so we know what we are to deal with rather than wasting nearly 15 minutes of the whole day?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I guess it is now for the seventh time—I said there would be resolutions or motions introduced that would be referring work to the standing committees. This will be done well before next Wednesday.

Mr. Makarchuk: The Prime Minister has wasted years of our time!

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

OSC SUSPENSION OF STOCKBROKERS

Mr. Nixon: A question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs: Is he going to undertake an investigation into the circumstances and procedures undertaken by the Ontario Securities Commission in privately suspending two Toronto stockbrokers, and nine months later, arranging for a private appeal on that suspension?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): I had not thought of conducting an investigation. I shall certainly make myself aware, Mr. Speaker. If there is any particular point of information the hon. member would like to know, if he will direct the question to that I will endeavour to satisfy him.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: The thing I am concerned about knowing it, would the minister be prepared to make available a report of his investigations as to why these particular procedures should be carried on in private when the Ontario Securities Commission is specifically established to deal, I had understood, in a public way with the protection of the public?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, it is not my understanding that all investigations of the Ontario Securities Commission have to be conducted in public. I certainly would anticipate that in many of these investigations there are matters which affect the reputations of individuals, matters of business concern, that are not really for public information. I do not know the reason for the delay, if that is the hon. member's point of inquiry. I could find out. I would be glad to do that and answer it.

Mr. Nixon: And to make a report?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I do not say I would necessarily make a report available, because I think many of these reports are not for publication for the reasons I indicated.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): To the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, through you, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact the promoters involved in this case are Messrs. Feeley and McDermott, of some fame in this city, does the minister not think that the public has a right to be informed of what these gentlemen have done?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The public, Mr. Speaker, may have a right to a very considerable amount of information. All I have said is that other persons are involved as well as the gentlemen the hon. member named. They might be quite innocent, yet their reputations might be damaged in a serious way—that is their business reputations. I would only say that we will make available to the public the fullest information possible; but I do not for a moment say that the full conduct of the investigation is a matter that I would, at this moment, say should be made public.

Mr. Shulman: A second supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: If, after the conclusion of the hearings, it is found that the other gentlemen involved are found guilty, will the minister then agree to release all the results of the investigation?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know what the hon. member means by the expression “found guilty.” They may have contravened certain rules of the commission. They may have broken certain regulations under the Act—

Mr. Lewis: That means “not innocent.”

Mr. Simonett: Pinhead, will let you know.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Thanks, I am glad the member has come to that conclusion.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If they are found guilty of an infraction of law for which they can be prosecuted, they will be prosecuted.

An hon. member: “Found guilty,” the minister says?

ODC LOAN PROGRAMME

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I really do not know just how the time is progressing, but I do have one more question of the hon. minister of Trade and Development.

What procedures does he have through ODC to, let us say, police or insist that those companies in receipt of forgivable loans do come up to their minimum requirements in the provision of jobs?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, the machinery is within the corporation—to keep on top of the situation—to make sure that they do. Now if the hon. member is asking me precisely

how they go about this I cannot give him that detail, but it seems to me to be relatively simple to keep in touch with the corporation or the company.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Since it is reported that 20 per cent are in violation of their agreement, then obviously the government is not getting its money's worth out of the money that the Legislature votes for this purpose.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. Leader of the Opposition referring to the item which was in the newspaper which claimed that some of them did not live up to their agreement in respect of the number of those who were employed?

Mr. Nixon: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, there are some whose intention it was to carry out their agreement and because of the downturn in the economy—because of unemployment generally—some of those people, through no fault of their own, are not able to employ the number they had agreed to. I am sure the hon. member would not suggest that we take punitive action against those companies merely because, through no fault of their own—through the fault of the economy generally—they find that they cannot employ quite the number they agreed to employ in the original instance.

Mr. Nixon: Surely before the minister enters into an agreement they have to have an undertaking on their side? Is there not a concrete, signed undertaking before they get the free money?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is such an agreement, Mr. Speaker. I have discussed this with my officials and my officials advise me that where in their opinion it is not the fault of the company, that it is a matter of conditions generally, where the company is doing everything it can to live up to its commitments, they take this into consideration.

For example, there was a company, I think it was Westinghouse, which did not carry out its commitment in this respect because of actions on its own initiative. They were given a \$250,000 loan; the money was demanded back and we got a cheque for it, because through their own actions they did not carry out their commitment.

Mr. Nixon: What about the ones who do not fulfil and do not send the money back? Surely the minister has to take some action?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. member would agree it is reasonable to expect that if a company, for example, has promised to put into effect say 25 jobs immediately because of the assistance it has had from ODC, and it runs into this situation we are in right now, the economy being in the state it is in now, where it can only employ say 20, because its orders have fallen away, because of the economy generally. It is doing whatever it can to live up to its commitments, and as I say through no fault of its own they are unable to do so. We separate those from the companies which have no intention of living up to their agreement. I have pointed out the action we take in those instances.

If the hon. member has any situation where he feels a company has not lived up to its agreement on its own initiative and this particular situation does not occur in that particular instance, I would like to know of it because I would like to investigate it myself.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth has a supplementary?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Yes sir. By way of a supplementary, could the minister indicate what form of investigation took place into the reported bankruptcy of Brocair Systems Limited, of Brockville, which received \$139,083 in May of 1969? How much of this money has been recovered, or is it the intention of ODC to recover any?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that matter is being looked into at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peterborough has a supplementary?

Mr. Pitman: I have a supplementary. I wonder if the minister would be good enough to give the Legislature, which has voted the money, a list of the companies which are in arrears, which have not carried out their performance, and an indication as to what degree that performance has not been carried out?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will have to be careful in answering that statement. My first intention, Mr. Speaker, is to say of course that it should be the business of the Legislature to know this.

There may very well be—and I am not saying that is the case—there may very well be a situation where it would do the company a great deal of harm in its operation.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Oh, come now, we have heard that. That is a lot of nonsense.

Mr. Lewis: It is job money.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, do not get excited, I started out—

Mr. J. Renwick: Let the minister tell us he will give us the information.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just a moment!

I started out by saying that, Mr. Speaker. I also added that it is a simple thing merely to say, because it involves public funds, that the public has a right to know everything. When you are the minister and you see what situations may arise if you make some of these things public and you trigger off a situation where there will be more jobs lost because of the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now just a moment! Do the members opposite want answers to their questions or do they not? I will sit down and not bother answering if that is the way they feel about it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it seems reasonable to me. I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, that I know of any such situation, but I am attempting to be honest with the members of the House. It just does occur to me that quite possibly the credit of a company may be impaired, its operations may be impaired, and obviously we would be blamed as a government if we made public information which would trigger off more unemployment. Now that is all I am saying.

If the hon. member has any specific situation in mind I will look at it and find out if—

Mr. Lewis: Yes, what about the statements which were made by the minister's director. Those are the specific situations.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I guess they do not want an answer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Scarborough West a further supplementary?

The member for Wentworth has the floor, has he a further supplementary?

Mr. Deans: Yes sir, a supplementary: Might I ask the minister whether in the instance that I mentioned he intends to make that information available to the House?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It seems ridiculous to ask a question supplementary to an answer which I was not able to give! Now if hon. members want to hear me give them a reply and ask a supplementary question, I would be glad to consider it, but I was not able to give the reply to the last question.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East has a supplementary?

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question to the minister: Has the managing director—Mr. Etchen, I believe—submitted his resignation to the minister?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, he has not, Mr. Speaker, and I have not heard of that before either. I would think that under the circumstances it was not a very nice question to ask.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, it was not. The hon. member is implying something wrong with a civil servant who is employed by my department. If the member has anything to say about that let him get up and say it. Why does he not get up and say it if he thinks he should resign?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. T. Reid: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. My question was, "Has Mr. Etchen, the present managing director and vice-chairman, submitted his resignation?" I object, sir, on a point of personal privilege, to the minister accusing me of criticizing a civil servant.

I did not ask the minister whether they are going to fire him, I asked whether that gentleman had submitted a resignation because he cannot stomach the minister's policies.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Cannot stomach our policies? What does the member mean by that?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for Scarborough West has the floor for a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Along with all the other information he is tabling, would the minister table the names of the 13 companies for which subsidies have been cancelled because they did not proceed with their announced intention to build or expand their plants?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will take that under advisement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron-Bruce has a supplementary?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I wondered if the minister could give the House any indication as to whether the ODC is giving these companies which are in arrears additional time; and if so how much additional time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have not any such information. I will be glad to get it for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Peterborough a further supplementary?

Then the member for Scarborough West has the floor for questions.

COST OF EDUCATION

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker: I am not sure I caught all of the Premier's statements before orders of the day. Did he announce that Dr. McCarthy would be undertaking a one-man commission into the cost of education in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, I did not announce that. I announced that Dr. McCarthy would be involved with the royal commission on book publishing and that he would also be related to the question of an assessment of costs and many other aspects, the terms of which will be announced by the Minister of Education very shortly.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, did the Premier cast Dr. McCarthy in a specific role in relation to this question of costs?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker. He will be part of a study group that will be making this assessment—

Mr. J. Renwick: That is very specific.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary—

Hon. Mr. Davis: —the details of which, Mr. Speaker, I said in the statement, will be announced by the Minister of Education.

Mr. Lewis: What is the habitual pattern of first Dr. Wright and now Dr. McCarthy, to analyze the costs of the system over which they themselves have presided? Is there not some value of an independent look at the costs of the system?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the first point that needs to be made is that Dr. Wright, who is the chairman of the commission on post-secondary education—

Mr. Lewis: Sure! The government knows what happened to that commission.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right. It has done very well.

Mr. Lewis: It was quarrelling internally and the Premier stepped in. The hon. minister knows it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the commission is not quarrelling internally. It has done a very excellent amount of work and will continue to do so, no question whatsoever. He has not been—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: For the member for Scarborough West to say that Dr. Wright has been presiding over the university system, of course, is a statement of non-fact.

Mr. Lewis: When the Premier was Minister of Education was he not Deputy Minister of Education?

An hon. member: Dr. Wright was the chairman.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am amazed, literally amazed, that the member for Scarborough West is so ill-informed. I am talking about Dr. Wright who has always been chairman of the committee on university affairs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I will go back to the question I asked. Was Dr. McCarthy not involved as deputy minister in the educational system?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, Dr. McCarthy most certainly was involved.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Then I take it that the hon. minister has again appointed the most senior official in the related area to examine the costs over which the hon. minister himself officiated through the years of his tenure?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there are very few men in this province who are more qualified than Dr. McCarthy.

Mr. J. Renwick: We understand that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Right.

Mr. Lewis: Like the Minister of Justice and Attorney General, the Premier feels wounded about the persecution of his civil servants.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I never feel wounded.

Mr. J. Renwick: That is why Dr. Band is chairman of the review board of the welfare system of the province.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question.

Mr. Pitman: I realize the Premier will be giving further details, but could he indicate whether there will be open hearings and open submissions in relation to this investigation into the costs of education being directed, or at least related, to Dr. McCarthy's role?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the statement made it very clear that Dr. McCarthy would be related to it. Of course there will be submissions, open hearings and everything else.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary, the member for—

Mr. Lewis: And "everything else." What is everything else?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. Only those things that are associated with—

Mr. J. Renwick: Et cetera.

Mr. Pitman: I do not want to impinge on the Prime Minister further. Would the hon. minister indicate what kind of a staff will be assigned to Dr. McCarthy and the degree of detail and the length of time this will take, and the exact nature of this investigation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will get a copy of the statement to the member for Peterborough. I said in the statement that the details of this would be announced to the members of this House by the Minister of Education very shortly.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East has a supplementary?

Mr. T. Reid: Will Dr. McCarthy continue in his position as Deputy Minister of Education while he is evaluating the education system? If so, will there be any witness when he interviews himself?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the very sarcastic and facetious tone of the latter part of the question.

Mr. Singer: Very clever.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, it is.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier is discerning.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am discerning, and once again I am quite amazed, because in my statement, Mr. Speaker, relating to the committee on government productivity, I very specifically stated that one Dr. E. E. Stewart was to become the new Deputy Minister of Education. I guess the answer to the question is really very self-evident.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): It is hard to tell.

Mr. T. Reid: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will Dr. McCarthy, who is going to investigate the costs of education, be interviewing the former Deputy Minister of Education concerning his policies over the last few years?

Mr. Speaker: This is quite a facetious and out-of-order question. The member for Scarborough West has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: It is not out of order. It shows how preposterous it is. The same kind of thing that happened in the committee yesterday. That is what the Premier has done. Just another avenue.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not at all!

NIAGARA ESCARPMENT PURCHASES

Mr. Lewis: I have a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests, if I may, Mr. Speaker. When the minister's department acquired the land in Caledon Township as part of its acquisition of Niagara Escarpment property, how much, at that point—I think it is within the last month—had been purchased by the government of the original recommendations in the Gertler report?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): I would be pleased, Mr. Speaker, to take this question as notice and provide the information tomorrow.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Could I then ask, by way of supplementary, if information is to be proffered—

Mr. Speaker: I think it is not proper, by way of supplementary, because there has been no answer given. Another question, perhaps?

Mr. Lewis: I have a further question then. Thank you for correcting me.

Would the minister indicate whether the land was purchased by Caledon Mountain Estates in July and August, 1969, at \$763 an acre and then resold to the government in early 1971 at \$1,450 an acre, and if in fact that is so, why did the government cost the taxpayers an extra \$300,000 for the acquisition of that land when the Gertler report was in their hands at the beginning of 1968?

Mr. Breithaupt: Who are Caledon Estates? Is that the Minister of Justice?

Mr. Sopha: It is public money.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to reply to that at the same time.

Mr. Sopha: The former Prime Minister never used to get into that trouble.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has now expired.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (London North): That is not what the member told me then.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member a bill? Yes; well after the government bills are introduced, then private bills are introduced by members.

REAL ESTATE AND BUSINESS BROKERS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendments in this bill is to permit loan corporations registered under The Loan and Trust Corporations Act to be registered under The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act. Last year, both the federal legislation and our own Provincial Loan and Trust Corporations Act were amended to permit loan companies to have real estate operations. These amendments bring The Real

Estate and Business Brokers Act into agreement with the legislation already passed by this House.

TIMOTHY INVESTMENTS LIMITED

Mr. Gilbertson moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act respecting Timothy Investments Limited.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

HUMAN TISSUE ACT, 1962-1963

Mr. Burr moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act to amend The Human Tissue Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, the amendment permits the use of a donor's body, without the authorization of next of kin where he dies outside of hospital. The amendments permit the use of a body of a person who is not a donor to be authorized by the nearest class of next of kin who are available, notwithstanding that persons in a closer relationship exist that are not available.

THUNDER BAY FOUNDATION

Mr. Meen moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act respecting the Thunder Bay Foundation.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day, there is a matter that last week was raised in the House. The hon. member for Riverdale asked me to have research done to disclose whether it could be said to be a practice of this House that ministers of the Crown be not included in the membership of the standing committees. This has now been done and I am pleased to share with the members the interesting results of such research.

In 1946 the membership of ministers on standing committees was quite large; 12 on each of two committees; 10 on two others, nine on four, eight on one and four on two. It is to be noted that the Prime Minister of the day was a member of all standing committees.

This practice and pattern continued for some years and it is interesting that in 1949 when the standing committee on privileges and elections was very active, it was under the chairmanship of the hon. Leslie M. Frost, the Treasurer.

In 1950 there appeared to be some effort to reduce the size of the committees. However, the number of cabinet ministers on such committees was still very high; only two having as few as two ministers and several having six and seven. The Prime Minister of the day was on two committees.

In more recent times it is to be noted that the number of committees had grown to 17 and that there were still as many as six and seven ministers on several of the committees. Moreover, the number of ministers on the other committees actually appeared to have increased since 1950.

It was in the session of 1964 that the practice of omitting most ministers from the committees started. I am advised that the reason for this was that the committees were smaller and the striking committee felt that the ministers, who might find difficulty in attending because of their workload, should give place to the private members who were anxious to serve. However, this was certainly not consistent practice as ministers have served on committees from time to time since that date.

No foundation can be found for the contention that it is a common parliamentary practice to omit ministers from membership on committees. It is obvious that in jurisdictions where the balance between the government side and the opposition is close it would be impossible for the government party to man the committees if ministers were excluded.

It is interesting to observe that in Manitoba it is not only the practice to include ministers on committees in the present closely balanced Legislature, but in fact this has always been a practice since the creation of the province. An even more interesting practice is that in the past almost all standing committees in Manitoba have been chaired by members of the cabinet; and in the present Parliament this practice continues, at least with the committee charged with legal affairs which is chaired by the Attorney General.

It seems to be the antithesis of our parliamentary system to suggest that ministers should not be on committees. Under our system they are chosen from among the members of the House so that they will be responsive and responsible to the House, and to bar them from one of the most important functions of the House would be inconsistent. It must be remembered that the ministers have a dual function and that as members of the assembly they have the same duties, rights and privileges as all other members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, just one thing with regard to the statement you have just given to the House: In fixing on the date of 1946 as the first date in which that happened, do I conclude correctly that that was the first occasion in which ministers became involved in committees of the Legislature?

Mr. Speaker: I am advised by the Clerk, who of course is very knowledgeable in these matters, and what I was about to have said myself was that 1946 seemed to be a reasonable time—25 years or so back—and the research was started then. But there have been many cases in the past—in fact I have looked them up myself—where ministers have been on committees. Therefore, it is not a recent development within the period of the administration, or at least of the party which has formed the government since that time.

Mr. MacDonald: Since 1946?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a further point of information, I am rather curious as to the references to the government of Manitoba being the criteria by which this Legislature is governed in determination of such a question. Would it by any chance be influenced by the fact that there is a New Democratic Party government in the province of Manitoba at the present time?

Mr. Speaker: I thought that the hon. member would be interested in what our sister province is doing, and particularly since the question came from a member of that party, I thought he would be interested in knowing what practice his party, in power, followed. I was sure the other members would be interested in that also.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on another point of information: As I understand the standing orders of this House at the present time, if there is any question of custom that has to be decided, reference will be made not only to the custom of this House but also to the custom of the Parliament at Ottawa. I am interested to know—

Mr. Singer: He is at his pettifogging best again today.

Mr. J. Renwick: I am interested to know whether or not in the Parliament at Ottawa, in the House of Commons, it is customary for ministers to be members of the standing committees of that House.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure that there are many ways for the member to find that out. As

far as I am concerned, the practice in this House has been the tradition which we follow, and if the traditions are not here and the facts are not here, then we go elsewhere. In this case we do not need to go elsewhere. But as a matter of information, and as I said in order to let the member know what the party he represents is doing and let the hon. members know, I included the Manitoba reference.

This is not to become a debate. If the hon. member wishes to have further research made I am sure the Clerk will arrange it for him and provide the necessary information.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, if I may just, on this particular statement, make the position of this party perfectly clear, the subject of such further research, as Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order! This is not a place for a debate.

The hon. member asked for certain information. I have tried to give it to him. Now if he is not satisfied with it that is fine; I have done the best that I think I can do under the circumstances. I will be glad to provide additional information if he wishes it, but this is not the place to debate it.

If he wishes to make a submission that he wants some additional information I am sure that the Clerk's Office, which is the main research office for this House, will be glad to undertake it. Now does he wish to ask for certain other information?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I certainly wish to ask for certain other information, and subject to such further research as Mr. Speaker may have available to him for the purposes of informing this House, and subject of course to this party forming a minority government—in which case it would have to take advantage of the opportunity of appointing certain ministers—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is asking a question.

Mr. J. Renwick: —to the standing committee of the Legislature—I would certainly say that in our view the evolution of the parliamentary system would indicate that the practice of appointing ministers of the Crown is a policy which should now cease.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is making a speech now. If he wants further information and will ask me for it, I will try to see it is provided.

Mr. J. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: Oh the hon. member is not going to subside like that even if he is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we might have a little recess here and have something a little more pleasant because it will give us the time to recoup ourselves. Before the orders of the day, as has been my custom when one group of legislative pages has been about to leave, I wish to draw to the attention of the members of the House the names and home ridings of those pages who now serve us. These boys will be leaving us tomorrow, although the girls will be serving for a further period.

Those who are now completing their tour of duty are as follows:

Ian Barr of Toronto, from the riding of Eglinton; Paul Figueroa of Toronto, from the riding of Eglinton; John Free of Whitby, from the riding of Ontario South; Peter Frise of Richmond Hill, from the riding of York Centre; Peter Grespan of Kitchener, from the riding of Kitchener; Jim Irwin of Dunnville, from the riding of Haldimand-Norfolk; Robert Kyle of Port Hope, from the riding of Durham; Khan Majid of Scarborough, from the riding of Scarborough East; Jeff Marshall of Bay Ridges, from the riding of Ontario South; George Morrison of Thunder Bay, from the riding of Fort William; John Newcomb of Elliot Lake, from the riding of Algoma-Manitoulin; David O'Brien of Peterborough, from the riding of Peterborough; Brian Paul of Willowdale, from the riding of York Mills; Scott Payne of Iroquois, from the riding of Grenville-Dundas; Anson Quon of Toronto from the riding of St. Andrew-St. Patrick; Robbie Sagar of Scarborough from the riding of Scarborough West; Kent Sheridan of Scarborough from the riding of Scarborough North; Jack Siegel of Toronto from the riding of York-Forest Hill; Raymond Stericker of Scarborough from the riding of Scarborough Centre; Mark Stevens of Morrisburg from the riding of Grenville-Dundas; Cary Watson of Toronto from the riding of St. David; Kevin Wells of Etobicoke from the riding of York West.

I think perhaps some day, if we live long enough, we may see some of these young people back here occupying the seats we have had and indicating, as they did in their mock Parliament the other day, how well they can manage the affairs of the province.

The hon. member for Scarborough West on a point of order.

Mr. Lewis: I have a point of order, Mr. Speaker, which I am purposely raising now because I was not sure whether I should interrupt the proceedings before. I hope you will grant me the indulgence.

I would like you to explain to me if possible, sir, why it is that the chairman of the human resources committee, before whom a specific resolution was passed yesterday, has no report to make to the House indicating the content of that resolution today, since he is now in his place in the House.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, when a major resolution is passed by committee, or several resolutions, for subsequent debate by members of the House in the very context which was put to us earlier by the Premier, it is a simple matter of custom for the chairman of the committee to inform the House.

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West): No, it is not!

Mr. Speaker: I do not know whether the chairman wishes to speak to the matter. It is quite in order as far as I am concerned, but in the first place I have no way of dealing with it as Speaker of the House because the committee is a law unto itself within the authority delegated to it. It would seem to me that the next move would be for the committee to have the report presented, and if the chairman does not present it then I presume the vice-chairman or a member can do so.

Secondly, of course I presume the motion is duly recorded in the minutes of the committee and eventually it will come before the House. But until something comes, there is not very much Mr. Speaker can do about it.

Mr. Lewis: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, if I may.

Mr. Lewis: Well, go ahead.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, I feel it is very important that Mr. Speaker consider these matters. As I recall the functioning of the committee in the past, it has often happened, or has happened in my experience, that the committee would undertake to invite people to appear before them and undertake certain other things without reporting it to the House. Also it was the custom—and I think it would be required—to report to the House on duties and matters assigned to it by the House.

That is the whole problem that we have here, since the Premier has stated—and Mr.

Speaker is going to examine it, I hope—that the committee can do nothing that is not sent to it formally by the House, and then of course it would have to make a formal report back. But certainly there have been instances—and the old standing committee on education is a good case in point—where expenditures were entered into—we went out from this House to examine matters in other parts of the province, we entered into decisions to call people before us in order to get their views—without getting permission or reporting back to the House specifically at all.

Mr. Lewis: I agree.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, by way of speaking to this point of order, it seems to me the dilemma we faced a few moments ago, which caused some tensions between myself and yourself, is now right out on the table.

Your comment, sir, was that there was nothing officially before the House because we got no report from the committee. Now if the committee is not supposed to report back, then nothing will ever be before the House. It seems to me, sir, this is another area where if there are going to be debates and the kind of differences of opinion that have emerged earlier this afternoon, then somebody should say to the committees—and I suggest, sir, it might be your prerogative—that there should be a report back.

I grant that the Leader of the Opposition is correct: We are moving into a new kind of straitjacket. It used to be that the committee could summon people by resolution—they could do lots of things by resolution—and now, presumably, like little boys, we have got to come back to teacher and get approval before we do it.

Those presumably are the new rules under which we are operating. But if those are the rules then let us live up to them, and after every meeting everything that we have done will have to come back to this House and be approved before we can proceed further.

Mr. Lewis: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, could I ask—if it is not presuming too much—whether the chairman of the committee wished to say anything to the House about the matter.

Mr. Speaker: Well, this may or may not be a debate, and if it is a debate then of course the hon. member has spoken once and he would be out of order.

Mr. Lewis: I was on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: But is it a debate on a point of order? All I wish to say to this, and particularly to the hon. member for York South—and I have already asked the chairman if he wished to speak—is that this, I think, is the proper place for the matter to be raised, or when the order for reports was called—not in the question period.

I quite agree that it is something that should be brought before the House, and I think it is now properly before the House and the Speaker, and I certainly now have no hesitation in saying that I will try to look into the matter and see if it falls within the Speaker's jurisdiction to do anything. The Speaker, of course, is ruled by the majority of the House, and he always has that dilemma.

But this is the proper time, in my opinion—either now or when motions were called—for this matter to be dealt with, not in the oral question time.

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, I have no comment to make at this time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order—

Mr. Singer: “No comment” point of order.

Mr. Lewis: Well, on another point of order, Mr. Speaker. Because there was no report from that committee chairman at this stage of our proceedings, I am inclined to think that the committee chairman was instructed by the Premier to say nothing during the course of the proceedings this afternoon—

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe East): That is not so.

Mr. Lewis:—and that the committee chairman should at least have had the courtesy to indicate—

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

Mr. Lewis: Well, I am coming to the point of order. I am stating the point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member should come to the point of order.

Mr. Lewis: The committee chairman should have the courtesy to inform the House of the resolution which was passed in order that the House may judge, rather than the Premier unilaterally judging, whether or not it was out of order. What right has the Premier to—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is now making a speech and is out of order.

Mr. Lewis: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, my contention is that the Premier has no right to take unto himself whether or not matters of committee are out of order, that you have no right to acquiesce in his presumption to usurp the Speaker's authority in the Legislature, and that the chairman of the committee has equally been intimidated by the proceedings today and yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo South.

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, if I might speak to the point of order. It seems to me that we are governed by the standing orders of the House insofar as committee procedures are concerned, and surely the notices of the committee indicated it was purely an organizational meeting. Since there was nothing referred to the committee for consideration, I fail to understand how any report could be made.

Mr. MacDonald: Well that is a real hamstrung—

Mr. Pitman: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me—

Interjections by hon. members.

M. Pitman: It would seem to me that the major problem which we have here is the fact that the scheduling of committee meetings has changed drastically. Apparently we are going to meet once a week, on Wednesdays. It would seem to me that Mr. Speaker might well take into consideration the responsibility of seeing that reports emanate from that Wednesday meeting and appear in this House by Thursday so that the members of that committee will know where they are going on the following Wednesday. It seems to me that the new scheduling of these meetings makes this especially incumbent upon the Speaker.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order and on the previous point of order, that government members of the committee did partake in the vote and certainly did not indicate at the time that they did not regard it as a constitutional meeting of that committee, and did not indicate that they were not prepared to go further than regarding it as an organizational meeting. They remained in the meeting, they passed several motions, and it seems rather strange indeed that government members should be prepared now to

look upon this as a non-meeting and everything that took place as a virtual denigration of the duties of that committee.

Mr. Makarchuk: They have had their wrists slapped.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): The member should know better than that.

Mr. Speaker: I have already said that I would be pleased to look into the matter and see if there is anything that lies within Mr. Speaker's power to deal with the matters which have been raised by the opposition. I also am very much aware of the rules of the House as quoted by the Deputy Speaker and also by others here today.

Orders of the day.

FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 10, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I would be guided by your direction in this matter.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister may speak first and he may reply, and close the debate; or he may wait and speak last and close the debate.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: With that advice, sir, I would like to say that in my opinion—and I am sure the opinion is shared by our department and the government of Ontario—the ultimate solution to the problems of international or interprovincial agricultural trade and supply management must be found at national level. We believe that Bill C-176, the national marketing bill now before the House of Commons, provides the legislative machinery whereby this national rationalization of production and marketing can be realized.

When I appeared before the standing committee on agriculture of the House of Commons meeting here in Toronto on January 25 last, I supported the principle of national marketing legislation. I continue to support that principle. I believe many of the problems now facing our industry in Ontario, in Quebec, in Manitoba and in fact in most of the provinces of Canada would not have occurred—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order!

Might I ask the minister before he gets too far on in this debate, if in fact Bill 10 is intended to add a new subsection, a new section 12*b*, or if it should not have meant adding a subsection 12*b* to section 8, because in reading it I have had difficulty in reconciling it. Now it may be he means it as it is printed or it may be he made an error.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer. My legal adviser is here, one of the solicitors from the department is here and—

Mr. Singer: I think it is most material to the debate if somewhere along the line, very shortly, we could get the answer.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, if I may continue. I suggest that had the national marketing legislation now before the House of Commons been in effect, in my opinion the problems we now face across Canada would not have occurred, as far as inter-provincial marketing problems are concerned.

Now as I understand it the national bill, Bill C-176, will be introduced for third reading in the House of Commons in the very near future. I am advised by the office of the Minister of Agriculture of Canada that the bill has passed the standing committee on agriculture stage, has been returned to the House and will be proceeded with.

When it is passed it will provide the legislative authority at national level, but it must be complemented and supplemented by an exchange of power with the provinces. Here, Mr. Speaker, I wish to assert that I have assured the office of the federal Minister of Agriculture that we in Ontario will introduce the necessary amendments to our Farm Products Marketing Act to bring it in line with the national legislation, to provide for the reciprocal exchange of the necessary legislative powers.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I believe that the urgency of the situation which we now face in the province of Ontario makes it imperative that we move on the passage of this bill, which I now present for second-reading consideration of the House. This matter has been brought to our attention because of certain infractions against the regulation provided by the Broiler Chicken Producers Marketing Board, implemented last September 3. The Broiler Chicken Producers Marketing Board of Ontario had little trouble enforcing its regulations until just recently.

As a matter of fact, within the last few days, they found that there were certain individuals who would not adhere to the market permit regulation. I think it only fair

to say that those who do not adhere to this regulation will have a distinct advantage over those who do. It seems to me that if we are going to have legislation we must have legislation that is effective for all to live under. I do not think we can make fish of one and flesh of another.

I think we must have uniformity in this particular regard. This is why I have brought forward this legislation, fully realizing that we recognize the powers that are contained in the national bill. We believe that that is the ultimate solution. We have no assurance as to when that bill will pass the House of Commons; and even if it were to pass, I believe the necessary hearings that will be required to be held in getting the legislative machinery in operation, the regulations in operation, that it is quite conceivable that many months might elapse.

With regard to hearings that might be held before the Supreme Court of Canada, I cannot give any assurance as to when that will happen. We have heard rumours there is no possibility the hearing can take place before sometime next fall. In the meantime, with the threat of wholesale introduction of broiler chickens into the Province of Ontario from outside of this province, I believe the welfare of the broiler chicken producers within the Province of Ontario is at stake.

In this instance I beg the favourable consideration of the House, Mr. Speaker, through you, for the passage of the legislation in second reading; and I would hope that it would pass third reading and be given royal assent as quickly as possible.

Mr. Singer: Does the minister have an answer to the point of order?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My solicitor advises me that it was clearly intended to add a new section as section 12*b*.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, perhaps pertaining to the point of order and the minister's answers to my colleague from Downsview, we will have more to say about that, but we have certainly examined the bill very carefully indeed. As a farmer myself I can tell you, sir, that I am aware of the problems that the primary food producers in this province are facing.

As a matter of fact, we attempted to raise these problems in what amounted to a supply debate on the second day of the session. I felt at that time the problems should have been given more substantial consideration by members on all sides of the House.

You may recall, sir, that our amendment at that time was voted down by the Conservatives in support of the administration, as well as the NDP. There is a feeling, I think by too many people, not only in this House but in the community of Ontario, that the welfare of the agricultural producer is something of even tertiary importance, political and otherwise. I think it is a good thing that this debate comes along at this time when we perhaps can examine at least some of the details specifically referred to by the hon. minister in his presentation of the bill for second reading.

It is not my intention to spend much time on the history of the development of this interprovincial warfare, which has come to be known as the "egg and chicken war." But the minister knows that for the past four years there has been an escalation of the competition among provinces, particularly those of the primary producing provinces that want to expand their markets among the consumers in other provinces.

This is true not only of chickens and eggs, but of beef and hogs, tobacco to some limited extent, and certain other products.

I think it was in Regina in 1968 that the Ministers of Agriculture, including the minister of Ontario, and officials of the various departments as well as those people concerned with the egg industry met in order to discuss their common problems. At that time the consensus was that national legislation was the best answer.

We of course, have marketing legislation assisting our primary producers of eggs and other products in this province, but obviously when it comes to interprovincial trade there are terrible difficulties, constitutional and otherwise. There are national difficulties in exerting provincial controls, particularly to the exclusion of markets outside our provincial boundaries, but not outside our national boundaries.

A further discussion took place among the ministers in November, 1968, and it was decided that the problems associated with eggs were definitely as important as for other products—broilers, chicken and turkey evidently, hogs and tobacco and other products that could be mentioned. This culminated in March 1970, with the introduction in the Parliament of Canada of Bill 197.

I think it is unfortunate that the bill did not proceed to proclamation. Parliament adjourned without final disposition. There was substantial objection from among those mem-

bers, particularly from the western part of Canada, who have never felt that they could accept this sort of marketing legislation with their views of free enterprise and agricultural development. I think there was a time in this province when there was much sympathy for that attitude, but we have come a long way since then and we do not feel that our rights have been unduly trespassed upon by legislation.

There are always complaints, certainly, but as a primary producer myself I have examined the area of controls in the milk field and have felt that our marketing system in that particular area is working as well as could be expected. But now we find that the problems we are facing, particularly with the Province of Quebec, are escalating to the point that sometimes we are losing if not our objectivity at least some of our good judgement.

It is true that the federal legislation was reintroduced this year as Bill C-176. As the minister has already said, it has had approval in principle and has had detailed discussion in committee over a long period of time and has been reported from committee to the House.

The minister is correct when he says there is no way of knowing when it will be approved by third reading. It will be considered by the Senate, would get royal assent and would become the law of the nation. There are those who feel that this could be accomplished before the end of next month, but there is no way of saying for sure. However, this bill has been delayed for a good long period of time.

The minister and anyone else interested in the agricultural industry knows the source of the delay and I need not refer to it in any particular here. All we know is that the legislation has been before Parliament for two years and it has now received approval in principle and has been reported by the standing agricultural committee.

During this period of time the Province of Quebec, having some substantial difficulties with both the egg and the broiler market has brought forward its own legislation. It has developed an organization called FEDCO which has substantial powers to control marketing in that province. Egg marketing is their main responsibility because they have found that this province, producing a surplus of eggs, has found it to its advantage to use Quebec as an additional market for this product from here.

On the other hand, the province of Quebec has tremendously expanded the production of

broilers largely, I think, not in the hands of the independent farmers, but it is mostly the major feed companies which have been involved in this, as in fact they are more and more in the Province of Ontario. Sometimes, we think that we are talking about the little farmer on the concession and how he is going to be affected, and we find the net results of our deliberations and regulations are perhaps more to the concern of the large feed companies than in any other area.

A part of this matter, of course, was that the regulations brought in under Quebec legislation were tested in the Supreme Court of that province and upheld. This is already a part of the discussion that took place in the previous question period in the Legislature here a few days ago. Similar regulations, in fact in some particulars identical regulations, passed under the authority of the government of Manitoba, were rejected, however, by the Supreme Court of that province and there is now—

Mr. Singer: And the Court of Appeal

Mr. Nixon: And the Court of Appeal, the member is right.

There is now pending an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. Certainly there is a tremendous division in the views of our eminent judges at the provincial level, waiting for, I suppose you would call it, the supreme decision of the national court. The minister opposite knows that in fact what we are attempting to do here this afternoon may in the future be judged illegal or beyond the powers of this Legislature. But he, in his presentation, has said that he intends to go forward in spite of that very real possibility. I think Mr. Speaker, it would be useful if I read you the judgement of Mr. Justice J. A. Dickson, delivered in Manitoba in this particular reference. I quote:

I hold the view the proposed legislation is bad on the grounds it infringes the exclusive federal power given by section 91 (2) of The British North America Act. It is not within section 92 of The British North America Act and would have the effect of impeding the free flow of trade between the provinces, and therefore runs counter to the section 121 of The British North America Act. Clearly, if a province can effectively prohibit the entry of eggs, it can prohibit anything else, any other product of farm or factory inevitably leading to the disappearance of a truly national economy.

That certainly is a strong and effective statement of one side of the argument. The

minister, I think, in his presentation here has upheld the other side but we are not concerned with that approach. We are concerned with the protection of our own farmers. That means that this is essentially a sensitive subject indeed because we have to recognize that this minister, as Minister of Agriculture and Food of Ontario, must consider that as an important responsibility and he must also take a broader view.

I, for one, have often felt that Ontario must lead the other provinces in a moderate and judicial approach to legislation which the minister knows is certainly examined, if not copied, by other jurisdictions. The approach that he is taking through this legislation will undoubtedly lead to further escalations in what has become a trade war among the provinces, and particularly between Ontario and Quebec.

There have been reported threats, and there is no other word that can be used, on the part of the Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Quebec that if Ontario proceeds with this restrictive legislation—the powers to seize and impound and destroy if necessary—he will be forced to take similar steps to protect the egg industry in Quebec. This is what we are facing. The minister raises his eyebrows. He perhaps knows of no particular statement on the part of the Minister of Agriculture in Quebec in this regard, but we can only go by what his reported words are in the responsible press; not only of this city but in farm journals in Canada.

It surely would be the role of this Minister of Agriculture and Food and this government to provide a different form of leadership than that which is inherent in this bill—the kind of leadership which could convene a meeting of the Ministers of Agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture for Canada, maybe just the three who are directly concerned with this problem; or a broader conference if need be, in order to try to calm down the rising feelings on the part of the farm community, and particularly among the Ministers of Agriculture who have the same responsibilities that the minister sitting opposite exercises at this present time.

There are these alternatives: that we are not satisfied on this side that there has been proper communication; that we are convinced that federal legislation will contain within itself the power to solve this problem and that it may very well be available within a few short weeks. For this reason we feel there were alternatives to this course of action open to the Minister of Agriculture and Food of Ontario.

Certainly if he was going to regard this as a Canadian rather than simply as his responsibility in this province, it could have been and should have been his responsibility to take an initiative other than this—to go to Quebec again if necessary, or to Ottawa, or to any other place and meet with his opposite numbers in the other provinces who feel the pressure rising upon them.

Now we know that the economy of the farm community is in as serious a situation as it has been for many years. The price of eggs is precisely the same as it was in 1931 and the minister opposite knows in detail where the break-even price lies. I have referred to this in my remarks previously in the House on the no-confidence vote that we brought before you a few days ago, Mr. Speaker.

We know that hog producers and others are facing the kind of problem that seems to be insoluble, where they have followed all of the advice of the experts representing the minister's economic branch, the experts in the extension branch and from the University of Guelph, the Ontario Agricultural College. They have consolidated their lands; they have concentrated on one form of production, whether it be eggs or broilers or beef; and still they are facing almost insurmountable problems.

Many of them have loans from the Industrial Development Bank of Canada or farm loans at the federal level which has given them a commitment to a process which in fact they now find does not return them sufficient funds even to meet their day-to-day payments. This in the face of the fact that their feed bills went up by an average of \$1 per ton per month over the last many months.

These are the problems they face, and the minister and I and others in the House are as aware of them as anyone. But surely there has to be an approach of co-operation among the provinces rather than the exclusive exertion of these very extraordinary rights and powers which are requested in the legislation which is before us.

We feel that the minister has acted precipitately. We feel he had alternatives in negotiation which he has not examined and that there are alternatives in legislation at the federal level which can and should be expedited. We hope that they may be and will be. For these reasons we cannot support the legislation as it presently is.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member—I have been following his speech with interest—what are those suggestions at the federal level that can be implemented now? What are they? The hon. member says there are things we can do at the federal level.

Mr. Nixon: Certainly one of the suggestions—and I have particularly tried to avoid this—is for the Conservatives at the federal level to stop impeding the legislation. That is precisely—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: We are getting the catcalls from the member for York North (Mr. W. Hodgson) up in the back seat. He knows, specifically, that this legislation has been in limbo for many weeks because, specifically, of the Conservative opposition to the legislation which his own minister here in the province has said specifically he supports. That is what is holding it up.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Do not blame the Conservatives in Ottawa. Blame the majority in Ottawa.

Mr. Nixon: I would suggest to the hon. member who is interjecting—

Mr. W. Hodgson: If they want to pass the bill, all they have got to do is pass it.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, that may be the way the Conservatives in Ontario like to do democratic business but it is not the way the government of Canada proceeds, and the hon. member should know it.

This, of course, is the alternative, but even ahead of that there is the leadership of the Minister of Agriculture and Food here, who is one of, I would say the senior minister of Agriculture—is he not?—across Canada in point of tenure.

The hon. minister has met these men as they have come and gone over a number of years. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that these provinces have looked to Ontario for leadership in this area. For us to respond with this kind of legislation, I feel, is inadequate. There are no other words that can be applied. It is inadequate. It does not meet the needs of the farm community of Canada and, I suspect, it will not meet the needs of the farm community of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, there are the alternatives that I have put before you. There is serious criticism of this type of approach, phrased

in the report that Mr. McRuer has written, which the hon. colleague of the Minister of Agriculture and Food is reading at this time and which my colleague from Downsview will bring to your attention.

I feel that it must be a matter of careful consideration before this House approves the legislation which is brought before it. It may very well be that when negotiations reach an impasse we will have to have this sort of regulation and power. It may be that, if the delays at the federal level—and we know the cause of those delays—are continued, then action in this Legislature will be necessary. But action right now is precipitate. I think it is ill-considered. I do not believe it is in the best interest of Canadians or even of those Canadians who make their living as farmers.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Downsview that Bill 10 be read a second time on this day six months hence.

Mr. K. C. Bolton (Middlesex South): Mr. Speaker, we in the New Democratic Party have examined this bill very carefully. We recognize the urgency that has been—

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

I have an amendment to the motion which has to be put.

Mr. Nixon moves, seconded by Mr. Singer, that Bill 10, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act, be read a second time on this day six months hence.

Mr. Bolton: Mr. Speaker, we in the New Democratic Party have examined this bill thoroughly. We recognize the urgency of the problem. We believe that this bill does not meet the needs of the day.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, the other day I asked the minister a number of questions which provoked an answer which surprised me. I asked when the bill would be brought forward. I also asked if he would, in presenting the bill, give us the comparative figures of what is exported into Quebec compared to what we import from Quebec.

The reason, of course, this question was asked was that this is, basically, a problem between Ontario and Quebec, with a suggestion that Quebec may wish to retaliate if our attitude here is too stringent.

I also asked the question, which I did with very genuine concern and with no intention of trying to provoke the minister, if he could assure us that there would be no balkanization. This term seemed to inflame

the minister, if he will permit me to say this. He accused me of mouthing, which I believe is done more by ventriloquists' dolls than by human beings, the concern of the New Democratic Party of Manitoba.

I took the expression "balkanization" from a letter addressed to the minister himself by an inhabitant, a native of Ontario, a very prominent farmer of this province, who had this to say:

Regarding the so-called "chicken-egg war," why has this matter not been referred to the Supreme Court of Canada and why does the Ontario government allow itself to be a party to the balkanization of Canada by protecting a group of integrators in Quebec, and at the same time allow the federal government to use this "chicken-egg war" as a smokescreen to justify Bill C-176, which in its present form Ontario farmers do not want?

With that specific reference to the merits of this statement, I use the term "balkanization" because I am concerned, not about the balkanization of Ontario—and here the minister misinterpreted me—I am concerned that this is one country of 10 provinces. It is a country in which the primary producer is having an extremely difficult time to make ends meet.

In every province the farmer is caught in a cost-price squeeze. It is vital that the farmers of this country, and the primary producers in general, should ally themselves together and work co-operatively.

If the minister, in speaking to this motion today, were to persuade us that this bill will hasten co-operation and delay the increase of tension between the various provinces, then we would be very happy to receive that assurance. We are not happy about the terms that are being used about this "chicken-egg war"—very generally used and not initiated by us.

In *The Farm and Country* of Tuesday, March 24, we have a heading:

PLANS BROILER SHUTDOWN

Ontario broiler growers will move aggressively this summer to recapture the Ontario chicken market lost to Quebec growers.

The Ontario Broiler Chicken Growers Marketing Board is setting quotas of \$17.4 million, up 20 per cent from last year. And "We will sell them," says John Jantzen, secretary-manager of the board. "This will be costly for Ontario, but very costly for Quebec."

Subsequently—a little history of the warfare—I have indicated March 24, 1971—sorry, 1970.

Now then May of 1970, Quebec, through the federation of egg producers, received permission to handle or license all eggs entering Quebec—the response to the broiler approach of Ontario, one would assume. July, 1970, court case in the Superior Court of Quebec upheld the decision which will be carried shortly to the Quebec Appeal Court. August, EEC gets into the act and sets up a permit system to control the out-of-province broilers.

September, 1970, Ontario government permitted Ontario Broiler Board of Control entry of broilers into the Ontario market by requiring a permit at retail level of out-of-province broilers. And along come New Brunswick, Alberta, Nova Scotia and other provinces. Alberta and Manitoba both asked the federal government to rule on these violations of the right to free provincial trade. This was not acted upon until, as you have heard, October of 1970.

Manitoba applied and was told the Supreme Court could not make a ruling at that time. So then Manitoba introduced its own regulation, and then has a ruling pending on that.

Mr. Speaker, others of my colleagues will speak on the legal problems inherent in this Act. I just want to reassert my question, initiated the other day: Can the minister give us the comparative figures as between Ontario and Quebec? Can he assure us that this Act will help to relieve rather than increase the tension between the provinces? These are considerations which are vital to our acceptance of this bill.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, it is a very difficult problem to try and understand the thoroughness with which the government embarks on courses such as the one which the Minister of Agriculture and Food would have us follow. In the question that we put to him about this Act, he made the strange admission that he had not sought the opinion of the law officers of the Crown. Nor did he intend to seek the opinion of the law officers of the Crown in Ontario.

However, this minister is a knowledgeable man and he was familiar with what had happened within the courts of Quebec and the courts of Manitoba, and certainly he was as aware as anyone was, probably more aware, of what the Manitoba Court of Appeal had said, and had said unanimously, and was aware of the judgement which my hon. leader read in part just a few moments ago.

I have to question, Mr. Speaker, and I have to question just as strongly as I can, how a responsible minister of the Crown in the Province of Ontario can, in fact, bring before us legislation about which there exists substantial doubt as to its validity. Certainly one cannot dismiss with a wave of the hand the unanimous opinion of the Court of Appeal of Manitoba. They may be wrong, but certainly they are a responsible judicial body and there was no doubt in their minds at least, that when the Province of Manitoba asked for similar powers, the province did not have that power in accordance with the interpretation by the court of appeal of The British North America Act.

One would have thought it would be almost axiomatic, Mr. Speaker, that before embarking upon this course, the Minister of Agriculture would have gone to the legal officers, the law officers of the Crown in Ontario, and asked for their opinion. But I suspect that he was afraid to. I suspect that he was not anxious to receive the opinion of those gentlemen who advise the Crown in the Province of Ontario, because I suspect that he had a pretty good idea that had their opinion been sought and had it been given they would have come down on the side of the exercise of judgement by the Court of Appeal of the Province of Manitoba.

Whether they would have or not, we are not able to tell because their opinion was never, in fact asked, and that is just beyond my understanding. Now, if it was not asked, and the minister goes one step further and says he has no intention of attempting to intervene before the Supreme Court of Canada when it hears the appeal from the Court of Appeal in Manitoba, he knows, or he should have been advised by his own Department of Agriculture legal advisers, that the Province of Ontario has a right to intervene before the Supreme Court of Canada when a constitutional point is being raised.

If the minister is, in fact, sure that his position is correct and the Court of Appeal of Manitoba is, in fact, wrong, surely another elementary step that he should have announced to the House was, "We, the government of Ontario, think that the Manitoba Court of Appeal is wrong. We have instructed our law officers to appear at the hearing of the Supreme Court of Canada, to intervene on behalf of the Province of Ontario and to sustain the position that we, in Ontario, want to take." But he has not taken that second step.

Mr. Speaker, we heard in the one speech in the Throne debate, that has been given by a cabinet minister, by the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), fulsome and well-deserved praise of the efforts put forth by James Chalmers McRuer when he tabled his very comprehensive and very useful and very effective work on civil rights in the Province of Ontario. I suppose it is just by fortuitous coincidence that today we had volume 5 of that work tabled, and in volume 5 Mr. McRuer devotes chapter 112—page 1756 all the way to page 1802—to the Farm Products Marketing Board.

He concludes by setting out some 37 recommendations, which criticize—in the strongest terms that he uses throughout any of the five volumes of this report—the present provisions and procedures of the Farm Products Marketing Board and the procedures used under it, and so many of them are pertinent to the legislation that is presently before us.

So perhaps, Mr. Speaker, there is another reason why the Minister of Agriculture neglected to get the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, because on looking through this report I note that the letter of transmittal, signed by Mr. McRuer when he transmitted this volume 5 to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Ontario, bears the date February 22, 1971.

That is almost two months ago. One would well imagine, and I think validly conclude, Mr. Speaker, that by the time this Act was ready to be introduced the law officers of the Crown might have had some intimate knowledge of the provisions of chapter 112 of the McRuer report; and had they been asked what they knew about the decision of the Court of Appeal of Manitoba, and had they been asked in light of their examination of chapter 112, I at least would conclude, Mr. Speaker, that their report about this Bill 10 would have been hardly a complimentary one.

In fact, it would have been my opinion that the law officers of the Crown, had they looked at Bill 10, looked at the decision of the Court of Appeal of Manitoba, and looked at chapter 112 of the McRuer report, would have come to the conclusion that Bill 10 is badly drafted, negatives so many of the proposals set forth by Mr. McRuer, is an invasion of civil rights, and probably is beyond the constitutional power of the Province of Ontario.

I am going to refer at some length to some of the provisions, some of the recommendations and some of the comments made in chapter 112.

In listening to the minister's introduction, he talks about the necessity for swift action and I wonder if the minister and his advisers have thought this matter through?

Here we have a bill whose constitutional validity is in doubt from its very inception. Here we have a bill which gives very, very arbitrary powers to officials of the board and of the local boards. And here we have a bill that if it is enacted and if it is attempted to be enforced, is undoubtedly going to be challenged by those people who are going to be affected by it—particularly, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there is serious doubt as to its validity.

So I ask the Minister of Agriculture, notwithstanding the fact that he was in such a rush to get this thing through, must it not be obvious that if it quickly becomes a part of the law of the Province of Ontario that almost immediately he is going to have to meet a challenge in the Courts of Ontario as to its validity? And the courts of Ontario are not going to give any ruling as to the validity of this bill until the Supreme Court of Canada has in fact disposed of the matter that is pending before them.

So, what in effect is going to happen? The minister is presenting to those people who want to challenge this bill an opportunity to continue to evade it, even if it is valid, until the definitive decision comes from the Supreme Court of Canada.

Now, wherein lies the necessity or the practicability for the hurry, for the rush, for the precipitous action the minister talks about? I think by reason of his indication that he wants this precipitous action he is just begging for trouble and he is putting Ontario into the position where it is going to have to wrestle with the validity of this bill for an indeterminate period, at least as long as the Supreme Court of Canada takes to deal with the Manitoba legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as I looked at the bill and compared it with certain provisions of the Act, the question of order which I raised at the commencement of the minister's remarks occurred to me as being a very important matter. Because if you look at the bill, the bill apparently intends to introduce a new section—only one new section—12*b*, to The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Section 12*b*, being a new section as I understand it as a lawyer, stands by itself. And section 12*b* purports to give certain powers to the farm products marketing force. However, by the time we get down to subsection 4 and again to subsection 6 of this proposed new section 12*b* the draftsmen have varied from their reference to "the board"—which means the Farm Products Marketing Board—and begin to talk in those two sections about the local boards.

So what is envisaged here is a delegation of authority from the main board—from the farm board to the local board—without any power, in fact, being given to allow such delegation. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I wondered whether or not the draftsmen might have in fact made a mistake and did really intend to introduce this new 12*b* as a further subsection to section 8.

Section 8 has a number of subsections in part 1, but in part 5 of section 8—8(5)—and the arithmetic is very difficult to explain logically in 8(5) there is power given and there is existing power for the main board to delegate its powers to the local board.

I would think, in addition to all the other points that I have raised, the fact that the Act presently before us, Bill 10, provides no power in the new section for the main board to delegate its authority to the local board, would indicate that it is unworkable. And had it been inserted as a new subsection in the existing section 8, then subsection 5 of 8 would have applied and in fact then the theme or the scheme that the department envisages could have been carried out.

But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that because it has not been done in this way—and that is why I ask the specific question—then the bill as before us falls on its face because it envisages a power to subdelegate. Certainly it is trite law to say *delegatus non potest delegare*—the person who is delegated power by the Legislature cannot delegate it further on. And section 12*b* as in this Act purports to do this, and certainly there is no legal doubt that this is an impossible feat to be accomplished by the Legislature without its specific words. And that in fact has not been done.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): What does Mr. McRuer say about that?

Mr. Singer: Well, I am going to read it to the members at some substantial length.

Mr. J. Renwick: Please do.

Mr. Singer: I am just saying—and I am sure that someone as intelligent as the hon. member for Riverdale can understand this very well—quite apart from the ability to delegate there as to be a specific power in the statute allowing it.

The point I am making now, if the hon. member for Riverdale was listening, is, as this section is presently worded there is no such additional power to delegate. There is such additional power in 8, subsection 5, but this amendment does not form a part of section 8. So therefore, on its face, Mr. Speaker, the Act is in fact bad.

Now, let us see what Mr. Justice McRuer does say. As I say, he starts to talk about the Farm Products Marketing Board at page 1756 and on page 1757 he says:

The references in section 2 of the Act to "the marketing within Ontario" and to "the producing and marketing within Ontario" are reflections of the province's incompetence to regulate the production and marketing of products in interprovincial and export trade.

That is the very thing they were talking about before the Court of Appeal in Manitoba and that is the very thing, Mr. Speaker, that I would have thought the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food would have sought an opinion of the law officers of the Crown about. But he did not.

And Mr. McRuer refers to the case "Reference re The Farm Products Marketing Act (1957), 'Supreme Court Reports' at page 198"; and specifically to Mr. Justice Rand at page 210 where the court said in that case:

The producer is entitled to dispose beyond the province without reference to a provincial marketing agency or price, shipping or other trade regulations.

Well now, if what Mr. Justice Rand said in the 1957 case means anything I would think, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest humility, it must mean that this Act is not a valid Act. What else can it do? Mr. McRuer went to great pains to point this out.

Again, Mr. Speaker, at page 176, at the bottom of the page, Mr. McRuer questions some of the things that are in The Milk Marketing Act, and the same errors again are produced here:

The device of extending the definition of "farm products" to "such other natural products of agriculture as are designated by the regulations" is, also, objectionable. The definition of "farm product" contained in the first part of the clause and the

potential consequences which may ensue to the producers and marketers of a non-included product if it is brought within the ambit of the Act, are such that the Legislature itself, and not an appointed body, should decide what the Act is intended to cover.

There we have it again, Mr. Speaker. Bill 10 delegates this power either to the main board—the Farm Products Marketing Board—or to the local boards, but the Legislature will not now, if this bill passes, make the decision. Either the main board or the sub-board will make the decision. And Mr. Justice McRuer says in unmistakably clear language “the Legislature itself, and not an appointed body, should decide what the Act is intended to cover.”

But apart from all the other criticism, Mr. Speaker, if the minister's concern is about broilers, then why does he not deal with the question of broilers in the statute? Why does the legislation itself not say that?

These provisions in this new section 12b are so broad that the appointed board and the appointed sub-board are going to make all of the decisions and the Legislature none of them. What in fact the minister is asking for is an absolute blank cheque where people one or two times removed from this body are going to make decisions and not this Legislature.

Well, Mr. McRuer's comment speaks probably better than my comment in relation to this matter, and again at page 1796 where he talks about subordinate legislative powers and I commend that immediately to the minister's urgent reading list. From page 1769 on, that whole section—talking about subordinate legislative powers, he talks about section 8, subsection 5, and that is the principle of *delegatus non potest delegare*—a delegate cannot delegate. The minister purports to do it without even bringing in a companion piece, or a similar piece to 8(5). As I said earlier, I do not think his section is valid insofar as it purports to give any power to sub-boards.

This is what Mr. McRuer says:

Under section 8(5) this power may be delegated to a local board. This provision, in fact, enables the power of delegation to be exercised without laying down any standards or guide for the local board in making laws with respect to any matter coming within the ambit of the Act and affecting wide areas of the economic life of the province.

Later on, on the same page, Mr. McRuer says:

It serves to shield loose definition of policy and imprecise draftmanship.

Well, as loose as it is in 8(5), it is looser and more imprecise in the new proposed 12b because they do not even tell us how it is going to go from the main board to the local board. So as Mr. McRuer finds fault with what already exists, what is presently intended is much worse.

Again, on page 1771, Mr. McRuer is still talking about subordinate legislative powers. He says in the paragraph about three-quarters of the way down:

The powers with which we have just been dealing are of an expropriatory nature.

And those are the powers that the minister presently envisages.

Their exercise, whether in their present form or in the form of a power of adjudication, as we recommend, should be dependent on the satisfaction of definite and objective conditions precedent. For example, the powers should only be exercisable for some definite reason, such as the financial mismanagement of the affairs of the local board in question.

Or in this case, such as dumping or deliberate price undercutting or something. The point Mr. McRuer makes again is patently obvious that where this kind of unusual confiscatory power is given by the Legislature, surely it should be spelled out in clear and unmistakable language the conditions precedent on which this kind of power is going to be allowed to be exercised. But we find none of that, sir, in the bill that is in fact before us.

Again, sir, on page 1773, Mr. McRuer says:

It is essential that the form and content of marketing laws should be subject to political control.

It is very important—political control.

We therefore recommend that both board regulations and local board regulations should not come into force until approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. The adoption of this recommendation will substantially meet the objections and criticism which we have made with respect to the power of sub-delegations.

Insofar as I have been able to ascertain in my quick reading of this chapter in McRuer's volume 5 and the existing Act and amending Act that is before us, I see no

scheme whereby the regulations that will be made by the local boards are subject to anybody's review. And this is something that Mr. McRuer points out is anathema to anyone believing in the theory of political responsibility.

The whole question of regulations of this industry gets so far beyond us that we in the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, are unable to know about what is going on, are unable to control what is going on and are going to be unable to debate what is going on, let alone the people who are going to be affected by the legislation. Because there is really no place that the people who are likely to be affected by the legislation are going to be able to go to find out what regulations are being passed by the local boards because they do not even have to be published in the *Ontario Gazette*.

Now where would one ascertain what are the regulations of the local boards? I do not know, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. McRuer makes a point that if this sub-delegation is to go on, which he abhors, then there should be some provision for their publication and their gathering together in a central place where in fact they can be found.

Mr. McRuer goes on—and he has a substantial section of this chapter, starting at page 1782, dealing with appeals; and look as I might through this new bill there is no provision for any appeals where the local board or the main board has gone in and seized and detained and disposed of products belonging to somebody else. There is no provision for appeal at all, and again one would think in this day when the Attorney General says Mr. McRuer has given this yeoman service to the Province of Ontario and established the principle of civil rights, that at least the Minister of Agriculture and Food would pay a little heed to his words. But there are no provisions for appeal in so far as these matters are concerned.

On page 1786, Mr. McRuer says:

The Farm Products Marketing Board should not be the final arbiter on the legal issues involved in these decisions. Where the decisions are predominantly of an administrative . . . nature a right of appeal should lie from the board to the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

And where they are of a legal nature then there should be provision for judicial review.

But in these new procedures, which are separated as I say from the procedures in section 8, there seems to be no such provision at all.

Mr. McRuer, in dealing with the powers exercised in relation to tobacco matters under this Act, and under section 4, I think it is, of the Act dealing with the right of inquiry and inspection, makes three observations.

First, that "they permit entry and inspection of a private dwelling." Well in this case there is not entry and inspection of a private dwelling but you can enter and inspect anything else other than a dwelling and he says that there should be some safeguard against this almost unbridled right of entry and inspection.

His second point is:

There is no restraint on the use of information that may be obtained on the inspection. The members of the local boards are those engaged in the production of the regulated product. Under this legislation, they and their inspectors are in no way restrained from using or communicating to others the information they obtain . . .

He recommends there should be such restraints in the event information is obtained. And the same thing in regard to books and records.

A question about penalties: He refers generally to the penalty section of the main statute and has great criticism about the way that section is drafted. For instance on page 1792 his recommendation is that the legislation should be amended "to define expressly what are the orders and directions referred to in section 13," which is the penalty section. It should:

—provide that they should be in writing; to provide that the orders and directions should be brought to the attention of the person concerned before their contravention can constitute an offence, and to provide that the orders and directions should state on their face that a violation thereof constitutes an offence and may be prosecuted . . .

One would think that that is sort of basic, Mr. Speaker. Those are positive recommendations made by Mr. McRuer in volume 5 dealing specifically with this Act, and here we have these new and arbitrary powers, with none of these safeguards at all, and all of this information lay within the knowledge of the law officers of the Crown, lay within the knowledge of the Attorney General, and was available to the Minister of Agriculture and Food if he had only bothered to inquire and find out what Mr. McRuer thought about the general principles that underly The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Well Mr. Speaker, I have marked several other parts of this chapter 112. Let me just refer to one or two briefly.

Mr. McRuer comes close to his conclusions on page 1797 and says:

The legislation — that is, The Farm Products Marketing Act — however, offends against many principles of orderly law enforcement and the rule of law.

There is no good reason why this legislation should not conform to ordinary rules of just procedure. The decisions which are required to be made pursuant to it appear to be primarily of a judicial nature and it would appear fair and logical that a person whose tobacco is sought to be destroyed—

And here he seeks to destroy broilers—"that a person whose broilers are sought to be destroyed," let me interpolate, "should be heard before such an order is made."

A very positive recommendation, but the Minister of Agriculture and Food hears nothing and sees nothing and does not change his ways at all.

Finally, sir, at the bottom of page 1797, Mr. McRuer says this:

As we have said with respect to similar provisions in other statutes, we can see no reason why members or employees should receive any wider protection than is afforded by the common law for those acting under statutory authority.

Because you note in the theme of this Act. Mr. Speaker, the people who are allowed these unusual and arbitrary powers can exercise them almost at their own whim and they are, or purport to be, given protection. They do not have to, according to this, provide any justification if in fact they were wrong. The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is that all of the activities, whether proper or improper if this statute became law, are exercised at the expense of those persons whose products are being taken.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very sad commentary really on the performance of this government, that it brings in such a badly researched bill, and that it has not made the necessary provisions of The British North America Act.

There it is—sections 91 and 92—and the minister knew about them and he did not even take the basic step of making inquiry from the law officers of the Crown. What is the precipitous action that is so necessary and that is going to be affected? As my leader said, certainly we take second place to no one in having concern about the protection of the agricultural industry and all

phases of it. We are concerned, Mr. Speaker, that it is very hard for many, many farmers to make even a reasonable living under the conditions that presently exist. One would expect from the Minister of Agriculture and Food something better than Bill 10.

We urge him to take it back and take another look; to read Mr. McRuer's comments about The Farm Products Marketing Act in particular; to read the decision of the Manitoba Court of Appeal.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: And the Quebec Court of Appeal?

Mr. Singer: And the Quebec Court of Appeal and evaluate them.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They are opposed—

Mr. Singer: Exactly, they are, but I suggest, sir—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: But the member has conveniently forgotten—

Mr. Singer: It does not lie with the minister to arbitrarily decide that Quebec is right or Manitoba is wrong. When he is aware of this substantial difference in legal opinion, surely the most obvious place to which he must go is to his own law officer? Is the minister afraid of going to his law officer? Why did he not? Why will he not now? If he is so sure that he is right, why does he not intervene in the case presently before the Supreme Court of Canada?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is not before the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. Singer: It is pending—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Pending, yes, next December, next January.

Mr. Singer: It is pending, yes. If the minister is going to intervene he is not going to intervene on two minutes' notice. He is not going to be able to tell his lawyers that tomorrow morning he supports the Supreme Court of Canada.

An hon. member: So that the broiler producers of this province are wiped out.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is what the Liberals want to happen in this province. That is exactly what that party's position is today.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the minister is so unhappy.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Let *Hansard* record it, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals want the broiler producers wiped out in Ontario.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I have aggravated the minister a wee bit, that his temper is on such short fuse.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I was just telling the member the truth. He is a lawyer, I am a farmer.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, one would think that it would be one of the fine criteria of any minister of the Crown, that where there is doubt he would at least inquire and use the facilities that are available to him to inquire. There is a lot of high-priced help over there, and pretty good ones too, whose job it is to give legal opinions. But there is no legal opinion from the law officers of the Crown.

Now sir, I would think that the minister should take to heart not the pat phrase that he uses—that we are against the farmers—there is nothing that is more untrue than the words he has just uttered. The only thing that is more untrue, perhaps, is that all the faults that belie the province of Ontario have their origin in the government of Canada.

Those two blatant falsehoods do not justify lack of action or improper action by this government. We, here at Queen's Park, can expect surely that when this government wants to act, wants to protect an important segment of our community, that it will do it in a way that will be effective. Our suggestion, sir, our caution, is that this bill will not do what I think all members of the House in fact want it to do. Therefore please, Mr. Minister, take the bill back, get opinions, read McRuer, bring us in a better bill, one that will stand up; and we will be amongst the first to support it.

Hon. Mr Stewart: And let the broiler growers go down the drain in the meantime, which is what the member wants them to do.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, if the minister will desist from his grandstanding, I will get on with the debate.

Mr. R. Haggerty: Is the member a farmer?

Mr. Lawlor: No, I am one of those legalists he does not like and there will be more legalisms imposed in just a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the hon. minister thinks about the human beings in the Province of Ontario, but it has struck me

that generally speaking he has an ongoing attack and harassment of the animal population, dead or alive. It was not so long ago that we had to deal with cats and dogs under particular penalties and we will all remember that somewhat disagreeable experience. Now he is attacking—either before birth, the embryo, the egg (back to the egg says the minister) or after death in the post-mortem phase of the chicken, after it has been properly embalmed. He does not wish to see it imported into the Province of Ontario.

I think this is carrying things pretty far in terms of the animal kingdom, and since they are unable to speak for themselves I think some member of this House ought to presume to speak on their behalf, again, dead or alive.

Sometimes one wonders in the course of the debates here, despite all the accolades that are rendered as to whether the law officers of the Crown really have spent any time reading McRuer and embodying the recommendations there into the heart of these bills. This minister, particularly, Mr. Speaker, has offended against that principle time and again. He just seems to be oblivious to the import of the nature of civil liberties and this legislation is a living spokesman in that particular regard.

May I commend the member for Downsview. The report had hardly arrived on our desk—it is still warm as though the hen had just laid it, so to speak—and he is able to quote at length and into its interstices, pointing out over many pages just where the hon. minister falls short in recognizing the newest report.

As most things are done in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, it is an offhand compliment, and a backhanded one too, because it does show to what extent and with what assiduity the hon. member has studied this bill in terms of the overall ramifications in McRuer. The amount of time that must have been spent in this study strikes one as the work of a great scholar.

Now there is much more in these passages I was able to peruse while the hon. member was speaking which are directed to the central point of this bill. I am not going to go into its interstices at length, because you could speak here for quite a long time as to area after area. The minister, through his office and his department, has given a half-hearted or blinking cognizance of McRuer here and there, but on the whole has missed the spirit and not really embodied the true tenor of that document in this legislation.

Albeit the legislation is, from his point of view, of great urgency and necessity, and it has to be brought before this House at the earliest possible moment, its drafting obviously was done under the impress of some expediency and the way in which it is set up here thoroughly proves that. It was not given proper review. It was not in the light of the principles of the common law given any severe scrutiny, and for that reason it fails in numerous regards.

For instance, in the right of entry on to property; the first in order of time and perhaps in order of a logical priority on to a property. There is no safeguard that the people so making this entry must do so under some qualifications or restrictions; they have the widest possible power. McRuer says there that it must be subjected to the restriction of reasonable grounds or reasonable cause at the very least, as a minimal requirement in this particular regard.

Now in the slothful way in which this legislation has been set up, at the next step of the road to seizure, once the entry has taken place—out of the blue, so to speak, and without any safeguards—then he writes the safeguard in with respect to the seizure, in that seizure must be done only when “the person making the seizure believes on reasonable grounds an offence against the Act or the regulations has been committed . . .”

Thus far, that is good. But on the first it fails, whereas on the second point a proper and a just respect for the legalities, much as one may find them irksome, are given cognizance to.

There is not in this legislation, again, the proper respect for the domicile. It inserts a phrase in the course of the legislation, “other than a dwelling,” which gives lip service to McRuer, but it does not give protection to those other buildings and personal property of a real property nature which, on reading McRuer, should be equally safeguarded in this particular respect.

Then when you do go on to movables, to various other forms of containment other than the private dwelling house—“a vessel, a boat, or car or truck . . .” Again, no provision in that particular entry is set up or are any safeguards written into the legislation to protect the civil liberties of individuals as has been recommended in the old volumes of McRuer, over and over again. McRuer says at 410 of the second volume:

The basic right of the individual is to be free from physical trespass to his prop-

erty and to be free from interference with his privacy.

Then at page 413 he says:

While powers of entry are a necessary part of many types of modern legislation, they ought to be sparingly dispensed by the Legislature and always with proper safeguards.

That is the basic contention of McRuer under that head.

Let us look at another provision which runs helter skelter through the centre of civil liberties. It is a rather minor matter perhaps, but it gives some feeling of the way in which this legislation was done.

There is perpetuation in this legislation of a provision specifically outlawed by McRuer, and that has to do with the business of the risk being on the side of the owner. It says here: “Any regulated product seized and detained under this section is seized and detained at the risk and expense of the owner.”

Let us see what McRuer, at 424, has to say about that sort of provision:

It is an unreasonable trespass on the rights of an owner that the detention should be “at the risk of the owner.” There seems no reason why the ordinary rights of bailee and bailor should not apply. The owner has no means by which to protect the products that are detained, insofar as the detention may be continued until the owner of the farm product complies with the Act and regulations. This is an extraordinarily vague section of a penal nature. No one appears to have authority to determine when the owner has complied with the Act and the regulations.

In the course of making these rather penetrating statements, McRuer is, curiously enough, referring specifically to legislation before us today.

At the top of the page he gives section 61 of The Farm Products Marketing Act. No, I am sorry, The Farm Products Grades and Sales Act, in that particular case, which falls directly under the minister’s jurisdiction too.

Then he does mention examples of the same legislation as in The Live Stock and Live Stock Products Act and The Milk Act. So it is rather endemic in this particular department that the blatant disregard of that particular right of the citizen is not only maintained but perpetuated in the present legislation.

I would ask the minister if, in all fairness, and in light of the explicit remarks of the former Chief Justice, whether or not they should not consider deleting that. Throw a crumb to the opposition. Be in line with virtue and light and concede the point that that ought not to be in there. That would be the very least I think we would do in the context of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there are two other points that I want to bring attention to. One is this business of sub-delegate power as set forth in this legislation.

You see, Mr. Speaker, under the legislation power is given to the marketing board to make regulations. Now the marketing board in turn is sub-delegating that power to local boards to make similar regulations, coming under The Regulations Act and so being published in the *Ontario Gazette*, are all pertinent and apply and should be provided for before this legislation goes through this House, by way of amendment or otherwise, or by way of concession from the minister since again the point is perfectly obvious. But in doing that, there rises in our minds, not just as a mere legality, that the minister's passing powers down the line in this particular way to lower bodies obviates and traverses the role of this body, in the sense at least, that the ministerial responsibility is not properly arrogated and attachable.

With that in mind, I would again to quote from McRuer, volume 1. Here he says—this is at 350, under the term “Sub-delegation.” He is referring in this case precisely to The Farm Products Marketing Act again:

The Attorney General makes such regulations as he deems necessary for the purpose of this Act.

Then:

If the Attorney General deemed it necessary to confer upon other persons subordinate power to make rules, it might be within his authority to do so.

The authority to sub-delegate power—

this is the important point:

The authority to sub-delegate power to make regulations should not be conferred, except in relation to the exercise of emergency powers.

It goes on with respect to the powers of the parent Act, but the sentence is carried over into the purport and the weight of the remarks made subsequently in the volume before us today, volume 5 of the McRuer Report.

I would ask emphatically that the minister be good enough, as a man sworn to uphold the law of the province, to give safeguard and recognition to what has been said under that head in this particular legislation.

There is only one other point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, arising out of the legislation. It is, as the member for Downsview has pointed out to this House, true that the right of this one statute, this single statute, has been carved out from other legislation specifically by McRuer in the latest volume. He has 37 different points where he takes grave issue with the way in which it is drawn, the couching of terms, the liberties that are not safeguarded and the general tenor of what this legislation means.

Instead of obviating that—instead of making those traductions of the legislation less onerous than they are, the minister is perpetuating them. It is going from bad to worse and, in bringing forward this particular section that he has before us today, it is a reaffirmation of an insensitivity—to say the least—to what McRuer has recommended.

I would just read from one recommendation of McRuer which has reference to the legislation before us, and that is No. 12:

Board regulations, and local board regulations, should be subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, which would make them subject to the provisions of The Regulations Act.

How about a little thing like that? Surely concessions can be made on that particular point, one out of 37 touching the issues involved, and the minister then could come before us on these grounds, to expect to elicit from us sympathy and support when he seems so regardless of—what is it—report commission by his own government; of which he as a cabinet minister must take cognizance and give effect to, to the full weight of his power instead of going constantly against ignoring and being possibly ignorant; which he ought not to be and cannot be permitted to be by this opposition with respect to the kind of legislation he is bringing before us.

The legislation is a warp and woof of loopholes, of traduction. You can drive a cart and four through it, so far as any safeguarding of basic human rights is concerned. Surely over against dead poultry, a little modicum of civil liberties might be preserved, even under this legislation?

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): In joining this debate on this bill, I would like to join with my leader in the proposal that he has made and hope the Minister will agree that this bill does need a little more consideration.

The member for Downsview has dealt with the legal aspects of this bill, and I would like to deal, from a farmer aspect, with the practicality of this bill. The minister has mentioned to us that we on this particular side of the House are not interested in the farmers of this great Province of Ontario and that we in effect are against the broiler growers. Now he knows that this not—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Very obvious this afternoon.

Mr. Innes: He knows—

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): The federal government looks after the member.

Mr. Innes: I just want to say to the minister that we want to look after the interests of all the farmers of the Province of Ontario and we have weighed our decisions fairly in the way we have made the proposal.

I want to say to the minister that we have had good relationships with the—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): That is going to cut off the beef.

Mr. Innes: —with the people in the Province of Quebec. I only mention the Milk Marketing Board that currently has 200 producers from the Province of Quebec enjoying the facilities of our Milk Marketing Board. The milk producers in Quebec see the good relationships and the good legislation that we helped put in the Milk Marketing Board; and these people are utilizing this board and we co-operate with them.

I mention the Tobacco Marketing Board. Currently, the Tobacco Marketing Board is processing upward of 10 million pounds of tobacco which comes from the Province of Quebec. The Province of Quebec utilizes or imports somewhere in the neighbourhood of, I would think, about 20 million pounds from the Province of Ontario.

The member for Middlesex South was mentioning the balance of trade. Well really I do not have specific figures, but I do know by the figures that I have arranged to pull together we do have the plus factor at the moment. I would say somewhere in the neighbourhood of 20 per cent more trade goes to Quebec than comes from Quebec to Ontario. I think this is somewhere close.

Mr. Gaunt: That is right. The member is right on.

Mr. Innes: The minister has mentioned that the legislation is required to protect farmers from the Quebec integrators, but I want to remind him that there are integrators in the Province of Ontario too, and that some of them have quotas from two to four million birds per year. You will ask me why this is. Why are these integrators—who are in most cases the same integrators in the Province of Quebec as in the Province of Ontario—sending their birds over here at the moment?

I can tell him why: Because the Province of Quebec gives them a subsidy on their interest rate, that is through the farm credit corporation; and you know it was this minister who wiped out the junior farmer loans in the Province of Ontario, whereby they were getting a little bit of a break on interest rates at that particular time and this is why the integrator, who is the same integrator in the Province of Ontario as the integrator in the Province of Quebec, is taking advantage—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Not in all cases.

Mr. Innes: Well not all, mind you, but he will be fair and say that some are.

Mr. Nixon: The big ones.

Mr. Innes: The big ones are the same. He knows that. And he must admit that this is due to the cancelling in some parts of the junior farmer loans legislation. Only as recently as this morning *The London Free Press*, which is a paper that might be known by the hon. member for Middlesex North, has this to say: "Hatching of Interprovincial Problems"; This refers, of course, not to the hatching of eggs I suppose, but to a different kind of hatching. It says:

Sources in both Ontario and Quebec, and indeed in other provinces, may find that any short-term gains they may seem to make from interprovincial restrictions of service and trade will be overbalanced by losses in the long run.

This is what I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, the long run.

When we mention the various products that are currently being utilized in Quebec that come from the Province of Ontario, the number of farmers who are involved is quite conceivably 20 times 20 more than the broilers. But I am not saying that we are not concerned about them. We are concerned

about them, but let us not do it to the detriment of the people in the province. You will notice just recently in the press, in the editorial here:

The ban which is being sought on Ontario labour going into Quebec for construction jobs has already drawn a warning from union officials in the Hull-Ottawa area. This could work in reverse and hit Quebecers with jobs in Ontario.

These are the little frictions that are currently there, and we are sort of setting up another little friction area. I say to him that I, as a Canadian, like to feel when I walk from Quebec to Ontario there is no border, and that I hope that he will continue to encourage his Conservative friends in Ottawa to hurry up this national marketing bill and then we can get on with the business.

It goes on to say:

The free movement of goods and people within Canada is natural for a viable nation and in the final analysis will prove mutually beneficial. The farm products marketing bill now before Parliament but locked in controversy over some of its ramifications is an attempt to assure the development of markets but also offering some safeguards to producers within a particular region. More than that may be required to effect a satisfactory flow of interprovincial commerce.

I do not know that I have too much to say—we have other members that are going to speak on it—but one of the prime reasons why I would like to see this held up for a while is that we will concede that national marketing is going to be the solution to our marketing problems across Canada. And as such, if we will give it an opportunity to be passed without putting too many stumbling blocks in its way after it is passed, that we are looking to the interests of all Canada and not just to our own little province of Ontario.

So these are some of the reasons that I feel I would like to support my leader and have this bill hoisted for six months so we can have a look and let national marketing do the job that it is intended to do and hopefully will do if we all get behind it and make sure that it will work.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this Bill 10 giving more power to the broiler board to seize and detain broilers coming into the Province of Ontario from Quebec. I might say that when I first heard the bill I was

greatly interested in it, but of course since the bill has been introduced there has been considerable interest developed across this province.

Certainly there are different boards, in support of this bill; there are large numbers of egg producers in this province who are against it—the egg board, as I understand it, is for it—and I must say that I have been called and asked to attend meetings. These barriers between the provinces are a serious matter. We know the broiler people are in difficulties, but we know many other products in this province are in difficulties. We know the pork industry has problems. We know that the egg producers have problems. These barriers between the provinces are not a good thing—and the minister has admitted this. Also the beef producers are very concerned that we are passing a bill that is going to put another barrier between one province and the other, and also the corn producers in this province are very concerned.

As the hon. member for Oxford has said, we ship a lot of agricultural products to Quebec. A few days ago the minister said that Quebec will not retaliate—but there is a great concern they will after this bill is passed. Those producers in Quebec will agitate the government to take some action against some of our products entering Quebec. As I understand it, 2,500 hogs go into Quebec every week; as I understand it, they buy a lot of our corn. Also a lot of egg producers market their eggs in Quebec. And it has been brought to my attention that this is a serious matter and if Quebec retaliates on the broilers, more power to our broiler board so that they will be able to seize and detain.

And so I rise to support my leader's motion, Mr. Speaker because it is such a serious matter. Agriculture has very serious problems across this province. We ship so much into Quebec, that I would say that I would like to see this bill go before the committee on agriculture and let those men who have voiced their objections to me—and I suppose to you and many other members in this House—appear before the agriculture committee and express their views, give them an opportunity to speak.

I know other members of this party have expressed their views. I would like the minister to reconsider this. Give it a six-months' hoist, and then I would say that the federal government's bill C-176 will be passed, we hope.

These are my comments, Mr. Speaker. I am not against the broiler board whatsoever,

or the broiler producers, but I will tell you if they retaliate in Quebec it will be a serious blow to the other segments of agriculture here in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): Not the member for Huron-Bruce, too. Unbelievable!

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments with respect to this bill. It has been said that the broiler industry has pressured the minister to act in this fashion, and I believe that is so. I understand that the broiler producers, through their marketing board in the Province of Ontario, have indicated to the minister that, as far as they are concerned, they want some protection from what they term the powerful Quebec integrators who have something like 87 per cent of the broiler production in the Province of Quebec. I just want to look at that for a moment. My colleague from Oxford mentioned it and I just want to deal with it further.

Obviously, we have some of the same integrators in this province that they have in Quebec. For instance, in this province we have Maple Leaf Mills which holds a 2.5 million bird quota per year; Purina Feeds, 1.2 million bird quota per year; Jim McGrath, Purina Feeds, five million bird quota per year; Canada Packers, 500,000 per year; Campbell Soups, 400,000 per year. Some of these people obviously operate in the Province of Quebec. For instance, Purina Feeds—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): How about the other 700 small ones?

Mr. Gaunt: —operates in the Province of Quebec. Canada Packers operates in the Province of Quebec. These people are integrated to the same extent in the Province of Quebec as they are here, maybe even to a greater extent.

When our board here says, "We have to have protection from the integrators in Quebec," what they are really saying is, "We want protection for our integrators here in the Province of Ontario."

The other fact that has been mentioned is that the Quebec industry greatly increased its production over the past number of years. Of course, this is true, Mr. Speaker. There is no question about it. Quebec broiler production over the past number of years has increased dramatically. There are many reasons for this: the integration that has taken place in the industry; the cheap money that my

friend from Oxford mentioned; and the fact that the government in the province was, to my knowledge, promoting the broiler industry and encouraging, not only the broiler industry but the agricultural industry generally.

However, I think there is a point here that we should remember, the fact that we in the province, having recovered from the first impact of the tremendous increase on the part of the Quebec broiler producers, then decided to recapture our own market. Last summer in the months of May, June and July we were up something in the neighbourhood of 20 per cent in setters. Those broilers would come on to the market in September. This was an attempt on the part of our broiler producers to recapture some of the market that was lost to us here in the province by way of the tremendous increase in production in Quebec.

The minister has indicated that we can absorb—and indeed we have to have—around 250,000 broilers coming into this province per week in order to fulfil our market requirements. He has also indicated that if we get in the neighbourhood of 700,000 to 800,000 per week then we have a tremendous backup of birds and our own broiler producers suffer. That is quite true.

I just want to point out, and I think it bears in a very pertinent way on this particular Act, that the broiler producers in the Province of Quebec have now undertaken to engage in a supply management programme. In other words, they have agreed to quotas; they have agreed to control their production and to bring some order out of the chaos which they have been creating. I make that point to illustrate that, in my view, with this commitment on behalf of the broiler producers' board in Quebec, the pressure on the Ontario market will not be as great in the months ahead as it has been in the past number of years.

Whether in fact there was an arrangement made whereby the federal government, in providing its \$400,000 export subsidy, made some arrangement and got some commitment from these people to the effect that they had to do this type of thing if they wanted the federal government to participate in this export subsidy programme, I have no knowledge. I do not know, but if they did, I think it was a good thing and I underline the point again, that given the fact that Quebec has now entered into a supply management programme, I think the pressure on our markets will not be nearly so great in the months ahead.

Hence, I really cannot see the pressing need for this type of legislation when it is balanced over and against what it can do in terms of balkanization, in terms of reciprocal action on the part of Quebec, whether it be by way of eggs or by way of some of the other products. It has been mentioned this afternoon that our trade balance between the two provinces is in our favour, and my colleague used the percentage of 20—20 per cent in our favour—and to put it another way, I think it is roughly 10-to-7 in our favour. In other words, we shove into Quebec 10 agricultural products to every seven they shove back in here. So the balance of trade, when judged one against the other, is definitely in our favour. I feel, if we take this kind of action at this particular point in time, we are only inviting disaster to the rest of our agricultural community and I do not really feel that it is necessary at this time to do so.

Having said that, I realize that at one point in time our broiler producers did need this type of protection, but I have already said that I do not think the pressures are going to be as great in the months ahead.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Is the member for or against it? Is he for the farmer or against him?

Mr. Gaunt: Now as to this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I am on record—

Mr. Nixon: Why does the member for Renfrew South not pay attention? When is he going to speak?

Mr. Gaunt: I am on record as supporting my leader, and I think it would be rather obvious from that comment when I stand in relation to the bill.

Mr. Henderson: Go to the farmers.

Mr. Gaunt: But I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that as far as I am concerned this bill—

Mr. Yakabuski: He is talking on both sides of the question.

Mr. Gaunt:—may offer some very short-term advantage—

Mr. Henderson: That is Trudeau talk.

Mr. Gaunt:—but in the long term I think it would be detrimental to agriculture in this province.

Mr. Nixon: All right. Are the members opposite not going to speak? Are we not going to hear from the big beef producers?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Do not get personal.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a little bit of time on the bill because it has produced a serious problem of government. The bill itself, of course, reflects the incapacity of the government to deal with the serious problem which has arisen. Therefore, I am going to try in a few minutes to place before the House some of the aspects of the problem that require the kind of attention which I would expect the government in this province to give to a serious question with many ramifications to it.

The bill, as presented by the Minister of Agriculture and Food, clearly reflects the incapacity of the government to isolate a problem and to deal with it in an effective manner. I want to draw to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, that the bill itself does not refer at all to interprovincial trade. It does not make any reference whatsoever to the Province of Quebec. It makes no reference whatsoever to the broiler industry, to the egg industry, or to any particular area in which there is a threat to the economic life of certain of the persons engaged in the agricultural industry in the Province of Ontario.

That is the first point I want to make; that while it may be significant from the Minister of Agriculture and Food's point of view to draw a smoke cloud over the problem by providing wide legislation, what he has done, in the absence of the comments of the minister and the existing problem in the broiler and egg industry involving the provinces in Canada and particularly the provinces of Quebec and Manitoba, is to introduce legislation which deals with the capacity of local boards under regulations made by the Farm Products Marketing Board to seize and detain any regulated product within the province. There is no limitation on that.

I bow to those who know more about the structure of the agricultural industry than I, but I believe there are something like 18 or 19 local boards in the Province of Ontario. We are being asked in this Legislature to deal with that specific problem. We are being asked to provide widespread power of the grant of regulatory power by the Farm Products Marketing Board to each and every of the local boards to permit them to seize a particular regulated product.

Let me emphasize that point. We are not dealing with the broiler and egg industry in isolation under any circumstances. And in many ways this again points out the abdication of the government when faced with a specific problem—the only way they can purport to deal with it is to throw the net so wide that inadvertently we will grant powers to many local boards over all regulated products in an amendment to a statute which is not going to disappear from the statute books of this province when the federal Act comes into force. Certainly there is nothing that the minister has said which would indicate his intention at any time to repeal this particular section, if and when the federal Act comes into force.

I want to say that that is the first reason why we are going to vote against the bill when it comes before the House on second reading.

The second reason—and let us now put it into the three areas which are basically concerned. I know that the Minister of Agriculture does not like legalisms because he always thinks that legalisms are devoid of social and economic problems. What we are faced with, whether we like it or not is that by law, and therefore involving legalisms, the minister is attempting to deal with an economic problem. We in this party recognize the economic problem which is involved in the introduction by the minister of this bill. We recognize that regardless of the state of the industry as a whole—regardless of the relative degrees of integration in the Province of Quebec as opposed to the Province of Ontario, regardless of the corporate intrusion into the broiler industry in the Province of Ontario—we recognize that there are individual farmers in the Province of Ontario engaged in these particular forms of specialty activity who are being hurt because of the conditions reflected by the inability, to this date, of this government to contribute in an overall way over the past 27 years to the establishment of an effective national marketing policy in which this government, in co-operation, would participate.

Following along on the same point, I think it is very significant to show the inability of the government to isolate and to understand a problem of economic threat to the life of some portion of one segment of the industrial capacity of this province, namely, one segment of the agricultural industry. It is the Minister of Agriculture and Foods who is introducing a bill which relates to and has something to do with trade and has very little

to do with the question of agriculture. Of course, the Minister of Trade and Development is not really a Minister of Trade and Development because we are talking about trade and everybody who has spoken has been speaking about trade—and the Minister of Trade and Development is not in the Legislature.

I want to draw to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, a very pertinent statement made by one of the present judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, Mr. Justice Laskin, one of the acknowledged constitutional authorities of Canada—if not the acknowledged authority—on the question of the joint responsibility for agriculture under the constitution of this country. I am saying to the government that this bill reflects the incapability of this government, in the attitude which it has on constitutional matters, to work out a co-operative federalism in one of the clear cases where, under the constitution of this country, there is a joint responsibility.

Before reciting the particular quotation by Mr. Justice Laskin about this question of agriculture as such under the constitution, let me, Mr. Speaker, put on the record the sections, as I believe them to be, which we are dealing with under a constitution which is designed not to solve legal problems but is designed to provide a framework in which the economic, social and political development of this country will take place. In this particular instance, we are talking first of all about the provisions of section 92, which deal with the question of property and civil rights, and that is in fact the major head of power under which The Farm Products Marketing Act of the Province of Ontario was upheld at the time it came before the Supreme Court of Canada in 1957.

It may also be upheld under that particular head of section 92 which deals with a matter of a purely local nature. That is an intra- as distinct from an interprovincial character. Those are the two heads which are related to the provincial power, apart—as I will come to later—section 95 of The British North America Act on the question of the joint responsibility for agriculture.

Then we are talking about what is in substance the national Act, which the minister states will solve these problems if and when it is passed, as if he had no responsibility for the vacuum which has existed for many years in Canada in this whole field. He talks not about the joint exercise of the agricultural responsibility under the constitution, but he talks about the specific legislative head of

power granted to the federal government under section 91(2), relating to the heading of Trade and Commerce, and that is where the bill is being supported and make no mistake about that.

It is not being supported by this minister under any suggestion that it is a matter dealing with the joint responsibility of this Legislature and the Parliament of Canada to deal with agricultural problems.

Then we come to section 121 of the Act—before I come back to section 95—which states, and again I do not intend to enter into any long dissertation as to what it means but it is perfectly clear what was the intention of those who established this constitution for Canada that all articles, and I quote the section of The British North America Act, section 121, “that all articles of the growth, produce, or manufacture of any one of the provinces shall from and after the union be admitted free into each of the other provinces.”

Now I know, Mr. Speaker, that it is rather trite to say that, of course, that means there cannot be customs barriers between the provinces. But in any living constitution the meaning of the word “free” in that section of The British North America Act does not simply mean that there are to be no custom dues as between the provinces. That, I think, is a significant section in The British North America Act.

I particularly want to come now to the section dealing with the joint responsibility for questions relating to agriculture. We have in section 95 a section dealing with agriculture and immigration. This government, under one of the former ministries, did in fact assert the provincial power with respect to immigration, but this government, which has for many years prided itself upon being the spokesman for the farm community in the Province of Ontario, has never asserted a co-equal responsibility to discharge its responsibilities in co-operative federalism pursuant to this particular section. This section says, and I quote section 95 of The British North America Act:

In each province the Legislature may make laws in relation to agriculture in the province and to immigration in the province and it is hereby declared that the Parliament of Canada may from time to time make laws in relation to agriculture in all or any of the provinces—

and I repeat, “in all or any of the provinces”: —and to immigration into all or any of the provinces, and any law of the Legislature of a province relative to agriculture

or to immigration shall have effect in and for the province as long and as far only as it is not repugnant to any Act of the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. Laskin in his book on the constitutional law of Canada has this to say about the erosion of section 95 of The British North America Act—and I quote from page 354 of the second edition of his book. There is a later edition; I do not happen to have it with me, but the substance of these remarks has not been altered in the subsequent edition.

Among the least illumined areas of constitutional adjudication is that concerned with the scope of the concurrent power in relation to agriculture given by section 95 of The British North America Act. Here, as much as if not more than anywhere else in the Act, was an invitation to a working federalism by which problems in the field, if not adequately serviced by provincial legislation, could be taken up or solved through national legislative policy.

The possibilities represented by section 95 have so far foundered on a construction of the agriculture power which has drained it of substance both as a source of provincial legislation and of federal legislation. Neither the Privy Council nor the Supreme Court of Canada had on any occasion to consider the agriculture power during the first half-century following Confederation. Such lower-court decisions as were given on the matter during the period touched what may be reasonably termed the periphery of that class of subject.

And I skip one portion of it.

When opportunity arose for a wider assessment of agriculture as the potent force that it was and is in the Canadian economy, there was a curious refusal to square legislative power with legislative fact. None of the considerations which moved the courts to a narrow view of both the general power and the trade and commerce power were operable in respect of section 95. Yet the resulting construction of the agriculture power juxtaposed to that of the trade and commerce power created a definite hiatus in regulatory possibilities.

On the one hand the former would not support regulation of trade in natural products although it might support control at the production stage, while the latter could not embrace production and was limited in respect of trade regulation to

interprovincial and export aspects in their strict sense.

The expansion of the trade and commerce power, of which evidence is slowly accumulating, may very well make it unnecessary to rely on revitalization of the agriculture power to support national marketing policies respecting products of the soil. If this happens—

and I emphasize this:

—it will provide another instance of a rather unnecessary reduction, not to say obliteration of an express power.

And I am saying to the minister in substance that what Mr. Laskin was saying, what we here are saying, is that the minister is talking about trade and commerce; he is not talking about agriculture. And this department, this government, has failed and has contributed to the gradual obliteration of the joint possibility of a working federalism between the federal and provincial government in this whole field of national product marketing.

I know the minister is going to say, "Oh well, we are going to co-operate." But does he not realize that in his co-operation he is co-operating not under section 95 with respect of the joint exercise of that agricultural power, he is co-operating in abdicating to the federal government the responsibilities of this government with respect to trade?

Once this government permits the federal government to accept total responsibility for the trade across the country in respect to farm products, without a co-equal assertion by this government of its right in the field of agriculture, then this government is contributing to the default in the capacity of the government to develop a working federalism.

What Mr. Laskin has said I repeat that this was an invitation to a working federalism in section 95 and this government is abdicating its responsibility under that section of the constitution and permitting the federal government to occupy the whole field under some guise that is going to solve the problems of the broiler producers in the Province of Ontario.

There is no indication whatsoever of any interest by this government in the passage of that Act which would say to the House of Commons in Ottawa, "We in Ontario, under the power to deal with agriculture which we share jointly with you under section 95, want you to know that in the assertion of that power we expect to have an overt requirement of co-operation and mutual support."

Otherwise, I say to the minister that what he is putting before us, as a measure by which the broiler producers in the Province of Ontario will be protected, will turn out to be, once that federal Act is passed, an opportunity for the federal government to further move in its destruction of the inherent federalism of the country.

I want the minister to understand that we in this party are committed to a federal system. We in this party object to a government which does nothing to assert the power of this government under a joint agricultural programme to work out in a sound way within a working federalism, supported by law, solutions to the economic problems facing the agricultural industry across the country but specifically, so far as this assembly is concerned, facing the agricultural industry within the Province of Ontario.

I say to the minister, and I venture to prophesy, that it will not be very long until the Conservative government, should it remain so long in office, will be fighting the federal government again, as it does in constitutional matters, as it has in taxation matters, under the guise of government, and will be engaged in this internecine warfare which has been non-productive, which has resulted in the province coming to a standstill insofar as its industrial productive capacity is concerned. It will not be long until the Minister of Agriculture and Food of the Conservative government will be standing up fighting the federal government over some policy adopted under this national farm products marketing provision in the national marketing Act, in which the minister now thinks all solutions are to be found and which precludes him from intervening in the Supreme Court of Canada, as he has the right to do and as this government has the right to do.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Would the hon. member permit a question? Is my hon. friend suggesting that the national bill, C-176, now before the House of Commons, is not a proper means of proceeding to resolve the very issues of which he speaks? What is the member's position on that?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I thought I was making it perfectly and abundantly clear that—and I will try to make it even more abundantly clear—there is a power in the federal government to regulate trade. It is under the exercise of that power that bill is being passed in the House of Commons. If this government permits it to go unchallenged under that head of the federal power, it will

result for many, many years in the inability of this government ever to give any vitality or life to the co-operative federalism which was designed to be worked out in the field of agriculture and in the field of immigration under section 95. That is the point which I am making. It is an abdication to the federal government of the responsibility of this assembly.

I am not suggesting for one moment that the government of Canada does not have an area of responsibility under section 95, because that is what it says. It is not exercising its authority under section 95 except as a backstop to the exercise of its power under the trade and commerce power of section 91.

What I am saying—and I am trying to state it in non-legal terms; I am trying to state it in the substance of the economic problem with which we are faced; I want to put it in direct political terms—is that there will be a Minister of Agriculture and Food forced to stand up in this House and attack at some point some decision of the federal government in the exercise of the powers under that bill when it is passed. It will be almost impossible to attack it on any sound grounds except to rail against it, which is the stance of this government in its substitution for government in all matters related to the federation.

What I am saying to the minister is that some form of bill—not necessarily this bill because we are going to oppose it for the reasons which we have given, it is too broadly drawn—I do not think it is exclusive to say that it is possible for the Minister of Agriculture and Food, after proper consideration with the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of the province, after proper consultation with whomever else they want to consult with, can devise a bill which will meet the present emergency problem insofar as it affects certain persons in the Province of Ontario in the broiler and the egg industry, principally the broiler industry.

It is possible to devise that kind of interim emergency bill, and it is also possible at the same time for this government to get its head out of the sand and to intervene in the case in the reference which is going to the Supreme Court of Canada as the result of the opposing decisions of the Quebec Court of Appeal and of the Manitoba Court of Appeal. Those are not mutually exclusive and we urge upon the government that they take that course.

That is, they do not press the passage of this bill which is drawn in much too wide,

many too-wide terms to deal with this specific problem; that it introduce the kind of a bill which is within its province to pinpoint this specific economic problem with which we are presently faced; and, concurrently with that, indicate, as the leading province in Canada—or one of the leading provinces in Canada—that it has a vital concern before the Supreme Court of Canada in a constitutional matter which has been before the courts on many, many occasions since the Confederation in 1867.

I might say that in the time of Sir Oliver Mowat as Premier of this province—and God forbid that I should praise any Liberal at this late date, but there was no New Democratic Party at that time—in one of the crucial constitutional questions related to the trade and commerce power, the Premier of this province, Sir Oliver Mowat, appeared in person to argue the case.

It had to do with insurance, it dealt with the trade and commerce power, and it was one of the evolutionary cases leading to the decision in 1957 which upheld a very limited question placed on a constitutional matter about the present Farm Products Marketing Act.

Now I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that this particular problem of which this bill is the government's meek response merits exactly that kind of attention by the government of the Province of Ontario. In my judgement—and it may be something which cannot be communicated to the farm community in the Province of Ontario—but in my judgement if the government fails to intervene in that reference before the Supreme Court of Canada in this matter of vital concern to Confederation, of vital concern to the distribution of legislative power, of vital concern to the farm community or a portion of it—and make no never-minds this particular one may be only significant to one part of the farm community, but it is of vital concern to the agricultural community in a federal system over the long period of time—this government will have forfeited the right to the support of the farm community.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member find this a convenient point to break his remarks?

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a shame because I was going along so well, but perhaps at 8 o'clock I could continue.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 15, 1971

Financial support for preparation of biographies of former Ontario Premiers, statement by Mr. White	429
Tabling third report of McRuer commission on civil rights, Mr. Davis	429
Tabling first report, Royal commission on book publishing, Mr. Davis	430
Tabling second interim report of committee on government productivity, Mr. Davis	431
Tabling list of sources curtailing operations on April 12 under Air Pollution Control Act, Mr. Kerr	433
Mr. Francottie's arrest and inability to raise \$20 bail, statement by Mr. A. F. Lawrence	433
Report, Royal commission on publishing, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. Makarchuk	436
Action re decision of standing committees on education, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Lewis, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Martel, Mr. Ben, Mr. Bolton	437
OSC suspension of two Toronto stockbrokers, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Shulman	443
Making sure companies with ODC loans provide minimum number of jobs, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Deans, Mr. Pitman, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Gaunt	444
One-man commission into cost of education, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Pitman, Mr. T. Reid	446
Land acquisition in Caledon township as part of Niagara Escarpment programme, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Lewis	448
Real Estate and Business Brokers Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	448
Timothy Investments Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Gilbertson, first reading	449
Human Tissue Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Burr, first reading	449
Thunder Bay Foundation, bill respecting, Mr. Meen, first reading	449
Membership of standing committees, Speaker's ruling	449
Farm Products Marketing Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, on second reading	453
Recess, 6 o'clock	475



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, April 15, 1971
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 1971

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

Mr. Speaker: When the House rose at six o'clock the hon. member for Riverdale had the floor. Will he please continue.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Try and stop him.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, before the dinner recess the government was tottering, and it is obviously having great difficulty recovering at the present time. But perhaps the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) would tell me just exactly where I was in the course of the argument that I was putting to him about the bill.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): The member has not said anything yet. Read on.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The member opposite just did not grasp it.

Mr. J. Renwick: I am glad to see the member for Lambton here because he is going to pay very close attention to what I have to say as well as the hon. member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton) of course, and my friend the former Minister of Justice (Mr. Wishart).

Mr. Speaker, what I was trying to say before dinner—and I would like to recap very briefly—was that the government has abdicated any support to which it may have been entitled in the past from the farm community in the Province of Ontario because of its incapacity to understand and deal with the nature of the problem before it.

It is confronted by the interprovincial war going on with respect to broiler chickens and eggs. At least the government of the Province of Quebec and the government of the Province of Manitoba are making some effort to deal with the problem in an intelligent, sane and wise way.

Recapping, I simply pointed out to the House, Mr. Speaker, that the minister had brought in a bill purporting to deal with

this problem and pretending to deal with this problem of the broilers and the eggs, and he has drawn it so wide that it is going to be a piece of permanent legislation on the books of the Province of Ontario dealing with all of the products which come under the jurisdiction of The Farm Products Marketing Act.

I am saying that because of that, amongst many other reasons, we will oppose the bill on principle on second reading.

More important, I was indicating to the government very clearly that to the extent they think that the Act being passed by the federal parliament is going to solve the problem they are kidding themselves. They are kidding themselves because of the joint jurisdiction of the federal and provincial government over matters dealing with agriculture as set out in section 95 of The British North America Act, which I placed on the record before the dinner recess.

The point is very clear and very simple. As Mr. Justice Laskin, as he now is, a professor in constitutional law before he was elevated to the bench, had to say, what in fact is taking place is that the federal government under the exercise of the power of trade and commerce under section 91(2) of The British North America Act is preempting from this government, without any intervention by this government, the whole field with respect to the regulation of trade in agricultural products.

I am glad to see that the Minister of Trade and Development is here because the bill which is before us is a matter dealing with trade, not agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture and Food has abdicated his responsibility with respect to the provincial jurisdiction in the field of agriculture.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Do I take over the broilers now?

Mr. J. Renwick: It should have been a bill introduced by the Minister of Trade and Development. It may well be that the Minister of Trade and Development is incapable of grasping it—he strikes his head with his hand.

Mr. MacDonald: He deals only with swine.

Mr. J. Renwick: It is a very visible symbol of the inability of the government to deal with a problem of trade. He is dealing with it through the Minister of Agriculture and Food and he does not think it has anything to do with him. He thinks he is here to build houses. He is the Minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. Lawlor: He does not even do that.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister arrived just in time.

Mr. J. Renwick: But the Minister of Trade and Development perhaps should recognize very clearly that he is talking about inter-provincial trade.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): The member for Lakeshore is much too kind.

Mr. J. Renwick: The Minister of Trade and Development does not understand that the responsibility of this government, with respect to the broiler and the egg industry, is one to which he should direct his attention. He is obviously not going to do it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How does the member know I am not?

Mr. Lawlor: It is him.

Mr. J. Renwick: I can tell. The minister was not here this afternoon. He did not even understand that the bill had anything to do with him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is because I was directing my attention to this matter.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister's capacity for empire building is well known.

Mr. Lawlor: We know he is disinterested in broilers from way back.

Mr. J. Renwick: I will come back to the constitutional question in a few minutes. I want to deal with two other aspects of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member thinks broilers are something to do with the plumbing industry.

Mr. J. Renwick: The second aspect of the bill is that the government again is using the McRuer report as a camouflage to introduce legislation which is an intrusion upon civil

rights, and which does not contain the kind of provisions which should protect the ordinary citizen of this province against the grant of these rights.

Mr. Lawlor: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Renwick: Let us be perfectly clear. Disguised as an endeavour to protect a certain limited area of the agricultural industry in the Province of Ontario, the bill provides for the seizure and detention of persons' property. There is nothing to indicate that it has anything to do with the Province of Quebec, the Province of Manitoba or any other province. It is a power which we are asked to grant to the government to seize and detain any regulated product under any of the local boards established under The Farm Products Marketing Act. When we in this assembly are asked to approve of a bill with respect to the seizure and detention of other persons' property by Act of the government, we are entitled to have a very clear and explicit statement as to why that is necessary and whether the bill contains the protective provisions which are required to protect the individual's property in this province.

This bill fails in that regard. It fails on a number of counts. The first of the counts is that it fails because it is a sub-delegation—as the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) tried to indicate today from the most recent of the McRuer report which was tabled in the House today—it is a sub-delegation of power and there is no provision for anyone to know what the regulations are which the local board promulgates under the authority of the statute of the Legislature.

That is the first thing. There is nothing, so far as I know, and the minister can disabuse me if I am wrong, which requires any publication of any of the regulations by any of the local boards which are made pursuant to the authority which we are asked to give to the government.

The second point is an intrusion of civil rights. If it is necessary to seize and detain property one would think that the government, having gone through the McRuer report and picked out all the isolated recommendations and assiduously implemented them, would give some thought to the spirit and intent of the McRuer report. That simply said that in the future, if this government exercises or purports to exercise, through legislation which they alone can pass, arbitrary powers, there would have to be certain fundamental and basic protection.

There is nothing in this bill which indicates any procedure which can be taken by the person whose property is seized, any procedure which he can take by which he can secure the release of that property.

Mr. Lawlor: Right!

Mr. J. Renwick: I want the House, Mr. Speaker, to pause and understand what that means. "Any regulated product," for practical purposes means each of the products which is regulated—by how many, 18, 19 or 20 local boards in the field of agriculture—having nothing to do with inter-provincial trade at all, necessarily, they can be seized by the local board if they make regulations. They can be seized by the local board and there is no procedure spelled out in the statute by which action can be taken so that the person can go before some kind of a body.

At this particular point in history in the Province of Ontario, I say to the government, is there any kind of a body to which it can put forward its position—the person's position whose property has been taken and establish whether or not it has been done legitimately and wisely? The very seizing authority happens to be an officer or a delegate under the appropriate section of the Ontario farm marketing programme.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister is a bigger socialist than I am; he will not even give compensation.

Mr. J. Renwick: They seize it—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why does he heckle the hon. member?

Mr. J. Renwick: —and the person—

Mr. Lawlor: I never heard of anything so arbitrary!

Mr. J. Renwick: And the person has no recourse, Mr. Speaker, no recourse!

If one looks at the second section of that bill, it is up to the local board to decide. If the local board is satisfied that the owner of the regulated product complies, it can be released. There is no body to which an appeal can be made. There is no way in which that arbitrary decision can be overturned.

For that reason, I believe the third or the fourth reason, the bill is defective. The bill is a fraud on the people of the province.

I am not going to stand here in this Legislature and hear the Minister of Justice

and Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) in his contribution to the Speech from the Throne debate, extol what this government has done to implement the McRuer report, while standing on the order paper in the name of the Minister of Agriculture and Food is a bill which allows for the arbitrary detention and seizure of property. With no provision for appeal, no reference made, only really lip service, as my friend the member for Lakeshore has pointed out, only lip service to the McRuer recommendation.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. J. Renwick: That is the one. It says there is reasonable notice, reasonable evidence, belief on reasonable grounds that there has been a contravention of the statute, or that the private residence cannot be entered for the purpose of seizing the product. There is some provision that any of the regulations of the local board must be approved by the Farm Products Marketing Board. That is schoolchildren's compliance with the McRuer report. It shows no evidence whatsoever of any ability to comprehend the crisis that this government was in when Mr. McRuer was appointed for the purpose of reviewing the question of protection of civil liberties in this province.

If one will read the bill I cannot possibly understand how any member of the government, at least any member of the party that supports the government, can in any way, shape or form support this bill without substantial amendment to the provisions which are included in it. Then, they have the nerve, if I may coin a phrase, the unmitigated gall—

Mr. Lawlor: That is a good phrase.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Unmitigated plagiarism the member means.

Mr. J. Renwick: I may have stolen it from the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) who has used it on occasion. They had the unmitigated gall to say that any regulated product seized and detained under this section is seized and detained at the risk and expense of the owner. They seize it. On the question of the arbitrary seizure, the owner has no way of dealing with the question of the arbitrary seizure, and then they say it is at the risk and expense of the owner.

I speak to the members of the party which supports the government—how can they support such a bill in the light of the report which was tabled today in the name of Mr.

McRuer as part of the contribution of this government to the protection of civil liberties in the Province of Ontario?

Mr. Lawlor: Just how?

Mr. J. Renwick: If members will go back, not to the instant learning of the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer)—and I wish he was here today—not to the instant learning of the member for Downsview, but to the original report which my colleague the member for Lakeshore spoke about earlier this day. I just simply want to point it out for the purpose of underlining it that Mr. McRuer, in chapter 23 of volume 1 of his report, when he was dealing with the problem of the sub-delegation of regulatory authority under legislative sanction of this assembly, made this point. I repeat it solely for the purpose of underlining the crucial paragraph in what he had to say.

The authority to sub-delegate power to make regulations should not be conferred except in relation to the exercise of emergency powers. It does not appear that the scheme of the parent Act—

And he is referring to The Farm Products Marketing Act—

—would be frustrated or impaired in those cases where there is sub-delegation of regulation-making power if the regulations were subject to the approval of a political authority.

I say to the minister: How can he possibly defend the bill on the basis of implementation of the McRuer report when the McRuer report says two things which the minister has not spoken about. One is that there is an emergency which requires the sub-delegation of these powers to the local board. The second point of which is that if such regulations are made, they are to be subject to the approval of a political authority.

He has paid specious attention to the McRuer report by making the regulations of the local board subject to the approval of the Farm Products Marketing Board. The Farm Products Marketing Board is not in any sense the approval of a political authority. The Farm Products Marketing Board is appointed by this government. That is an appointed board, but that does not make it political. A political authority is a responsible minister responsible to this assembly or collectively the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council responsible to this assembly for that purpose. And that is another reason, Mr. Speaker, why we will not support the bill on second reading in this House.

We are also concerned, as an economic matter—and others in this party will deal with it—but we are concerned as to whether or not the minister is in fact inviting retaliation from other provinces within the country because of this persistence in this government of always fighting back.

There is a place and a time for fighting back but it is not an appropriate occasion to fight back in this way if on balance the retaliation against the agricultural community engaged in this part of the agricultural industry is going to be unnecessarily hurt by reason of the legislation which we may pass.

I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, to the minister that he is in fact inviting retaliation, and he is inviting retaliation for the same fundamental and basic reasons that I tried to enunciate earlier, that the government does not understand how they should go about coping with an immediate problem in the agricultural industry pending the proper decision about how we are going to have an adequate working, co-operative federalism as established and inherent in the provisions of section 95 of The British North America Act.

I want to conclude my remarks on the second reading of this bill by reverting, not in any unnecessary length, to the constitutional question. The minister must know—certainly the Minister of Justice must know—that the whole story of the evolution under the constitution of this country from the time it was established to the present day, that this question of the marketing of farm products is part of an evolutionary problem.

It is part of a process which will become an effective process if this government does not abdicate its position. One need only go back—you can go back—you can talk about the Severn case in 1878; you can talk about the Parsons case, the one to which I referred before the dinner adjournment, in which Sir Oliver Mowatt intervened personally to argue the case; you can talk about Hodge and the Queen, and Russell and the Queen, and McCarthy and the Queen; you can talk about The National Farm Products Act in 1937; you can talk about the reference of this very bill; The Farm Products Marketing Act which went through for constitutional review in 1957; you can talk about all of the later cases which are involved in—

There was an interjection by the minister from Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop) which I did not hear.

Hon. E. Dunlop (Minister without Portfolio): I said the member must have been reading Mr. Laskin's case book.

Mr. J. Renwick: Not only did I read it, I had the privilege of studying under Mr. Laskin.

Mr. MacDonald: And furthermore, he understands him.

Mr. J. Renwick: That is right.

I happen to be one of the persons who does believe that in this assembly there is not proper attention paid by this government to the wisdom which is involved in the constitutional law of this country as enunciated by Professor Laskin, as he then was.

Now let us get it perfectly clear. If that was in any denigrating sense, I want the member for Forest Hill, the Minister without Portfolio, to understand that what Professor Laskin, as he then was, was saying has come true; that this government is abdicating its constitutional responsibility by failing to engage in the on-going process of constitutional evolution by not intervening in this case in the Supreme Court of Canada on the reference between the conflict of the Court of Appeal in Quebec and the Court of Appeal in the Province of Manitoba.

That has got to be done. If it is not done, then I am simply saying that this ministry will end up—as they always do under the guise of trying to make federalism work—will end up fighting.

That is their only response. We have listened to it, disguised under all sorts of canopies, over many years now, but every time when the chips are down their concept of a working federalism is to fight the federal government, not to co-operate.

Mr. Lawlor: He is right.

Mr. Renwick: Now this party, the New Democratic Party, is engaged in a belief and a confidence in a federal system, a belief in the workings of the federal system.

Mr. Lawlor: They are really secret separatists all of them.

Mr. J. Renwick: We are simply saying, Mr. Speaker, to the government as it is now constituted, that it will be a serious, fundamental, basic mistake if this government does not intervene in the evolutionary process of the constitution of the country by intervening in the case before the Supreme Court of Canada.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Nobody said we are not going to intervene.

Mr. J. Renwick: Fine!

Mr. MacDonald: Well where has the government been for the last year when they have been in the courts?

Mr. J. Renwick: Is the government going to intervene?

Mr. MacDonald: Why did the government not support Manitoba in its reference to the Supreme Court of Canada?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): It has not gone through there.

Mr. MacDonald: The original reference. Where was the government then?

An hon. member: He has not said he was not going to intervene.

Mr. MacDonald: He has never said it up until now. We provoked it out of him at this point.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There has been no reference to the Supreme Court of Canada yet.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, perhaps my attendance has been reasonably good in the House, but I take the minister's interjection to be that in due course he is in fact going to intervene. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We will determine that in the fullness of time.

Mr. Makarchuk (Brantford): That is an original phrase!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Why does the minister not remain silent if he has nothing to say?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to my hon. friends across the floor, they are suggesting that the reference to the Manitoba Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of Manitoba has already been referred to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. MacDonald: We are not suggesting that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, that is what I take out of what they have been saying all day. That is what they have been saying. We are suggesting that when the notice of leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada is sent to the Attorneys General of the

various provinces on the matter of constitutionality, which involves this matter of Manitoba, then we will deal with the situation at that time. It has not come to that stage yet. We do not know whether it is going to proceed to the Supreme Court of Canada or not. All we know is what is in the papers.

Mr. MacDonald: Where was the minister when the original appeal was made to the Supreme Court of Canada?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I am quite content with the Minister of Agriculture and Food's comment, and that perhaps is a good note on which I can sit down and depart from the debate. I take that to mean that in substance and in fact the government of the Province of Ontario will reverse its determination not to intervene and will intervene when the case comes before the Supreme Court of Canada. If so, we are happy and content.

We will oppose this bill on second reading for reasons which I have given, which are the constitutional reasons—the invasion and intrusion of individual civil liberties, disguised as compliance with the McRuer report; and the inability of the government to deal with the isolated special but important economic problems produced by this war between the provinces on the question of broilers and eggs.

On those grounds we will oppose the bill, but we are delighted to have the concession of the government that it will intervene in due course, in the fullness of time, when the matter comes before the Supreme Court of Canada. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I said nothing of the kind and I do not want the hon. member to sit down putting words in my mouth. I simply suggested to him the facts of the case are that it has not yet been referred to the Supreme Court of Canada. When it is referred—and when we are advised that it is referred—then we will take the matter under consideration as to what our position will be. I want to make that abundantly clear.

Hon. Mr. Crossman: That is the way you run a government.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Before the minister replies, the member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few remarks to this Bill 10, without too much repetition, and to stay away from the legal angle that has been going on in regard to the constitutionality problem of which we are confronted.

In my own mind, I feel that the minister has been caught in a very nasty situation. I think all of us are aware that this impasse in the broiler business has been one of the real thorns in our marketing legislation in this province. In the minister's wisdom, and on certain advice, he has proceeded with this particular bill. I think we in this party feel that possibly he has received bad advice in the introduction of this particular bill.

The Province of Quebec has a bill on the statutes of that province, but I believe that at the present time they are winking at it. They are not enforcing it and much of our regulated product is flowing into that province. It must be the concern of egg producers and suchlike in eastern Ontario to have these large markets in Montreal with which they make their living.

Personally I can support such a bill if it was going to be directed against United States imports during our growing season. This I would like to see; I know my farmers would like to see something like this, but I realize that this is outside the jurisdiction of this province. I do not know whether it has any application whatsoever in the thinking of the minister and his officials that these products could be regulated in a manner such as is suggested here.

On checking in my riding in Essex county and in Kent county I find that the bulk of the egg producers and the broiler producers in our area are not in favour of this legislation.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Broiler producers are not in favour of it?

Mr. Paterson: The ones that I have talked to in the Essex and Kent area do not seem to favour this. Certainly the producers of other agricultural products in Essex and Kent counties are quite concerned about this, for fear there might be some reciprocal action against some of their products. I would hope that this would not come about. This was what prompted the question I placed on the order paper several days ago requesting the dollar value of these various commodities that we ship into Quebec and, conversely, that they ship in to us.

The fear of the specialized agriculturalist in my area is that if the Quebec government—and that is a big "if" and we hope it

does not implement it—does take reciprocal action against certain Ontario products that it will enlarge its acreage in onions or in some other products that it is now moving into on a much larger scale.

And when this federal legislation comes down and the courts decide on this matter—and if everything is thrown out in this Ontario bill—the consumer or the producers of these products will be faced with a much greater acreage in the Province of Quebec and Ontario, thereby flooding the market.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is already going on now.

Mr. Paterson: We feel that this bill is going to heighten it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Just nonsense.

Mr. Paterson: This is the talk in the concessions in the rural areas in Essex and Kent counties.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is just nonsense.

Mr. Paterson: I do not feel so, Mr. Speaker. I have always admired the minister's tenacity to work and I have respected his actions on behalf of the farmers—not always his judgement, but certainly his willingness to work on their behalf.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the member mean the way the minister fought for crop insurance for the Essex farmers?

Mr. Paterson: Not in that—on other matters he has been—

Mr. MacDonald: Oh! I thought the hon. member always admired the way the minister fought for him.

Mr. Paterson: —a very hard-working minister with this government.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member must never admire anybody on the government side.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Paterson: That is right. But this is a minister with whom I have had very good co-operation on a great number of products, but I feel that he is barking up the wrong tree on this particular bill.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): He is milking in the wrong pasture.

Mr. MacDonald: Or in the wrong chicken shed!

Mr. Paterson: The people that I have talked to this past weekend feel that possibly, by taking action on this bill, specifically in relation to the broiler industry—and I guess I have got to put the words that are given to me—that the minister is, in fact, protecting the very large producers of eggs or broilers in this province, and some of the medium-sized and some of the smaller producers, who in fact are owned or controlled by the feed companies.

This is a feeling in the rural areas, in many cases where they have lost control of their own destiny because they are so far in debt to the major feed companies.

This is the word that is coming off the concessions. It appears to a great number of people, and I hope that this is not the case, that this is the basic reason for this bill—and I hope it does not have the repercussions that many of these people have expressed to me and that might jeopardize the total of the agriculture production in our province and its relation to Quebec and the eastern markets of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I am still a little overwhelmed by the profound knowledge of my colleague from Riverdale on the question of eggs and broilers. It just goes to show that when one approaches even such lowly forms of life from the intricacies of the law, profound wisdom flows.

Seriously, however, he raised a number of points which I think this government, if it is going to protect the interests of agriculture and if it is going to play a constructive role in building one country, has got to pay some attention to. I suspect that it is just possible, to borrow a phrase from the Prime Minister, it is just possible that "the germ of an idea" has been handed to the Minister of Agriculture and Food that he might ponder.

My remarks are not going to be lengthy, because I think that most of the things that need to be said have been said, and well said. Therefore a brief recapitulation on one or two points and then one or two relatively new points that I want to add.

I do not think the minister himself can deny the fact that this bill raises the prospects of a serious escalation of the inter-provincial trade warfare that is going on in this country at the present time. He has not denied it. Indeed there is no point in denying it because the bill is to give powers which will result in an escalation of that

interprovincial trade warfare. The net result is going to be some further contribution to the balkanization of Canada.

Now the minister defends his position in saying that he has an initial paramount responsibility to defend his farmers, those who happen to be producing broilers. But I think there are a lot of other factors which I hope I can weave into the picture as I am dealing with it.

The minister has the choice, faced with this kind of situation, of either heating up the situation or cooling it down. Now we know, having watched the minister for many years, that if he gets into a rather tough fight he relishes it. He has a capacity for explosive breaking-out in every direction, and this bill is a legislative personification of that characteristic of the minister. Instead of sitting down, instead of working it out, as has been suggested by earlier speakers, with the two provincial Ministers of Agriculture and, if necessary, with the government at Ottawa, he is willing to heat the whole situation up. Indeed, he is going to make a bad situation worse.

When you combine with that the fact that on this issue we have become bogged down in a constitutional morass in Canada, and again it is going from bad to worse. The minister the other day interjected, when we raised some aspect of this situation, that the government in Manitoba had introduced politics in this and gone off on the wrong road in dealing with the problem, when it went directly to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Surely, in retrospect, that was the thing to have done, if the Supreme Court of Canada could have been persuaded to have dealt with the issue, because now we have a situation in which the highest court in the Province of Quebec has said that the powers as exercised by the Quebec government in its legislation are valid, whereas the highest court in the Province of Manitoba has said that the exercise of those powers by the government of Manitoba is invalid.

Now the conflict has got to be resolved; it has got to be resolved at the highest court in the land. I would have hoped, instead of getting up on his little political podium the other day, that the minister would have devoted some of that energy in getting this government to move, as I think it might have moved, in making representations along with the government of Manitoba, in the original reference to the Supreme Court of Canada, which would have resolved the issue to begin with, instead of having to go back

by the devious route of the various courts in Manitoba and Quebec and, then, ultimately back to the Supreme Court of Canada.

In other words, the government of Manitoba took the initiative to resolve the issue right at the outset. Now many, many months—indeed, it may be a year or two later—we will get it resolved by returning to the same Supreme Court of the land. Now the unfortunate thing about this, Mr. Speaker, is that the minister is a member of a government which is reiterating its strong, continued support for the Robarts approach to constitutional problems and for building one Canada. Surely, it becomes a bit of a mockery that a minister of this government should, on one hand, be paying tribute to the former Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and the kind of approach he took to the constitution and dealing with constitutional problems, and then, on the other hand, coming into the House with this kind of legislation, which inevitably is going to lead to a further balkanization of Canada.

So there is one serious aspect of this bill—from the Canadian point of view. We should look beyond the Province of Ontario, our immediate concerns and our immediate obligations to the broader obligations of Canada because, if I can paraphrase rather freely the comments of the hon. member for London North (Mr. Robarts), on a number of occasions, what is good for Canada has to be good for Ontario. This is not going to be good for Canada and therefore ultimately it is not going to be good for Ontario.

However, let me narrow my concern for a moment to the Province of Ontario. I am, quite frankly, not in the position to speak with the kind of authority I would like on a key issue—what is the trade flow between the Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec on agricultural products? I was interested in the assertion this afternoon of, I think the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Innes), who contended that Ontario exported to Quebec—if I may use that terminology—about 20 per cent more agricultural products than it imported from Quebec. I think the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) said it was a 10-to-7 ratio.

Quite frankly, I do not know and the intriguing thing is that in Canada nobody knows.

The Dominion Bureau of Statistics has never gathered the statistics on interprovincial trade. I have talked to some of the statisticians in the minister's department as I tried

to get some ball-park assessment of this situation a few days ago, and I certainly was left with the impression that the flow of Ontario agricultural product to the Province of Quebec, as compared with the reverse flow, is far greater than a 100-to-80-percentage ratio as was suggested by the hon. member for Oxford. I heard some people contend that it is as much as 10 times as great from Ontario to Quebec as it is from Quebec to Ontario.

I do not know what the appropriate and the accurate figure is and I trust that this government, in conjunction I assume with the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, is going to get these statistics, because they are fundamental to a real assessment of the problem we are getting ourselves into.

However, let me add another dimension to it. If the flow of Ontario agricultural products to Quebec is that much greater, as is suggested by many people, what the minister, in effect, is doing is heating up an interprovincial trade warfare in which it is impossible for the Province of Ontario not to be more greatly hurt than Quebec in the long run. If we have far more of our agricultural produce going into Quebec than Quebec has coming into Ontario, if the government challenges them to this kind of a tit-for-tat retaliatory kind of approach, we are going to suffer.

In fact, the thing that intrigues me most, and I say this in the presence of all too few members from that solid land of eastern Ontario which is represented by Tories in this House—

Mr. Yakabuski: The member's party has not too many over there itself.

Mr. MacDonald:—just listen for a moment. In counties like Prescott and Russell, I am informed by people who are very knowledgeable about the picture, as much as 90 per cent of their produce goes to the province of Quebec. As far west as Grenville and Dundas, 70 to 80 per cent of their produce goes into the Province of Quebec. As far west as Leeds, still as much as 50 per cent of their produce is going into the Province of Quebec.

Somebody said 60? Well, 50 to 60 per cent.

Which simply means this, Mr. Speaker, that by "heating up" the interprovincial trade warfare in which we in the Province of Ontario are exporting so much more of our agricultural produce, and thereby inviting retaliatory action, the minister is going to

hurt the whole of the agricultural industry in the Province of Ontario. He is going to deal a devastating blow, particularly to the eastern part of Ontario because such an overwhelming portion of its produce goes to the Province of Quebec.

This is why I cannot understand what the minister is up to.

He says that he is going to protect the broiler industry. Well, I am not going to repeat everything that the hon. member for Huron-Bruce said this afternoon, but I would like to have a bit more knowledge as to where the thrust came from for the minister to intervene at this point and fight for the broiler industry.

Mr. Sargent: From the big feed companies.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, that has been said and I want to repeat it. He poses as a champion of the little broiler producer, but may I suggest to the minister if he examine it in his heart of hearts, the thrust for this whole thing came from the board. And the dominant and the influential people on the board are the big quota holders. And the big quota holders are invariably people who are tied in with the feed industry.

It is nonsense for the minister to try to pose as the champion of the little broiler producers against those big integrators in Quebec, when in fact he is responding to the pressures and the lobbying of the big integrated broiler producers in the Province of Ontario.

What the minister is going to do, Mr. Speaker, in protecting a small segment of the agricultural industry in the Province of Ontario, is sacrifice the overall welfare of the agricultural industry across the whole province. With that flow of agricultural produce to the Province of Quebec—in inviting retaliatory action—he is really going to create a very serious problem for the farmers of this province.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Sargent: Pull the bill!

Mr. MacDonald: For that reason, Mr. Speaker, we are going to oppose second reading. There have been many other solid constitutional arguments that have been advanced in terms of the continued invasion of civil rights while this government prates about royal commissions and the implementation of their recommendations to protect civil rights. But those only bolster the essential economic

argument, and on that I rest my case and I think the case is conclusive.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I want briefly to bring up two areas of the minister's position concerning this bill that really concern me.

The first one that did surprise me was a point that he reiterated a few minutes ago—that he had not yet stated the position he will take if and when—and we believe it is just when—this case comes before the Supreme Court of Canada. It seems to me that, knowing this government's interest and the minister's interest—that we are Canadians first and Ontarians second—there is no question about the position the minister will take, and take as vigorously as he can, to support those who are upset with great reason with this whole measure of balkanization of agricultural markets within Canada.

Every effort this minister should be making through the courts and every effort he should be making politically to the government in Ottawa should be that of endeavouring to break down those barriers which have been thrown up, artificially balkanizing our agricultural markets in this country. Surely we should be emphasizing and fighting for that first and foremost and announcing our position as the major province in this country, and such an important agricultural producer that we are, for Canada, a Canadian market and perhaps even a North American market.

Above all, we should demonstrate we are not encouraging and playing tit-for-tat with any other province which chooses to take this very short-term and very unenlightened approach to our Canadian agricultural market.

The second point I wish to bring to the attention of the House is the matter of what we do when we introduce a temporary, short-term measure. Tonight there was a party in the pages' quarters for a couple of lads who are having birthdays and among the candles on the cake were a couple of trick ones. The boys thought they were blowing out the candles and suddenly the fire kept on coming up in two and three spots again. It was almost impossible for them to extinguish the blaze.

This is the sort of situation we are going to find ourselves in by resorting to very short-term—and we in our hearts know incorrect—approaches to dealing with a problem that all of us regret our producers in

this province are facing. A few specialized groups particularly are facing these problems.

Surely we cannot resort to these short-term procedures? In business we know it is a great mistake, and in agriculture we know it is a great mistake.

If the minister is a chess player, he will know that he has to see the moves a long way ahead or first thing he knows, he has lost the game. I think—in fact I know—he is going to find this bill is going to lose him the game; and lose the game, not just for him, but for the farmers of this province.

I urge the minister to think of the position, not just as a temporary stopgap but to take a longer-term view of the whole situation and withdraw the bill and fight for once again having an all-Canadian approach to the marketing of agricultural products.

Mr. Speaker: Any further speakers before the minister sums up?

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker, just a few points on the same thing.

Earlier today the Minister of University Affairs (Mr. White) announced that there will be a history written of the Premiers of this province, and probably one of the things that will be written about this Premier of the province is the fact that he presided over the great egg and broiler war.

It will be a short chapter I must admit.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): A short history.

Mr. Makarchuk: It will be a short history; a short chapter in the book. I hope the book is an on-going thing after that.

But it is a very silly situation to bring in, that we have to be involved in this kind of a battle, the results of which, of course, would be to the detriment of the country. I think the minister realizes that it is an economic problem. It is an economic problem resulting from the fact that the farmers have not been getting a fair return for their produce. It has been argued in this House on numerous occasions. We have asked the government to investigate the prices that the farmers have to pay for the inputs. We have asked the government, or the party in power, and we are asking them to investigate, whether the farmers have been getting a fair return on the outputs on the produce they sell, and on all occasions the government refused to act. Now a situation develops and it brings in this particular band-aid measure which will only

inject and extend the whole situation into something ridiculous.

This matter, Mr. Speaker, was raised in the House by myself in questions of the Minister of Agriculture and Food when the problem developed in Manitoba. I asked the minister then whether he would try to find out, and perhaps get involved at that time, to see if he could defuse the situation, or take sides and perhaps call a conference of the various agricultural ministers in the country with the federal minister to try and defuse the situation. He refused to act at that particular time. Now he comes in with this particular bill. He has embarked on a course that is going to hurt the farmers. It is certainly going to hurt the people of this province, and eventually it will hurt the country as well. We have no choice; we have to oppose this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong this debate too long as a number of speakers have covered almost all of the things that need to be covered, I would suppose. Maybe we wonder why we get into these positions that we are in. It is a matter, I suppose, of over-production in some areas of our country, and the broiler industry, certainly, was over-produced in Quebec in the last few months or the last couple of years. I see that they have exported three million pounds of poultry to Japan and they were bailed out apparently by the federal government to get an export market. The word is now that they are going to be better boys and not produce so much.

But I just do not think that we can live in a province like Ontario and not think we are Canadians—at least I always felt that I am a Canadian first. I was born in Canada, so I think I am a Canadian first and an Ontarian second. Whether everybody agrees with that principle or not I do not know, but I think I do.

I worked in the customs and immigration service for a couple of years and never thought the day would come when we might have to have such things on the borders between each province. Of course, we know that The British North America Act allows no custom duties between provinces, but this just does not seem right at all for a country like Canada—a growing country with a large area, a small population but great

potential yet—to start having barriers between each province. I think that there are other ways of conquering this. I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture in Quebec and the Minister of Agriculture and Food here and whatever other provinces which are felt necessary should be able to get together—I think the minister said the other day he was not fluent in French but his deputy minister was; but I am sure that he can find someone who is very fluent in French and get his point across—surely that is not too much of a problem, and I do not think that this is proper legislation at this time whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker: Any further speakers before the minister sums up? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest this afternoon to the various points that were put by the respective speakers concerning this legislation.

Mr. Sargent: No support over there at all.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am more than concerned with the attitude that has been taken to this legislation. I was as surprised as anyone to see the McRuer report presented this afternoon—I did not even know it had been submitted to the government—and for the hon. member for Downsview who absents himself from the House this evening to suggest—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): He will be here.

Hon. Mr. Stewart:—that I knew that the report was out and that I should have consulted with whoever had the report, to me was less than dignified as far as a member of the House is concerned. I suppose it can be expected of that member, but I do not think it was quite the thing to do.

I listened with some interest to the Leader of the Opposition when he suggested that there were alternatives open that we should have pursued, and I would have liked the Leader of the Opposition to have been in the House this evening to have heard me explain that discussions took place on innumerable occasions—in fact, he mentioned one of the occasions when he referred to the meeting of ministers held in Regina in 1968, when it was I who raised the question there with the new Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Olson, that something had to be done to resolve the issue that was developing as far as poultry

products were concerned in interprovincial trade in Canada.

There had been discussions held on innumerable occasions before that between myself and my deputy and the minister and his deputy in the Province of Quebec. There had been discussions held between myself and other ministers in Canada at previous agricultural ministers' meetings to that one held in Regina in 1968, to which the Leader of the Opposition referred.

It was as plain as the nose on anyone's face that we were faced with a real problem as far as the marketing of poultry products is concerned in Canada—and there is a very simple reason for it: Poultry products can be multiplied and produced in abundance virtually overnight. You cannot do this with beef. Much less can you do it with hogs. But you can get into mass production of poultry products overnight relatively, and of course the problem built up. There is no question that it built up. We recognized it. We could see it coming.

We saw the virtually uninhibited production of eggs developing in Ontario. We saw what was happening in the Province of Ontario. We saw what was happening in the Province of Manitoba, with large corporate interests moving in, some of them with half a million birds producing eggs in the Province of Manitoba today—not owned by the farmers, owned by corporate interests.

We saw the same thing happening in the Province of Quebec as far as broiler production was concerned. Our broiler producers, if I can recall for the benefit of the members of the House, Mr. Speaker, in the early 1960s were suffering from prices that were at almost disaster levels. They decided to do something about it by voting in an agency marketing plan which would provide for supply management in broilers. They did this themselves. They established quotas, they established price, and they increased those quotas based on what the market would demand and based of course on the increase in population and the increase in the popularity of their product on the market. But while they were increasing production, say by six per cent in a given period, in the same period Quebec increased by 26 per cent. I just point that out as an illustration. There was no quota restriction in the Province of Quebec; there was no quota restriction in most of the other provinces, but we did have it here.

Now we have recognized the problem that we could not say to our egg producers in Ontario, "You are shipping eggs into the

Province of Quebec—cease and desist." That was their right. They were doing it, and Quebec obviously needed those eggs. As the Quebec Minister of Agriculture himself told me within the last few weeks, "We require and need at least 30,000 cases of eggs from the Province of Ontario every week." Now what is wrong with them shipping them in there? But he goes on to say, "I do not want those eggs to come in at prices that will put our producers out of business."

The big egg producers of Quebec voted a number of months ago the establishment of a plan—it was finally introduced last year—which provided for the establishment of a central selling agency for eggs in the Province of Quebec. It was implemented, I believe it was, in May or June of 1970, and required that all eggs—not only produced in Quebec but marketed in Quebec from outside—had to be sold to that agency, and that agency would disperse them throughout the province and the agency would pay the producers for them.

It caught our producers completely unaware. I recall the great distress that many of them exhibited here in the Province of Ontario because they did not know whether they were going to be allowed to participate in this new plan or not. But the law was the law, and as far as we were concerned, Quebec had decided that this was what they wanted to do for their egg producers; many of our producers got permission to ship in through FEDCO.

The unfortunate part of it is that FEDCO, in my humble opinion—and this is only an opinion, but I have expressed it to the minister of Quebec and I express it here—perhaps had established the price ratio too high to make the plan really effective. When you set a price differential between Toronto and Montreal, of the kind of difference that was established, then it simply encourages people to ship eggs into the Province of Quebec other than through FEDCO. And this happened, obviously it happened. Black-market eggs went into Quebec, and I am told by some producer-packer-shippers in Ontario that they are shipping them in there and are not observing the law as far as the Province of Quebec is concerned.

But it is up to the Province of Quebec to enforce that law if they want to enforce it; that is their prerogative. They have the teeth; they have the right. It is their job to do it. Our job is to be responsible to the producers of the Province of Ontario.

The broiler producers of Canada outside of the Province of Ontario are required to

have marketing permits to sell broilers in Ontario. We have not said to them that they cannot ship broilers into Ontario. We have not said to them that they cannot store broilers in Ontario. We have not said to them that they cannot send them through the Province of Ontario to sell in other markets. We have simply said that when they sell broilers in Ontario they require a marketing permit to do so. And in my opinion—and this opinion is shared by many people, both at provincial and federal level—this is not ultra vires of The British North America Act.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Where are the free-enterprise boys?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: So here we are. I find it interesting, Mr. Speaker, that no one rose on his feet when this House opened to criticize what we did in giving the broiler producers of Ontario on September 3, 1970, the right to issue these marketing permits. No one said a word. The Opposition apparently approved of what we did; they raised no objection. Now we simply introduce a section in The Farm Products Marketing Act which provides for enforcement through seizure and detention of products, which applies to all products; we are not discriminating against anyone. We are simply putting that legislation forward because it is in many other statutes that the members of this House voted unanimously to put in. There it is.

Now why the opposition to this from my friends across the aisle? They voted for meat inspection, we have it there; they voted for The Beef Cattle Marketing Act, we have it there; they voted for many such Acts. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to call to memory that The Farm Products Marketing Act was passed in 1937 by the Liberal government of that day. Here the Liberals are today saying that we are doing the wrong thing in protecting the interests of the farm people of the province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is what they are saying, my friends; that is what they are saying. As for my hon. friend from York South, I have always listened to him with great interest because I think, even though he is not a farmer, he has forgotten more about the agricultural industry in this province than all the rest of his caucus ever knew. I would suggest this—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That does not say that he knows very much, Mr. Speaker, but it does say he knows a lot more than all the rest of them put together.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): He is magnificent.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He talked about the possible escalation of the provincial trade war and how Ontario should have joined Manitoba in referral to the Supreme Court. Nobody has said, as I said earlier, that we are not going to. He talked about supply management as not being good for Canada. The former leader of the socialist party, the member for York South, was saying in this House that supply management is not good for Canada. Mr. Speaker, history has been made here tonight, really it has.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is what I got out of it. He said it is not good for Canada and, therefore, it is not good for Ontario. Well, there it is.

Mr. MacDonald: Wait until Pat Chefurka gets the minister.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: As a matter of fact, I am looking forward to that.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand what happened to the member for York South. He came up to Middlesex North to have a meeting of the farmers. By Jove! He was going to tell those farmers what a terrible guy that fellow Stewart was.

Mr. Breithaupt: They already knew.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Many of them maybe did know a great deal, but he was going to reinforce their knowledge. He introduced one of the eastern Canadian editors of a national farm magazine as the next candidate in Middlesex North.

Mr. MacDonald: I did not.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well now, that is the report that came back.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister's spies at that meeting were off-base.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They came back and said that was the chap who was introduced. I could not understand what happened, for all of a sudden that guy just disappeared.

Mr. MacDonald: They came back, but I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Is that not too bad, because I cannot understand why he did not say that? He persuaded that particular person and his family to come to Toronto as the delegates from Middlesex North to the leadership convention of the ND Party.

Mr. MacDonald: On a point of order, the Minister of Agriculture and Food must know that I do not, nor does anybody else, appoint delegates for any riding association. They are elected by that riding association. He thinks that democracy always operates in a Tory fashion.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The NDP nomination meeting in my riding was held in a telephone booth.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have that matter clarified. I wondered what happened to that fellow for a long time. Now I know. Let me get back to this legislation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What will the young NDPers say? Tell us about them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have been wondering what all of the discussion has been.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, if anyone thinks that I, as Minister of Agriculture and Food for the Province of Ontario, have not turned every stone that I can think of turning to develop a national programme of marketing in Canada, they just do not know the story. I have done everything that I can possibly think of doing to generate some way of sitting down around the table and working out these matters of great complexities.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Why clutter it up now, though?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend says, "Why clutter it up now?" I suggest to him that what he is saying and what has been said by many others this afternoon and this evening is simply this, that we are ready and we are willing; we want to support national marketing legislation where it applies to commodities where there are problems with interprovincial trade.

But when is this going to come about? We do not know. We have been waiting for months to get this legislation through the House of Commons. We all know the reasons. I am not pretending to anybody nor am I throwing bricks at anybody but we know what has happened.

We felt, quite frankly, that the answer does not quite lie in the referral to the Supreme Court, because heaven only knows when that report will come down. And what are our broiler producers to do in the meantime? Are they to be thrown to the wolves? Are they to go down the drain? Are their investments to be thrown away, or are we to say to them, "In the meantime we are going to look after your interests"? We will continue to work, Mr. Speaker, for the development of the bill at the national level. That is our objective and our purpose.

Mr. Speaker, when somebody says to me tonight that all I am interested in are the large producers—the people associated with the feed companies, with the processing companies—that they are the only ones I am protecting, they just do not know the story.

Here I have, I sent out for and got—I did not know until tonight what quotas the broiler board members have—the board members. I have them right before me.

Mr. MacDonald: We are not talking about the board members.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We are talking—the hon. member referred to the board members—yes, he did.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: If the minister wants to clarify this point, let him clarify it. I was not talking about the board's members. I was talking about the top six quota holders.

Now, will the hon. minister give us the figures for the top six quota holders, because none of them is a member of the board?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is not what the hon. member said, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, it is not what the hon. member said.

Mr. MacDonald: I have them all here.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The hon. member said that I was supporting the members of the

board who were integrated operators with the feed companies who held big quotas.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the hon. member intended to say, all I know is what I heard.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: They pay the freight company anyway.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The figures that I had given to me of the board members' quotas—and since it was raised I think it is fair to report them:

Gerald Tedford, the chairman of the board—a 25,000-bird quota, four times per year.

Mr. McLeod—I believe that is Ken McLeod—15,000, Stapleton 80,000, Woods 32,000, Tisdale 30,000, Person 7,000, Hepburn 20,000 to 30,000, Enns 28,000, Martin 25,000.

Mr. MacDonald: What about Jim McGrath and the others?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not know. He is not a member of the board.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, the hon. minister does not know about them?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not even know the man.

Mr. MacDonald: These are the front men on the board. How about the big boys behind the scene?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have no idea about them because I have—

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, the hon. minister would not know! The hon. minister has not named the top six quota holders.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have no idea who they are.

An hon. member: Are they members of the board?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, they are not. All I do know, Mr. Speaker, is that I have—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Lawlor: Does the hon. minister know or does he not know?

Mr. Stewart: I find it difficult, Mr. Speaker, to understand why the hon. member for

York South takes such extreme exception to what we are trying to do to protect the interests of farmers in Ontario. He has always said that we should not be breathing over the shoulder of the farmers of Ontario in marketing legislation—we should let them run it themselves and not take that paternalistic attitude. These are the words he used before and tonight he has really taken the other approach. I just do not understand that at all.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. minister has taken four different approaches in the same speech.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There was reference made to the fact—with great eloquence by my friend the member for Riverdale—that there was no provision for appeal in this marketing legislation.

I would direct his attention—and I assume that he has not read The Farm Products Marketing Act—to section 10(a) which is the appeal section of the Act. It covers two pages of the Act, Mr. Speaker, in outlining every method of appeal that is “open to any person deeming himself aggrieved by any order, direction or decision of a local board.”

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member for Riverdale just lost his QC to the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have to ask, why would a man make a statement like that? I just do not understand that at all. So that deals with that situation, I think, quite effectively.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. minister has missed the main point.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend suggests that what we are doing is ultra vires of The British North America Act. We challenge that very definitely. We do not believe that it is.

Reference was made to a decision of the Manitoba Supreme Court which was in direct opposite opinion to the same court in the Province of Quebec—based, I believe, on almost an identical plan referred to both courts. Here we have a difference of opinion.

But those plans are not the same kind of a plan that we have in the Province of Ontario. There is no difference between the Quebec and Manitoba plans that I can see. Maybe there is something the lawyers can see, but I do not see the difference. But it is entirely different to what we have in the Province of Ontario.

We are simply talking about marketing the product in the Province of Ontario. The purposes of The Farm Products Marketing Act as described in section 2, Mr. Speaker, are: "to provide for the control and regulation in any or all respects of the marketing within Ontario of farm products." There it is.

Surely what we are attempting to do is to help the people, but the Opposition members do not seem to want to help. That, to me, is a revelation that I am astounded to realize and recognize in this House today. I really am.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Shame!

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): The member for Huron-Bruce must be embarrassed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where is the leader of the NDP if this is so important a matter of civil rights? Where is he?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will bet that he is at the hockey game.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know he is at the hockey game.

An hon. member: He is not at the hockey game.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please!

Mr. Sargent: Would the minister accept a question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So important a matter as civil rights!

Mr. Sargent: Does the minister not think it is completely inconceivable that we have to set up trade barriers within our own country?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh well!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I would say that it would be preferable if we could resolve the matter around the table of negotiation. I have suggested this time and again to people in Quebec, in Ontario, in Manitoba and in many other provinces of Canada. Since we cannot resolve it around the table until we have a national marketing Act—similar to The Canadian Dairy Commission Act which acted really as a catalyst for the various dairy boards within the provinces of Canada to work under—I think we have to take the next best course of action.

Quite frankly, in this legislation that we are providing here, we are not just saying seizure of a product coming here from some other province. We are not discriminating against producers from other provinces. We are saying that this is general seizure and detention legislation that applies to all products.

Supposing broiler producers within the Province of Ontario decide to ignore their quota and go on and produce far beyond their quotas and attempt to market them just as producers in other provinces are attempting to market. Are we to do something about that? This is what this legislation is intended to do. It is not designed, it is not directed, at such other places specifically.

It is similar legislation to what we have everywhere else and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand why we have had such opposition to this particular legislation. We think it is proper; we think it is right. I do not know what my hon. friend from Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter) has suggested, I have no idea, but I do know that on March 26 this year, in meeting with the federal minister and the other ministers from across Canada and their deputies at Ottawa, the matter of national marketing legislation came up. It was generally agreed by all of us that the proper way to solve this thing is around the table.

But unless you have something to work with, unless you have a vehicle, there is just no way to resolve it, because people say "There is no authority here; we ignore it." This is what has happened. In the Province of Ontario since September 3, there was a sort of a gentleman's agreement that people abided by the marketing permit regulations.

Now there are people who are saying "We are ignoring that and we are going to challenge your legislation. We are going to pour broilers in here." There are chain stores saying "We are going to sell those broilers and you try and stop us." They know full well that in the marketing legislation we have in the Province of Ontario there is no effective teeth to do it.

The legislation of the Province of New Brunswick—and I have it right here—and the legislation of the Province of British Columbia does have those clauses. We are simply introducing this amendment. My guess is it will never be used in this province. I think it will effectively control the whole issue. We will put the fire out. We will contain the issue and in my opinion, and I hope beyond hope, we will have that national marketing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude this brief reply to hours of debate this afternoon I would refer to my presentation to the standing committee on agriculture in the House of Commons. I believe my hon. friend, the member for York South, attended those hearings; I am not sure whether there were other members there or not. But on page 3, and I quote, Mr. Speaker,

I suggest to you that the question facing this committee is not should we or should we not have national marketing legislation but rather it is how soon can we expect to have national marketing legislation to bring order and stability to the industry. We can scarcely stand idly by and allow our producers who have adopted supply management programmes to become buried under the unplanned production of other areas that is literally dumped on our markets. Until a national marketing Act has been developed and proclaimed, provinces will be forced to use whatever measures they can develop to protect the interests of their producers. It is possible that voluntary agreements can be established, but our experience has indicated little success by this method.

That sums up the position of this government, Mr. Speaker. I suggest to all hon. members of this House that we support this legislation; that we provide the protection that is necessary; and that we lend all the support that we can in this government—

Mr. J. Renwick: The minister had better rally them.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —to the passage of that national legislation. Bearing in mind the comments made by my friend from Riverdale, we are not in any way selling out the farm people of the Province of Ontario through national legislation. We are simply saying that we as people, responsible people in this province, will sit down around the table with federal people and our counterparts from other provinces to work out this complex and difficult situation—

Mr. J. Renwick: The government will have lost its constitutional power.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —for the benefit of all producers of all Canada, including Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: The minister has got my vote.

Mr. Makarchuk: Never has so much eloquence been wasted on one egg.

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West): Who are you?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: That about defines the member's position on agriculture, too.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Was the member for Riverdale wrong about the appeal?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Hon. Mr. Stewart moves that bill—

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of University Affairs): The member will be sorry.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Mr. Stewart moves that Bill 10, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act, be now read a second time.

Mr. Nixon moves that the motion be amended by striking out the word "now", and adding thereto the words "this day six months hence".

Now, by our standing order number 46A, the first question to be decided, of course, is whether the bill shall now be read the second time.

The House divided on the question, shall the bill be now read a second time, which was approved on the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Allan	Braithwaite
Apps	Breithaupt
Auld	Burr
Bales	Deacon
Belanger	Deans
Bernier	Edighoffer
Brunelle	Farquhar
Carruthers	Ferrier
Carton	Gaunt
Connell	Good
Davis	Haggerty
Demers	Innes
Downer	Jackson
Dunlop	Lawlor
Dymond	MacDonald
Evans	Makarchuk
Gilbertson	Martel
Grossman	Paterson
Guindon	Pilkey
Hamilton	Pitman
Haskett	Renwick
Henderson	(Riverdale)
Hodgson	Ruston
(Victoria-Haliburton)	Sargent

AYES

Johnston
(Carleton)
Kennedy
Kerr
Meen
Morningstar
Morrow
McKeough
McNeil
Price
Pritchard (Mrs.)
Reuter
Rollins
Rowe
Rowntree
Smith
(Simcoe East)
Smith
(Hamilton Mountain)
Stewart
Villeneuve
Wells
White
Whitney
Winkler
Wishart
Yakabuski—47.

NAYS

Shulman
Smith
(Nipissing)
Spence—26.

Clerk of the House: House in committee of the Whole; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

House in committee on Bill 10, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 10, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act. Are there any comments, questions or amendments to any section of this bill? If not, shall the bill be reported?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, as usual, the government either does not know what the business is going to be or it moves precipitously to force a bill through the House. I have not yet had an opportunity to write the amendment to the section which is required at least to indicate our concern about it. Therefore, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, if while I am commenting I also write at the same time, I may be able to move the proposed amendment.

Mr. Chairman: What section does the hon. member wish to amend?

Mr. J. Renwick: It is clause 1 of the bill, which would be section 12*b* of the Act, which would be subsection 6 of section 12*b* of clause 1, and the motion which I would like to move is that the word "board" be deleted, and in substitution for the word "board" the words "the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council" be substituted, and that the further words be added to the clause, "and that any such regulations, before coming into effect, would be published pursuant to The Regulations Act of the Province of Ontario." That is the substance of the motion, Mr. Chairman, and if I could have a moment to write it out, I will do so.

Mr. Chairman: If the hon. member will take the time now to write out the motion, we will hold up proceedings.

Mr. J. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On section 1:

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Mr. J. Renwick moves that the word "board" be deleted and the words "Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council" be added, "and that no such regulation—it says "that the word 'board' be deleted and the words "Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council"—does the hon. member mean be substituted therefor, because he does not say anything in the motion at all?

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 47, the "nays" are 26.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves third reading of Bill 10.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, may we suggest that the bill go to Committee of the Whole House at the appropriate time?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, the Speaker, of course, inquires to know whether the bill goes to third reading or not.

Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Committee of the Whole House?

Some hon. members: Yes.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I gather it is not the intention of the minister to send it to what used to be the agricultural committee, now the natural resources committee.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the House leader that we move the House into Committee of the Whole and deal with the bill.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I intended that the word "board" be deleted and the words which I have inserted there be inserted in lieu of the word "board".

Mr. Chairman: In lieu thereof.

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: "And that no such regulation come into force until it is published pursuant to The Regulations Act."

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I think the purport of the amendment is perfectly clear. It is an amendment to subsection 6 of section 12b of clause 1 of the proposed Act. It is designed to meet two of the principal recommendations of the McRuer report. One is that any regulations which have this kind of drastic effect with respect to the rights in property of persons in the province should be first of all approved, not by a board but be subject to approval by the government, that is the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, before they come into force. And, in addition, before they come into force, they should be published in the *Ontario Gazette* so that everyone in the province is given notice of the terms of those regulations.

I think it is a perfectly reasonable and proper amendment. It is consistent with the remarks which we made on this particular point on second reading and is certainly consistent with the spirit and indeed the precise recommendations of Mr. McRuer, both in his most recent report and in his earlier report to which reference was made earlier this afternoon.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The hon. member is right, but it will not sell.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that we, in this party, will support the amendment. I gather, under legal language, the amendment, and the purport of the amendment, means that the delegated power cannot be redelegated.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Does the member for Huron-Bruce understand it? Does he understand the amendment?

Mr. J. Renwick: It has to at least come back to the government.

Mr. Gaunt: It has to at least come back to the government, and we support that principle. My friend from—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Downsview?

Mr. Gaunt: —Downsview (Mr. Singer) this afternoon made some lengthy comments with respect to the delegation of powers under the Act, and I think that this amendment makes good sense.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Abundant good sense!

Mr. Gaunt: Abundant good sense.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): For that reason, the government will turn it down. It makes good sense.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister wish to comment on the amendment?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Chairman, on the surface the amendment appears to be quite reasonable. However, I believe from a purely legal standpoint of the terms and regulations of The Farm Products Marketing Act that when the hon. member recognizes that subsection 6 reads: "No regulation made by a local board . . ." a local board is an elected board. These are the people who are producer-members elected by their peers in the country; fellow producers of the commodity involved in such regulations do not have to come back to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

If the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, in other words the government, had appointed the local board, then any regulation they make, or may make, has to be returned to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council for approval. But because this is an elected board, that is not required. They simply report their regulation to the Farm Products Marketing Board, which is a board appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The minister should not have told them.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is as I understand it. Am I correct in this description? I am told that I am, and this is the reason why it is not necessary that this be done.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member for Huron-Bruce not think that it makes abundant good sense?

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. J. Renwick's motion?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if I may just comment on what the minister had to say, that the local board may well be an elected board.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Sure, what is the difference?

Mr. J. Renwick: That is quite fine. It does not indicate in any way that this government can shuffle off the responsibility for regulations which are made under statute enacted by the assembly. What we are simply saying is that if what the minister says is correct, then there is no need for the provision that they have to be approved by the board.

All we are saying is that the Farm Products Marketing Board is an appointed board; it is not a politically responsible board, and therefore in substitution for the board, as Mr. McRuer said in the first volume of his report, "it should be responsible to a politically responsible body," and I assume the politically responsible body is either the minister himself, or the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Renwick: I notice that the minister did not comment at all about the question that any such regulation should not be a clandestine matter. He did not comment on that. Any such regulations should be published in the *Ontario Gazette* before they are of any force in effect.

Now surely, Mr. Chairman, if we require other regulations under other statutes which are not an exercise of sub-delegated powers to be published in the *Gazette*, there is every other reason why a sub-delegated power to seize and detain a particular regulated product should be subject to publication in the *Gazette* before anyone is subject to the enforcement of that regulation. It seems in all good sense that we should have some public notice of regulations made by any one of the local boards. So far as I know there is nothing in The Farm Products Marketing Act which requires any local board to make any publication of any such regulation. I do not think it is sufficient for the minister to stand up and ignore that part of the problem.

I am asking the minister, in the light of the McRuer report, in the light of everything which has been said, to accept the kind of amendment which we propose tonight or else to answer the question as to why the matter should not be published so that there is public notice of those regulations.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister have any further comments?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I can understand my hon. friend's concern, but I would say this,

that if we adhere to his suggestion and we approve his amendment, it means that The Regulations Act would have to be amended. It is as simple as that.

I recognize the reference he makes concerning Mr. McRuer's suggestion, and we will be, of course, reviewing The Farm Products Marketing Act in the light of the report that was tabled today. If it appears that this is the thing to do, we will have to take the necessary steps so to do, as has been done with other legislation which, it has been already announced, will be changed in accordance with the McRuer reports.

The publication of any regulations of the local board or any other regulations, even of an appointed board, as is the Farm Products Marketing Board, is governed by The Regulations Act. It is as simple as that. For us to accept that amendment tonight means that we have got to amend The Regulations Act to do what we want to do, and I do not think we want to do that at this particular time.

Mr. J. Renwick: Why? Ask him why.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Is the minister sure of that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is what my law people tell me.

Mr. Lawlor: I am getting a copy of that Act now.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in supporting the amendment by the hon. member for Riverdale, the federal plan is in the area of the elected officials at this point. The minister has assured the House tonight that, in essence, this may never come about. I gather that from his discussion, this will never happen, but it gives the minister more or less a lever, or a threat, to say this could happen. But I am concerned about the fact that we are once again getting away from the elected people, with powers to seizure and detention by a board—it says any local board. This goes the whole gamut, Mr. Minister, it could be very involved, and insofar as the—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: With no disrespect for my hon. friend, may I suggest that, while it may go to any local board, it can only go there on the approval of The Farm Products Marketing Board which is appointed by the Lieutenant - Governor - in - Council which in turn is responsible to this Legislature. That is the connection, so the Farm Products Marketing Board is responsible to an elected political body, such as this group right here.

The government appoints them, and they are the ones who grant the extension of powers to the local board. They do not grant those extensions of powers unless there is very good and valid reason for granting any extension of powers to those boards.

Mr. Sargent: I will go along with that. The only point I have is that, at this point, the whole area is in the hands of elected people for discussion at federal level now. If they are withholding their decision, we necessarily would not need this, if they were doing their job and giving a national plan. But it is now being decided by the elected officials and the government is tossing it back to a board, which I do not think it is proper should be given these powers. I agree with the hon. member for Riverdale; it should go back to the Lieutenant Governor and the cabinet.

Mr. Chairman: Those in favour of Mr. J. Renwick's motion will please say "aye".

Mr. J. Renwick: Before the matter is put, it is always rather tiresome to reiterate to this government point after point after point. But the point that we are trying to make is that regulations made by a local board under this Act should be published in some way so that the people in the Province of Ontario know that such regulations have been promulgated. Surely that is a very simple and elementary part of the process that we have developed in the Legislature. This is not some regulation, minute regulation, under one of the other statutes of the province, which does not have any impact, where publication is required. This is the power of an elected local board, which has special interests, to seize the product in which they have a special interest and to detain it. The fact that it is an elected board does not eliminate their special interest.

Surely the minister, if he is saying to us—and I do not know if he is correct; my colleague from Lakeshore is trying to ascertain the correctness of his statement that The Regulations Act must be amended—surely before the Lieutenant Governor gives royal assent to this bill, it would be possible, for whatever minor amendment is required, for The Regulations Act to come to the assembly. We would certainly expedite its passage.

I want to reiterate to the government that this party is not prepared to vote for the principle involved in the bill as it is before us in committee, under this section which permits powers of seizure and detention of any of the regulated products to be done

under the statute without the regulations, in fact, being published. Can we ask the government, can we beg the government, to adopt that simple process of saying that there must be publication of regulations where the private property of a regulated product of any person is, in fact, seized by a governmental authority? Is that too much to ask of this government or not?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, in reply to that suggestion, of course I recognize the validity of the hon. member's argument. I have already given the undertaking that the complete Farm Products Marketing Act will be reviewed in the light of the report which has been submitted this afternoon.

Now if we are to make this piecemeal regulation change, as I am advised by my legal counsel, an amendment to The Regulations Act is required to publish the regulations and to return the regulations first of all to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council for consideration and approval, and then to publish them, because they are an elected board. They are not an appointed board. As I understand it, The Regulations Act only pertains to regulations passed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. This is my understanding. If we have to delay this legislation to bring in an amendment to The Regulations Act, to my way of thinking this is undue delay because we have, as I pointed out earlier, Mr. Chairman, in many pieces of legislation already approved and in effect and in operation in this province, the right of seizure and detention. I have not heard one hon. member stand in his place today and say that those powers have ever been abused. I simply suggest that we are asking for the same power here.

Mr. Lawlor: On two points!

The first point as to The Regulations Act. I cannot bring myself, acute as the pain may be, to agree with the minister that he is correct, if he would look at section 1 of The Regulations Act.

If I may just depart from that for a moment; you know, pulling this kind of debate and forcing it on coercively is not fair to the opposition nor fair to the government itself in terms of interrogation or of the dissection of the legislation, or bringing this kind of technical point forward at this time of the night. In any event, in other words, I have not had a chance to check the statutory reviews down through the years. But taking the statute as it appears in the

1960 statutes, and I am sure it remains the same to this day, section 1(d) says:

"Regulation" means a regulation rule, order or bylaw of a legislative nature, made or approved under an Act of the Legislature by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, a minister of the Crown, an official of the government, or a board or a commission, all the members of which are appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

It does not include a series of bylaws or regulations under a number of Acts, none of which have any reference to The Farm Products Marketing Act before us tonight. This particular Act is not excluded, therefore, to give even some kind of whispering lip service to the contentions of McRuer. There should be no reason in the world why the minister would not bow before the request of my colleague and embody that in his legislation.

Let us take a situation: You make a seizure of some poultry product coming in from Quebec, and the individual involved—from whom this has been taken so high-handedly—approaches a lawyer in Grimsby, in some small town, and says, "What are our rights under the existing legislation?" The lawyer says, "I will go and look up the regulation", because that is what the Act talks about, but where are the regulations? They are nowhere to be found. You are left relying completely and gratuitously upon the local board as to whether out of the charity of their hearts they would be prepared to let you glance at their local regulations which are published nowhere.

Surely that is an affront to any concept of justice that we ever had in this province. Surely you are flying in the face not of McRuer but deep-seated principles of British common law. We cannot let that pass. This minister has the authority and the power; please exercise it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, one other point. A few moments ago, in a very specious way, the minister argued that, "We only got the McRuer report this afternoon. We will take a look at it and, in the light of that, we will amend the whole Farm Products Marketing Act." They have had the first four volumes of the McRuer report, and if the minister and the government have not grasped the essential principles of the first four volumes, quite apart from the fifth one, they will never grasp

it. It is our job to see if we can get this little point, this germ of an idea, across the floor of the House. The Prime Minister has come in; maybe he can grasp it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have been here all night.

Mr. MacDonald: No, the Premier has not been here all night.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I heard the member's speech earlier.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the thing that disturbs me about this minister is that he comes in and on occasion he can become so dissembling in his approach—he is so benign, he is so gentle and conciliatory. He came into this House one time and said, "Give me this power. I will never exercise it." Remember what happened—the time came when he, in his misconceived appreciation of the situation, went down like a Peruvian South American coup and took over a whole marketing board while the directors of it, namely the bean board, had been misled off into the hotel down in London.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Why is the member singling out Peru? What have they done to him?

An hon. member: When?

Mr. MacDonald: When? What I am saying is that this minister says, "We will not exercise this power. We will regard it with care." I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, our problem is that we have got to protect this minister against his own tendencies on occasion. And his own tendencies—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): The member's leader should protect him over the dinner hour. Really that is the big problem we are facing now.

Mr. J. Renwick: Oh, come, come. If there is anybody who does not understand democratic principles it is the Treasurer of the Province of Ontario. He has no regard for them whatsoever.

Mr. Pilkey: What does the minister think this is, a banana republic?

Mr. MacDonald: Having eaten my dinner tonight in the J and J dinery, I do not know what protection I needed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Where is that?

Mr. MacDonald: The Premier should visit it some time and find out what the rest of us live with.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What has the member got against Peruvians?

Mr. MacDonald: I shall not drag it out. All I am saying is that this minister should learn from his own experience. He was the one who got his fingers burned on earlier occasions.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Did he?

Mr. Pilkey: Is that an American banana republic?

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, the thing backfired and then the growers re-elected the same board and put the same man back in as chairman of the board.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): But on a much different basis. Tell all of it. Tell the other half of the story.

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Mr Henderson: Tell the other half of the story.

Mr. MacDonald: I thought I had told the whole.

Mr. Henderson: You have not.

Mr. MacDonald: I have not?

An hon. member: The member for Lambton will get a chance!

Mr. MacDonald: The minister interjected a while ago with a rather left-handed compliment—that I had forgotten more about agriculture than the rest of my colleagues knew. As I was pondering that comment, it occurred to me that he certainly has forgotten more than the whole of the rest of the government know about agriculture but that is not speaking very well, either for him or the rest of the government. Particularly the hon. member for Chatham-Kent.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): The member did not need to say that now.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I will tell you, I have really made my point but I am trying to fill in time to assist the minister, the deputy and his solicitor. The “germ of

an idea” is sinking, the idea is getting across, they are consulting on it over there. It is just possible that they will bring it back and we will be able to protect the people of Ontario against the intentions or the nomenclatures—

Mr. Chairman: Would the hon. member mind speaking to the amendment?

Mr. MacDonald: I guess I have run out.

Mr. Chairman: Any further comments?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am anxious to hear what the minister has to say about this technical question of interpretation. I am not myself, and this party is not prepared, to be put off on this kind of an issue. We expect the government to say either that The Regulations Act now covers the situation or that it will accept the amendment. If necessary, even from our point of view, we will delete the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council provided we can get the publication.

The minister will tell us in this House now that either The Regulations Act is adequate or, if it is not adequate after consulting with the Minister of Justice and Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), undertake that before this bill receives royal assent that there will be an amendment to The Regulations Act introduced into the Legislature which will cover the point. We are not going to be put off about some grandiose view that The Farm Products Marketing Act is going to be reviewed and changed and altered. We are simply saying here that this party stands on the principle we will not agree or consent to the grant to any local board, whatever its constitution, of the right to pass regulations to seize and detain a regulated product, unless those regulations are published in the *Ontario Gazette* and are therefore available to the public, before they come into effect.

Mr. MacDonald: The government's proposition is offensive.

Mr. J. Renwick: Now that is a question of principle. This party stands on that principle; this party demands the undertaking of the government that this will be done before this bill is given royal assent. That is what we are asking; we can ask no less. We could ask a lot more; we ask no less. We want that undertaking. We expect to have it; we will stay here until we get it.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister have any comments?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have. I can appreciate the position taken by my hon. friends—

Mr. MacDonald: This is another piece of sloppily prepared legislation.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, it is not sloppily prepared legislation; it is completely consistent with every piece of legislation that we have in which this same power is contained. It is there. Now I suggest that if we pass this legislation, we in effect provide the cure for the problem which exists. What my hon. friend has suggested is that we delay the passage of this legislation, which is badly needed—

Some hon. members: No, no.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh yes, they do, because they say that unless we amend The Regulations Act to provide that this amendment can be published, they will—

Mr. MacDonald: Put it in this Act; it should be done in this Act.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, it cannot be done in this Act.

Mr. MacDonald: Why can it not?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It has to be done in The Regulations Act. I am told by my solicitors that The Regulations Act has to be amended in order to provide for regulations that are passed by a local board to be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Mr. MacDonald: Will the minister permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I will not permit a question at the moment. I will listen to the member's questions later, but let me explain the position as we see it.

The Farm Products Marketing Board, as all government boards that are appointed, must return its regulations to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council for consideration, approval and publication. The appointed board in this case, the Farm Products Marketing Board, delegates authority to pass regulations to the local boards, which themselves have to be returned to the appointed board, which is the Farm Products Marketing Board in this case, for consideration. And if they approve of those regulations, then the secretary of the local board keeps them on file and advises all who are affected—that is, the producers affected—by the regulation.

That is the situation, but I can see the wisdom of my hon. friend's suggestion and I am quite sincere in that, as far as I am personally concerned, I am quite prepared to recommend that this regulation be amended and changed. But what he is asking us to do is to delay the passage of this bill for an amendment to The Regulations Act. That means it has got to come back here for first reading, second reading, all through the piece.

Mr. Martel: How long would that take?

Mr. MacDonald: My question is simply this, the minister has hung his whole argument on the proposition that The Regulations Act refers to appointed boards, and so he argues the Farm Products Marketing Board is an appointed board, therefore The Regulations Act applies to it, but not to the local boards that are elected. Surely it follows that the local boards are therefore outside the purview of The Regulations Act.

Why cannot you amend this, since it has reference to any regulations that may be passed by the local boards, and say that they will not become effective until they are published? In that way you would cover those areas excluded from The Regulations Act. It seems to me that this is just plain layman's common sense. I do not know what sort of legal trap or maze we are wandering around in. An amendment in this Act refers specifically to what the government is dealing with. It has no reference to all of the other range of appointed boards and The Regulations Act. This is where we want to cover it, in reference to the exercise of powers that the government is bringing in here.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce had wished to speak before.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the minister what is the panic at this point? All these years we have had this situation; what is the panic tonight?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: We have an amendment before us.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: May I answer the question? As I explained to my hon. friend earlier today, we wanted this legislation through to deal with the particular situation and the point that he has raised in my opinion simply delays by a week to 10 days the

passage of the implementation of the legislation that we have given approval to today. He says that it has got to be published in the *Ontario Gazette*. How long will it take to get that done? My guess is 10 days.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have pointed out that I am calling for an amendment of this Act which means that at 10:30 when we rise the minister could prepare an amendment and bring it in tomorrow. It would then be introduced into the bill before we finish the committee stage and go to third reading. Now where is the delay? All it stipulates is that a regulation passed under this particular Act must be published in the *Ontario Gazette* or elsewhere.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is the very point. I am concerned with what can happen between now and when that regulation is published in the *Ontario Gazette*. If the hon. member understood the urgency that can develop in this particular case—literally tons of broilers can be in this province in a matter of hours. It is just as simple as that.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is playing with something that is going to backfire and blow up in this government's face more than Bill 99.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not think so.

Mr. MacDonald: He is playing with fire and does not even know it.

Mr. Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, it seems that the minister is playing a game of some kind, because it says under subsection 6 of section 1, which is pertinent to the amendment that we have made, that no regulation made by a local board under subsection 1 comes into force until it has been approved by the board.

Now let us be fair. That could take a week, 10 days, two weeks, two months—any length of time. We do not know how long it is going to take. And to say at this point that you are not going to take the additional matter of hours in order to make sure that it is published and available to the people who must operate within the provisions of this Act is, at least, treating the people who are supposed to operate within this Act in a very shabby manner.

Surely the government cannot tell me that under subsection—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member concerned about the citizens of this province or not?

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Of course we are.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He would delay it by 10 days to two weeks.

Mr. Deans: All right, that is fine, Can. the Premier assure me that the—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Sure it will. How can you get it published by then?

Mr. Deans: That is ridiculous, absolutely ridiculous. Is the Prime Minister saying that every piece of legislation introduced into this House to meet an emergency situation must go into force before regulations are published simply because it takes time to publish them? Is that what he is saying? That in order to meet an emergency situation you do not publish regulations because it takes too long? That, in other words, the people of the province must be governed by regulations over which, or under which, or during which, or by which they have no opportunity to become aware?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Standing orders indicate that the House must rise and adjourn at 10:30 p.m. and the committee should rise and report since it is now 10:30. There is no authority under the standing orders to continue unless by government motion to do otherwise.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the House continue to sit until further notice for adjournment.

Mr. Chairman: I believe this has to be done in the House. I do not think this can be done in committee. It should be done with Mr. Speaker in the chair. So I will entertain a motion to rise and report.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the Committee of the Whole House rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the Whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that pursuant to rule 3 the House continue to sit until there is a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any debate on the motion?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): There were no "ayes."

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): That was sloppy procedure, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It was quite obvious to Mr. Speaker that there was a larger voice vote for the motion than against the motion.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): How can you hear something you did not ask for and did not get?

Mr. Speaker: I have no objection to putting the motion again. The motion is that the House continue to sit.

Is it the pleasure of the House the motion carry?

In my opinion the motion is carried.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: House in Committee of the Whole; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

House in committee on Bill 10, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

On section 1:

Mr. Chairman: When the committee did rise and report progress, the hon. member for Wentworth had the floor. He may proceed.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The point I want to make is that when it suits the government's purpose, it seems to be prepared to bend the rules of the law. When we were debating a bill dealing with the layoffs—

Mr. Chairman: I must ask the hon. member to stick to the motion before us—

Mr. Deans: I am.

Mr. Chairman: —which is an amendment to section 6.

Mr. Deans: I am talking to the amendment and the government's answer that they cannot possibly wait until the regulations are printed. When we debate matters of increased pensions, or when we debate matters of provisions for layoffs, or when we debate any

number of other things in this House dealing with the effect of legislation on people, we cannot have it put into force until the regulations are printed, and that is always the big cry. We cannot get the regulations through. We cannot get the regulations printed.

So why is it in this case that suddenly that does not become of any consequence? Why is it in this case that people are going to have their produce that rightfully belongs to them confiscated without knowing under what conditions they have had it confiscated? How can you possibly have a law drawn up by some individual that affects the individual properties of people, without having some opportunity for those people to at least read the regulations?

This is the whole problem with the Act. You cannot tell me that it is not possible to have in printed form, printed in the press of Ontario, the regulations of this Act within 24 hours of the time that they are approved by the board.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): That is not what the hon. member said.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Has the hon. minister read the amendment?

Mr. Deans: Of course, that is what we said. All we are asking—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Is that it is in the *Gazette*.

Mr. Deans: No, it does not say the *Gazette*—it says "published". All we are asking is that the government agree that the regulations, prior to going into force, will be published—"published" could well mean in the local newspapers in the Province of Ontario—so that they are on the public record, so that the people who have to operate within the Act have access to the regulations, so that they know under what regulation it is that their produce, which is rightfully theirs, is being confiscated. Surely that makes sense?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): There is the next leader of the party. I can see it now.

Mr. MacDonald: That is more than we can say to the member opposite.

Mr. Yakabuski: The member for York South is a has-been.

Mr. MacDonald: That is better than a never-has-been.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, the minister is obviously discussing something, I would like to—

Mr. Chairman: Yes, but the hon. member has the floor.

Mr. Deans: Yes. I just do not want to keep repeating it until after I hear what he is going to say.

Mr. Chairman: I will call the member to order if he does.

Mr. Deans: I realize that.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member has the floor.

Mr. Deans: Is it not possible that the minister can agree to that very simple proposition that makes it entirely and abundantly fair to the people who must operate within the Act? Surely that kind of agreement is not difficult to obtain, and surely we can get it and carry on with the Act and get on with the business of providing some kind of protection?

If the minister can agree to that then we can continue. Is there no way that that can be agreed?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): I do not have the wording of the amendment before me, but I distinctly recall—and the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. J. Renwick) will confirm—that when he stood on his feet he expressed very clearly that his amendment required, and that he was asking—demanding, in fact—that the regulations of the board, he said clearly, be published in the *Gazette* and be not effective until published in the *Gazette*. Those are the words of the hon. member for Riverdale. I think the Minister of Agriculture and Food has clearly indicated this. Perhaps the hon. member for Wentworth does not understand that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —the *Ontario Gazette* is an official government publication which used to be, I think, published once a month. I believe it is now published every two weeks.

Mr. Deans: I get it sent to me every week.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: But it would take, let us say, two weeks to comply with the request as expressed in the amendment, and the minister has clearly explained that in that time

great havoc could be wrought to the producers of broilers in this province, and we cannot brook that delay.

Mr. Deans: That explanation sounds very reasonable. Now what we are saying to the government is this: We are prepared in the amendment that was offered to concede that the time may be somewhat delayed. We are saying that we are prepared to accept publication.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I want to revert to what a former colleague of ours would often say, that we here are not engaged in all the pendency of the semantics of drafting regulations. The former member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) used to make this point.

We will accept any amendment We will let the government propose the amendment. We will withdraw it, provided we get an agreement to publish in the *Ontario Gazette*.

One learns things instantaneously in the course of these debates. The Official Notices Publication Act—and I draw the attention of the government to that Act—seems to me to deal with the time problem which has now been raised by the government—the time problem to which my colleague the hon. member for Wentworth refers.

The government indicated that there would be a time lag from the time when the Ontario Food Products Marketing Board approved of a regulation until it was published in the *Gazette*, and that that time lag might amount to anywhere up to three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine or 10 days, and that the persons that the minister is going to move to protect under this bill would thereby suffer unless he could do it almost instantaneously.

I am simply saying to the government that this Official Notices Publication Act appears to me to say that the *Ontario Gazette*,

Being the official notices publication of Ontario, authorized by chapter 6 of the Statutes of Ontario, 1868, shall be published by the Queen's Printer at the times and in the form and style as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may order.

It would therefore appear to me to be quite possible, as was done with the *Canada Gazette* in wartime, to publish a single sheet, special edition of the *Ontario Gazette* instantaneously with the decision of the board to make the approval provided in the statute.

Therefore I am simply saying that if the order-in-council of the Lieutenant Governor is effective it could be drafted in such a way

to eliminate entirely any time lag between the time when the Ontario Food Products Marketing Board approved of the particular regulation and the time when it was published.

I have spent, as most members have, some time watching the display in the Ferguson Block or the Macdonald Block—whichever it is—about the great improvements in the *Gazette* and the printing of it. I am simply saying it is quite possible for this government to meet our requirement by saying that there will be a special, single-page edition of the *Ontario Gazette* published in such a way that there will be no time lag from the decision of the board to give the approval.

We will accept whatever amendment and language is necessary; we will recess now while they draft it. We will ask that it be done now; we ask that it be brought back tomorrow morning.

We really do not care as long as it is done and done in this bill. We demand that it be done, we ask and beseech the government to agree to give us this undertaking and to do so.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I simply suggest to you that to do this would be a complete departure from normal procedure in doing these things.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): That is exactly the point.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am quite willing to undertake—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, I listened to what my hon. friends said, maybe they would do us the same favour.

We are quite willing to undertake to publish, by letter, to anyone requesting the information, the regulation that would be drafted by the local board.

My hon. friends are setting up a situation hypothetically that would appear to affect thousands of people. Quite frankly I doubt if anybody will be affected. There may be the odd person who seeks to thwart the regulation which is now in effect—

Mr. MacDonald: Sometimes your hypothetical situations become realities.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —the regulation that is now in effect, which requires the marketing permit. If so, I want to have this legislation in effect to stop that kind of action. So I

suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we proceed with the approval of this legislation as drafted and we will undertake to provide the information to anyone requesting it.

Mr. Deans: I just want to make a point with the minister. This bill has sat on the order paper for at least a week. The time that he is talking about and the printing of the regulations that he is talking about is a week or 10 days. He was not concerned a week ago when he first introduced this bill as to whether or not the people who were supposed to be benefiting from this bill were suffering during the interim period. He suddenly became very concerned and I wonder how much of his concern is real and how much is political.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, we still have not heard from the minister any explanation as to why the procedure suggested by the member for Riverdale cannot be used—that is, the new means of putting out a special edition of the *Gazette* for publication. The whole speech made by the minister with regard to just sending it to those who appear to have some interest is meaningless. What we should be doing with all these regulations, in principle, is getting them out and published in the formal way that any regulation should be, and that is through the *Gazette*.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, may I explain to my hon. friend from York Centre that despite the interpretation made by the member for Lakeshore, section 2 of The Official Notices Publication Act from which he quoted a moment ago shows what documents can be published in the *Gazette*, and the local board regulations are not listed in that section. In effect, we have to amend that Act in order to do what we want to do.

I do not think there is anyone in this House who disagrees with the principle that is being debated. Certainly these regulations should be published. We agree. But we simply cannot do it without amendments to various statutes. The McRuer report was handed down today dealing with this very point, and as I indicated these Acts must be re-organized, looked at again—amended if necessary—to take into consideration these very valid points that have been made by Mr. Justice McRuer and supported by members

of this House. But in this situation we cannot do it, because we simply do not have the legislative authority to do what our hon. friend suggests should be done.

Now surely my word—spoken in front of the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) and the House leader, and this government and this hon. assembly—to undertake to do these things, I hope is sufficient to indicate—

Mr. J. Renwick: That is not sufficient.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —that our intentions are in the right place and so rightly directed. We want to get on with this legislation tonight.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, there are obviously a number of alternatives open to the government and they have dug their heels in and they are getting stubborn. As usual, when the hour gets late, we are going to be punished because they will not accept a reasonable proposition.

The minister stands up now and refers to section 2 of The Official Notices Publication Act which opens with the phrase:

Unless another mode of publication is authorized by law, there shall be published in the *Ontario Gazette* all notices, orders, regulations and other documents relating to matters within the authority of the Legislature that require publication.

There are alternative methods available.

First of all, we solved the time problem. There is nothing to prevent, by order-in-council, provision being made for special issues of the *Gazette* to meet the requirements of publishing these regulations.

We are now dealing with the next point that the minister raised—that somehow The Official Notices Publication Act does not require it. It gives the alternative, “unless another mode of publication is authorized by law”. This is going to be a law. If we change the amendment to say, “published in the *Ontario Gazette*” we take it out of this particular section 2 of the Act and we come under section 1. The time lag is met and the public knows what the regulations are.

Mr. MacDonald: Or published as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council sees fit, but published.

Mr. J. Renwick: You can do it any way you want to do it. I question very much the arguments that the government has put forward to defeat this particular amendment. I question very much the good faith of the

suggestion that we are going to wait for some overall amendment of The Food Products Marketing Act.

An hon. member: The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Mr. J. Renwick: The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): The member should not.

Mr. J. Renwick: Or of The Regulations Act. Is it because there are other statutes which contain it, that that, in some way, makes this right?

Mr. MacDonald: Every roadblock you have raised has been eliminated.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not, it is not.

Mr. J. Renwick: You are just destroying your own credibility on this question. I am simply saying to the Minister of Agriculture and Food, I am saying to the Prime Minister of this province that it is a fundamental principle that delegated legislation by regulation is published so that the people of the province know what the law is. It is just as simple as that. There is no time lag. There is no way, in any way, shape or form in which—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No one is debating that.

Mr. J. Renwick: —anyone is going to be hurt. Now let us get the amendment; let us get it accepted; let us get, at least, that minimum principle established—

An hon. member: There is nothing to it.

Mr. J. Renwick: —and stop this ridiculous nonsense of keeping us here to fight these nonsensical points.

Mr. Chairman: Those in favour of Mr. J. Renwick's motion will please say “aye.”

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to let the matter go forward.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. In any event, I have two other amendments to two other completely distinct and separate subsections of section 1. I would not want it to be, if this matter is pushed through, that it would obviate or eliminate the merits, which I am sure will be wholly acceptable by the government in this case, of the two sub-amendments that I have to make.

Could I have a ruling on that please, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: It has been the procedure in committee that, when we are dealing with any particular section of a bill, we deal with the subsections or clauses of that particular section in order and that, if there are any subsequent amendments to any subsequent section, it would be in order to accept it. However, we are dealing with the last item in section 1 of the bill.

Mr. Lawlor: By happenstance, if I may point it out to you, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member started at the beginning, which is normally a good place to start, but with the force that you drove it through, he was getting to the end rather quickly. In other words, while he was on his feet, in a single speech he went from the business of delegation and sub-delegation powers over to other—there was no breach in the middle. I suggest to you that it would be highly legalistic on your part to insist upon that.

Mr. Chairman: Might I say to the hon. member for Lakeshore that I did ask the hon. member for Riverdale which specific section he wished to amend and he particularly recited clause 6. However, I am not going to be that restrictive in this particular case.

I would ask that this particular amendment we are now debating, to the last clause of section 1 of the bill, be deferred in order to permit any previous amendments to come before the committee, because we cannot dispense with number 6; that carries a section if it is defeated.

Mr. J. Renwick: Without entering into the argument, Mr. Chairman, we would certainly agree to the deferment, because, during the deferment period, the government might very well be able to come in with an amendment which we would be prepared to accept.

Mr. Chairman: I think, under the circumstances, I want to be fair about this. If the hon. member for Riverdale will defer dealing with his amendment, then I will accept an amendment to a prior section from the hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the amendments which I wish to move—I will deal with them one at a time—will soften up the hard heart of the government sufficiently and, seeing the light and bowing their heads, they will enter then into the

peaceful valleys of what regulations should be made available or not.

The amendment I wish to make is moved by the member for Lakeshore that subsection 2 of section 1 of Bill 10 be deleted.

Mr. Chairman: Is that at the top of page 2, the second paragraph?

Mr. Lawlor: That is at the top of page 2; subsection 2 at the top of page 2, which reads: "Any regulated product seized and detained under this section is seized and detained at the risk and expense of the owner."

Now surely—

Mr. Chairman: May I put the amendment, please? Moved by Mr. Lawlor that subsection 2 of section 1 of Bill 10 be deleted.

The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I was saying, surely there can be no question but that this ought to be accepted by the minister if there is any good faith in the government at all. If he gives anything more than lip service to the recommendations of McRuer—it is all set forth, and I am sure that the minister has in front of him the power and the glory, the words of the decalogue in terms of McRuer himself. If he has not then—ad nauseam if it may be—we will repeat what was said at 424 of volume 1, report 1, which has been out for many years now. There has been plenty of opportunity to look it over, plenty of opportunity to embody its phraseology. It did not come before us as a revelation at 2 o'clock this afternoon. It has been around for an awful long time, and it says:

If the right of stoppage is to be given, the officer should at least have reasonable grounds to believe that the vehicle contains a farm product.

And then comes the important part:

It is an unreasonable trespass on the rights of an owner that the detention should be "at the risk of the owner." There seems no reason why the ordinary rights of bailee and bailor should not apply.

That is someone who has taken over a chattel from somebody else and is responsible to that other for his control and possession of that.

The owner has no means by which to protect the products that are detained, and the detention may be continued until the owner of the farm product complies with the Act and regulations. This is an extraordinarily

vague section of a penal nature. No one appears to have authority to determine when the owner has complied with the Act and the regulations, and that last sentence is equally applicable to this present legislation as it was to the anachronistic old legislation. No one seems to have this final determination of authority but that is a secondary point—one which we have not relied upon or brought into debate to any substantial degree today, but do look at that section. By what reason, in the light of what I have read from McRuer, can the minister possibly maintain a section that flies in the face of obvious civil liberties to the extent that this does? Will it take any skin off his back, or for that matter off the top of his head, if he deletes that section? Just what detrimental effect does it have? Surely, as I said to begin with, he ought to give at least that much cognizance to what McRuer has set forth and if he does not do that, then a pity it is because then, in my opinion, this government sitting over there has very little rapport with, understanding of, or desire to give effect to the recommendations of McRuer.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): In response to the amendment which has been made by the member for Lakeshore, surely in this subsection this government, which is much given above all else for the protection of property in this province, has the obligation now to protect in this sense the rights of the persons who are in effect being circumscribed by this type of legislation.

We have seen time after time, not only in the courts but in the general activities within our society, a situation whereby property rights are being placed, time and time again, over and above certain other civil rights. In this situation, especially for a government that views property in almost a sacrosanct light, it is most important that the charges and costs which are going to be imposed upon someone who is presumed evil or presumed to be breaking the law before the matter is proved should surely concern us here.

In this case any regulated product is going to include a large variety and a great number of products as the years go by. If indeed we are to build up, as it would appear, on the same position of a disarmament conference, the approach from one province to the other of separate rules and regulations which may be negotiated, we are obviously going to be getting ourselves back into the same situation that the Ottawa agreement on tariffs

resulted in in the Commonwealth preference problems in the early Nineteen Thirties.

If we are attempting to hedge in our own prosperity so that we are all right compared to what other provinces or other nations may be, then we are going to be building up a forest of regulations and a forest of problems which is going to be a gargantuan task to overcome.

In this case, surely the owner who is involved in the shipping or the ownership of various products—and they will be many if they are all the regulated ones that we presume—surely he should have the protection of the courts available to him and should not have the onus shifted on to him by this portion of the statute.

There are too many regulated products that we can presume are of a perishable nature. If the government is going to involve itself in their seizure, I think there must be some obligation to state that if this seizure does not prove to have been invalid or unnecessary or unwarranted, the costs of the losses which these persons may be put to should be validly the subject of compensation from the government.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, two points—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, two points; one, the minister says that the legislation was not sloppily drafted. I want to ask if the word “use” and “risk” are interchangeable in his mind? Because in the explanation at the side of subsection 2, it says, “regulated products seized and detained at the use and expense of owner”, while in the subsection itself it is “detained at the risk and expense of the owner.”

If you do not think that is sloppy drafting, I do not know what it is. Anyhow, aside from that, it is a very small point. The whole situation here is that a person could well be in violation of a regulation that he is unable to obtain.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, the minister said he would make it available. We have also said we would be prepared to alter The Regulations Act to solve this problem comprehensively and on a practical basis. Surely this should be sufficient.

Mr. Deans: Some day.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not some day.

Mr. Deans: In the meantime, anyhow, it is quite conceivable that a person starting the day after these regulations are approved by the board could be in violation of a regulation that he has not had an opportunity to view. His produce could be seized or detained at his risk and expense without his having had the opportunity to view the regulations under which he might operate and must operate. Surely that does not make sense.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Let us be practical.

Mr. Deans: We are being practical. We have offered the government a solution to that problem.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, the opposition did not.

Mr. Deans: Of course it is. It is just as practical as saying that the people who are shipping the produce are going to ship hundreds of thousands of tons of it into the province simply because they have a one-week delay in regulation publication. Every bit as practical.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Quite possible!

Mr. Deans: I do not think it is right to have a group of people in competition with someone else, to draft regulations that are not published, and then to make other people subject to those regulations without their first having prior knowledge of the content. To hold them responsible for all risk and loss does not make any sense. I think that minister, if he thought it out, would agree with me.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): Which party are you working for tonight?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I think that from where we stand now at this point, we are supposed to be intelligent people. I see by going—

Mr. Henderson: Let us hear this bit of business.

Mr. Sargent:—through this bill that there are any number of amendments that I think I would like to bring about if I wanted to filibuster.

Mr. Henderson: Go ahead.

Mr. Sargent: I do not see any intelligence in going on this way. I would like to move that we rise and report and adjourn the House and come in tomorrow and talk about it freshly.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if this is a motion before the House, I would like to ask the government why must this go through tonight? Why, when it has been sitting on the order paper for a week, is there suddenly the necessity for such haste? You know, a year—

Mr. Henderson: Why must the opposition stop it tonight?

Mr. MacDonald: Will the member listen for a moment? A year ago last December, this minister rose in the House and told us that we had to pass a piece of legislation because research was grinding to a halt in our universities because they did not have animals—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): They have not yet proclaimed the Act.

Mr. MacDonald: Yet the minister has not proclaimed the Act 18 months later. The government's credibility is nil in terms of urgency for getting legislation proclaimed. The minister has been sitting on this bill for a week; now why are we being detained here extraordinarily behind—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): The members talk too much.

Mr. Pitman: There is a bright remark.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Pitman: He is worse at the front than at the back.

Mr. J. Renwick: Why does the member not go home to Chatham?

Mr. Chairman: I have a motion. I do have a motion; the hon. member for Grey-Bruce has moved that the committee rise and report. Those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

Mr. MacDonald: Let us vote on it. Why does the government want to waste time in such an assinine way? They have fumbled—

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): John Robarts would never do that.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): That is not what the member told—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The question before the committee is Mr. Sargent's motion that the committee rise and report. Those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

I should have called for the hon. members to rise. Those in favour of the motion will please rise. Those opposed to the motion will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 22, the "nays" 43.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost. We must now deal with Mr. Lawlor's motion that subsection 2 of section 1 of Bill 10 be deleted.

Those in favour of Mr. Lawlor's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Is it agreeable that we take the same vote as the previous vote?

I declare the motion lost.

Are there any further questions, amendments, or comments to any other section prior to section 6?

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I rise stripped of my armour, ready to throw in the towel, not because of the lateness of the hour albeit, but because I have been convinced during the recess by the former Attorney General of the rectitude of his ways. I had prepared to talk about being bull-headed and intransigent and what not—I had a list of adjectives here which were perfectly suitable to the last one which you rejected. One that I had before me on this count had to do with entry. It is paragraph (a) of subsection 4 of section 1, having to do with entry.

I felt that section should be subjected to the same scrutiny and the same regulation, as to having reasonable justification for making the entry, as a previous section with respect to search and seizure. Nevertheless, looking at it very carefully, I have come to the conclusion that it is done backwards as usual. It was poor drafting. Surely entry takes place before seizure; surely it has to? Even McRuer says it has to. And where the entry is not specifically looked after in terms of McRuer he says it should be embodied.

He uses the example of The Grain Elevator Storage Act at 410, and he says when you have got entry it should be subject to one of two conditions; either there should be a search warrant or there is a condition precedent requiring seizure.

You would have thought your legislation would have been set up that particular way, but no, you go to the point where entry already having been made, seizure takes place and then you make it subject to reasonable grounds. You pass the regulation before you make the entry, validating the seizure and ipso facto, I suppose, validating the entry.

With that, I will not move my amendment as I intended to do. I think the government, due to a logomachy, and in their own backward way, going out the back door frontward, are quite right and therefore, I sit down.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Proposal is *nullus defunctus*.

Mr. MacDonald: We are open to rational persuasion. I wish that could be said on both sides of the House.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore has dealt with sections up to and including clause 4.

Mr. Deans: Clause 3.

Mr. Chairman: Clause 3?

Mr. Deans: I wanted to say something, but he had already spoken about it. On clause 3, I want to ask a question.

Mr. Chairman: All right, ask the question.

Mr. J. Renwick: Quiet!

Mr. Deans: I want to ask a question under subclause 3. It says where any regulated product is seized and detained under the section, the local board shall forthwith notify the owner or person who had possession of the regulated product of the seizure and detention and of the release from detention and disposition of the regulated product.

Surely they must also have the responsibility and obligation to notify the person of the reason for the seizure and detention? Surely it is not enough to say, "We have seized and detained your product," without in law having to notify them why?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, for heaven's sake.

Mr. Deans: Or is that to be found out some day in the obscure future when The

Regulations Act is changed? To tell me that you have arrested my wife but not tell me why is hardly of any value to me.

Mr. Breithaupt: They may dispose of her too.

Mr. Deans: They may. You do not think that this Act is poorly drafted?

Hon. Mr. Davis: What did we do to your wife? I was trying to do two things at once.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, this Act is so full of inadequacies and loopholes, and this particular section—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. The hon. member said he had a question on clause 3.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Change the record.

Mr. Deans: I have asked the question.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member has asked the question. Will the hon. minister care to reply to the question?

Mr. Deans: The minister is not going to reply?

Mr. Chairman: We will then proceed to section 5.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, just one matter on clause 4. I notice that under subsection (a) there is certain power granted to enter any vessel, boat, car, truck and so forth, or any premises other than a dwelling. I am wondering whether the government has decided that it has no business in the store-rooms of the nation. Perhaps we have a problem here of some person who has 10,000 broilers, you know, in the front room of his house—who is to say?

Mr. G. Demers (Nickel Belt): Give or take a couple of chicks.

Mr. MacDonald: Maybe in the spare bedroom.

Mr. Breithaupt: Perhaps the minister can tell me why the dwelling is exempt in this case?

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): You are invoking The War Measures Act on the broilers, that is what you are doing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister wish to reply to that question? If not is there any comment, question or amendment to clause 5? We will then move to the amendment before the committee on clause 6, as moved by Mr. J. Renwick, the hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment briefly on the proposed amendment, now that we are resuming consideration of it.

The attention of the House has been focused both on second reading and clause-by-clause discussion of the bill on the broiler question. The government forgets that the ambit of the bill deals with any regulated product under any of the local boards in the Province of Ontario. It does not have any reference in the Act to products coming into the province from other provinces. It is not restricted in scope to that limitation at all. Therefore, what we are simply saying—and we are repeating it and I want to repeat it again—is that an elected board, in which there may very well be a genuine adverse business interest in operation, is here given the power by unpublished regulation—a regulation which is not available to anyone in any formal sense—so that it is known in advance that they can go in and seize and detain a product.

At any point, there does not have to be any suggestion that there has been non-compliance. It would have to have reasonable grounds but it could only be released if the local board is then satisfied that it complies. It should have reasonable grounds in the first instance. We repeat the very same point that we have made before: that whatever the nature of the amendment which is required, it can be done through this bill. It can be done now. It can be done tomorrow morning to provide for the publication of the regulations made by the local board which are then subject to approval by the board.

Mr. Sargent: Question!

Mr. J. Renwick: And then the question of publication comes up. Obviously the government have dug their heels in and are not prepared to accept any amendment. I want to say to the government that this party thinks that it is a serious breach of the principles under which this Legislature is operated. It is a serious breach of the principles of the McRuer report. It is an undemocratic, unauthorized method by which this can be done.

Therefore, we are insisting that the government, before this bill is given Royal assent, will make whatever change is required to satisfy us that publication will be made to the people who may very well be adversely affected by this detention and seizure.

Mr. MacDonald: The last cabinet minister who tried this kind of police state legislation—

Mr. Chairman: Those in favour of Mr. J. Renwick's amendment will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it. Will it be agreeable to accept the previous vote?

I declare the amendment lost.

Is there any comment, question or amendment to sections 2 or 3 of this bill?

If not, shall the bill be reported?

Bill 10 reported.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report one bill without amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill 10, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, on the third reading of the bill I want to very briefly reiterate the opposition of this party to the bill, both in the substance of the bill and the points that were made in the course of the second reading earlier today, and in the specific provisions to which we have drawn attention during the course of the clause-by-clause discussion of the bill.

Those are recent events, since the government precipitously decided that this was going to be the way in which they would deal with the bill. I am going, as a last resort, to urge the government again to give some consideration, before royal assent, to their stubborn attitude which has been determined in this bill, in such a way that they will under no circumstances alter a single

word in the bill. I want to say to the government that it is losing the confidence of the very gut community on which its life as a government depends. It is losing it and it is going to lose it on this bill. The erosion set in long ago and this government is not able in any way to staunch the flow because of its total incapacity to be anything but rigid, formal and obstinate about this kind of legislation.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Who is obstinate?

Mr. J. Renwick: We are unalterably opposed to the bill and to the manner in which the government has put this bill through this assembly. I say this in the light of the recent debate which took place about it.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with my colleague on this. The government has couched this legislation in the broadest possible terms, not only with respect to interstate or interprovincial commerce but internal, too, with respect to the widest possible range of agricultural products. It does not really mean to do that because its mind throughout this debate has been directed to certain products coming in—namely, broilers from Quebec. When they say that they will take the thing—store the thing—at the expense or the risk of an owner, they really do not mean to do that internally with respect to peaches, or any other number of things that may be operative within the province. They simply do not want to pay for storage of broilers coming in from the outside.

But you do not couch legislation in the present terms when you are directing your stiletto on to a particular product and they should have said so in the beginning—equally with respect to the publication matters that were brought before the House. It is unheard of in British law that you do not have immediate availabilities to publication of the law. They have to be promulgated and known to the public, otherwise there is an abrogation of civil liberties.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Mr. Stewart moves third reading of Bill 10.

As many as are in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

As many as are opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

Some hon. members: Same vote.

Mr. Speaker: Same vote? Same vote as which?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I may say that the other votes were taken in committee.

Mr. Speaker: In committee? That is what I was going to inquire about. I thought the votes that were referred to were in committee.

The House divided on third reading of Bill 10, which was approved on the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Allan	Breithaupt
Apps	Burr
Bales	Deacon
Bernier	Deans
Brunelle	Edighoffer
Carruthers	Farquhar
Davis	Ferrier
Downer	Gaunt
Dunlop	Good
Evans	Haggerty
Gilbertson	Innes
Grossman	Jackson
Guindon	Lawlor
Hamilton	MacDonald
Haskett	Makarchuk
Hodgson	Pilkey
(Victoria-Haliburton)	Renwick
Jessiman	(Riverdale)
Johnston	Ruston
(Carleton)	Sargent
Kennedy	Smith
Kerr	(Nipissing)
Meen	Spence—21.

AYES

NAYS

Morningstar
Morrow
McKeough
Price
Pritchard (Mrs.)
Reuter
Rowe
Rowntree
Smith
(Simcoe East)
Stewart
Villeneuve
Wells
Winkler
Wishart
Yaremko—36.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 36; the "nays" 21.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion for third reading now carried.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Resolved that Bill 10 do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I would inform the House that the order of business tomorrow will be the first order, the resumption of the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at 11:57 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 15, 1971

Farm Products Marketing Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading	479
Farm Products Marketing Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, reported	496
Third reading	513
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to	514



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, April 16, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 16, 1971

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This morning as guests we have, in the east gallery, students from York Memorial Collegiate Institute, Toronto, and St. Norbert Separate School, Downsview; in the west gallery now or later, from Burlington Central High School, Burlington, and members of the Young Women's Christian Association from Lockport, New York; in both galleries, from Westmount Secondary School, Hamilton.

Later this morning, we will have in the galleries, students from St. Mary's Academy in Windsor; Annette Street School in Toronto; Annandale High School in Tillsonburg, and Haliburton Highlands Secondary School in Haliburton.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, in recognizing the importance to the public and the persons effectively concerned with the passage of Bill 10, we have prepared, and we will endeavour, as a condition of any approval of the regulations made by the broiler board, to require that these regulations be published in the press.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Is that not a great thing?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: And we recognize of course—

Mr. Singer: The minister read the book last night; well, that is good.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: But the member did not read the section! Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Downsview very conveniently missed the section of Mr. McRuer's report which says—

An hon. member: He missed the vote, too.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —that The Farm Products Marketing Act had been tried and proved in the Supreme Court of Canada with only one dissenting voice. He missed that point.

Mr. Singer: I said there were 37 points McRuer said the government should change and the minister did not change one of them yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We did!

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): The member for Downsview should have been here last night.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, had he been here last night—he conveniently absented himself from the House last night—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: I went with the minister's leader to the baseball game in Montreal.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He would have heard me refer to the fact that we will undertake, and did undertake last night, not only to review The Farm Products Marketing Act but The Regulations Act which also requires revision as a result of Mr. McRuer's report.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Nobody has missed more of the main points of the McRuer report—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He would also have heard me say, Mr. Speaker, that I had no knowledge that Mr. McRuer's report had even been filed with the government.

Mr. MacDonald: If the minister had asked the law officer of the Crown, he could have told him.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There was no need to ask the law officer of the Crown anything about what was in the report or what was in the legislation because it was a known fact that we had the same requirement in the legislation in Bill 10 as we have in most other Acts that are operated by our department and many other departments of this government. It was there already. And it was simply a situation—

Mr. Singer: Just carrying on the debate.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am carrying it on, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the hon. member for Downsview who felt it was not necessary to be here last night when he was so involved in—

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. minister would make his statement and not indulge in cross-fire.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I made the statement and we will undertake to do that. The Broiler Board is quite willing to publish these, but I want to point out, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: It takes a long time for anything to get through to the minister.

Hon. Mr. Stewart:—that there is really nothing official about the publication of these in the normal press. It has to go in the *Gazette* and unfortunately, there is nothing in The Regulations Act to permit us to do that at the present time. We will amend it.

Mr. Speaker: Any further statements by the ministry?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): On a question of privilege, sir: Yesterday, sir, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) and myself asked the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs if he would release the report to this House of the hearings that were being held by the Ontario Securities Commission in the matter of Hevenor and Company and Messrs. Feeley and McDermott, and the minister at that time refused. I quote his words: "I do not for a moment say that the full conduct of the investigations is a matter that I would, at this moment, say should be made public."

Sir, within 15 minutes of his refusing to give the House this report, a member of his department phoned three reporters in this city and said, if they would send a taxi, he would give them a copy of the report. Sir, I think this is an abuse of the privileges of the hon. members of this House.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would like to read all my remarks, even those he read indicated that I did not refuse to release the report. I said standing here, at that moment, I could not say that it was a report that would be released, but I did go on. If he reads the rest of my remarks in *Hansard* he will see that I said there may be a great deal of information here which the public should have and, on examination, it would certainly be released to the fullest extent.

Those were my words; the member will find them in *Hansard*. The report, having been examined, has been fully released.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): It was released without the minister's authority.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It was released with my knowledge, but I did not have a chance to examine it.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The minister did not examine the report?

Mr. Speaker: Order. It would appear to me that the proper mode to deal with these matters would be that the hon. members of this House should have first knowledge of these matters. I would respectfully suggest to the ministry that in the future this course be followed.

Oral questions.

Mr. Lewis: Very uncharacteristic of the minister.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILL 10

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, further to the statement made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, has he arranged with the leader of the government to request his Honour the Lieutenant Governor to give royal assent to this bill today?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: I would ask further if he intends to amend the legislation in the immediate future, calling for the registration of the regulations and their publication within the *Ontario Gazette*, or is he going to do it in an informal way?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I tried to explain this morning, Mr. Speaker—maybe not with sufficient clarity—that we will have these regulations published in the press.

Mr. Nixon: In the *Gazette*?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, not the *Gazette*, because there is no provision of The Regulations Act for the publication of these regulations in the *Gazette*. We will endeavour to have them published so that people may be aware.

Mr. Singer: Very generous of the minister—on-going.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We certainly will—as I undertook last night—review The Regulations Act. This pertains to many other departments than ours. We will review The Farm

Products Marketing Act in the light of McRuer. There will be, obviously, a great many changes to be made, if we are to implement all of Mr. McRuer's report.

I would point out, however, Mr. Speaker, with great respect, that The Farm Products Marketing Act in this province has served the farm people of this province extremely well. To my knowledge, there has never been a case where the abuse of powers has been used by anyone, either on the government side or on the farm products marketing side or by anyone else. This would lead one to believe that it has been a very successful Act in its application to problems it was intended to deal with.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question without regard to the last part of the minister's statement, which I think is probably accepted by most people. I take it he now feels, however, that the regulations both by the board and the local boards as well as the Farm Products Marketing Board should all be in the public domain and it is the minister's responsibility to see that they are?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will undertake to do that. I feel, frankly, that it is quite right.

With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the members of the House that under The Milk Act all regulations of the milk board, which in this case is the local board, are filed under The Regulations Act. The reason they are filed is because the milk board was first of all appointed by this government. It was not an elected body; it was an appointed body. Therefore, their regulations were required to be filed in the *Gazette*. Since the board is now an elected board they still ask us to approve their appointment by order-in-council—in other words, approve their election by order-in-council—so that their regulations are required to be filed in the *Gazette*.

The other farm products marketing boards operating under The Farm Products Marketing Act are dissimilar to that situation. We will attempt to bring them in line with that. I am sure no one will object to this at all.

WIRETAPPING BY POLICE

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. Has the government got a specific policy requiring the Attorney General to be informed of the decision taken by any police commission regarding wiretapping?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of this but I shall check with the Attorney General and get the information for the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

ONTARIO HYDRO BOND ISSUE

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer. Can he give further details to the House on the negotiations with American financial interests to borrow \$100 million on behalf of Ontario Hydro? What are the rates of this loan? Why was the decision made that all of the \$100 million will be, and in fact must be, spent in the United States?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I cannot give the details as to what the rates will be. What happened last Friday, which is the normal occurrence, was that the loan itself was registered in New York, which is the first formality.

Presumably sometime—and I am not sure of this date—Hydro officials and our own officials meet with our New York managers and determine the rate—it is a matter of negotiation. Then, at that point, the bonds will be offered to the public in the United States or to the lending institutions. This is a process which, I think, takes about a month from start to finish.

The very simple reason why we and why Hydro chose to borrow this money in the United States at this time is that, in our view, that market is receptive to such an offering, perhaps more receptive than our own market.

I think that what is perhaps concerning the Leader of the Opposition is the impact which this might have, or in fact did have, on what is a very sensitive issue now—the value of the Canadian dollar.

We looked at this matter rather closely, which of course is a matter of concern to the Bank of Canada and the government of Canada rather than a specific concern of this government, although we are always glad to co-operate. But we had to point out to the federal government that three provinces have gone to New York within the last two or three months.

And it so happens that this \$100 million, when it is received in New York to the credit of Ontario, will never leave New York. It so happens that there is a refunding issue in New York, I believe in the amount of about \$400 million; the money which we

borrow in May will refund that issue, and then Ontario Hydro will leave the rest of the money there for coal purchases, which will take place within the next few months.

In actual fact, I discussed this with the chairman of Hydro a few days ago, and between refundings, coal and equipment, which it is necessary to purchase in the United States, Ontario Hydro is probably spending something in the neighbourhood of over \$200 million in the United States in this year at any rate, and in any given year. So where we borrow the money really does not matter. The money is not going to leave the United States.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Is the Treasurer aware that the last time Ontario Hydro went to the American market it paid for, I believe a \$100 million loan at that time, an interest rate of 9.68 per cent, an investment available to the Americans that was far more lucrative than was ever offered by Ontario Hydro, or in fact the government of Ontario, in the home market? Would it not be part of his consideration that at least a part of the loans at these substantially higher rates than are available to investors here might in fact be split off and offered on Canadian markets, because certainly our investors would like to have a piece of that kind of action.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It so happens that particular loan was at the peak of the market.

Mr. Nixon: It so happens that we did not have a chance to get into it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member certainly did. There is nothing to prevent the hon. member from purchasing a bond in the United States.

Mr. Nixon: Why could it not be offered on the Toronto market?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Because at that particular point in time—

Mr. Nixon: You could have got the money cheaper.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —it was deemed advantageous to borrow on the American market.

Mr. Nixon: It was deemed advantageous.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This happens to be on the advice of the people who give advice to this province and to Ontario Hydro as to where, when and how we borrow money. I am not equipped to debate—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister would not debate it at this time in any event, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition, if he has further supplementaries, will rise and place them in the proper order.

Mr. Nixon: I have one further supplementary. Will the minister table a prospectus associated with this particular negotiation as soon as it is available?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, I can see no reason why we would not.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce has a supplementary?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, to the provincial Treasurer: In view of the fact that over 40 per cent of all federal funds come from the Province of Ontario, and—

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): A late admission.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, it is very important right now. In view of the fact that on page 3026 of the House of Commons *Hansard* it shows that the federal government made a \$200 million loan to India for 50 years at zero interest last February, it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister of this province and the Treasurer should go to Ottawa—

Mr. Speaker: The member will ask the question.

Mr. Sargent: Why do they not go down there and sit on their doorstep and say, "Why in the hell, if you can give it to India, do you not give Ontario the same deal?"

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Why does the member not come over here?

Mr. Speaker: The question is not strictly supplementary, but if the hon. minister wishes to reply he may.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The answer is that the supplementary is not necessarily supplementary to the original question, Mr. Speaker. On the other hand, I do not think it should go unanswered. Whether this particular loan of the federal government should have been made at a particular point in time perhaps should be debated in another place, in the House of Commons, but I do not think we on this side of the House would want, by not answering that question, to indicate in any way that this government does not

support some of the work that this country is doing in all parts of the world.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary: In view of the fact that there are 600,000 people who cannot get jobs in this country, why should \$40 billion of our money go to India?

Mr. Speaker: This has nothing to do with the original question. It is out of order. The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Sargent: Well, it is ridiculous.

An hon. member: Mr. Speaker is embarrassing his leaders.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition has the floor. Order!

LAYOFF OF TEACHERS

Mr. Nixon: In the absence of the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a further question to the Premier on a matter that does involve his responsibility to negotiate with the government of Canada and, in a very real sense, involves his previous responsibility as Minister of Education. What steps are being taken to see that the layoff of qualified teachers in the manpower retraining programmes associated with community colleges is going to be, let us say, either kept to a minimum or stopped?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure just what the most recent step has been as it relates to the responsibilities of this government. I can only say to the Leader of the Opposition that it is one that is giving us very real concern and one which both the Minister of Education and I personally intend to pursue with the federal authorities.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: I think it might be useful if we knew just what the present agreement is with the government of Canada on the payment of the salaries of teachers retained specifically for Manpower retraining purposes? Can the minister tell me if this is a 100 per cent responsibility of the federal Treasury or is the money transferred in block grants to The Department of Education for the support of this educational programme?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it really matters as it relates to this problem. The terms of the agreement are how it is financed. The financing is basically done

by the federal government. It is done under the agreement by way of contract. We provide, in many instances, the services at the direction of the Manpower offices and the decision is made by the federal government to restrict or alter the programmes, of course. We are the service part of it and I do not think it really matters how the funds flow through.

The point that has to be made is that we would like to see the programme maintained at its present level. We think, at this precise moment, with unemployment as it exists, it seems a bit of a contradiction to have these programmes restricted. We are taking this up with the federal jurisdiction.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Can the minister then tell the House specifically, do provincial authorities hire and fire these teachers?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it varies from one programme to another because we have our own Manpower training programme. Sometimes the services are shared, but basically, the responsibility relates to the federal government.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary: Since the Premier has stated his views on this, and I would say that I agree with them, we should not be cutting back these services at the present time—

Mr. Speaker: What is the question?

Mr. Nixon: Would the minister undertake at least to review the possibility of maintaining the teaching staffs at their present level, or as they were until three weeks ago?

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is already under consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth has a supplementary?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Yes, sir, a supplementary question: In addition to undertaking the review of the teaching situation, would the minister investigate the claim by Canada Manpower that there is inadequate seating capacity—inadequate seats in actual fact—in the retraining programme at Manpower that is keeping people who have been on the waiting list for some time from getting into the programme; would he try to make the facilities available?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will be quite delighted to look into this suggestion from the Manpower officials. This suggestion

is in some contradiction, of course, with what is the present policy, and that is, cutting back on the programme. I find it difficult to reconcile the two and certainly will look into it.

Mr. Deans: They are making excuses.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brantford has a supplementary?

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that at the Brantford campus at Mohawk College some of the instructors received only three hours' notice before they were fired, while other instructors were hired only three days before they were fired, can the minister ensure that while he is investigating this thing, he will find out that there is some planning or foresight in the development going on in this area?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, we, of course, are endeavouring to do so. I do not want to be facetious but it is not always easy for this particular government to determine the planning and the foresight of the federal administration.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, the—

Hon. Mr. Davis: In fact, some days it is impossible.

Mr. Lewis: —the 18, I think it was, the 18—

Mr. Nixon: It is going to run a little thin about the time you go to the polls.

Mr. Lewis: —retraining instructors at Mohawk College who were released, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: Those were the Minister of Agriculture and Food's arguments yesterday.

Mr. Lewis: Were they released on the authority of the federal government or were they released on the decision of the community college?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: That is inconsequential.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will get that information for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Has the Leader of the Opposition any further questions? The member for Scarborough West.

NIAGARA ESCARPMENT PURCHASES

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Lands and Forests initially: I wonder if he has been able to get for me the information I requested of him yesterday?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has passed me a note that he has that reply, and if this is a new question he may answer it now.

Mr. Lewis: A perfectly appropriate time.

Mr. Speaker: The minister might answer that.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the member yesterday, I have an answer concerning the Niagara Escarpment area.

Since the inception of the land acquisition programme in 1962 we have acquired approximately 16,330 acres within the escarpment. From May to August, 1969, Caledon Mountain Estates acquired four parcels at an average price of \$726.75. The 500 acres acquired by the government early in 1971 at \$1,450 per acre included the most valuable valley and river land of their substantially larger holdings which had been acquired for development purposes in this area.

As you can see we have actively been acquiring lands for many years along the escarpment and the timing of purchases is a matter of setting priority within the funds available. At that time we were acquiring lands which in our judgement had a much higher priority.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a number of supplementaries Mr. Speaker, the first that strikes me is that surely the minister is not attempting to imply to the House that there was a difference of \$700 an acre on the basis of the choice land from those various parcels?

I understand, Mr. Speaker, the minister to say that the difference in effect between \$760 and \$1,450 is the choice land in those parcels. I have it on authority from a member of the staff of one of the related departments, that we are discussing the same land.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations. One is that, with respect to the Gertler report and the recommendations to us, this does not necessarily mean that we have to accept all the recommendations and all the lands that were proposed. We are purchasing those lands that we feel have a very high recreational area.

The lands in question are exceedingly good recreational land for all-year-round purposes. Two or three years ago—we have a limited budget for land acquisition—at that time we had land that had a much higher priority than those lands.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, would the minister indicate where the purchases took place of the land which had the higher priority? Would the minister then indicate to the House what has happened to the 55,000 acres which Gertler placed in priority A, at the time of his report which the minister had in June, 1968—a full year ahead of the private acquisition which we are now discussing!

Would the minister then tell the House further, why it is necessary for the people of the province of Ontario to pay an additional \$300,000, almost three years after the event, because of the neglect and the delay of the government in following the Gertler proposals? Can he answer any of those questions now?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we can find instances in land acquisition in many areas in the province where the land has substantially increased over a period of a few years.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, right.

Mr. Deans: Yes, 50.4 per cent.

Mr. Lewis: But you knew that was required.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again I must repeat, we have a very limited budget and it is impossible to buy all the land that we would like to acquire.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): That is false economy!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would like to make available to the member as much information as we can. But at the same time there is certain information that should not be released because it has an effect of upgrading, accelerating the price of lands.

Mr. Lewis: Sure, but you knew all the details at the time. Mr. Speaker, does the minister recognize that in the Gertler report there was set out in the Mount Nemo-Caledon Mountain area the acquisition of 7,455 acres of land which would have cost at that time \$3.6 million? May I ask the minister why now he has purchased 6.5 per cent of that total land and spent 20 per cent

of the money then indicated? How much more inflation will he tolerate by way of land acquisition before the government acts on the Gertler report?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In respect to this whole question of land acquisition, Mr. Speaker, we recommend lands and we have a very limited budget. A lot of the land is purchased by another department and I cannot—

Mr. Lewis: It is really false economy.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Also this land in question is—

Mr. Lewis: We are losing the escarpment in the process.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We could have bought land at a much cheaper price; however, it did not have the high recreational value this land had. This land in question was to be used for subdivision purposes, which commands a very high price, but we felt that this land was most desirable for park purposes.

Mr. Sargent: What does the minister mean “we felt”? His civil servants told him what to do.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of a final supplementary, since the minister knew about this 505-acre parcel back in 1968, and since he knew he wanted it for park purposes then, would it not have made sense to put certain restrictions on the transfer of land in that area so that the people of Ontario did not end up paying an additional \$300,000 or more? And what about the rest of the land which Gertler has advised the minister to purchase?

All right, Mr. Speaker, I shall come back to this on Monday with further particulars. May I ask a question of the Premier, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management not being present?

EXPORT OF ELECTRIC POWER

Has the Premier available the governmental submission to the National Energy Board on the export of power in north-western Ontario? I think the hearings begin on Monday and we hope to have it in the House in advance.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the hearing perhaps is to commence on the Tuesday. I do not have the submission here.

ODC DIRECTORS' INTERESTS

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Trade and Development: Are there any procedures governing the board of the Ontario Development Corporation, the six- or seven-man board, to identify any interests or associations members of the board may have either by way of professional or corporate relationships with those companies which do receive and have received forgivable loans?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this is the case, based on conversations I have held in the past few meetings I have had with some of the ODC officials. I think the answer to that would be yes, but I will get the information and make sure that is the answer.

Mr. Lewis: Am I to understand then that the minister is suggesting that if there were, for instance, accountants or auditors on the board of ODC doing business with one or more of the companies seeking loans, that they would declare an interest at the point at which the loan is discussed?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sorry, I guess I did not understand the hon. member's original question. He is then referring to the possibility of a possible conflict of interest on the part of a member of the board?

Mr. Lewis: Well, I am asking if there are procedures governing these situations.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know that, Mr. Speaker. I will be glad to get the information.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce has a supplementary?

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker, there was a \$23 million loan made to Cadillac Development—Mr. Goodman is their legal counsel—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not a supplementary.

Mr. Sargent: It is along the same line, I think.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member and all hon. members, of course, object when the Speaker cuts a question off before the full question has been asked whether it is in order or out of order because they have very good

systems of converting them into a proper supplementary question if they warrant; therefore I have taken the attitude that I will always hear the question.

That being so, if it is a question which has certain political or other overtones, I think then it is only fair that the government should have the opportunity to comment or answer the question as asked.

The hon. member's question, of course, is not a supplementary in this case.

Mr. Lewis: I have a final supplementary I wish to ask of the minister: whether he would then table for the House what disclosure proceedings there are amongst the members of the board of the ODC, should they have associations—I am not asking in conspiratorial terms; I am asking in simple business terms—if they have investment, economic, professional or other associations with the various companies to whom loans have been or are being granted; and if the procedures are there, what they are.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why that information cannot be divulged.

Mr. Lewis: I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker: Any supplementaries? No. The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: No, I will leave it at that.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Simcoe East.

NON-LEADED GASOLINE

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Revenue. In order to encourage the sale of non-leaded gasoline in the Province of Ontario and thus help reduce the air pollutants, would the Minister of Revenue consider reducing the gas tax on non-leaded gasoline?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member will recognize the financial implications inherent in his question that do not permit me to answer him directly, but because of the merit of the suggestion I will be pleased to take it under consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Public Works has the answer to questions asked by the member for Parkdale.

SALE OF FORMER SITE OF MERCER REFORMATORY

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Parkdale asked me the other day what was happening about the disposal of the old Mercer Reformatory property.

At the time, I misunderstood him and thought he was talking about Mimico. The department has been attempting to dispose of the reformatory property for a couple of years. It has been advertised for sale twice; the first time the tenders closed December 1, 1970, and the second time March 12, 1971. At that time no bids high enough, in our opinion, were received. Subsequently the Ontario Housing Corporation has expressed an interest in the property and we are waiting to hear from them, hopefully before June 1 as to whether they propose to use any part or all of this. There apparently is some zoning question that they have to sort out with the city. I am not aware of the details of that.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question: On the first occasion when you made a tender of this property did you not receive some bids, one at least being for \$1.2 million?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that after the tenders were closed we had a verbal submission for \$1 million and something. I do not have the figures in front of me but it seems to me my people told me that the highest written bid that came in in accordance with the tender called was something under \$1 million.

Then there was a verbal suggestion from somebody after this time that they would offer \$1.2 million or \$1,250,000, but by this time the Housing Corporation had evinced an interest. Our own assessment of the value of the property indicated that perhaps \$1.5 million would be a reasonable offer, but proceedings have stopped at the moment until we can find out what Ontario Housing wants to do.

Mr. Trotter: When this property is put up for sale and you ask for tenders, do you put a reserve bid on the property?

Hon. Mr. Auld: In effect we do, Mr. Speaker, because we simply say that the highest or any tender is not necessarily acceptable.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? Then the member for Scarborough East has the floor.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education, who has just left his seat for a moment.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Middlesex South.

FIRING OF WAITRESSES

Mr. K. C. Bolton (Middlesex South): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour. Is he aware of the circumstances surrounding the firing of two waitresses recently in London by the Country Fair restaurant and tavern on Dundas Street, on the sole ground they refused to work braless, wearing see-through blouses? Is he—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bolton: I expected some laughter, Mr. Speaker, and it is precisely because of that kind of laughter that the question is asked. These people have their personal dignity—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has asked his question. He will now allow the minister to answer it. He will not make a statement of his own opinions.

Mr. Bolton: Mr. Speaker, I thought perhaps I had the right to rebuke the member who—

Mr. Speaker: No, the hon. member does not have the right to rebuke anyone. He has the right to ask the question and to state the facts upon which it is based.

Mr. Bolton: May I then proceed with my question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: If it is a question, the member may proceed. If it is not, he may not.

Mr. Bolton: May I ask the minister if he is aware of these circumstances? Is he satisfied that the dignity of the workers is adequately protected in view of the fact that these two workers both gave satisfactory employment, one of them for a period of five years, and that this condition was not existent when they were employed?

Mr. Stokes: I think he was asked before and he said he would take a peek at the situation.

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member, I would advise him I also had a letter from the hon. Minister of Agriculture with respect

to this matter in London, and because of the delicate situation involved, the minister himself did take a personal look. I would point out that, as I see this situation with see-through blouses in this particular matter, there are two points involved. Firstly—

Mr. Singer: Can he afford the time away from the House to do that?

Hon. Mr. Carton: —with respect to the particular—

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is labouring—

Hon. Mr. Carton: —with respect to the particular matter, in fact, I did attend at the restaurant and can honestly vouch that there were no see-through blouses in attendance. They wore, in fact, sweatshirts. What in fact was underneath I am not concerned about, but I do compliment the particular tavern for having a good advertising campaign, because it was doing a very good business that night.

On a very serious note, I agree with the member completely and discussed this with my legal staff and we are looking into the matter. As a matter of fact, we have a draft clause that could possibly be inserted in The Human Rights Code for this particular purpose. The thing that is giving us some concern presently is the administrative problems that may be involved, but we are looking into it. It is in the hands of our legal department presently.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

HOUSING PROGRAMME

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A question of the Minister of Trade and Development: Does the new programme to create additional housing provide for a major expansion by the province in the provision of wholesale water and sewage facilities to eliminate the crippling shortage of serviced lots and, in fact, create a surplus of serviced lots?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will take that question under advisement and advise the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South—you have a question? The member for York South was on his feet some time ago and is the next in line for questions.

ODC LOAN PROGRAMME REVIEW

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Trade and Development. With reference to the announcement that was carried in the *Globe and Mail* on Tuesday of his review of the subsidy and loan programme of the Ontario Development Corporation, will the minister indicate whether this programme was reviewed last year by the comprehensive government-wide review of loans and subsidies that was carried out by the Treasury Board?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that statement in the press report, as quoted by the hon. member, is taken out of context. If the hon. member will read the balance of it, he will find that I said I was reviewing all branches of my department. Naturally, as a new minister, I would review some aspects of all branches of the department or many of them with which I am not acquainted. Some I am not too sure I agree with. It is a general review. Now, as to the previous question, I have no information on that. I would be glad to get the information for the hon. member.

Mr. Deans: By way of supplementary question, might I ask the minister then if the report that he is reviewing—the circumstances surrounding the Selkirk-Metalbestos-H. G. Wright situation—is also inaccurate?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is also what?

Mr. Deans: Inaccurate.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member asking me whether my review of this is inaccurate?

Mr. Deans: No. I said is the report that minister is investigating—the situation surrounding the the Selkirk-Metalbestos-H. G. Wright situation—also inaccurate?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, it is not inaccurate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Makarchuk: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister indicate if he is finished reviewing the conditions under which ODC loans are granted to commercial fishermen?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will have a statement or an answer to that question for the hon. member early next week.

Mr. Lewis: Quite a department the minister inherited!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It sure is.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East.

ETV CHANNEL 19 EXPANSION

Mr. T. Reid: I have a question of the Minister of Education. In view of the statement by Douglas Marshall in the *Globe Magazine* of March 27, 1971, that The Department of Education will spend an additional \$20 million expanding day-long ETV throughout the five main regions of Ontario, how does the minister justify such an expansion, in light of the results of the survey taken last fall by the Bureau of Broadcast Measurement that only six per cent of the audience within range of the ETV channel 19 tune to the station at least once a week?

Hon. R. S. Welch (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

COMPULSORY OVERTIME IN AUTOMOBILE PLANTS

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour: Has the minister reviewed the matter of compulsory overtime in auto plants from the point of view both of the health of the workers and of the need to share the work with those who would otherwise be unemployed?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I am presently making a review of this. The hon. member is aware that there is an onus on both employer and employee under The Employment Standards Act, and this having been brought to my attention a day or two ago, I am looking into the matter and will report back to the House.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Parkdale.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE PAPER

Mr. Trotter: I have a question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Does the Premier plan any improved system whereby the questions on the notice paper are answered more promptly than they have in the past?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, like all activities of the House, we are endeavouring

to expedite them and I anticipate we will have answers to some of the questions on the order paper very shortly.

Mr. Trotter: By way of supplementary question, does the Premier think it is fair or efficient that I have had to put questions again on the order paper that I put on the order paper last June? I have been waiting for answers since last June and they are back on the order paper.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to comment on whether it is proper. Obviously the hon. member wants this information. If I were in his position, I would put it on the order paper again and I assure him he will get an answer to it.

Mr. Trotter: Waiting since June!

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

DRUG USAGE IN HIGH SCHOOLS

Mr. Shulman: I have a question of the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that the use of LSD and opiates has more than doubled in our high schools in the past two years? How does he equate this great increase in the use of these dangerous drugs with the cutback of funds for drug education in the high schools?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, On the first part of the question, yes, I have read some surveys and some studies with respect to the use of drugs by young people of school age; and secondly, I do not know what the hon. member means by a cutback in drug education programmes within the schools.

Mr. Shulman: Is the minister aware that in Toronto the board has cut back funds for this purpose?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, this minister is not aware of that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: Which department is the minister in?

Mr. Lewis: It is in *Hansard*.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, if I may. What does the minister intend to do about it now that he is aware of it?

Hon. Mr. Welch: This minister intends to look into the matter raised by the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Essex-Kent a supplementary?

Mr. T. Reid: Related to that question, Mr. Speaker, is the minister considering revision of the junior and intermediate health curriculums for the schools so they become much more relevant to this question?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the entire curriculum programme in this division of our elementary schools is under review now.

Mr. Speaker: This will be the last—

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister give us a date within reason of when such a report will be made public in this place?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex-Kent.

LOANS TO SERVICE INDUSTRIES

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development. Has the minister processed or is he ready to grant loans now to other forms of industry or service industries in place of just manufacturing industries as stated, I believe, in the Throne debate?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I expected to have a statement on that outlining the details of the new programmes this week. I am sorry I have not had it ready. I expect I shall have it sometime next week. Of course, we cannot put the programme into effect until the Legislature has been advised first of its details.

DEMOLITION OF ORCHARD HOUSE

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Public Works. Can the minister indicate the demolition of Orchard House, and what is happening in regard to the fact that the Apex Construction Company is indeed doing the demolition?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to give the hon. member that answer yesterday but I guess we did not have time. The lowest bidder on the project was C. S. Wark and that firm was awarded the contract—

Mr. Deans: What was the bid?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Deans: How much?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It was \$83,000 I think. I gave the hon. member the figure the other day. There were two other people who also bid who were under that figure, as I explained to him, and two others who were higher. But the two who bid less did not bid on the whole job and consequently their tenders were not accepted.

The contract permits the contractor to sub-contract part or all of it. The information I have is that Wark has subcontracted a substantial portion—I am not aware of how much—to Apex who was not an original bidder.

Mr. Deans: It was not an original bidder? I would like to ask, by way of supplementary question, if the minister would reinvestigate that because my information tells me that Apex bid \$50,000 in the initial bid.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned the firm which bid and was successful had complete authority to subcontract the work to one, two or three or four other firms, if it so wished.

Mr. Shulman: Who were the five bidders?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The two highest bidders, as I recall, were Teperman at \$117,869 and Greenspoon Brothers at \$119,840.

Mr. Shulman: Who was the lowest bidder?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Welland South!

Hon. Mr. Auld: The lowest bidder who bid on the entire job, according to the tender call, was the firm that got the job.

Mr. Lewis: According to the tender call.

Mr. Speaker: If the members wish further information, they can address it either to the order paper or by letter to the minister.

Mr. Shulman: May I ask a supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: No, there will be no more supplementaries. The member for Welland South has the floor.

FORT ERIE REPRESENTATIVES ON PARKS COMMISSION

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Has the Premier given any consideration to the request of the town of Fort Erie to petition the provincial government to amend The Niagara Parks Commission Act to make provision for representatives on the Niagara Parks Commission from the municipality of the town of Fort Erie?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this request or suggestion has been made. Like all requests and suggestions that are made, it is being considered. I would not want to lead the hon. member astray by suggesting to him that their suggestion will necessarily be agreed to by the government, but it is being considered.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has now expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. E. A. Dunlop (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the fourth report of the select committee on election law. In addition to the copies which are being placed on members' desks, copies will also be placed in their mailboxes. This report has mainly to do with municipal elections, and arrangements have been made to furnish copies to municipalities and municipal associations.

Mr. MacDonald: A question of the minister, Mr. Speaker. May I ask a question?

Mr. Speaker: For clarification, yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the minister intend, at any point, to bring in any clarification of election procedures with reference to provincial elections?

Hon. Mr. Dunlop: As chairman of the committee I brought in, I think, three reports on that matter; this is the fourth.

Mr. MacDonald: A further supplementary: If the minister is devoting his full time as a minister of the cabinet, is there any possibility that some of those recommendations will be implemented this year?

Hon. Mr. Dunlop: That is a matter of government policy.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what I thought. Government policy is to procrastinate.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Welch moves that the Legislature's committee on human resources be asked to examine the costs of education as they are reflected in the estimates of The Department of Education and for which the Minister of Education is directly accountable for to this House, including the funds provided for the Ontario Institute for Studies in

Education, the Ontario Educational Communications Authority, the Teachers' Superannuation Commission and the Province of Ontario Council for the Arts, and that the committee be encouraged to invite officials of The Department of Education and representatives of the bodies named and other interested representatives to appear before the committee as the committee may decide.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The most progressive government in North America.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The members opposite should not have been so suspicious yesterday.

An hon. member: Ask and it shall be given.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Perhaps the ministry would allow this motion to be put. Is there any debate on this motion?

Mr. T. Reid: Yes. Mr. Speaker, I have a number of brief comments to make on this. First of all, of course, we welcome the move by the Minister of Education to back up the motion made in committee the other day.

I would like to ask the minister whether he will also make available, or help to make available to that committee, the necessary research staff, hopefully including accountants and management people, and the funds necessary to have this adequate research staff?

I remember reading through the debates when the committees of this House were established, and either in the Premier's remarks or in the remarks of the member for Durham (Mr. Carruthers) it was stated that the committees could have research staff and research personnel.

I would urge and request on behalf of the Liberal party, as its education spokesman, that if that standing committee is to do its job of looking at the priorities in education, at the costs in education, even within the fairly narrow definition that the minister has placed before us today, it must have this staff.

We also feel, sir—the minister could clarify this if I am incorrect—that many of the problems in terms of costing and what we consider to be wastage and unnecessary duplication in the total education system are a result of the fragmentation of authority over various aspects of the education system.

By way of example, sir: For over a year now our position in this party has been that we have evidence—albeit it very scattered

evidence—that there is duplication of programmes, facilities and teaching personnel between the 20 colleges of applied arts and technology in this province and at least the 100 secondary schools nearest to them.

If I understood the minister's motion today, sir, he specifically said, "The Department of Education"—his department—and we have heard in the Throne Speech that the authority over the community colleges has been transferred to another minister, the Minister of University Affairs (Mr. White).

I would like some clarification on this if at all possible. I suspect that, in terms of the minister's motion referring this matter to committee, it is not broad enough to allow us to look into such areas of duplication.

It is also not broad enough to allow us to look into the areas of duplication between the schools of nursing and the community colleges, because the schools of nursing fall under yet another minister.

It will not allow us to look into the duplication, if you like, between the community colleges and the universities, or Ryerson, because the terms of reference of the minister's motion are not broad enough.

If I understand correctly, sir, the minister's motion is not broad enough to examine the duplication of programmes and teaching personnel between the Ontario College of Art, Sheridan College of Applied Arts and Technology, for example, and, at least five secondary schools in Metropolitan Toronto.

Finally, sir, again another example of the fragmentation, if you like, of responsibility over educational programmes in the province: The terms of reference that the minister has laid before us are not broad enough to include an examination of the duplication between the various institutes and colleges of agriculture which lie under The Department of Agriculture and their relationship with the community colleges.

We feel disappointed that the minister's terms of reference are not all-inclusive, that we will not be able to look at what could be the single most important area of unnecessary duplication and wastage—that is the duplication among the various bodies that receive government grants which are concerned with education or manpower training.

I noted further in the minister's statement—and he will correct me if I am wrong in this interpretation—that his terms of reference are not broad enough to call in for questioning the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation.

Hon. Mr. Welch: And other interested representatives—

Mr. T. Reid: Is that right? Unfortunately, I did not receive a copy of the minister's motion. It would be very nice if that courtesy was extended to hon. members of the House, particularly the opposition spokesmen.

Mr. Singer: Come on, it is only common courtesy and it makes the progress of the House efficient.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When did the member know anything about common courtesy?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Certainly I did not learn anything from the minister.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I make two concluding comments. The first is, if I understand the motion establishing the committees of this House—and I do not have my copy in front of me but the government whip will correct me, I am sure, if I am wrong—the import of the statement on the standing committee on human resources, and perhaps the other committees, was that the House "may" refer to the committees, matters that it deems to be important.

I would ask you, sir, in terms of the discussion made here yesterday, to examine the importance of that word "may". The word was not "shall"; the word "may" did not restrict the terms of reference of the committee, in our opinion on this side of the House. The hon. minister has his chance to reply, I am sure, and comment on this. The point I am making, sir, is that the committee, in our opinion, is not restricted to examine only those things referred to it in effect by the relevant ministers or by the ministry. It still has the power to call before it people it wishes to interview if there is a majority vote in that committee—which necessitates, of course, either the absence of government members or their abstention or their voting with such motions.

I would like to ask the minister this, sir, but perhaps it is a question which must be reserved for your ruling on this. Our understanding still is that in spite of the minister's motion today the standing committee on human resources, with respect to education as an example, still has the power to call in people it wishes to hear. It has the power to do things that the minister does not refer to it.

I say, sir, that we still consider the motion that I made in the standing committee on Wednesday last to be *intra vires*, to be correct, to be proper. We feel that it is much broader and allows a much broader examination of the costs of education, particularly duplication, than the minister's motion.

In concluding, sir, I think I can say on behalf of this party that we are pleased that the minister has acted to clarify the situation to the extent that he has, but we stress the committees, we feel, still have the right to initiate. We think it is a necessary cross-check on ministerial power that is not incompatible with the democratic processes of a parliamentary system.

Finally, sir, we stress the need for all members of that committee, regardless of their political affiliation, to have adequate research staff, particularly accountancy staff, so we can go over the books of various institutes and various school boards and so that we can have a way in which we can ask relevant questions. Right now, sir, for the House's information, I am trying to have volunteers do research on the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education because I would like to have relevant questions to ask, but it is very difficult to have a hard-headed analysis of educational costs on behalf of the people and the taxpayers of this province if we are acting in isolation.

With that, sir, I conclude my remarks.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, just to reply to the one point made by the hon. member for Scarborough East. I hope that the resolution or the motion here this morning indicates precisely what was said yesterday afternoon and perhaps allays the fears expressed by some of the members opposite—it is the intent of this government to make the standing committees meaningful. I will not get into a debate this morning.

Mr. Trotter: Why interfere with their motion then?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will not get into a debate this morning on the matter that has been referred to the Speaker as to the proper procedures that should be used. I say, with respect, Mr. Speaker, that the procedures we are presently using are those that are set down in the original motions that were passed—

Mr. Nixon: Will the hon. minister permit a question in that connection?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes. But as I say I am not going to debate it this morning because the Speaker has been asked to make a ruling on it and he will be doing so. I will say to the hon. members of the House, Mr. Speaker, it is the intent to have other resolutions of this kind introduced by other ministers, including the Minister of University Affairs. There will be no problem with this.

I should point out one other aspect of it, Mr. Speaker. When this is done—and while I know the hon. member for Scarborough East is particularly interested in the educational aspect—one point that has to be made is related to all of these standing committees. The human resources committee also must involve itself with matters of health, social and family services, correctional services, and boards and commissions that relate to those. This must be part of the House's right to determine, with all members, myself as an individual member, if there are items that we want referred to the standing committee. We have to be very careful not to single out just one particular area of interest.

Mr. Nixon: Might I ask a question? Will the Premier answer a question, Mr. Speaker? Does he intend to have a similar resolution brought forward at this session—I mean today—by the Minister of Agriculture to complement the resolution that was passed by the committee on physical and natural resources, which calls before the committee next Wednesday the Ontario Food Council in order to determine their role and the role of farm prices in the price war in the grocery business?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. Leader of the Opposition will read the resolutions that have been passed already, he will find that that is automatically included within the resolution that presently exists.

Mr. Nixon: What resolution has been passed already?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The one setting up the committees. Read it.

Mr. Nixon: Clarification is surely essential because the motion that was put before the committee dealing with agricultural matters calls for a review. It calls for the appearance of certain special groups before the committee and is very similar, if not identical, to the special resolution that you are putting forward.

Hon. Mr. Davis: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for the Minister of Agriculture to introduce a similar resolution in my view, and I am subject to the ruling of the Speaker. It will be necessary for the Minister of University Affairs, which he shall do, although I think the committee will have ample scope on Wednesday—

Mr. MacDonald: Why are you so frightened about investigating education?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —to introduce a resolution as it relates to, say, the community colleges and what have you.

Mr. Nixon: You mean it is all right to investigate farm prices on the behest of the committee, but you have to get authority to investigate school costs?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am saying it is automatically within that resolution. Ask the Speaker.

Mr. Singer: A difference without a distinction. Ludicrous.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, the whole proposition is really a silly one. It is almost a childish one. You are not as ept as one would have thought in the legislative process at this point.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Ept?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, ept as opposed to inept. Because it has a funny flavour about it, this 11th-hour repentance. You walked in at 11 o'clock on a Friday morning with a resolution in order to retrieve the shambles of yesterday or yesteryear.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not at all; you were told yesterday.

Mr. Lewis: That is precisely what you have done. We were told yesterday, as the Premier fished frantically in the recesses of his mind for a way in which to explain what he was doing. And suddenly there occurred to him from on high that he would provide a resolution which would encompass it the next day.

Mr. Singer: The Minister of Trade and Development gave another speech about his—

Mr. Lewis: That is quite a way in which to govern. When the Leader of the Opposition stands and says "What about the Minister of Agriculture bringing in a resolution to govern the Ontario Food Council?"—an absolutely parallel situation—the Clerk whispers to the Premier "It is automatic."

The Premier stands on his feet and says "It is automatic." Remarkable puppetry in this Legislature. I did not know all the authority vested in the centre of the floor, although I understand and have regard for the Clerk.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member for York South was asking questions of the Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, you are engaged in a sort of ad hoc retrieval operation. It will not work. You cannot have every single minister—University Affairs on Monday, Correctional Services on Tuesday, Health on Thursday, and then Social and Family Services on Friday—this little school-boy litany of ministers standing up and saying, "We permit the Legislature," or "We move that the Legislature investigate such and such or so and so."

Hon. Mr. Davis: We knew that in standing committee.

Mr. Lewis: The direction is clear. The government intends to maintain the control of the committee system.

Mr. Trotter: That is it exactly.

Mr. Lewis: That absolutely underscores everything that was said yesterday and indeed it underscores it today, however generous the minister's resolution may have been. The instructions go out—one can feel it—by osmosis through the House and all of the Tory backbenchers sense that. "The Premier is irritated. He is calling us into line. He makes it sound generous, but"—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am never irritated.

Mr. Lewis: —"we will know how to vote next time that committee meets."

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member is too suspicious.

Mr. Lewis: The Provincial Secretary did not carry quite the same authority last Wednesday morning.

An hon. member: He was flim-flamming; he knows how to flim-flam.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): I was not flim-flamming.

Mr. Lewis: Right, right. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: Why did you unleash that?

Mr. Lewis: I thought the minister had left and it was safe. I apologize to him.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that I really do believe many of us on this side believe that one can hardly disagree with this resolution on the face of it, can one?

Mr. Singer: Yes, one can.

Mr. Lewis: But one can judge it on the basis of what occurred yesterday in this House when the Premier, in an unprecedented moment in this Legislature, ruled a committee out of order the day before, exercising an arbitrary authority—

Mr. Speaker: A point of order?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have no power to rule any committee out of order. I passed a personal point of order and it was the intent of the government to regularize this, as we are doing by this resolution.

Mr. MacDonald: The Premier said it was out of order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Right, and on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This has now been referred to the Speaker for his ruling, which I am more than prepared to accept. But in that his ruling may or may not come today, we are presenting this resolution so the committee can function effectively on Wednesday next.

Mr. MacDonald: That is right—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it is completely consistent and completely logical.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the Prime Minister finished? I just want to deal with this one point of order. Our Speaker has indicated that we make our own rules, the majority of our House rules; when the Prime Minister—

Hon. Mr. Davis: But the member asked him for a ruling yesterday.

Mr. MacDonald: When the Prime Minister gets up and gives a personal view that ultimately is going to be the Speaker's ruling—if that does not happen it will be unprecedented; we will look forward to hear what the Speaker's ruling is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not at all. The member gives personal points of view every day of the week.

Mr. Lewis: With that bashful reticence which attaches to the ordinary member from Peel North, who entered the debate yesterday to share with the House his private view of the matter, we will see whether the Speaker's view will coincide with his private view which he so gently introduced into the debate yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Quite different from the arrogance of the member for Scarborough West.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was, very.

Mr. Lewis: Well, the message was clear. The Prime Minister is concerned about the costs of education—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly.

Mr. Lewis: He knows it is the Achilles heel of his government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it is not.

Mr. Lewis: It is causing trouble all over the province for them and they are determined to maintain constraints on the committee system. However generous this sudden resolution may sound, it was clear in the words and authority which the Premier conveyed to the House yesterday how tightly he intends to hold reins.

It was particularly clear because, of course, it is absurd that a resolution should be introduced this morning dealing with education costs, and the entire post-secondary area is not even mentioned. And when the Premier suddenly twigged to that after the event, moving with that unerring facility, he says the Minister of University Affairs will introduce another resolution to encompass it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Quite. Sure.

Mr. Lewis: Falderal! He could have had it in a resolution this morning. Had he been thinking about it, it would have been there.

Mr. MacDonald: I thought it was covered.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They want to deal with the ODE.

Mr. Lewis: With great respect, it is not for the Premier to decide that which the committee deals with.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was the House.

Mr. Lewis: The committee may decide at its whim that it wishes to examine community colleges, technical schools or universities,

and if the Premier was serious about the resolution he would have instinctively incorporated all of that this morning. Even then, it is this careful measuring out of what it is the committees will be entitled to deal with.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The community colleges are still in the estimates of The Department of Education.

Mr. Lewis: Right, and that is another aspect, Mr. Speaker—the careful phrasing about the areas to which the minister is “directly accountable to the House.” What about the school boards across the province and our capacity as a Legislature—not out of interest in inquisitorial terms, but out of interest to ask them to appear—to take a look at some of the municipal and various county school boards and what is involved.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Read the resolution.

Mr. Lewis: We will see if the resolution permits that. What about the extension of aid to the separate school system, which is not now in the budget of the minister? Will that be an entitlement of the committee, that we should have an actuarial analysis of costs, that we should bring representatives before the committee? Not on the basis of this resolution carefully phrased to exclude those areas within which the minister is not directly accountable to the House.

The resolution is not even presented in good faith, in terms of its present wording—thrown together somewhere between yesterday afternoon and this morning, huddled over quietly with Dr. McCarthy under the railings, while the member for Scarborough East looked frantically for the Minister of Education some three-quarters of an hour ago.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Under what railings?

Mr. Lewis: The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that it was all done in a hurried last-minute fashion, that it does not smack of the good faith which the Premier should be willing to give the committee system. It is actually a mistake in political judgement, if I may be so bold, Mr. Speaker, because in fact the committee system, if it operated well, need not be an embarrassment.

But the Premier is so fragile about his own policies, he is so defensive, so self-conscious about the errors of government and the problems it poses for all of this province, that he cannot even allow a system to operate as it should. Indeed, he has got to marshal Tory troops for a committee, as though he were

whipping them into line for the House. I do not know how many should have been there—maybe nine or 10—but there were only five or so—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Six.

Mr. Lewis: Five or six, and the word must go out even to the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member's whips marshal his troops. His whips were looking for the member last night.

Mr. Lewis: That is right. Some of us, as it happened, were elsewhere.

Mr. MacDonald: We were looking for the minister when he was in Montreal.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, the members were not. There was no vote Tuesday afternoon.

Mr. Singer: Did the minister not get to the ball game?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member for Downsview and the leader of the NDP were at the hockey game during the very important debate.

Mr. Singer: The Premier was at the ball game. I am very jealous of that.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I do not imagine that it would serve any useful purpose—other than for the purpose of debating and dividing the House, so why engage in that—to put an amendment simply to bring in all the post-secondary educational studies before the committee in similar or broader terms since the Premier is going to apparently bring it in himself on Monday after the phone call is made to the Minister of University Affairs over the weekend to urge him to draft it and get it in preparation. The government is planning well in advance all the stages of this committee procedure!

We are not happy and pleased about the resolution, Mr. Speaker. One cannot very well afford to object to it. But we will press those committee proceedings to the limit, and on every single occasion they will have to arbitrarily overrule the committee in certain areas where even Tory backbenchers will agree with the opposition.

Mr. Trotter: Right.

Mr. Lewis: As to the proceedings of that committee in fields beyond the delimiting nature of this particular resolution, it is a very frustrating business. The new Premier feels so insecure about the operations of his own group that he has to set out this kind of limits on the committee system and the Legislature cannot operate as it has operated in the past, and not as effectively as it could.

But given a different kind of atmosphere, we could collectively do a first-rate job in that committee. By the absence of research, by the delimiting nature of the resolution, by the 11th-hour way in which this has been approached, they are obviously viewing it in bad faith. So we will have to go through the absurdity of fighting every committee session through again to establish the kind of position where we can do the investigation which we in this House think we are entitled to in that particular committee and with the costs of education significantly in mind.

Mr Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I think it is terribly unfortunate, as the leader of the NDP says, that we have to approach this with all the threats and the warnings that have come from him. The statement has been made that the only reason that the Premier is undertaking this rather tortuous approach is simply to protect his position as former Minister of Education. I think it is simply ineptitude. I am quite convinced, and the Premier opposite certainly should be as well, that with representatives of all three parties forming these committees all of us should have the confidence in our representation on those committees to take action that is in the best interests of this House and, certainly, in the best interests of the community of Ontario.

I feel that the Premier has been badly advised in his attempts to take over the control of the committees by means of these hastily worded resolutions, copies of which are not available.

Mr. Speaker, we could argue here a long time about the parallel between the motion that was put forward in the committee dealing with education by the member for Scarborough East and the motion put forward in the committee on natural resources by the member for Huron-Bruce. Both of them called for the appearance of specific bodies responsible to government or established by the action of this Legislature. Both of them

called for investigation into specific areas of widespread public complaint, the one on the cost of education and the one on the costs of the production of agricultural produce.

For the Premier, wherever his advice comes from, to say that they are essentially different, when the one requires the imprimatur of the Minister of Education and the other one is at the behest only of that particular committee, means simply that he regards the one as more delicate, more dangerous than the other. I would say to him, if he is going to proceed with this method of having the committees being led by resolutions put forward by the various ministers, that the committee system will not be adequate. It will not be effective and, in fact, it will break down.

I think we should settle it in this House, and frankly, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the ruling that will come from your chair, in regard to this important matter. We have to emphasize the independence of these committees. If we stick on the wording of that resolution, where the committees refer, and deal only with those matters specifically referred to them, then of course, its effectiveness will be practically null.

I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we are supporting the resolution, as my colleague has said, simply because it enables the Premier to allow his supporters to continue with the work that they themselves voted for independently in the committees. All he has done in this particular situation is show that he has no confidence in an independent committee system and, certainly, I would hope that he would review his own position even before Mr. Speaker's ruling is available to the members of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must point out, I believe on a motion, each member may speak only once. Then the mover of the motion may wind up. I had permitted the Leader of the Opposition to ask questions previously.

Mr. Nixon: This is not the second reading.

Mr. Speaker: No, this is a motion. I think each member can speak only once on this motion. Has the hon. member for York South spoken previously?

Mr. MacDonald: I was on the point of order.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member is quite right. It was a point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: That is right. It was a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the basic case on behalf of this party has been well made by our leader. I just want to add one ramification.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): Which leader?

Mr. MacDonald: The leader of the party, and if the minister does not know, he is as slow in this as he is many other things in catching onto the facts of life.

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of University Affairs): The member learned yesterday when he was asked to sit down.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: The point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is this. I am now increasingly puzzled as to what is the point of the careful interparty consultations with regard to rules of this House. I voice a quiet protest that is going to become less quiet as time goes on.

I was one of the members from this group that met at great length last spring and last fall with regard to new rules for the House and new approaches for the committees. Sometimes we had differences of opinion and we argued out the detail of coming to some sort of a consensus. We came to a consensus. Then after we came to a consensus, Mr. Speaker, the government, unilaterally, does as it damn well pleases.

Somebody, over the head of the man who was chairman of the committee, who presided over the arrival of this committee, decided there could not be flexibility and interchange, which was one of the basic approaches between these committees. I do not know who did it. I would be curious to find out who did it because the chairman of the committee who created it is opposed to it. Now whether it was a dictate from the Prime Minister, or whether it emerged from one of the backroom boys in the Tory caucus, I do not know.

Now we have a new development, Mr. Speaker. Because of the sensitivity of the government in the controversial area of education costs—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The right one.

Mr. MacDonald: —the Prime Minister is in the process of imposing a straitjacket in the operation of the committee for the consideration of this issue.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member could not get a broader resolution.

Mr. MacDonald: Look.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well?

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): The member has not read it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Yakabuski: The member would like to have it both ways, would he not?

Mr. MacDonald: Have I got the floor, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Fine, thank you. If the Prime Minister says we cannot get a broader resolution, why did he need to bring in the resolution at all?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Because the rules say so.

Mr. MacDonald: Look, the rules say so because the government has framed the rules that are creating a straitjacket to deal with those issues which are embarrassing to the government.

I am speaking to the Prime Minister, if he would not be so rude as to go and talk to somebody else.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member passed the resolution.

Mr. MacDonald: I am speaking to the Prime Minister, through the Speaker, because it is just possible that he can get the germ of the idea I am trying to transmit. This is not a completely new development, Mr. Speaker. Last year the government was profoundly embarrassed when one of its own chairmen decided that the committees would act in an effective way, namely the health committee. Now, this Prime Minister is going to try to contain the independence of the hon. member for Quinte (Mr. Potter) by putting him in the cabinet, albeit as a Minister without Portfolio. Surely that is the cheapest kind of an effort to try to silence a member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will speak to the motion before us, please.

Mr. MacDonald: On this issue, he is now bringing in rules, and interestingly enough he is revealing that his rules are only going to apply to this committee and to deal with

this situation because he argues that the other resolutions with regard to the other committees are all-inclusive. For example, on the natural resources committee, they can call in the food council; they do not need a directive. In short, any time the government is on the defensive politically—

Hon. Mr. Davis: But it is one of the boards. The hon. member should read the resolution.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have made my basic point, and what I want to say to the Prime Minister is this: He is in the process of violating the consensus that was arrived at by representatives of all parties. He is adding, as he arbitrarily chooses, new regulations. He is in the process of destroying the experiment with regard to committee work at the very outset. If that is what the Prime Minister wants to do, go ahead and do it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, if we are to take the wording of the motion that is now before the House, the best we can say about it is that it is a smart political dodge. In effect, the wording of that motion is broad enough to include a number of things that could be done.

What in fact is happening is that the administration is throttling anything the committees want to do on their own. If the committee system is to work in this Legislature, then certainly the members have some responsibility to their constituents, and certainly this government has some responsibility to the members, to let them think and do as they wish in this House.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They will.

Mr. Trotter: The Premier shouts across the House that they will. Well, if the minister has any confidence in the members, why is it necessary to bring in this motion in the first place? There is no question in my mind that despite the fact that this motion is well-worded from a political point of view, in truth the minister is using all the dexterity of a surgeon who uses a meat cleaver to remove somebody's tonsils.

An hon. member: It is like taking a sledgehammer to a fly.

Mr. Trotter: It is about time that this government got away from its autocratic manner that it has carried on in the administration

of this government over a long period of time. When these committees were set up, and when the original motion setting up the committees was brought in, I had some hope that the government would give our committees a broad enough scope that we could do some investigating on our own.

Why should we, Mr. Speaker, be dependent upon what the minister of a particular department wants us to do? If we are going to be forced to follow the motion that is before this House, it is in effect that we are being told we must investigate and look into only those matters that a minister of a department wants us to examine. So obviously the government is going to avoid every controversial issue, every embarrassing issue it possibly can.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That one resolution would take me five years to cover. Five years! I might not even do it in five years.

Mr. Trotter: We have had experience in this Legislature within the last two years of this government removing a chairman of a standing committee who attempted to investigate and to look into real problems that were, in effect, embarrassing to the administration in power.

Hon. Mr. Welch: That is not true.

Mr. Trotter: This, in effect, is just one more example where we, as members, are going to have even less opportunity to speak up and use the power of the standing committee that we should be able to use. The situation is such, Mr. Speaker, that the way the voting system is in this House, there is little we can do to make the change.

Except, I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this House—and in particular the administration through you—that I will use every opportunity in the committees, or in the particular committee which I am on, to investigate many of the issues that this government tries to ignore. I had the opportunity to be in from the very beginning in the human resources committee, discussing the motion on education. There is no doubt, having seen the original motion as introduced in that committee and the motion that is before this House—

Hon. Mr. Davis: On natural resources?

Mr. Trotter: —that the government is trying to cover up. The government is trying to throttle the committee system.

Hon. Mr. Welch: That is not true.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for Parkdale knows better. He knows better.

Mr. Trotter: I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is a disgraceful situation when an administration can exist in the Province of Ontario in this day and age and carry on in the manner in which it is now doing.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, I understand from what the Premier has said that the rules require that a resolution be brought forward to this House, by this House, with instructions to the committees. But I disagree with the way the Premier is handling this situation, because if he does it by having each of his ministers bring in a resolution—

Hon. Mr. Davis: You agree with the first part though?

Mr. Deacon: —he is confining too greatly the scope of the committees. The committees are now set up by the House in such a way that they do deal with natural resources or human resources. They basically deal in the programmes and it is a very fine way that we have now of preventing overlap. I suggest that if the Premier himself would bring in the resolutions and word them in such a way that they allow the committees full freedom to investigate within those programmes we can eliminate the problem we are now faced with by this resolution now before us.

For example, the Premier has mentioned that he has to have a resolution or he intends to have the Minister of University Affairs bring in a resolution in due course, perhaps Monday, that will enable the committee to look at not just the primary and secondary but the post-secondary aspects of education as well. I suggest there are many other areas of human resource studies where education of a sort is involved. Our colleague from Scarborough East has already mentioned health and agriculture, for two. In addition, the committee might want to look into the area of correctional services, which has an educational aspect that is very important.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I hope it would.

Mr. Deacon: The educational aspects through the community activities under The Department of the Provincial Secretary, Social and Family Services—these are all different departments. Under the present system, the Premier would have to have each of these ministers permit the committee and give the committee instructions so it could call for these other resources.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is the House.

Mr. Deacon: The House?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Right.

Mr. Deacon: Right, the House will be doing this, but surely the way to deal with this is to have the Premier himself bring forward these resolutions, giving the clear delineation of opportunity to the committees to study, within the scope of their particular field, the human resources or the natural resources. This system that we are now using is a patchwork and I am disappointed that the Premier has not seen the necessity to make it possible for the committees to deal in a comprehensive fashion with their responsibilities.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen! His own members' resolution was completely restrictive and it would not have permitted that at all.

Mr. T. Reid: No, it was wide open.

Mr. Trotter: Why change it then?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I can find no complaint whatsoever with the resolution brought in this morning by the Minister of Education. I think it is quite wide enough to allow the committee to look into this problem quite freely. They certainly will not have enough time to look into it and could go no further. I can understand some of the alarm which you have heard voiced here, but it is a theoretical alarm because the resolution certainly is quite wide enough.

What I would like to ask the Prime Minister, through you, sir—

Mr. Nixon: He does not speak for us. He speaks for them.

Mr. Singer: He speaks for the leader of the NDP.

Mr. Shulman: I think we are all allowed to speak our own minds in this party and I should hope it will always continue to be like that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: I think the Prime Minister could allay the alarm—

Hon. Mr. White: It is not obvious.

Mr. Shulman: —felt by members of my party, and by the flutterers to my right as well, if he would give assurance that when

a committee—any committee—brings forth the resolution that it wishes to investigate such a matter, he and his government will bring in the necessary motion which would solve all the problems.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is just what we have done.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two observations in view of the discussion we have had this morning. I would agree that the wording of this motion does provide a very broad term of reference for the discussion of a very important aspect of our provincial operation. We are responding to the wording of the resolution itself setting up the standing committee on human resources which quite clearly says "Other matters relating to the department may be referred in the discretion of the House."

"In the discretion of the House," that is a resolution asking the standing committee to go into these matters in some detail. I welcome—I want it quite clearly understood—I welcome the study by the standing committee.

Mr. T. Reid: Do we get an independent research staff?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The member has had his go. I will go through this in an orderly way. I will come to that. That happens to be number one on my list.

Mr. Singer: Temper, temper!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How about some common courtesy? Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for Scarborough East would not understand.

Hon. Mr. Welch: What I am getting at is I want it clearly understood that I think, in view of the tremendous interest in the question of the cost of education throughout this province, this is a very welcome study on the part of the standing committee.

I would hope that committee members would take cognizance of the fact that they are to be encouraged to invite officials from the departments and other interested representatives to come and to share with them their views.

Mr. Sargent: It is a monster the minister has created. He will rue the day.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think the organization of the standing committee itself and the staff that it will require will have to be determined by the committee. Its members will have to see themselves what is the extent of this type of investigation. I say this; please keep in mind that there are very competent people on staff who can be of some assistance, if members would only bring them up to help to explain the operation. I can imagine that committee members would bring before them the head of the grant section to explain the grant system. I think they have to understand some of these things first and then once they get whatever facts they require, they can come to whatever decisions they like.

Mr. Nixon: Dr. McCarthy is quite busy. Everybody else is reviewing for the Minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. Singer: That fellow, Clare Westcott—do you let him in the committee? Very competent fellow.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think that having this resolution and having these terms of reference as broad as they are, the committee members naturally want to do an effective job in order to have as complete a study as possible.

Now I say that in the context of two or three other matters. First of all, members will recall that yesterday the Prime Minister himself made reference to the fact that the present Deputy Minister of Education, among other responsibilities, would be asked to organize an inquiry into the cost and effectiveness of the educational system of the province.

I think really, as the member for High Park said, there is a tremendous amount of work to be done. There is no sense duplicating the work of other boards and commissions and I would hope that this study by the standing committee, and the study to be done by the inquiry of the task force—about which I will have something to say in the early part of next week—should be complementary, so that we, in fact, are getting all the information out as quickly as possible. Members made some reference to the fragmentation of authority—

Mr. Lewis: Complementary is the word?

Hon. Mr. Welch: —I point out to you that there is already a commission on post-secondary education going into some aspects of that particular group.

Mr. T. Reid: The minister is an elected representative. Why not them?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I know, but surely objectivity and the limitations of time would demand that wherever possible the committee would not duplicate, but utilize—

Mr. T. Reid: I am willing to work full-time.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —utilize the work that is going on in the studies that are already under way. I would hope that the standing committee, with whatever limitations it might have, in view of time and the fact that this is not the only department that comes within the purview of its interests—

Mr. Singer: Imposed upon us!

Mr. Trotter: And a Tory majority!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Let us make it a Liberal majority.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The inquiry to which the Prime Minister made reference yesterday—about which I will have more to say in the first part of next week as to the areas to which I hope that they would go—and the fact that there is a post-secondary commission or, rather, a commission on post-secondary education—I would hope that all of this dialogue would be very helpful and indeed would provide us with the type of information we need to come to some valid conclusions with respect to our educational programme in this province and the priorities. So I welcome the unanimous acceptance of this. I wish the standing committee well and I give the committee the assurance that the officials of the department over which I now preside are anxious, willing to co-operate—

Mr. T. Reid: We want our independent researchers.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —and to attend before you to provide you with whatever information you need. My suggestion is—

Mr. T. Reid: Independent researchers—

Mr. Nixon: That is essential.

Hon. Mr. Welch: You might discuss in committee—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Welch: You might discuss within the committee itself what other procedures

you might want to follow to assure yourselves of objectivity. I think you have some obligation to get the facts first and then the examination of those facts will remain with you as a member of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, may I conclude as I started, by saying that I am very pleased that the standing committee will have this particular priority before it. I hope to listen in myself on as many meetings as I can to help to understand many of these matters. I am very pleased as well that there is such interparty interest in this very important programme as far as our government is concerned.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: That was one of the minister's worst!

Mr. Speaker: Order! Before I put the motion I would like to say to the hon. members to my left who earlier in the debate raised certain questions, that so far as Mr. Speaker is concerned the motion before the House is quite in order. If the members of the House do not concur in the motion and do not like it then, of course, they can vote against it. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker is guided by the opinion of the members of this House as expressed in the chamber.

We are now voting on the motion by Hon. Mr. Welch with respect to the committee on human resources. As many as are in favour of the motion—

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if you would read the motion, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: May I read the motion again?

Hon. Mr. Welch moves that the Legislature's committee on human resources be asked to examine the costs of education as they are reflected in the estimates of The Department of Education, and for which the Minister of Education is directly accountable to this House, including the funds provided for the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, the Ontario Educational Communications Authority, the Teachers' Superannuation Commission, and the Province of Ontario Council for the Arts, and that the committee be encouraged to invite officials of The Department of Education and representatives of the bodies named and other interested representatives, to appear before the committee as the committee may decide.

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

SOCIETY OF INDUSTRIAL ACCOUNTANTS OF ONTARIO

Mr. J. R. Smith moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Society of Industrial Accountants of Ontario.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CONTROL OF EAVESDROPPING

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the Control of Eavesdropping.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to control wiretapping and all other forms of electronic overhearing of conversations except in cases involving national security or organized crime, and then only for periods of time not exceeding 48 hours. No person may engage in eavesdropping without a court order.

The bill provides that a court order may only be granted on the application of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General or a Crown attorney and specifies the information that must be given to the court on such an application.

FINANCIAL ACCOUNTS OF UNIVERSITIES

Mr. T. Reid moves first reading of bill intituled, an Act respecting the Financial Accounts of Universities.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, this bill will require each provincially assisted university in Ontario to file detailed financial statements of revenues and expenditures with the Minister of University Affairs each year, and it requires the minister to table these statements unedited in the Legislature immediately thereafter.

The bill also enables the Provincial Auditor to prescribe the exact form and content of the financial statements of the universities in order to allow the public to know where exactly their tax money is going.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, the health care situation in Ontario is unsatisfactory. It is unsatisfactory for patients; it is unsatisfactory for doctors; it is unsatisfactory for paramedical workers and hospital workers. It is, surely, with an election bulging over the horizon, unsatisfactory for the government.

Nobody needed the 15 volumes of the report of the committee on the healing arts and its special studies to make this apparent. "The system is excessively confused, unco-ordinated, complicated and wasteful. It just grew with all the difficulties which lack of planning inevitably introduced." Such is the beginning of an excellent series of articles by Jean Howarth in *The Globe and Mail* about our health care system in Ontario. These articles contrast our system in Ontario, which has been largely unplanned, with Alberta's system, which has been thoroughly planned.

Again and again, Ontario was found wanting. Our system is unco-ordinated, costly, with certain areas being oversupplied and other areas very much undersupplied. We have depended too much on the very costly active-treatment-bed hospitals treating the seriously ill, rather than developing the less costly but equally efficient convalescent, rehabilitative and chronic care facilities. We have not stressed sufficiently the home care programme, and again another cost-saving form of care is underdeveloped. We have left the construction and operation of nursing homes to private enterprise, with the result that a great deal of variation exists as to the type of facility, standard of care and distribution of nursing homes in the province, so that a number of key areas are completely without this facility.

While one must give credit to the nursing home operators for the need they are meeting and the way they are meeting it, nevertheless one cannot help but wonder why the provincial government has not been a great deal more active in the construction and operation of government-owned nursing homes to ensure a more uniform standard of facility and of care, plus a much better distribution of such throughout the province.

With the need for profit removed, it might even be possible to cut the per diem rate, should the government enter the nursing home field.

There is no doubt about it, the health care delivery system in this province is too costly, has too many gaps in it and needs a thorough-going overhaul. To quote further from one of Jean Howarth's articles:

It is amazing how many individuals in positions to know can list an almost identical catalogue of problems in the Ontario health care system. It is even more amazing, when such unanimity exists, to discover how little has been done to correct the problems.

Since the problems, along with solutions to them, are readily identifiable, why has there not been action taken in this regard?

Jean Howarth presents several reasons which are a pretty accurate assessment of the inaction by government and its bureaucracy.

One reason is that the government which preceded that of Premier William Davis was not enthusiastic about providing convalescent, rehabilitative and chronic beds, especially in separate institutions. It is argued that because a very high percentage of general hospital patients require only very brief hospital convalescence, the beds needed for this purpose are part of the active treatment hospital beds in Ontario.

According to former Minister of Health Tom Wells, patients stay longer in Ontario active treatment hospitals—the average 1970 stay was 10 days—than they do in the active treatment hospitals of any other jurisdiction or country in the western world. What is more, that stay costs from \$34 to \$89 a day whereas convalescent beds in Alberta cost \$14 to \$20 a day.

In other words, former Conservative governments have deliberately opted for the more costly active-treatment bed programme, thus ensuring that our hospital system is one of the most costly there is.

Secondly, Jean Howarth contends that the empires in the health field frustrate change.

"We have bad hangups in Ontario, on an empire basis," said a doctor who had spent some years trying with others to co-ordinate the efforts of the University of Toronto and Metro Toronto core hospitals and quit in frustration.

"The hospital commission, the health department, the welfare department and its old nursing homes; OHSIP, HIRB, the hospitals, the university—they are all empires and everyone is spawning dozens of internal empires.

"Toronto talked regions for five years. The province cut off resource funds to stimulate togetherness, but we are still talking regions. You just could not get the university to provide any leadership or even get into the act."

The government must give leadership on a no-nonsense basis and shake up these empires in a dramatic fashion so that they do not frustrate and impede the badly needed changes. Since so many of these empires are the creatures of successive Tory governments, I suggest that really if we are going to get sufficient reform and change in the health care system, another government other than the one opposite is an absolute necessity.

Consider this statement by Jean Howarth:

An opinion expressed by many of those who worked for change in the Ontario health care system was that senior civil servants make too many policy decisions that ought to be made by the cabinet and that the sheer bulk of the civil service stands in the way of change.

Need I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that it is the Ontario consumers of health care and the taxpayers who suffer because the government refuses to accept the responsibility for making the necessary policy decisions for the health care system and leaves them too much to the senior bureaucrats. Only a change of government can curtail the undue influence in policy of senior bureaucrats and can rightfully restore leadership in policy to the cabinet where it belongs. This an NDP government will do.

The Tory party has formed the government in this province for more than 27 years. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that they are directly responsible for the present unsatisfactory state of affairs because of their refusal to believe in or practise planning. The people of Ontario are fed up with the costly unco-ordinated under-differentiated health care system in this province. They know where the blame lies and they will vent their anger yet again for the government's failure in health when election day comes along.

On January 25, 1971, the then Minister of Health (Mr. Wells) said in a press statement:

At the next sitting of the Legislature it is my intention to present a detailed statement outlining the guidelines and principles for the development of a comprehensive health services programme for the people of Ontario.

I looked for some statements in the Speech from the Throne, but all we received were, "New policies designed to promote a more efficient, economical and comprehensive system of delivery of health services will be brought forward during this session."

That statement could mean a great deal or it could be some more of the pious platitudes this government so regularly dishes out. Will we get action or will we get more words?

While we were debating the estimates last year on matter after matter where change and reform are long overdue and the methods are generally accepted by everyone, in response to our prodding all the minister would say was, "We are studying it. We are taking a look at it. We need more time to look at it further."

That was the only response we could get. We could get no commitments. That kind of response was unsatisfactory, then, and it is unsatisfactory now. We want action and we expect action now. Anything else will be a further insult to our intelligence and will perpetuate a long-standing crisis that demands well-known solutions.

We in the New Democratic Party are committed to a real overhaul of our health care system so that it will provide a comprehensive programme of care to all citizens, regardless of their financial resources. One of the things that seems most pressing is the establishment of regional health councils throughout the province so that the facilities, needs and resources could be assessed in a given area. Then steps can be taken to make sure that a full programme is developed and put into force in these regions.

At present, there are chronic patients, convalescent patients, and rehabilitative patients in active-treatment hospitals, but its costs too much to maintain them where often they do not receive the therapeutic services they need. There are patients in nursing homes who do not need nursing home care and should be in homes for the aged. There are patients who could be cared for just as adequately and much more cheaply and often more happily at home under a home care programme.

A regional medical director should be appointed with authority to move a patient promptly into the institution that meets his need, regardless of the preferences and conveniences of doctors, administrators, boards or patients, or patients' families. As Jean Howarth says, "Ontario can have first-class health care at a price it can afford only if patients are moved rationally through a system that is devised to meet their needs."

We, therefore, must move to provide throughout the province chronic, convalescent and rehabilitative care in hospitals specifically designed and built for these purposes. Potential savings are to be derived from emphasizing then, auxiliary hospitals and nursing homes. Studies have conclusively shown that patients can be served in auxiliary hospitals at about half cost of treatment as in active-treatment hospitals. Here in Ontario this means a saving of \$25 per patient-day. Nursing homes provide care at one-quarter the cost of active-treatment hospitals. These facilities must be evenly distributed throughout the province, particularly in areas of northern Ontario where nursing homes do not exist. And—of course—care in these institutions must be covered under the public insurance programme.

The present Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) told us a week or so ago that he puts the highest priority on having nursing home care covered by insurance. The former Minister of Health, true to form, told us that nursing home costs in our medical insurance were under active consideration. In all this time people are using up their assets waiting for this government to act. More and more people are being hurt every day.

Because OHSIP and OHSC are financed by both Queen's Park and Ottawa, the minister plans to meet his counterpart in Ottawa, the hon. John Munro, to discuss this question. Whenever he gets around to seeing the federal minister he will give the matter the highest priority. When that will be we do not know.

In the meantime the same insensitivity to an urgent human and social problem persists among the minister and his colleagues in cabinet. I asked the minister that if the federal government refused to make the necessary changes was this provincial government prepared to act on its own. The minister responded by saying: "My position would not be improved by answering that question."

If this government really cares for people—and I now have serious reservations that it does—then I submit that this government should act immediately to cover the cost of nursing home care and negotiate later with the federal government. Such a course of action would conclusively prove that the minister and his colleagues are acting in good faith to meet a long-standing and urgent need of a great many of our citizens.

Further potential savings in the health care field are to be derived from an extension of

the home care system. The Ontario programme is very good and is established in 18 communities in the province at the present time.

A home care programme takes hospital services to the patient. Nurses, laboratory technicians, physiotherapists, speech therapists attend the patient in his home. Hospital equipment is taken to him. His family is taught to provide necessary services. Homemakers are made available. Taxis or ambulances take him to hospital for treatment that cannot be given elsewhere, and take him home.

The service costs \$8 to \$9 a day whereas the cheapest active treatment hospital service costs \$34 a day. It is better suited to many patients, such as mothers who are anxious away from home. Thus if more use were made of home care throughout the province, the savings would be anywhere from \$25 a day to about \$45 a day for each user.

Last year, home care programmes covered 10,952 patients for 353,812 patient-days. If we could just double the home care programme, the savings would amount to about \$9 million.

In actual fact the programme could be increased many times. While the programme is good, it is not growing very fast.

Jean Howarth says of this programme:

"The difficulty seems to be that Queen's Park has not taken strong initiatives. The municipalities know the money is there for home care programmes, but they have not been urged to use it. When a municipality does show interest it takes the civil servants a long time to get the programme functioning. The patient's doctor must co-operate. Only he can admit the patient to home care.

As one official said succinctly, "Doctors do not care for home care programmes." Their income is generated more quickly moving swiftly down hospital corridors.

Again some toes have to be stepped upon, for it is evident in their general attitude to this programme that neither the government nor the medical profession is seriously interested in saving the health consumers and taxpayers of Ontario very much money, or else their attitude would be different in this particular instance.

Further potential savings in health costs can be derived from a public, centralized drug purchasing agency, particularly one which emphasizes the purchase of generic

drugs. The Ontario Pharmacists' Association, appearing before an October, 1969, meeting of the Legislature standing committee on health, estimated the 1968 costs for drug coverage under a public health care plan at \$143.4 million, including five per cent for administration. If we accept their figure and project to 1970, we can estimate the cost in 1970 at \$150 million.

The 1970 federal task force report on the cost of health in Canada recommended that group purchasing techniques be introduced province-wide for core drugs immediately. It stated drug prices would then be reduced at least to the level of the hospital which pays the lowest price and that consolidated purchasing for a number of drugs could yield a saving of 30 per cent or more.

Premier Ed Schreyer of Manitoba, when announcing his intentions to set up a central drug purchasing and distribution agency to resell drugs, presumably at cost, to hospitals, clinics and retail drug stores, suggested that such an agency would produce savings to the consumer of 25 to 30 per cent. Let us, for the sake of argument, take the lower figure. Apply it to the \$150 million and it produces an estimated saving of \$37.5 million.

The Ontario Pharmacists' Association also told the standing committee on health that Ontario consumers in 1968 were paying \$90.6 million a year for prescriptions. If we project this to 1970 at \$96 million, then without a Medicare plan which included the cost of prescriptions, a centralized drug purchasing plan would produce savings within the present system of about \$24 million a year.

I want to emphasize that Premier Schreyer's figures are realistic in that they are based on a study undertaken by the Manitoba Department of Industry and Commerce and Department of Health and Social Services.

Oh you may say that the Ontario government has introduced its Parcost programme to cut the cost of prescription drugs. According to C. A. Palmer, co-ordinator of the Parcost programme, the average cost of a prescription in Ontario has dropped about 10 per cent since October 1, when the first Parcost index was published.

Good; but the programme has one serious roadblock that keeps it from working as effectively as it should to lower prescription costs. An amendment should be made to The Pharmacy Act to permit pharmacists to substitute a lower-priced generic drug in place of a higher-priced brand name pro-

vided such is listed on the comparative drug index.

If this were to be done, along with centralized purchasing and distribution by a government agency, much greater savings could be realized by the drug consumers in this province. I can assure you that when we come to power, these programmes to cut drug expenses will be given high priority with us.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Hear, hear!

Mr. Ferrier: Another area where great potential savings can be realized is in the widespread implementation of group practice community health clinics throughout the province.

As far back as 1964, the royal commission on health services headed by Mr. Justice Emmett Hall declared that the advantages of group practice far outweigh the disadvantages and that inducements should be created to encourage a larger proportion of doctors to provide their services through group practice clinics.

The federal task force on the cost of health services in Canada in 1970 reported that first priority should be given to establishing community health centres containing a full range of preventive, diagnostic and curative services.

Similarly, the committee on the healing arts in Ontario recommended that the province give priority to extending financial assistance to public and non-profit agencies for a range of ambulatory care facilities and services designed to promote health, to prevent disease and to deliver essential health care in the community.

The Economic Council of Canada in its seventh annual review declared:

We believe there is considerable scope for the development of more economical team approaches in various forms, involving various mixes of general practitioners, specialists, paramedical personnel, nurses, social workers, psychologists and other professionals.

Even the Canadian Medical Association in a 1967 report on group practice admitted:

Medicine is fast becoming too important a facet of our highly industrialized society to be considered solely in the light of the preferences of the individual doctor with respect to the degree of organization which he may or may not bring into the practice of his profession.

With all these eminent bodies favouring group practices and community clinics, we should expect any government desirous of cost-cutting to seize the initiative and encourage widespread implementation of this concept of the delivery of health care. The previous Minister of Health led us to believe in the estimates last year that we could look for some government initiative in this direction in the near future, but we are still looking.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): They are there.

Mr. Ferrier: We are still looking and we have not seen any of them.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The member has not asked David Archer what is going on.

Mr. Ferrier: The Hall commission observed that advantages of such facilities far outweigh the disadvantages, especially in terms of cost savings to the taxpayer. Community clinic facilities greatly reduce the utilization of the hospitals by as much as 20 to 40 per cent. Doctors would no longer have to admit patients to hospitals to obtain diagnostic and other services available in the clinic, leaving hospital beds for those who need them. By stressing preventive medicine and annual checkups of members, some illnesses are avoided while others are caught in the early stages, and thus long stays in hospitals are sometimes avoided.

Even the Ontario Medical Association, in its report to be discussed at its annual meeting next month, states:

Claims that services rendered by the clinic are better and less expensive than services supplied elsewhere may sometimes be valid—if one considers American studies.

Even that begrudging acknowledgement by a body that is pretty strongly espoused to the fee-for-service principle is quite something.

A renowned model of the group practice concept financed on a capitation rather than a fee-for-service basis is the Kaiser Permanente experience. The Kaiser Permanente structure consists of three parts:

1. The Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, a non-profit organization that arranges medical care for paying members by contracting with individuals and groups;

2. The Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, a separate corporation that owns all the hospitals in the system and provides space and equipment for the medical group clinic;

3. The Permanente medical groups, independent partnerships of physicians that contract with the health plan to provide all professional services to the subscribers.

Hospital and clinic facilities are closely integrated, usually on the same property, so that physicians have easy access to their hospitalized patients while treating their outpatients.

For example, in northern California the Kaiser Permanente operations include more than 2,000 beds in 11 hospitals and 14 clinics including offices for 900 physicians, or which approximately 12 per cent are permanent full-time partners. This accounts for the care of approximately one million subscribers.

The results: In 1965 Kaiser required only 59 per cent as many hospital beds per person in the health care plan population as did the State of California, and Kaiser's per person cost for providing hospital care, after adjustments to make the Kaiser subscribers mirror the state population in age composition, was only 61 per cent of the state-wide cost.

The Kaiser operations were studied by the committee on manpower of the Ontario Council of Health, headed by Dr. Harry Botterell, former dean of medicine at Queen's. In its 1970 report, the committee was impressed.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the hon. member would allow the Prime Minister to have the floor for a minute, as a courtesy.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): I regret interrupting the member for Cochrane South, but His Honour is waiting to give royal assent to a bill. If I might interrupt, I will go and escort him to the chamber.

The Honourable, the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the throne.

Hon. W. Ross Macdonald (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed a bill to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant: The following is the title of the bill to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to this bill.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Mr. Speaker: May I thank the hon. member for Cochrane South for his courtesy. He now has the floor to continue his address.

Mr. Ferrier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was talking about Dr. Botterell's comments on the Kaiser Permanente plan after having made a trip to California, and I am quoting from a *Medical Post* article. Dr. Botterell said:

It noted that under the Kaiser plan hospital days per 1,000 subscribers dropped from 650 in 1966 to 500 by 1968. If this figure were age-adjusted to compare to Ontario it would rise to 545 days per 1,000. But the Kaiser figures do not include convalescent, chronic, psychiatric or rehabilitative beds.

In order to get a direct comparison between the two systems, the committee adjusted the Kaiser figures to include, hypothetically, all these categories of patients, plus mental patients, according to standards of care prevalent in Ontario. It found that the adjusted total of days of hospital care per 1,000 subscribers under the Kaiser programme would be 1,722 compared to 1970 (OHSC) plus 888 mental patients—for a total of 2,858 hospital days per 1,000 people in the general population.

In effect, the total days of hospital care required in the Kaiser system are equal to only 60 per cent of 1967 Ontario figures. The manpower committee was so impressed with its findings that it recommended a technique of health care delivery management, utilizing economic incentives for efficient use of hospitals similar to the Kaiser system, be introduced on an experimental basis in Ontario.

At an OHSC conference on May 20, 1970, Dr. Harshman of the Ontario Medical Association provided my colleague from Scarborough Centre (Mrs. M. Renwick) with some OHSC operating cost figures. The OHSC budget for net allowable operating cost in 1970 was \$701,598,771. This represents a per diem rate of \$49.94 and a per bed rate of \$14,539.

If these figures could be reduced to the Kaiser level they would be, respectively, \$422,713,260, \$30.09 and \$8,760. In other words, the savings to Ontario if the Kaiser

experience had been duplicated here in 1970 would have been \$278,885,510 in total—\$19.85 per diem rate and \$5,779 per bed. That is, a Kaiser system in Ontario would save us \$250 million to \$300 million annually for comparable levels of service, according to figures supplied by the government's own Ontario Council of Health and the OMA.

Dr. T. H. Tulchinsky, the executive director of the Ottawa and district community group health plan presented a brief to the former Minister of Health and the government of Ontario in January of this year in which he outlined the following proposals which represent steps by which the government of Ontario could encourage the development of community health centres:

1. A combined medical-hospitalization capitation system of payment for enrolled members of consumer-sponsored community health centres be further developed, similar to the present agreement with the Sault Ste. Marie and St. Catharines community health centres. Such capitation should be available to new community health centres and should be negotiable, based upon the range of services (medical and ancillary) provided, and cost comparisons with closely equivalent population groups.

2. Community health centres be defined as public ambulatory hospital facilities.

3. A community health centre grant-in-aid programme be developed to provide a portion of the capital and startup costs of such programmes, in a formula similar to that used in the past for general hospital construction, provided that the sponsoring consumer group undertakes to provide a portion of the costs to qualify for this grant-in-aid.

4. Representations be made to the government of Canada:

(a) That the above grant-in-aid programme be developed in conjunction with The Department of National Health and Welfare to share equally with the province the costs of the community health centre grant-in-aid programme;

(b) That community health foundations be granted tax exempt status for the purposes of receiving charitable donations;

(c) That The National Housing Act be amended to provide for mortgages under Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation of Canada to such foundations for the purposes of constructing health centre

facilities, or alternatively other low-cost, deferred interest mortgages or loans be made available.

5. Bona fide community groups sponsoring community health centres should be assisted by the community health centre grant-in-aid programme where such groups show evidence of:

(a) Incorporation as a non-profit foundation under The Corporations Act of Ontario;

(b) An established development fund of not less than \$25,000;

(c) A board of directors of not less than 10 and not more than 30 persons representing the consumer groups sponsoring the project, and when not less than one-third of the members of the board of directors include persons associated with a number of the following: regional and/or municipal government; university administration and/or faculty; medical school faculty; social planning council or like body; welfare recipient representatives; university student organizations; urban renewal groups, tenants, associations, and the like; business community, employers and other service professions;

(d) A professional advisory committee to assist the board of directors in selection of an executive director and to advise and assist the executive director in development of the programme. The professional advisory committee should consist of not less than three nor more than seven persons knowledgeable in health care and/or community service organization;

(e) That the foundation commits itself to develop a service programme based upon integrated family physician and specialty medical services, as well as a broad range of investigative and allied health services. Where such services are beyond those covered by OHSIP, categorical payment mechanisms would be arranged under various government programmes to cover their costs;

6. That the local health services branch of The Ontario Department of Health be asked to assist community health centres by encouraging local health units:

(a) To second staff public health nurses to work in the community health centre;

(b) To rent office space for public health activities within community health centres;

(c) To provide advisory services to community health foundations.

I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are great potential savings in the health care field by the implementation of group practice community health clinics in this province. We in the NDP deplore the government's lack of leadership in yet another health field where precious dollars can be saved and allocated for other pressing programmes to deal with human needs. We are committed to the promotion of this kind of health care where feasible in the province; and when we form the government we shall move to the implementation of this programme wherever possible.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Do not hold your breath!

Mr. Ferrier: The government should have been doing a lot about this. There is a growing lack of leadership on its part.

At this point I wish to introduce a less plausible, but nevertheless interesting note into this debate, Mr. Speaker. There are potential savings to be derived from the extension of collective bargaining to physicians.

Up until now the OMA unilaterally decided what increases and fees it wanted and the consumers had to pay. The Minister of Health has been careful to point out, in response to questions directed to him in the House, that there are amicable discussions going on between the government and the OMA, but he has been careful to point out that there have been no negotiations per se.

A number of alternatives have been submitted to the OMA which is to pick the ones best suited to its needs. It looks like the usual capitulation by the Tories to a powerful monopoly.

We say, let them justify their increases in fees just as the industrial worker does by some form of collective bargaining with the government. If such were the case some startling savings in the cost of health care might very well show up.

Suppose this had been done for the years 1958 to 1968, the years for which firm information is available on physicians' earnings. During this period, physicians' earnings rose by 114.1 per cent, for an annual increase of 7.9 per cent. At the same time the industrial composite of average wages and salaries rose by 55.1 per cent, an annual percentage increase of 4.5 per cent.

Suppose we calculate what would have resulted if physicians' earnings during the

period had risen at the same rate as the industrial composite, as a result of the imposition of collective bargaining. According to my calculations, it works out to something like \$193,693,000 during that 10-year period.

In other words if, as a result of collective bargaining, doctors had maintained their income position vis-à-vis industrial workers rather than increasing the disparity—physicians' earnings were 3.9 times the industrial composite in 1958 and the difference rose to 5.4 per cent in 1968—the saving would have been about \$200 million.

It can, of course, be argued that because physicians are a highly organized and cohesive group, their bargaining power is very great and the savings resulting from collective bargaining would be less than I have calculated. Even if the savings were only one-half or one-third, it would still be a large amount.

In 1969 and 1970, the industrial composite rose by 7.1 and 8.1 percentage points respectively, which is about equal to the long-term annual increase in physicians' earnings. Unfortunately no reliable information is available on physicians' earnings in the past two years. I suspect, however, that because of the implementation of Medicare in October, 1969, physicians' incomes have risen sharply in the past two years. This has been the experience in other provinces after the introduction of Medicare. In Saskatchewan, physicians' earnings rose by 48 per cent during the year after Medicare; in Nova Scotia, by 35 per cent; in New Brunswick, The Department of Health estimates a 19 per cent increase.

Thus in spite of the abnormally high industrial wage increases in the past two years, it is likely that a collective bargaining procedure which gave physicians increases similar to those of the industrial composite would have produced substantial savings in Ontario in 1969 and 1970.

May I point out that the assumptions which have been used to calculate the \$200 million figure involved no deterioration in the physicians' position vis-à-vis wage earners in general. Dr. Glen Sawyer, editor of the *Ontario Medical Review*, expressed the common OMA opinion when he said in *The Globe and Mail* on January 10, 1970, that if physicians show restraint, they will "fall still further behind."

Even if physicians' earnings could be reduced to the point at which their percentage increase equalled that of the industrial composite, their annual increase would still be

substantial. For instance, if the industrial composite increase of 7.1 per cent in 1969 is applied to the 1968 average physician's earnings of \$32,098 he would get an increase in 1969 of \$2,279. This increase represents more than one-third of the entire earnings of the average industrial worker in 1969.

However we look upon collective bargaining in terms of its potential for savings on the health care of the province, it does present us with something very interesting to think about.

Another form of potential saving in terms of hospital costs would be to standardize the construction of hospitals and all health care institutions throughout the province. Hospitals that are being built today are custom built, which is the most expensive kind of building there is.

Jean Howarth refers to a doctor who has figured that 20 different plans would meet the requirements of all the sizes and sorts of hospitals that Ontario needs. For instance, there are available plans for truly modern hospitals, such as the Scarborough Centenary Hospital. Jean Howarth points out:

A study which compared Centenary with conventionally constructed and staffed hospitals found:

That Centenary registered nurses spent 32 per cent less time walking and registered nursing assistants 52 per cent less time walking than their counterparts in the conventional hospitals;

That Centenary leading nurses were able to spend 108 per cent more time in patients' rooms than conventional head nurses, registered nurses 37 per cent more time and nurse assistants 20 per cent more time;

That Centenary was able to cut its staff by 13 to 24 per cent, depending on shifts, compared with the conventional hospitals.

Plainly it was more service for less cost. Why not then, goes the argument, standardize Centenary's structure across the province, making changes in it only when they would spell genuine improvements. Why pile up the extra cost of different architects and designs and experiments with each new structure?

I am convinced that a standard pattern for the construction of our hospitals and health care institutions would bring about considerable savings, with increased efficiency of the staff. This, therefore, should receive high priority with the government, which up until

now has steered completely away from this very sensible concept.

A great deal of discussion is presently going on in the health field concerning the use of auxiliary personnel, and more specifically an expanded role for the nurse. All three of last year's important governmental commissions and committees on health matters—namely the federal task force on the cost of health services in Canada, the council of health and the committee on the healing arts in Ontario—made somewhat similar recommendations to the effect the pilot studies should be organized to consider the field of work, usefulness and training required, of a person who might serve as a physician's assistant in the delivery of primary contract health care.

These three committees were of the opinion that not only was the training of a nurse the most desirable educational base for such a person, but that also the availability of many nurses within the province together with their present widespread acceptance by the public as a recognized allied health worker, made the nurse the prime candidate to serve in whatever capacity might evolve as the nurse practitioner assistant. There are studies, I understand, going on at the present time at McMaster and Queen's universities.

There is a project at Sioux Lookout, sponsored by the Toronto Hospital for Sick Children and the northern health services branch of The Department of National Health and Welfare, and this project has met with a very positive response among many health officials. It is based on a hospital in Sioux Lookout. It has as its purpose the provision of improved health services for the over 16,000 Indian people who live in the area bounded by Hudson Bay, Lake Superior, the Manitoba border and Hearst. These people were either without services or dependent upon outpost nursing stations. The federal Minister of National Health and Welfare has undertaken to provide accommodation for such nursing stations and to ensure their radio contact with the hospital in Sioux Lookout as well as snowmobile, aircraft and other travel accommodation, if possible.

The outpost nursing stations are manned primarily by nurses whose activities include general health care and assessment, midwifery, minor surgery and general paediatric and medical supervision. They are able to obtain advice by radio-telephone to Sioux Lookout, and are visited periodically by doctors from the Hospital for Sick Children.

Physician manpower in Sioux Lookout consists of one or more doctors in the employ of the northern health services division with a rotation of paediatric residents of obstetrical, dermatological, internal medicine and other residents from the University of Toronto.

Nurses employed in these outpost regions in general require skill, training and experience in areas not usually available to persons graduating from either diploma schools of nursing or indeed the baccalaureate university programmes. In particular, midwifery is a most desirable skill.

This prototype in northern Ontario could very well be expanded to other areas of the north and throughout the province, such as our isolated or rural areas which do not have a doctor. Of course, the people in these areas throughout the province, wherever they may be, are paying as much for medical care, according to their ability to pay, as are those in our built-up areas, towns and cities.

As Dr. D. M. McPhail said to a conference on paramedical personnel in Ottawa last week, the next area the nurse practitioners should be used in are those which have only one doctor and face the prospect of having none when the present doctor retires. Next on the list should be ghetto areas which often are near a large teaching hospital.

I suggest that such personnel could serve a very useful role in community clinics as well as in doctors' offices doing routine administration, thus freeing the doctor to do more skilful medical services. It would have the effect of increasing the output of our medical team.

Dr. D. M. McPhail, in stressing the need for assistants, quoted a Canadian Medical Association estimate that Canada will be short 25,000 doctors by 1991 with the outlying areas showing the shortages before then. If he is correct, then we had better get our pilot project for nurse practitioners under way, and evaluate and, if possible, these auxiliaries into widespread operation, especially to help our isolated northern communities as well as many one-doctor rural communities in the south.

I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that the Speech from the Throne would have announced a thorough-going overhaul of our OHSIP and OHSC plans, but, of course, it was noticeably silent on these programmes. Generally speaking, the people of the province are very unhappy about the way these plans operate.

One of my colleagues received a letter from a doctor in his area just yesterday, and this is the doctor's evaluation of OHSIP. He writes:

Along with many other physicians, we have tried to co-operate with government by submitting accounts directly to OHSIP or Healthco carriers. In spite of this co-operation, we have met with poor payment of accounts and have even spent a day at OHSIP offices in an effort to iron out our difficulties. Several things are apparent:

1. OHSIP suggested the use of a foil imprinting system to facilitate handling of accounts. We spent something like \$600 to acquire this equipment only to find that OHSIP changes subscribers' numbers so frequently that the equipment is more of a liability than an asset. We have even had families carrying several OHSIP cards, all with different numbers and no effective dates listed.

2. OHSIP has, at last count, some 71 reasons for failure to pay accounts. They have adopted, it would appear, the attitude that all mistakes, whether theirs, the subscribers' or physicians', are justification for refusal to pay an account. They have spent vast sums of the taxpayers' money for computers that are able to cross-reference and correct any number of errors on account cards, but they refuse to provide this service. They are even able to provide an up-to-date OHSIP number in seconds, but never give this new number to the physician, and frequently fail to make the new number known to the patient.

It is virtually impossible to keep up with the numbers game being played by OHSIP. A recent bulletin from that organization suggests that shortly they intend to change subscribers' numbers en masse, making our present office records totally obsolete overnight. After my visit to OHSIP I came away impressed with the fact that their sole function is not the patient's health, but rather the processing of appropriate completed IBM cards, and that, since they change subscribers' details without advising either physician or subscriber, completion of the IBM card to their satisfaction becomes virtually impossible.

I would once again like to point out that this is totally unnecessary as they have complete facilities to process even inaccurate claim cards.

If you would like to see some examples of the mess they have created, I would be pleased to show you some records at your convenience.

That is a doctor's evaluation of the way OHSIP handles its accounts.

Of course, one remembers the government announced in October last year that there are to be administrative changes in OHSIP and OHSC so that they are joined together by July 1, 1972, under OHIC, the Ontario Health Insurance Commission. Even more welcome was the news that the designated agents known as Healthco would also be phased out.

We were never in favour of them in the first place and they, along with HIRB, have created an administrative nightmare that has inflicted a "bad trip" on the people of Ontario right from the inception of OHSIP. When the plans are joined together, it might just be that the government will come up with compatible computers this time around.

During the past year, I have spoken at length in this chamber and during the estimates of the kind of health care programme the New Democratic Party proposes as an alternative to the one we now have.

We continue to be appalled at the government's refusal to change the premium structure of the present schemes. We live in the richest province, yet pay the highest premiums for health care of any province in Canada. The funding of such schemes so largely by premiums is a regressive form of taxation that bears little relationship to one's ability to pay. We have advocated, when we unveiled our plan—and we agree with the government—that OHSIP and OHSC should be joined together under one number for administrative purposes. Contrary to the government, we believe that the funding should be on a different basis.

We believe that to the present coverage of our present plan should be added coverage for nursing homes and prescription drugs. With this package will come a combination of an increase in the personal income tax in the form of an eight per cent surcharge on present income tax in order to make the tax progressive rather than simply proportional. Added to this will be a three per cent corporate income tax, with sharply reduced premiums of \$10 a month for family coverage and \$5 for single-person coverage.

The Liberals raise the hue and cry that they are going to do away with OHSIP premiums altogether, but they have said absolutely nothing about doing way with premiums for

the Ontario hospital plan. So they will still be exacting \$132 a year in premiums from families and \$66 a year from single persons. Nor have the Liberals said anything about extending the health care coverage to include other costs such as we have done.

Even the member for Quinte (Mr. Potter) has talked about doing away with premiums for OHSIP, but there is still no word from him about OHSC. What his influence on the government will be, no one knows; but it is expected that they will try to keep him muffled.

For the time being premium exemption must be extended to OHSC premiums on the same basis as it is now extended for OHSIP but shortly, I suggest, the amount of taxable income that affects the exemptions will need to be revised upward to give more assistance to low-income citizens.

The ultimate objective of the New Democratic Party is the complete elimination of all premiums. Firstly, because they are a regressive form of taxation and, secondly, it will mean the possibility of being uninsured will no longer exist for any person in Ontario.

It will be possible to eliminate these premiums when we get meaningful tax reform in this province and when the potential cost-saving programmes of health care are implemented and become widespread in this province. Personally I believe it will not take long for the New Democratic government to move to the elimination of premiums for our health care programmes.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): It will take a long time.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): We will never know how long.

Mr. Ferrier: I have no intention of outlining a policy that is not feasible economically.

Mr. Sargent: It is very important to get elected first.

Mr. Ferrier: We will get there. Do not worry about that.

We also believe that double billing by doctors must be eliminated by direct negotiation with the OMA. An acceptable agreement can be worked out so that OHSIP pays the total doctor's bill, whether it be 90 per cent of the OMA schedule of fees or whatever. But it should pay the whole thing.

We also believe that it is desirable to use the full federal grant to offset the cost of the operation of our Medicare programme rather

than devote some of it to other needs, no matter how worthy they may be.

There remains for me but one final point to consider in this speech and that is dental care. The state of dental care in Ontario in 1970—in 1971—is far from what it should be—

Hon. Mr. Snow: It is last year's speech, the member forgot to change the date.

Mr. Ferrier: —compared with other countries of a similar socio-economic status. In terms of available dental services Ontario, with one dentist for 2,500 persons, ranks behind all the Scandinavian countries, Germany, Austria, the US, Australia and Switzerland. As I stand here today, less than half the people in the province receive little or no dental care.

Mr. Sargent: Shame!

Mr. Ferrier: In fact, a report of the committee on the healing arts suggested that two-thirds of the community regard dental services as being of minor importance. The committee also said:

The need for better services is enormous. The entire population requires more preventive care than now can be provided and, even worse, the existing volume of repair work required to bring the population up to an adequate level of dental health could not conceivably be provided by the existing service.

Someone, I suggest, is bungling the job of developing and spreading around the services that our society is capable of offering.

The clincher comes when the spokesmen for the profession tend to minimize the apparent shortage of services to patients, flying in the face of both common sense and the conclusions of every responsible study, provincial or federal, carried out independently in the last few decades. Essentially, this is because those who believe that the existing supplies of dental services are reasonably adequate tend to look not at estimates of need as such, but at the effective demand for dental services in the community.

These demands, I suggest, are muffled to a great extent and depend partly on economics, partly on the eradication of ignorance about dental hygiene, and personal dental care, partly on the quality of diets available, and on half-a-dozen other factors which tend to disguise the real needs of people.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Diets available or diets selected.

Mr. Ferrier: The economic factor, of course, is a major deterrent to people seeking dental care. I have been told by a responsible person at the University of Toronto's faculty of dentistry that there are dentists in Toronto with gaps in their appointment books, so that there are dentists available in this area to meet more of the dental demands of the local people.

Yet when the school of dentistry open their telephone lines each fall to accept patients for the students to work on during the coming terms, they only have to keep them open five days in one week as they receive at least 4,000 calls a day, seeking appointments. The demand is there but the economic deterrent is too great for a good many people to seek dental care.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Hear, hear!

Mr. Ferrier: Under private insurance plans for dental care, I am informed that less than one per cent of the population is presently covered for dental care. How far thinking is retarded in this area is indicated by the fact that 70 per cent of the population was already covered by some form of medical insurance before Ontario's Medicare scheme became reality. We have a lot of catching up to do with dental care.

There also exists a terrific disparity because of an uneven distribution of dentists throughout the province. How does the lack of adequate dental facilities affect an area? Take the village of Apsley which is situated on Highway 28 about 30 miles from the nearest dental clinic available. There are 186 pupils in the Apsley Central School with no dentist to go to. The principal of the school reported in an article in the *Peterborough Examiner* in October, 1970 on cases of the children of seven families whose teeth were completely rotted away. He said:

They suffer extreme pain but we cannot give them as much as an aspirin to relieve their troubles. We have 104 children in primary grades. It is important for them to retain their first teeth but with no dentists available, there is nothing that can be done at the school to see that proper dental care is accomplished.

Children do not have regular examinations to their teeth unless they travel great distances to obtain this service. We have children at school who will never be able to speak correctly due to decayed teeth.

Our speech therapist has supplied a list of families who will be advised to have proper dental care for their children. It is one thing to ask them to have this work done but if they do not have the money for the transportation and the dental work, how can this be accomplished?

Apsley is 40 miles from the city of Peterborough with a population dentist ratio of one to every 1,571 persons. That puts it in the top ten in the province. The ratio for the county of Peterborough is about 25 per cent worse at one to 2,107, but good enough to rate second best in Ontario. Only York county has a better ratio.

In all of Ontario, only Peterborough and nine other counties do better than the provincial average of one to 2,500. A full 43 other counties have less than one dentist for each 2,500 population. The deficiency is unsettling. Peel has only one dentist for 4,850 people. Cochrane and Prince Edward have one dentist for 5,000. Haliburton, Lennox and Addington have one dentist for more than 8,000. Prescott and Russell can attract one dentist for every 12,158 people.

These figures, Mr. Speaker, are taken from an 1967 unpublished study by Dr. A. M. Hunt entitled, "Projected Needs for Dentists in Ontario." While they may not be 100 per cent accurate on a present-day basis, they are close enough to give a clear picture on the situation in this province.

The deficiency is not entirely an economic problem. There are poor counties with a good ratio, and affluent counties with a bad one. Geography seems to have a significant effect. So too, does the level of education.

Nevertheless, Apsley is relatively well situated in the province. In the summer months, there are more than 10,000 people in this district at cottages and resorts. During the winter there are 2,000 potential patients plus an ever-increasing number of winter vacationists.

Apsley, remember—

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member give himself a place to break?

Mr. Ferrier: I have about two paragraphs, then I will move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker: I would think if the hon. member is within a few minutes of completing his speech the House would be agreeable to his completing everything.

Mr. Ferrier: It will take about 10 to 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Then of course the hon. member might find a suitable place to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Ferrier: After two paragraphs I will move the adjournment.

Mr. Sargent: Can the member get to the meat of his subject?

Mr. Ferrier: Apsley, remember, is in a county with next to the best population dentist ratio in Ontario. According to my information, to this day, it still cannot get a dentist to serve its needs. There are such gaps in Peterborough county. Imagine what the need must be in the less populated regions of Prescott, Russell, Haliburton or Rainy River. I do not pretend that Apsley is typical of towns in the province but neither it is exceptional.

The situation here is symptomatic of the way Ontario dentists have come to organize themselves to serve the needs of a scattered population. To me it indicates the fact that the distribution of dental services in Ontario is guided as much by the rules of supply and demand and the patterns of customer service as by public health needs.

Mr. Ferrier moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House I would like to advise the hon. members that we will continue with the Throne debate on Monday, and in fact all next week. We will sit three evenings next week—Monday, Tuesday and Thursday.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the acting government House Leader if in fact the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) will present the budget in the evening session?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I understand, Mr. Speaker, it is on the evening of April 26 the Treasurer will be presenting the budget.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): What prime-time, non-NHL night does the government have for the opposition to reply?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We are discussing that with one of the senior officials of the NHL at the present time, who is fairly close to us.

Mr. Speaker: In order that there may be no misunderstanding, the information which Mr. Speaker has lately received was that the budget would be at 3 o'clock in the afternoon of April 26, but I have nothing but verbal information in respect to that, so I think the members should just plan on Monday, April 26, for the budget.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There should not be any hockey fans left in Ontario anyway.

Hon. Mr. Kerr moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1 o'clock p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 16, 1971

Any approval of regulations made by broiler board to be published in press, statement by Mr. Stewart	519
Royal assent to Bill 10, Farm Products Marketing Act, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Nixon	520
Attorney General to be informed re police commission decision on wiretapping, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	521
Arrangements with U.S. financial interests to borrow \$100 million for Ontario Hydro, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Sargent	521
Layoff of teachers in manpower retraining re community colleges, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Deans, Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. Lewis	523
Purchase of escarpment land from Caledon Mountain estates, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Lewis	524
Governmental submission to National Energy Board re export of power, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis	525
Possible conflict of interests re board of Ontario Development Corporation, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Lewis	526
Reducing gasoline tax on non-leaded gasoline, question to Mr. Winkler, Mr. G. E. Smith	526
Disposal of old Mercer Reformatory property, questions to Mr. Auld, Mr. Trotter	527
Firing of waitresses by Country Fair restaurant and tavern in London, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Bolton	527
Expansion in housing programme to include provision of water and sewage facilities, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Deacon	528
ODC loan programme included in review of loans and subsidies by Treasury board, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Deans, Mr. Makarchuk	528
Justification for ETV channel 19 expansion, question to Mr. Welch, Mr. T. Reid	529
Compulsory overtime in automobile plants, question to Mr. Carton, Mr. Burr	529
Prompt answering of questions on notice paper, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Trotter	529
Use of LSD and opiates in high schools more than doubled, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Shulman, Mr. T. Reid	529
Granting of loans to other forms of industry including service industries, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Ruston	530
Investigating demolition of Orchard House by Apex Construction Company, questions to Mr. Auld, Mr. Deans	530
Making provision for representatives from Fort Erie on Niagara Parks Commission, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Haggerty	530

Presenting fourth report of select committee on election law, Mr. Dunlop	531
Motion that human resources committee examine education costs, Mr. Welch, agreed to	531
Society of Industrial Accountants of Ontario, bill respecting, Mr. J. R. Smith, first reading	543
Control of eavesdropping, bill to provide for, Mr. Shulman, first reading	543
Financial accounts of universities, bill respecting, Mr. T. Reid, first reading	543
Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. Ferrier	543
Royal assent to a certain bill, the honourable the Lieutenant Governor	548
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Ferrier, agreed to	555
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Kerr, agreed to	556







ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, April 19, 1971

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

**(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon our guests in the east gallery are students from Elmbank Middle School in Rexdale and Gladstone Senior Public School in Toronto; and in the west gallery from Oak Park Junior High School in Toronto and Tomkin Road Senior Public School in Mississauga.

Later this afternoon there will be students from Brant District Girl Guides in Burlington; and this evening the 15th Agincourt "A" Cub Pack from Willowdale and the 12th Agincourt Scout Troop from Willowdale will be with us.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, you will recall that in the Speech from the Throne it was announced that the committee on government productivity would direct a comprehensive study of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario.

The terms of reference require the committee on government productivity, "to inquire into all matters pertaining to the management of the government of Ontario and to make such recommendations as in its opinion will improve its efficiency and effectiveness." Therefore, as part of its work, the committee is studying the functions and arrangements of government boards, agencies and commissions.

Because of the large size and complexity of Ontario Hydro and its importance to the wellbeing of the people and economic strength of our province, the committee has created Task Force Hydro.

This task force will be made up of members of the business, industry and academic communities and will include knowledgeable representatives of Ontario Hydro and the Ontario Municipal Electric Association, as well as the staff of the committee on government productivity.

Task Force Hydro will review the objectives, function, structure, operations and financing of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission. It is expected to take about one year to complete its work.

The study will be conducted under the guidance of a five-man steering committee. The chairman of the steering committee will be the president of the Canadian Tire Corporation, J. Dean Muncaster. The other members are the president of Crothers Limited, Hugh A. Crothers; the vice-president and treasurer of the Steel Company of Canada Limited, Robert B. Taylor; the president of the Ontario Municipal Electric Association, Andrew Frame; and the general manager of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, Douglas J. Gordon.

In addition, the dean of engineering science at the University of Western Ontario, R. M. Dillon, has been granted leave of absence so that he may act in a full-time capacity as executive director of the task force and as an ex-officio member of the steering committee.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House I beg leave to table a copy of correspondence between myself and Mr. Robert D. Howland, chairman of the National Energy Board, concerning the Ontario-Minnesota Pulp and Paper Company Limited's application to export electrical energy to Boise Cascade's operation in the United States.

This correspondence will clarify the government's position with respect to this application. Rather than taking the time of the House by reading this lengthy correspondence, I have provided copies for the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the NDP group.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

TASK FORCE HYDRO

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, further to the statement made by the Premier: Can he tell us if he has any specific time limit set on the deliberations of Task Force Hydro; and secondly if the terms of reference specifically include advice to the government on rate approval procedures?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the terms of reference are broad enough for the committee to discuss this item. As I said in the statement itself, it is expected to take about one year.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: The Premier has no objection then to the examination of rate approval procedures, although it is not per se in the terms?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The material would be included in that.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question of the Prime Minister: Would the Prime Minister consider adding to that group some members of the Legislature and some consumers?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, not to prompt any discussion of any lengthy nature, I think it is quite appropriate that if the members of the standing committee that will be dealing with this particular commission wish to discuss this with Hydro, obviously when the report comes in will be a good opportunity for full discussion by members of the Legislature. I think this would be the appropriate way to do it.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): We will need a motion from the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No we do not as a matter of fact.

Mr. Deans: Can I ask, by way of one further supplementary question, whether the Prime Minister can assure us that during the time this review is being undertaken there will be no rate increases?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, obviously I cannot give that assurance.

The question of rate increase is not really related to this particular function; it is a question of the structure, methods of approval and so on. I cannot undertake to assure the hon. member that there will not be a rate increase.

Mr. Deans: Is the Prime Minister aware, by way of further supplementary, that—

Mr. Speaker: The final supplementary by this member.

Mr. Deans: Is the Prime Minister aware that the chairman of Hydro, Mr. Gathercole, stated last year that there would be increases

every year for the next three years? And would the Prime Minister agree that studying it now, while permitting increases to take place, is in actual fact negating the whole purpose of this study?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this is only one part of the study. As I recall the chairman of Hydro's observations, it was an anticipated increase—he did not state specifically that there would be rate increases.

Mr. Deans: He said he would be surprised if it was not.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are always surprised at certain things. That does not mean they necessarily come to pass.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): That said 1970.

Mr. Speaker: Has the Leader of the Opposition a supplementary?

Mr. Nixon: No.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Prime Minister if any of the people mentioned on the committee are from northwestern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say whether they are from northwestern Ontario. I think the chairman of the committee has had some relationship to the north, I will check into—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): He is from Sudbury, as usual.

Hon. Mr. Davis: From northeastern Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: North-central.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would be quite prepared to check out—

Mr. Sopha: A bit north.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —the geographic backgrounds of all of these people to find out if, over a period of time, any of them have had some involvement in the northwest.

Mr. Stokes: Does the Prime Minister not think it is important that they too should have a voice?

Mr. Speaker: A further supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, yes! The Premier asserted in a letter to the United Electrical Workers, March 11, 1971, in Hamilton:

While it is true that relatively modest increases in hydro have been made within the past few months, there are absolutely no commitments beyond the present and I can assure you that no long range plans for increases are being laid.

How does the Premier reconcile that with the assertion of the chairman of Hydro, that he anticipates increases for three years; and the assertion of Dr. Hay, chairman of the Kingston Public Utilities Commission, that there will be increases averaging seven per cent until 1978?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, there is no conflict whatsoever. One was a statement that was made, perhaps in anticipation.

As I stated earlier, when somebody says maybe these things will happen, I believe the proof of the pudding is in the eating. There has been no indication that Hydro will in fact do it.

Mr. Lewis: There is every indication.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

EXPORT OF POWER

Mr. Nixon: A question further to the statement made by the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Is it a proper assumption, having read his letter to the chairman of the National Energy Board, that Ontario will not approve the export of power under the circumstances of the request of Boise Cascade up until the present time? In other words, their plan to extend by the development of a veneer mill and stud mill has been vetoed.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, the letter referred to by the hon. Leader of the Opposition indicates that in the event that there is any plan, as a result of the export of this power, to build a new plant at International Falls, that this would have to have the approval of the Ontario government; so in effect the answer to the hon. member's question is yes.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Because the letter indicates that the government would permit the expansion of the present facility,

why could they not tack it onto their veneer mill, that is their present facility, and then get government approval on that basis?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No; I think, Mr. Speaker, the idea that there would be a stud mill or a fine paper mill is something that would not be considered an expansion on an existing facility. I think we can certainly divide or separate those two moves, if they in fact do take place.

We have also indicated in the letter not only the question of expansion or new plants, but also the question of loss of job opportunities on the Canadian side; so that one or two of these ingredients could in fact require the approval of the government.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: If I understand it then, the government is approving an increase of up to approximately 20,000 kilowatts per year, from 16,000, but will not go all the way to 37,000 without an absolute commitment from Boise Cascade of what it is they are undertaking and whether it will have any effect on the northwest.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, not entirely, Mr. Speaker. I understand that the present capacity is around 14,500 kilowatts. The total agreement—the application I should say—about 1980, would provide something under 30,000 kilowatts. Now as the hon. member knows, this is something that is considered by the National Energy Board. For example, the agreement I refer to in my letter made in 1961, was an application for a 10-year export permit, one might say, or an application to export power to International Falls for 10 years. The result of that application was a license for just one year, so that as any increase in power is made available by the Canadian company to the American company, which strictly is the exporter here, it would be reviewed by the board.

FARM MARKETING LEGISLATION

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: Is he aware of the charges made by the Attorney General of Quebec that our recently proclaimed agricultural marketing legislation is economic separatism and, further, that he said, and I quote: "We"—that is Quebec—"are not going to lose time before the courts. We will use our own legislative methods to retaliate"?

If he is aware of those statements, made over the weekend, and even if he is not, will

he undertake to get in touch with the government of Quebec himself or through his Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), so that by negotiation we can lower the temperature of this kind of interprovincial warfare, which is surely not in the best interests of anyone, let alone the farmer producers?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I assure you this government will be in touch with the government of the Province of Quebec on this issue.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, is the Premier aware of the pretty definite opinions expressed by Mr. Jed Baldwin, the Conservative House leader, about Ontario's legislation on the national news last evening?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I was otherwise engaged and did not see the national news last evening. I am also quite aware of the position of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, which I understand is in complete support of this legislation.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, just by way of supplementary, was the Premier aware in advance of the heat and extent of Mr. Choquette's observations? We were led to believe in the Legislature that deputy ministers had communicated amicably. A charge of economic separatism and retaliation is a pretty tough charge. Was Ontario talked with in advance?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am just going by memory now. I, personally, have not talked to Mr. Choquette, who is the Attorney General of the Province of Quebec. My recollection was that there were discussions between The Departments of Agriculture in the two provinces and that the Quebec Department of Agriculture understood what was happening here.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has a supplementary?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): In view of Mr. Baldwin's suggestion that Ontario's manufactured goods, such as textiles and cars, not be allowed to be sold in the west, does the Prime Minister now think that this legislation may produce a mini-depression in this province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not anticipate this. I think this statement of Mr. Choquette's perhaps must be taken in perspective.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Baldwin!

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Baldwin!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Baldwin's rather. I do not anticipate any great difficulties in sales whatsoever.

NEW OMA FEE SCHEDULE

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health: As the deadline for the imposition of the new fee schedule on the part of the Ontario Medical Association approaches, can he give us a further report as to how the negotiations, or discussions as he chooses to call them, with the OMA are progressing?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I was able to spend virtually the whole of this morning with representatives of the OMA. It was a very useful and constructive discussion and my hope is to have a statement ready for release to the House and presentation to the public, on Thursday or perhaps Friday of this week.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Following the release of the government's position in this regard, will the minister undertake to have the standing committee deal with it, both from the standpoint of the public interest and also the position that the OMA has been taking during these discussions, even though we have a promise from the minister that he is going to have some positive statements to make?

Surely the standing committee should be involved in these discussions, should it not?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader may ask the question, but—

Mr. Sopha: Should it not?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can make that undertaking.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brantford has a supplementary?

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Yes Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could indicate whether the OMA has made it a mandatory situation; in other words, that they intend to announce on May 11 or 12, or whenever they meet, that there are no more discussions regarding the rate increase; that the decision has been made already and their increases will go through?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the misconception that arises out of the tone of a question such as that is that this in some way is similar to the bargaining of a collective agreement in an industrial sense. It is not that.

Mr. Lewis: We understand that.

Mr. Deans: In a social sense it is!

Mr. Sopha: Yes, that is the problem.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? the member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Could the minister tell us why the physicians of the province have been unable to get copies of the new fee schedule from the OMA?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Pardon?

Mr. Shulman: Why can the doctors not get copies of the new fee schedule from the OMA? I paid them and cannot get it.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I know nothing of it. I cannot answer the hon. member. That is a private association.

Mr. Shulman: May I ask the minister if he has a copy of the new fee schedule?

Mr. Sopha: Stop paying the fees to them; that is what the lawyers would do.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Personally I do not, but I believe the department does.

Mr. Shulman: As a final supplementary, may I see a copy of it?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I think the hon. member can drop over and see me any time this afternoon.

Mr. Sopha: He needs to have a copy since he has a house call later today.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: He will be paid.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

LIQUOR LEGISLATION REVIEWS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question of the Premier. In the changing of cabinet portfolio responsibilities, does the Provincial Secretary still have the continuing job of supervising the review of liquor legislation and liquor law and legislation in this province, or did that review stop when the present Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) left that position?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is still with the Provincial Secretary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Could the Premier either add to the term of reference or speak to his minister about some problems that have occurred recently, specifically the Liquor Licence Board's ability, whether it is in the regulations or not, to undertake control of activities in licensed premises even during days when liquor is not for sale such as Sunday?

Surely that is the business of the police and not the chairman of the Liquor Board?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would be quite delighted to speak to the Provincial Secretary about this.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

PENTAGON GRANTS TO ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of University Affairs. Can he indicate to the House what amounts of money by way of grants for funding research projects were received by Ontario universities from the Pentagon in the last academic year and what plans there are in that direction for the coming academic year?

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that there were any funds received. The Pentagon is not a euphemism for Ottawa, is it?

Mr. Lewis: Not normally, no!

Hon. Mr. White: Well Ottawa provided \$40 million to the Ontario universities, Mr. Speaker. I was not aware that the Pentagon had provided any money. I will be very glad to inquire and provide the information to the hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, the minister will recall that the United States Department of Defence, Air Force, Army and related administrations gave in excess of \$1 million by way of grants, I think, in the last year for which information was available—the 1968-1969 academic year. I was wondering whether the pattern was continuing? The former Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) said he would take it under review.

Hon. Mr. White: I am not aware of any such funds being made available, but I will check and let the hon. member know.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question?

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Regarding these research grants, can the minister inform the House whether any contracts are now being let to the 14 universities in Ontario that have veto reserve rights attached to them?

Hon. Mr. White: I do not understand this question, Mr. Speaker. Does the hon. member mean to say research grants made available to professors in Ontario universities by Ottawa?

Mr. Burr: I mean by anybody, any government or industry, where the government or the industry has the right to veto the publication if it so wishes.

Hon. Mr. White: I am not aware of this, Mr. Speaker, and in fact I do not think it is my responsibility.

If a corporation in Windsor makes a contract with a professor at the University of Windsor I suppose the terms of such a contract are the exclusive concern of the contracting parties. I suppose that if the recipient of these funds finds those terms unacceptable he will not sign the contract. I do not think it is up to the Minister of University Affairs or this government to police those private arrangements.

Mr. Makarchuk: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that in most cases public facilities would be used to research the particular contract, would the public interest not be better served if the results of the research were made public?

Hon. Mr. White: Be that as it may—and there is an assumption, which is not necessarily correct and which takes us into an interesting and complicated area, namely the desirability or propriety of using university facilities for certain undertakings; that is something about which I wish to inform myself. I think the information is not easily available. I am not prepared to accept the assumption for the moment; and because I am not willing to accept the assumption I think it would be unwise for me to attempt an answer to the question.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): By way of a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, for purposes of clarification, may I direct this question to the Minister of University Affairs: Is the minister saying, in response to the original question, that if the professor who is

an employee or secured to the tenure of a university, enters into an independent contract with another party, that the university, or this government, has nothing to say in connection with the aspects of that contract? Is that what the hon. minister is saying?

Hon. Mr. White: In fact I said that I thought the minister and the government had no direct responsibility, and I am glad to reiterate that to my hon. friend. The reason, quite frankly, is because we are determined to safeguard as best we can—having in mind the need for accountability in the use of public funds—the autonomy of the universities. I am not going to be impelled to some direct control in instances like this, because the paramount need is to protect the independence of these institutions.

Mr. Bullbrook: Recognizing the need for the principle of security of tenure, is the minister therefore saying that the principle of autonomy that is given to universities is transferable to their professors?

Hon. Mr. White: No, I am saying that the universities must assume the responsibility—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. White: —and that the minister has—

Mr. Bullbrook: The hon. minister may as well sit down and go back to sleep.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. White: —no responsibility in these internal matters.

Oh yes I know how tempting it is to plunge into this for political purposes.

Mr. Bullbrook: The hon. minister talks in circles and says nothing.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside may have one final supplementary and then this matter will be closed.

Hon. Mr. White: I am quite aware of the dividends from that kind of cheap politics.

Mr. Lewis: What is the minister getting so aroused about?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sopha: The hon. minister looks more and more like a hungry seagull.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): The hon. minister has learned that from the hon. member over the years.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, is the minister not aware that last September the universities—I believe it was the committee of the presidents of universities—announced that the universities were trying to reach agreement that none of them would accept any research grants if there was a veto tied to them? They expected to make the announcement shortly.

My question is, have they made this announcement? Have they reached this agreement yet?

Hon. Mr. White: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. But here again I think my hon. friend's most recent question gives some support to my position; namely that this is the responsibility of the university administrations and of their agents, the committee of university presidents.

Mr. Burr: Will the minister let us know?

Hon. Mr. White: I will find out.

Mr. Speaker: That will be the last supplementary on this matter. We will move on to something else. The member for Scarborough West.

USE OF STUDDED TIRES IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs, Mr. Speaker: Has the Minister of Northern Affairs had any effect on the thinking of his cabinet colleagues regarding the use of studded tires in northern Ontario?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this matter lies with the Minister of Highways and Transport.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, have the impassioned pleas of the Minister of Northern Affairs to permit the use of studded tires in northern Ontario been accepted by his cabinet brethren: is it under discussion; is there a likely change in prospect?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I think the government has already announced a decision.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Will the minister take it lightly or sitting down? Does he intend to fight back?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has the floor for further questions of a proper nature if he wishes to—

ONTARIO MEDICAL GRADUATES

Mr. Lewis: That was hardly improper, it dealt directly with his honour!

Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health: Since medical schools in the last year in Ontario produced 366 graduates out of a total of 742 newly-registered doctors, is it likely that the proportions are to change and that we will produce more graduates at medical schools ourselves over the next several years rather than importing practitioners from other jurisdictions, many of which cannot afford the loss of the practitioners?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Generally speaking, I think the answer to that, Mr. Speaker, would be yes. I cannot categorically state whether or not next year's graduating group will be larger or smaller than this year's, but I do know that the effective policies that are underway will increase the proportion two, three and four years from now.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, would it be possible for the minister to table in the Legislature by way of reply the trend for doctor graduation in Ontario over the next two or three or four years so that we can see what is in fact occurring?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, I would have that information prepared and put on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question? The member for Windsor-Walkerville has the floor for a supplementary.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): May I ask the minister if he is prepared at this time to inform the House which of the universities in the Province of Ontario is going to be given permission to establish a medical school so that students now attending high school could prepare themselves accordingly?

Mr. Speaker: That, of course, is not supplementary.

Mr. B. Newman: Where will the next medical school be then?

Mr. Sopha: Tell him Laurentian.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brantford has a supplementary?

Mr. Makarchuk: A supplementary question of the minister: In view of the fact that the OMA has released a report saying there is a time lag of 10 years between the establishment of a school and the turnout of students—but they did indicate that other provisions can be made in universities immediately to turn out more students—can the minister indicate what actions are being taken now to ensure that more medical students are going to be graduated in the next three or four years?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the best advice I can receive is that the problem is not necessarily the number of institutions available at the university level. The problem is more fundamental than that and relates to the capacity of our hospitals, in relation to the schools, to handle the training of the students from a clinical point of view. It is in this field that I understand the log-jams and bottlenecks can be removed and will be removed.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Sudbury have a supplementary?

Mr. Sopha: No.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for High Park a supplementary?

Mr. Shulman: Has the minister considered using the plan used in this province during the war, that is using the medical facilities for 12 months of the year instead of the eight and a half being used at the present time?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I will consider that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Scarborough West have further questions?

Then the Minister of Northern Affairs has the answer to a question asked last week.

IMPORTS OF ALBERTAN OIL

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on April 7 the member for Scarborough West put the following question to me:

Has the Province of Ontario been consulted on the proposal put forward by the National Energy Board that imports of oil from Alberta into Ontario would be decreased substantially?

I undertook to look into the matter, Mr. Speaker, and I am now in a position to say that the simple answer to that question is no.

By way of further explanation, I would refer the hon. member to the recently published annual report for 1970 of the National Energy Board and especially to pages 12 to 14 and 21 to 24 of this report. It will be seen that not only is there no reference to any proposal to restrict imports of oil from Alberta into Ontario, but on the contrary the national oil policy is being actively promoted. That policy requires that markets in the central and western parts of Ontario should be substantially supplied with products supplied from indigenous crude oil.

Mr. Speaker: I have an extra copy of the 1970 annual report of the National Energy Board and I would like to send it over to the hon. member for examination.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

WILDERNESS AREA NEAR SUDBURY

Mr. Sopha: A question, Your Honour, of the Minister of Lands and Forests: Now that he is on the point of settling the problems of Quetico Park, may I ask him what progress has been made since the House met last fall toward the establishment of a wilderness area along the route of the newly opened Sudbury-Timmins highway?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, if I understood correctly, the question has sort of two parts—about the progress of the Quetico advisory committee?

Mr. Sopha: That was a preface.

Mr. Lewis: That was a concession.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would say, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member for Sudbury that he will be most interested to hear something in the very near future about the establishment of quite a large wilderness area not too far away from Sudbury.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Sopha: “Sopha, Brunelle and Harkness”—not bad!

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no! “Brunelle, Harkness and Sopha.”

WIRETAPPING BY POLICE

Mr. Singer: In light of the recent statement attributed to the Metropolitan Toronto police that they tapped 57 phones during the past three months—38 by the intelligence bureau and 19 by the morality squad—could the Attorney General advise us if there is any control exercised by his office over wiretapping by police forces in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I saw that report in the newspapers and I am trying to get more information about it at the moment.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could the Attorney General advise us whether he views with any concern at all the uncontrolled use of wiretapping by police forces in Ontario?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has a supplementary?

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the widespread wiretapping which has been revealed by the police, has the minister considered supporting Bill 22 which would control this problem?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I am as aware, as I am sure the other hon. members of the House are aware, of certain statements emanating from Ottawa respecting the control of wiretapping that will be forthcoming from that source. I look forward to seeing the actual legislation when it is presented at the federal House.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of a supplementary to the Attorney General, may we presume, as a result of the lack of information that the minister is able to give us today, that neither he nor his predecessor have taken any positive initiative in connection with the control of wiretapping through the Attorney General's department?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can presume that I have taken no steps to control the use of wiretapping.

Mr. Bullbrook: Can we rightly presume his predecessor had not either? The minister gives us no information.

Mr. Speaker: That is not a proper question to address to this minister.

Mr. Bullbrook: Can you tell me, Your Honour, why it is not a proper question?

Mr. Speaker: Because the hon. member is asking this particular minister about the actions of another minister who is—

Mr. Bullbrook: I am asking him about the actions of his department.

Mr. Speaker: I rule the question out of order. The member for Brantford has the floor.

FLIGHTS INTO QUETICO PARK

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Can the minister give us an answer to the question that was raised earlier in the House regarding Quetico Park, as to who were the government people who were using government planes to fly into the park and set up temporary structures?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Firefighters.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I had asked the member to give me some more definite information. However, I have not received it. May I ask that if the member is referring to—I believe it was in 1965—that the advisory committee to the then Minister of Lands and Forests spent two or three days in Quetico Provincial Park.

This advisory committee, Mr. Speaker, is comprised of very able persons who serve without any remuneration. One of their purposes of course is to familiarize themselves with various matters that are brought to their attention. I think it is only sensible that if they want to advise the Minister of Lands and Forests on Quetico Park they should spend some time in Quetico Park. At that time they stayed in tents and the meeting was held in quite a large tent which was dismantled about two days later.

So, Mr. Speaker, I fail to see where there should be any criticism of such a committee whose express purpose is to make recommendations to the department.

Mr. Makarchuk: By way of supplementary, if this committee has made this report, would the minister table this particular report from the committee that visited the park?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to send the hon. member minutes of those meetings. I attended those meetings.

I was then a member of this advisory committee and the late Mr. Kelso Roberts was then the minister. I can tell him that we spent three very active days studying various matters and I would be pleased to make them available to the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East.

AMERICANIZATION OF UNIVERSITY STAFFS IN ONTARIO

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of University Affairs.

In view of the shortage of positions for many Ontario university postgraduate students, and in view of the present high degree of Americanization of many departments in universities in Ontario, and in view of the persistent hiring policies of some of these departments which discriminate against Canadians; does the minister intend to investigate publicly the causes or the reasons underlying this situation and adopt a corrective strategy to rectify the situation for the remainder of the Nineteen Seventies?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, my predecessor did evince his concern about certain of these allegations, and we are collecting information to see what changes, if any, should be made in those policies respecting universities.

I would certainly hope, as did my predecessor, that all other things being equal, or as you and I would say, *ceteris paribus*, that the Canadian applicant would be given the priority. On the other hand, I think we should not err in moving too far in that direction for fear of excluding excellent academics from other places.

So the answer in brief is that I am informing myself about it, that I will expect no radical changes, and that the government policy will be subject to review based on these changing circumstances.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question: Is the hon. minister aware, or does the hon. minister have any knowledge, that at the University of Toronto, Donald Creighton, the present but outgoing head of history, is about to be replaced by an American? If the hon. minister has any knowledge about this, perhaps he could comment upon this rather sensitive situation.

Hon. Mr. White: I am not sure now if I have heard that before or not. Here again I have to say that I see the government as having no direct role in this matter. Or is the hon. member suggesting that I select the head of that department of history?

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question if I might, Mr. Speaker: Am I to assume from the hon. minister's reply that he is not concerned with the issue of the increasing Americanization of certain departments in certain universities in this province? And if he is not aware of this, is he just going to sit back and let it go?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I did answer that question and the hon. member is repeating it in an attempt to put me in a position which I will not take. Of course we are concerned about it.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, sort of *mutatis mutandis*.

Hon. Mr. White: We are not going to be impelled into running all of these universities, because I suspect if we were to do so even the hon. member opposite, whose acumen is not always apparent, would object to such an arrangement.

Mr. T. Reid: A final supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: There have been sufficient supplementaries. The hon. member for Cochrane South has the floor.

COST OF NURSING HOME CARE

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): I have a question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister now a date set when he will meet with the Minister of National Health and Welfare to discuss the taking over of the cost of nursing home care?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not.

Mr. Ferrier: Since the minister gives it the highest priority, will he set a date or make an appointment in the near future to discuss this very urgent matter?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, something will be discussed when we meet. There is a meeting tomorrow at the deputy ministers' level between his department and mine and I hope that will be followed by ministerial meetings in the near future, and that question obviously will be one thing on the agenda.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex-Kent.

HEALTH UNIT BUDGETS

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. Would the minister tell the House if his department has cut budgets of health units throughout the Province of Ontario, as was ordered recently in the Windsor metro health unit where 12 nurses were given notice of layoff?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that my department cuts budgets or raises budgets. I believe that they are supplied by the local region or municipality involved in the governance of the health units. I think the health units go to that level of government and not to me for budget setting.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Parkdale.

AMENDMENT TO THE WILLS ACT

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Does the Attorney General intend to bring forth legislation in this session to amend The Wills Act, permitting an individual of the age of 18 to make a will?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I have no present intention of bringing forward any such amendment this session, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: The age of majority is not going to be changed?

Mr. Trotter: By way of a supplementary question: Would the minister be in favour of such an amendment, because I believe his predecessor was and I understood it was under consideration by the department?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: If and when any such amendment comes forward to the House, it would then be governmental policy. I think I would rather refrain from indicating any personal opinion until that time.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

USE OF STUDDED TIRES IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of transportation and communications.

Why is the minister being so—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would address the appropriate minister, there being no such minister in the House at the moment.

Mr. Stokes: That is what he is being touted as in northern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member, with the rest of us, knows what the departments are, and he will use the proper terminology.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, but you are perpetrating a fraud then, we—

Mr. Stokes: Why is the minister being so hidebound about the use of studded tires in northern Ontario? Is the minister not aware that studded tires do not have the adverse effect on road surfaces in northern Ontario that they might have elsewhere? And is he not aware that they do not obliterate the centre line and that studded tires are an absolute necessity for the safety that is so important to life and limb and personal property in northern Ontario?

Mr. Lewis: The government is going to lose Kenora on top of everything else.

Mr. Makarchuk: Not only their lives but probably the government's too.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I would say in reply to the hon. member for Thunder Bay that that is hardly a yes or no question.

Mr. Stokes: I do not want a yes or no answer either.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, the member is not going to get one either, Mr. Speaker.

My answer to that question is that there is a renewed study being undertaken by the Canada Safety Council into the broad aspects of the use of studded tires.

Mr. Lewis: Another study?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The Canada Safety Council has undertaken a study because it has an overwhelming interest in matters associated with highway safety. We are inclined to wait for the decision of the Canada Safety Council for its recommendations. We are aware of the fact that there are different aspects to the use of studded tires in the north versus the south. We are not convinced and we will not be until we learn a little more about whether, on a broad

basis, these tires contribute to highway safety to any appreciable extent, either in the north or the south.

That is about the best that I can say to the hon. member. This matter is still under pursuit.

It may be of interest to the House, in terms of the use of studded tires, that many of the states which adjoin Canada, ranging from Minnesota on the west right through to New York on the east, are in the process of considering—and some may be well implementing—the same ban that is being contemplated and probably will go into effect in Ontario. Minnesota may do that very shortly. Wisconsin and Michigan are giving it serious consideration, and so is the state of New York.

It is recognized that the studs have some safety value as far as glare ice is concerned; and beyond that at this point in time, the department cannot see any useful aspect of studded tires.

The matter is being pursued. As I explained to the hon. member, we are waiting for the report of the Canada Safety Council.

Mr. Stokes: As a supplementary, is it fair—

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary: The member for Thunder Bay has the right to ask a question.

Mr. Stokes: Is it fair to say then, that the hon. minister's department is still open-minded about the subject vis-à-vis northern Ontario?

Mr. Singer: They are the most open-minded people there are.

Mr. Trotter: In one ear and out the other; that is how open-minded they are.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I regard that to some extent as a hypothetical question and I am not going to be categorical with the hon. member.

Mr. Deans: I have a mind to be open-minded; how true!

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition has a further supplementary?

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary: To put it another way, is it fair then, to say the legislation is still under review?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is hypothetical for them to be open-minded; let us leave it that way!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It is hypothetical. They have to be open-minded.

Mr. Nixon: It either is or it is not.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is fair, I suppose, for the Leader of the Opposition to say anything. I do not think that I am prepared to pursue the question any further than I have already and say that—

Mr. Nixon: The minister says it is now under review?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, it is under review by the Canada Safety Council.

Mr. Lewis: But not by the hon. minister?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We are going to rely on their advice. Whether it results in any form of continued use of studded tires, or some other sensible alternative that does not do the damage to our roads and whose performance, insofar as safety is concerned is better, then we may well take a look at it. I can be categorical and say that there are grave doubts, not only in this jurisdiction but other associated jurisdictions, about the overall safety factors associated with studded tires.

Mr. Stokes: Four hundred thousand people in northern Ontario cannot be wrong.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The minister has made a statement that indicates to me that nothing further is to be gained by supplementaries. The member for Waterloo North has the floor.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Yes, a supplementary question Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: The statement was that there can be grave doubts and serious doubts.

Mr. Good: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: No, this is a new question, if the member wishes a new question.

CAR HORSEPOWER RATINGS

Mr. Good: A new question! Then I shall direct this new question to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Since the car insurance companies in Ontario have for the past few years been placing special ratings on high performance—or high

horsepower cars—would the minister take the necessary steps to prevent the car manufacturers from juggling their horsepower ratings to show minimum horsepower rather than maximum horsepower; and also from their practice of changing their serial numbers so that the horsepower ratings are not identifiable from the serial number on the car?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice and look into the matter raised by the hon. member. I cannot give him an answer as to what has been done up to this moment in studying that problem.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, a question.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

COST DIFFERENCES IN COMPARABLE DRUGS

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health: Can the minister indicate whether any study has been done by his department to determine the difference in costs of comparable drugs in the province, as was done by the food and drug directorate in Ottawa, and whether there is any intention by his department to publish in a separate index those drugs that show a difference in cost in excess of 100 per cent?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: As far as I know, the answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

The second edition of the Parcost index is coming out. Again, my recollection is, in reading it, that it only relates to selected, economically significant, drugs; in other words the ones that sell in a large enough volume to have some significance from the point of view of the public and the market as a whole.

Again, there are a vast number of other drugs which sell in Canada and occasionally in Ontario in very limited quantities, and in isolated cases they may be found to be very cheap. But again, as far as I know, there is no publication intended, on the part of this department or this government, in relation to those last mentioned drugs.

He will find, I may say to the hon. member, this kind of information being developed by the federal directorate. Each of their reports I have seen recently on this has brought out a fairly large table including the whole spectrum of all drugs of a particular type sold in the whole of Canada. Their approach, of course, is not from the point of view of the market, it is more an

academic ascertainment of total prices and total qualities.

Mr. Deans: By way of supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has now expired.

Mr. Deans: It was nice to get there just at the end.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

KEDAR MINES LIMITED

In the absence of Mr. Meen, Mr. G. E. Smith moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Kedar Mines Limited.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Renfrew North has a statement.

Mr. M. Hamilton (Renfrew North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the House on a matter concerning the committee on natural and physical resources. There will be a meeting of this committee at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, April 21. It had been planned to have the Ontario Food Council appear before the committee. However, I have been advised that the chairman, Mr. D. E. Williams, will be away for some two weeks.

Under the circumstances, I have taken the liberty of inviting the chairman and members of the Milk Commission of Ontario to appear before us on Wednesday next. I think the appearance of the milk commission is most appropriate at this time. There have been many changes in the organization of milk marketing in Ontario in recent times, the most recent being market sharing quotas for milk producers, and plant supply quotas for processing plants. I trust that the arrangements for this meeting will meet with the approval of the members of the committee.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question by way of clarification: It was my understanding—and I learned of this on Friday afternoon—that the Ontario Milk Marketing Board would be invited before the committee. Apparently, this has now been changed. It is now the commission, as I gather?

Mr. Hamilton: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it will be the commission.

Mr. Gaunt: I was wondering why the change was made. Could the Ontario Milk Marketing Board not be made—

Mr. Speaker: I think that could be properly taken up in the committee, rather than in the House.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, or a point of clarification. Since I gather that other members of the committee were not consulted but that the chairman made the decision, perhaps he could indicate to the House in advance of the meeting why the milk marketing board has been excluded?

Mr. Hamilton: This was done after considerable consultation, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: With whom?

Mr. Speaker: This again, as far as Mr. Speaker is concerned, is a matter for the committee.

Mr. Lewis: With whom does the chairman consult?

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the report was accepted in the House. I would like to know with whom the chairman of the committee consults if not with his fellow members of the committee?

Mr. Speaker: There is no report in the House. The hon. member as chairman was announcing the meeting of a committee. If there is any discussion of that, then of course the proper place is at the committee, and then if it comes to the House—

Mr. Lewis: How much manipulation of the committee will the Speaker accept?

Mr. Speaker: —if it comes to the House from the committee, properly, then of course it is a matter for debate in this House. At the moment it is not.

Orders of the day.

Mr. Trotter: The minister tells them what to do.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, one fact is clear: In Ontario today we face a serious shortage of dental services. In terms of services to children, a child is lucky if he happens to live in North York, where the dentist-to-population ratio is one to 1,538; where, I understand, a dental programme is in effect in the school. But compare his chances with the children who live in Grey-Bruce, Wellington, Thunder Bay, Kenora, Lanark or Elgin, where the ratio is about one to 2,900, just a bit worse than the provincial average.

About 20 per cent of Ontario's children under 13 live in these areas, but less than half of them whose teeth need attention will get it. In North York we will be able to get at close to 60 per cent of the decayed teeth in children. In other words, where there is a ratio of 2,900 there is an opportunity drop of 30 per cent. These counties, remember, are the ones approaching the provincial average ratio.

Did you know that 72 per cent of all children under 13 live in areas of the province where the ratio is worse than 2,900? About 13 per cent of these live in areas where the ratio is approximately 6,000. About half their teeth are decayed and need filling, 40 per cent are missing or need extraction. We managed to fill only 13.3 per cent of their teeth compared to almost 60 per cent in the counterpart group in North York.

The government, along with the dental profession, is too complacent about Ontario's dental care record, and is too ready to overlook the fact that in the total view of things the quantity and distribution of services is at least as important as the level of technical achievement.

The government's plan to give a bursary to any dental undergraduate student on the provision that he practice a year in an under-serviced area for each year he receives the bursary is good; as well as guaranteeing a dentist \$22,000 a year income if he moves into a under-serviced area.

However this programme, to work more effectively, should consider the following additions: Many young dentists would go to an under-serviced area for a few years, yet hesitate to do so because of the capital investment required to equip an office. When the dentist decides to move elsewhere, maybe to a more populated area, he takes a big loss when he has to sell his equipment, if indeed he can sell it.

Moreover, a number of young married dentists on the bursary plan now have a great deal of trouble getting the necessary loans upon graduation to buy the equipment to set up their offices. My suggestion, Mr. Speaker, is that either the provincial government on its own in conjunction with municipal governments in under-serviced areas undertake to equip dental offices and lease them to a dentist when he sets up his practice.

If he moves in a few years an office is available to lease to another graduate who may wish to settle there and the original dentist does not suffer unreasonable capital loss.

Be this as it may, the government's bursary programme is only a drop in the bucket in meeting the overwhelming needs that exist. The answer is not to be found just in turning out more dentists every year. That has the treadmill effect of just keeping up with the increasing demands of the population.

Even if we added three new dental faculties to the province tomorrow, assuming that we had the resources to do that, each graduating 100 dentists per year, we would still have a ratio of one dentist per 1,700 population in 1981. In areas of the province where we have such a ratio now, as in York county for example, we are still unable to treat 42 per cent of children up to age 13.

This situation would presumably worsen if services were offered free because demand would increase. We cannot produce anywhere near 300 new dentists a year, and if we could, we would not be near solving the problem. The obvious fact, to me, is to increase the productivity of the dentists we already have and of their auxiliaries; as well as expanding the role of the auxiliaries we already have, and also setting up a new category of auxiliaries.

The federal *ad hoc* committee on dental auxiliaries reported in 1970. On page 5 of this report we have this statement:

There is no doubt that the dentist needs auxiliary personnel of one type or another. Indeed, these personnel to date have improved his productivity while at the same time increasing his income. For example, in 1963 dentists with one chair and no full-time helpers had an average net income of \$9,097, while those with one chair and one assistant had an average net income of \$13,366. Dentists with two chairs and no employees had a net income of \$13,108; with one assistant, \$15,974; and

with one assistant plus one hygienist, \$19,851.

All the gains are not necessarily due to productivity alone because in many places dentists who earn more may simply charge more. The American Dental Association reported, however, that dentists with two full-time employees saw 25 per cent more patients in a year than did those with one. In Canada, the overall ratio of hygienist to dentist was 1 to 18 in 1968. That is, less than six per cent of the dentists were able to make use of the only auxiliary who could work intra-orally. Hygienists, therefore, because of their limited numbers have not been able to play the role they are capable of playing in the overall productivity of Canadian dentists.

It is necessary Mr. Speaker, I believe, for the government with all haste to proceed to train many more dental hygienists, probably at the community college level; and along with the recommendation of this Wells report, amend The Dental Technicians Act to provide an expanded role for the hygienist as far as the duties she will be permitted to perform are concerned.

Furthermore, there are two prototypes of dental auxiliaries who have been in operation for a number of years and who have, by and large, received favourable enough reports for us to introduce them in Ontario. They are the United Kingdom dental auxiliary and the New Zealand type of dental nurse. In New Zealand, the dental nurse has a long history of working in the school system. The first school dental nurses were graduated in 1925.

The intra-oral duties of the school dental nurse include dental examinations, prophylaxis—including scaling and removal of stains—the filling of deciduous and permanent teeth under local anaesthesia and the radiographic examination of the teeth and supporting structures. The dental nurse's services are restricted to children under 14 years of age.

The UK dental auxiliary plays a similar role. A report of the general dental council of the UK evaluating her role notes:

From the observation of the assessors, it is evident that they found that most of the work—simple fillings and so on—of dental auxiliaries was of high quality. The evidence of the employing authorities also shows that the quality of clinical work is high.

As a minimum a pilot project using these auxiliaries should be introduced into Ontario immediately. I suggest that some thought should be given as to the training of this kind of auxiliary for our future needs.

Recommendation 31 of the Wells report goes as follows:

That dental care in its broadest sense be offered to all Canadians incorporating the same principles of quality control and financing as medical care, as soon as possible.

This recommendation squares entirely with the New Democratic Party's goal as far as dental care is concerned.

In any government we form we shall move in this direction as soon as possible. However, because of the terrific amount of dental work presently not being done, much more would have to be done immediately were a full dental care scheme to be introduced in one full sweep of the pen. Because of the present shortage of dental personnel it is therefore not possible to enter a dental care scheme other than by a staged programme. It will be necessary to provide facilities for training New Zealand type auxiliaries and to go ahead and train them.

To some extent it will be necessary to get more dentists into the field. The first step that this government should take immediately is to do as Quebec is doing and to implement recommendations 32 to 38 of the Wells report.

Basically this means starting a publicly financed programme, whereby we start with younger children and encompass new age groups on an annual basis until school leaving children have been included, at which time the whole Canadian population should be included, as in recommendation 31. We want this course of action now, without any delay.

The first step is of top priority. The leaders in the dental field with whom I have spoken are waiting for the government to move so that they can go into operation to make the necessary arrangements for its implementation.

In addition to what I am proposing, I suggest that we find ways and means of covering pensioners and long-term welfare recipients with prepaid dental care as soon as possible. While some on provincial pensions are covered, those on federal pensions are not.

Specifically, the cost of dentures are a heavy burden to pensioners. While the cost of such may be picked up by the municipal

welfare departments on a 50-50 cost-sharing basis with the province, it is an optional programme so that many welfare departments budget only a relatively low amount for them.

The administrator of the Cochrane district welfare board recently told me that under his jurisdiction there is a waiting list of 150 people needing dentures. His budget is such that it will be a long time before those on the bottom of the list receive dentures. It surely is a tragedy that many old age pensioners and such, who desperately need dentures in the worst way, are subjected to such delays and frustrations.

The Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence), in reply to one of my questions the other day, said he believed in a full dental care plan and would move on it when feasible, and that consideration was being given to the programme starting with school children and encompassing new age groups. I hope that he is serious, that he is committed to this action.

I urge him to make this initial step right now. At any event it has top priority with us, and given the opportunity we shall move on it upon assumption of office.

Over the last number of years, successive Tory administrations have not put high enough priority in their allotment of funds to meet obvious and pressing human need in a number of different fields. Because our health care system has not benefitted from long term co-ordinated planning, nor is it even now receiving the benefits of a real overhaul and significant restructuring, we have a system that is unnecessarily costly.

The government says that it cannot allocate any more funds for the health field. About two weeks ago the headlines of the various Toronto papers were saying "Staff Shortage; Some Retarded Children in Cages." The lead paragraph in the April 6 edition *Toronto Daily Star* by Claire Hoy, states:

Mentally retarded children in a provincial hospital at Orillia are being strapped into beds completely enclosed by cages because of the lack of staff to look after them.

The administrator of the Orillia Hospital for the Retarded, R. J. Wilson, is quoted further on in the same article:

We would like to get rid of these cage cots, we do not like them. If we had the staff we could probably avoid this kind of restraint.

An hon. member: Oh, they are crazy!

Mr. Ferrier: This kind of situation exists in Ontario today because the government, by its lack of foresight and present inaction, spends money that need not be spent and allows human beings to be treated inhumanely, as those retarded children are in Orillia—

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Nonsense!

Mr. Ferrier: —because they say they cannot afford the staff to look after them properly.

There is another illustration of government stupidity about health spending right in my own constituency of Cochrane South. In the summer of 1968 a \$6.5 million Ontario Hospital, now known as the Northeastern Regional Mental Health Centre, was officially opened in South Porcupine. The budget was allotted so that the hospital could become operational. Staff was hired so that the treatment programme in the hospital and throughout the region could get under way. Soon patients were receiving treatment in the hospital and the regional programme was meeting with a favourable response.

At this point the government was prepared to co-operate and made reasonable grants for all legitimate needs, and as the programme was developing and expanding, one would naturally think the government would continue to allocate sufficient funds to make it fully operational, especially since it was a new facility. But no, when the freeze went upon all spending in the mental health field, Northeastern, like all other Ontario Hospitals, had to hold the line.

As a result, the significant part of the hospital is still not utilized for patient care. Additional staff cannot be hired to treat more patients and open up new wards or to launch new programmes. As a result, the surrounding community has become disillusioned with the hospital and with the government for its stupidity.

During the municipal elections last December the hue and cry was to use the unused portions of the hospital as a chronic care wing. I have had correspondence with the former Minister of Health, and I have discussed this subject with a number of knowledgeable people in the community. The conclusion I have come to is that the hospital should be fully utilized for that for which it was built—that is a regional mental health treatment centre—rather than turn it into a partial chronic care centre, no matter how

pressing the need for such is in our community.

To do this the government must substantially increase the budget to Northeastern so that more professional staff can be hired, more beds can be used to treat mentally ill adults and emotionally disturbed children. I urge the Minister of Health to give the priority that Northeastern should have so that the job that should be done can be done. I have spoken to the Minister of Health about this situation at Northeastern. He asked me to write him and this I have done.

One of the suggestions I made was that an emergency ward be opened at Northeastern to deal with persons needing emergency care in the mental health sphere. I believe there is sufficient space at the hospital for such a ward. It can be under the supervision of one or two physicians specifically engaged for this service.

Now, persons in a critical mental state have to be admitted to a general hospital and kept there until a bed becomes available at Northeastern. Many physicians are reluctant to tie up an active treatment bed with a mental patient, especially when active treatment beds are in short supply, as in Timmins. Thus the patient sits at home and suffers along with other members of the family. The solution, at Northeastern, is if the government will allot enough funds to set up an emergency ward.

I believe that a laboratory can be set up at Northeastern on a large enough scale to do most of the medical tests that need to be done for the whole region. The Department of Health laboratory which is situated in Timmins carries out certain procedures. If this lab was moved to the hospital and its procedures expanded, a saving of over \$9,000 a year in rent could be made. But even more important, an expanded and better service in laboratory work could be established; more sophisticated procedures could be carried out.

This is another matter that I asked the minister to consider. I urge the minister to move in and provide the funds to make Northeastern fully operational so that the job that needs to be done can be done in terms of mental health in northeastern Ontario. If changes have to be made, make them, and let us put an end to the dissatisfaction and criticism of so many disenchanting local people. Let us have the planning that should have been done in connection with this hospital in the first place. Let it be done

now in the interest of good mental health care for the future of the northeast.

Mr. Speaker, in this speech I have dealt with a number of badly needed changes in our health care delivery system which, if made, would produce better service to the people of the province at much less cost than at present. The system is a result of successive Tory governments' refusal to adequately plan and co-ordinate the programmes throughout the province. It is in a very unsatisfactory state. According to Jean Howarth:

One of the distressing things that has become apparent during the production of these articles is that so many people know what ought to be done and yet do nothing but talk about it.

The meetings are legion in which the same ground is covered again and again; the same little in-fights are conducted; the same delicate stresses are put upon prestige; the same trivialities are rehashed while the meat of the matter is ignored.

And in the field of health as in many other areas, this Progressive Conservative government has lost its capacity and will to govern.

The people of the province need a leadership which will face up to these areas and put the solutions into practice, even if it means stepping on toes or putting aside the roadblocks of the status quo establishment in the senior civil service or health empires that have been built up. The stakes are too high to be timid in the implementation of pressing reforms. The New Democratic Party is prepared to give the leadership and take the decisive action that the people of this province so badly need in the reform and restructuring of our health care delivery system.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Speaker, this session has only been in progress a few weeks but I am certain that the "new wave" spoken about at our recent leadership convention is already evident. Under the excellent leadership of our new Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) we have kept the best of our older programmes and policies while introducing new ones to meet the pressing demands of today.

I am very glad that much of this attention has been focused on the important problems of unemployment. This urgent matter greatly concerns me and I have tried to help all those that I can in my great riding of

Welland. What I have done on a local scale, this government is doing for every corner of this province. This government recognizes that a strong employment rate is the backbone of a healthy economy. That is why it has made easing unemployment one of its top priorities.

Immediately after he was sworn into office, the Prime Minister set the machinery in motion with the announcement of a provincial-municipal programme to provide 7,500 new jobs. Combined with previous programmes announced by the Prime Minister's predecessor, this newest programme has brought the total number of new jobs created to 12,000.

In addition, the Prime Minister extended the provincial seasonal employment programme until the end of April. This has allowed the rescheduling of work on the traffic tunnel under the Welland Canal in my great riding, and has made it possible to create jobs for 70 men there for the next few months.

The Throne Speech is also geared to ease the plight of the unemployed. In addition to the housing programme, measures will be taken to find summer jobs for students, help the farmers and tourist operators, and stimulate other areas of the economy. The money generated through these jobs will, in turn, be poured into the economy. This will result in a healthier economic picture and the creation of even more jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I have the proud honour of representing one of this province's industrial centres, and I can say in all certainty that our area's growth would not have been possible without the hard work of our labour force.

I want to take this opportunity to point out the excellent legislation this government has developed to protect its three-million-member labour force. Because we are so well protected by these laws, I am afraid we do not always appreciate them as much as we should. But it is these laws, drawn up by a government which recognizes the importance of taking care of the working man's well-being, that have built Ontario into the "Province of Opportunity."

Our labour force has one of the best workmen's compensation Acts in the world. It is so good, in fact, that other countries send representatives here to study our legislation. Last year, \$131,212,629 was awarded in benefits under The Workmen's Compensation Act. That is an increase of almost \$50 million since 1965.

The privative clause in the Act is the envy of organized labour in both the United States and Britain. This clause prohibits any compensation cases from going to court. Because his right to compensation is already recognized by the law and therefore cannot be contested, the worker here does not have to sue for damages.

In addition, the benefits under the Act are greater than those in almost any other jurisdiction. For example, the minimum amount of permanent total disability benefits has been increased to \$175 per month, regardless of earnings, while widows' pensions have been raised to \$125 per month.

Appeals are possible under the Act. It does not take years to hear cases as it does in other jurisdictions, but only a few weeks. In addition, the three-step appeal system, involving a possible progression from a review committee to appeal tribunals to the Workmen's Compensation Board, is geared as much as possible to the employee's convenience by holding the tribunals in various parts of the province instead of just in Toronto.

Our labour force is also protected by several other excellent pieces of legislation. The revised Employment Standards Act calls for time and a half for overtime beyond 48 hours per week, equal pay for men and women doing the same work and seven statutory holidays for which employees receive time and a half if they work on these days.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): It took this government 27 years to implement legislation.

Mr. Morningstar: Good government, good government. It also calls for advance notice of dismissals to workers in layoffs or plant shutdowns, two weeks' vacation after two years' employment with the same employer, and provisions to facilitate the collection of underpayments of minimum wages.

During the first two months of this year the employment standards branch assisted 8,285 employees to collect \$310,697 in unpaid wages and other benefits from 1,589 employees.

Great work from this Department of Labour.

Mr. Pilkey: That is not saying much for the employers.

Mr. Morningstar: Ontario also has one of the highest minimum wages—\$1.65 hourly—in Canada.

The labour legislation protecting our female labour forces, which makes up one-third of the total, is also amongst the most progressive on the continent. Women under the age of 18 may not be required to work more than six hours a week overtime. Those women working shifts that begin or end between midnight and 6 a.m. must be provided with transportation between their homes and places of work. Women under the age of 18 may not work between midnight and 6 a.m.

Ontario has had an equal-pay law for just over 18 years, with more stringent provisions added in 1969. Until 1969, a woman who thought she was entitled to equal pay and not getting it had to lay a complaint with the Ontario Human Rights Commission. To do this she had to reveal her name. The result often was that rather than get equal pay she lost her job.

But in 1969, enforcement of equal pay laws became part of the employment standards branch of The Department of Labour. Now all a woman has to do is to report to the branch by telephone or in writing and the branch's inspectors will investigate without disclosing her name. The inspectors then look at all the standards, including wages, hours of work and vacation pay, so that there is no reason for an employer to suspect someone has complained about this equal pay.

The historic Women's Equal Opportunity Act, passed last year, prohibits discrimination in employment on the grounds of sex or marital status and dismissal for pregnancy. This legislation is way in advance of the practices in other Canadian jurisdictions and in the United States.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Oh, come on!

Mr. Pilkey: That is awful.

Mr. Morningstar: Our province also can boast very progressive legislation governing labour relations. The Labour-Management Arbitration Commission, established in 1969, facilitates arbitration of grievances which occur while union-management collective agreements are in force.

Last year the conciliation branch of the department was reorganized into the conciliation and mediation services branch to increase the effectiveness in helping labour and management reach agreements in contract negotiations. This is helping not only in the area of big-company, big-union—

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Make sure you get the right page.

Mr. Morningstar: —that is right—disputes where large numbers of people are affected, but also with disputes with small firms' first agreements which are often more difficult to resolve.

Mr. Pilkey: It just amazes you.

An hon. member: It is amazing.

Mr. Morningstar: A series of amendments last June to the Ontario Labour Relations Act is promoting industrial peace and providing additional protection to the rights and freedom of our workers.

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister without Portfolio): That is what we needed.

Mr. Pilkey: Tell them how it is.

Mr. Morningstar: But this government has not been content to merely provide our labour force with protective legislation; it has also been concerned with increasing industrial safety and providing further training. To increase safety in industry, the department consults with management to assist in the development of additional accident prevention measures and to raise standards of industrial safety, health and welfare.

Mr. Pilkey: That is why we paid out over \$300 million in accident claims.

Mr. Morningstar: In order to provide better service to the working force the department's industrial training branch is concentrating its activities more heavily among persons with employment problems, and in the areas of the province lacking industrial development. At the end of 1970 there were 18,500 apprentices enrolled in the various programmes provided by the industrial training branch. Another 5,000 will graduate this year from short-term training programmes sponsored by The Department of Labour in partnership with the federal government and industry.

Mr. Young: They are cutting it down all the time. The young people cannot get in any more.

Mr. Morningstar: No, no! In Welland and district, the great Welland riding and district—

Mr. Pilkey: Right. Let us hear about that. It is a great district.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Morningstar: As of the end of February, 123 persons had graduated and 118 were in training in the industrial training branch's various programmes.

Employee's basic rights are protected by the Ontario Human Rights Code and The 1968 Age Discrimination Act. Exemptions concerning discrimination in employment which had been extended to religious, philanthropic, educational, fraternal and social organizations not operated for private profit, have now been removed from the code. The Age Discrimination Act is helping to remove barriers to employment faced by older workers because of their age.

The uniform building standards branch has assumed responsibility for the development and implementation of a uniform building standards code for Ontario. This is another decisive step to ease the housing crisis. This code will give contractors built-in savings which will certainly prevent continual price increases being passed on to the purchaser.

An hon. member: The member cannot be serious.

Mr. Morningstar: Mr. Speaker, it is due to this legislation that Welland and the rest of Ontario have been able to obtain one of the highest standards of living in the world.

Mr. Pilkey: It is taken right out of one of the speeches of the member for Don Mills (Mr. Randall).

Mr. Morningstar: It is this legislation which has helped make Ontario the envy of the world because it has resulted in our never having tremendous industrial disputes—disputes where large numbers of people are affected—but also with disputes with small firms' first agreements which are often more difficult to resolve.

A series of amendments last June to The Ontario Labour Relations Act is promoting industrial peace and providing additional protection for the rights and freedoms of workers.

Mr. Pilkey: The hon. member is repeating the same page.

Mr. Morningstar: I am sorry.

An hon. member: The opposition was not listening the last time anyway. Say it over again.

Mr. Morningstar: —having tremendous disputes, yes.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It only happens when they use those Roman numerals.

Mr. Morningstar: It is wonderful legislation, because it has resulted in our never having—

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Go ahead and repeat it. It is so good they want to hear it again.

Mr. Morningstar: —tremendous industrial unrest. And it is this legislation which will help Ontario grow even more prosperous and make it even more of a mecca for the working man in the years that lie ahead. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Give him a hand.

Mr. Sargent: That is very kind of the hon. minister.

In rising to make my humble contribution to this debate, Mr. Speaker, I wonder what debate we are on—the Throne debate or unemployment. They are all mixed up.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): The hon. member would not know.

Mr. Sargent: I would not know. That is right.

However, to convey to the House and for *Hansard* and for anyone in Ontario who cares about what goes on here, I would like to tell about the sorry conditions in my riding. I think the only way I could get any action is perhaps to enlist the services of the member for London North (Mr. Robarts) on a committee of two and maybe we would get something done here.

I feel that things are in such a way, Mr. Speaker with the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) leaning on the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) so much that it is becoming enjoyable from this side of the House, that I think it is going to be chaotic for the former Attorney General's (Mr. Wishart) party—I forget the hon. minister's new title.

I am reminded of the story of the lady telling her neighbour, "I have had so much trouble with the lawyers these days over my husband's estate that I am almost sorry that poor Frank died." I think that somehow the

government members are kind of sorry that poor John walked out on them and now they have got to struggle through with genial Bill, smiling Bill.

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest, for the record, that this government is in the worst mess of any government in the history of the Province of Ontario. There is an old saying that people get the kind of government they deserve. I do not know what the people of Ontario have done to deserve that gallery over there. Things are going on like a dog's breakfast. We do not know what the hell is going on and neither does the government.

In the science of government we must be objective. Those of you who have been in—

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): This is the kind of speech that hurts them.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. member can go it that way, but laughing boy back here is laughing all the time. I am reminded of the story of the fellow who belonged to a wife-swapping club and he was not married. That is why he was laughing all the time. I hope we will hear a lot from the hon. member for Brantford.

Mr. Makarchuk: I will be around.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, being objective, I suggest to you the story of a nudist camp we have up our way. There was a prominent Tory who went to the convention they had and he said, in telling me about it, that even the butler was nude. I said, "How did you know he was a butler?" He said, "Well, he certainly was not the maid!"

I think that you must be objective in this business and this party it not objective. In fact, we have—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): What is going on?

Mr. Sargent: I am following a good act. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) is pretty tough to follow.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The hon. member is embarrassing the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Wishart) with these risqué jokes.

Mr. Sargent: Looking around, Mr. Speaker, we have chaotic conditions in education, wasting millions of dollars—no one knows how many millions and no one will ever know how much we have lost in the school consolidation programme.

We have the hopeless expeditions into regional government—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): And pollution!

Mr. Sargent: —And pollution! I think we have a very able minister of that. We talk a lot about pollution but we only contribute about 15 per cent toward pollution. Eighty-five per cent comes from across the border so we cannot do an awful lot about it. But we can go through the motions anyway to keep the people happy.

We have these floundering programmes on assessment across the province. We are wasting millions on countless projects. Take for instance the Ontario Place. Whoever told the then Treasurer to say, "We will do a project in Ontario Place," must have rocks in his head. An architect came in with a plan of some pretty buildings and somewhere along the line, someone said, "Go ahead."

Mr. Speaker, we want to do something intelligent for this area of the city. We need a domed sports palace. We have that land down there where the old Maple Leaf Stadium used to be. That should be a domed stadium where we could have National League ball.

We have the Ontario government, the federal government, the city of Toronto and I can raise the other 25 per cent of the money through a group. We could put up a domed sports palace in the city of Toronto. We need it badly, to have major-league ball and all the other great attractions we could have here.

But, Mr. Speaker, we build a nonsensical thing like that Ontario Place, which is a laugh. It is a tribute to the objective way they look at things over there. I would like to ask—no one will ever know—who said, "Go ahead with it"? The hon. member for Don Mills (Mr. Randall) said that he did not do it. Who did it?

An hon. member: Nobody has signed a contract yet.

Mr. Sargent: We have, I think, a continuous programme down there in Ontario Place. They are continuing to fill and you will see that they are starting now on Harbour City, whether you know it or not. God knows how many millions of dollars will be committed because of friends in the know in the party.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the government, that the whole approach of this government is completely unacceptable. Eight million people directly expect positive action.

Over the years we have been listening to the new Premier—I have been sitting here listening to him and he has been very flowery in his language—using such terminology as "enrichment, both horizontal and vertical," "optimal ratio variety" and "integrated experience."

Why can we not have a more businesslike approach to doing things for people? Let us get something done here instead of all this hanky-panky and nonsense.

Mr. Lewis: No more "enrichment."

Mr. Sargent: Today, I am going to talk about such things as "the great train robbery." I am going to talk about solving the unemployment situation. I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Nixon) plan to handle this would be direct and objective and with results.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): If anybody could figure it out.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. member should listen. As long as one has a positive attitude toward these things and a desire to get something done, that is the answer for the people of Ontario.

Mr. Makarchuk: Think positive and stand on it.

Mr. Pilkey: Did the member listen to his leader's reply to the Speech from the Throne? I would like to figure that one out.

Mr. Sargent: We are pretty proud of him, and so will the people of Ontario be, when he is the new Premier.

My leader's approach—and I suggest that my approach to it, to this tragic situation, would be too—is that where hundreds of thousands of our fellow Canadians are out of work, they have not got the dignity of a pay cheque, they do not have a place to live, we should mobilize all of our resources in this province to do two things: Give every man who wants to work the dignity of a pay cheque every week and a decent place to live. And the new chairman of the—

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of University Affairs): The hon. member should be speaking to his friends in Ottawa.

Mr. Sargent: I could not agree with the hon. minister more.

Hon. Mr. White: They are the people who are plunging everybody out of work.

Mr. Sargent: Frankly, I do not think that a back-bencher, or a lowly guy like me, can get anyplace in Ottawa. I think it has to come from the Premier of this province to speak for us, because 40 per cent of the federal budget is our money.

Hon. Mr. White: We started in October, 1969, to try to get them to change those policies.

Mr. Sargent: I hope this government can, because there is no love lost here for the group down there who cannot move, who go on and say that there will have to be many more unemployed people before they solve inflation. What a shocking thing for Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Benson to say.

Mr. Makarchuk: The provincial Liberals gathered around him like fleas around a dog when he was visiting our area.

Mr. Sargent: If the member would check the record, I was not there, I do not think.

Mr. Makarchuk: The hon. member is right, but he is the only one who was not.

Mr. Pilkey: He is the only one who has sense.

Mr. Sargent: There is an old saying, Mr. Speaker, how to make \$1 million is to find a need and fill it—five words—find a need and fill it. How to solve the unemployment situation? Find a need and fill it. We have the need; we have the resources.

We have Ontario Housing Corporation; we have CMHC money; we have banks willing to give us the money. We have the people who want to work. We have the need for—an unending need for—houses that we can never catch up with. So what we do is this.

In every city across this nation we have millions and millions of square feet of empty space in vacant plants through automation—every city has millions of square feet of dead factory space. We have three-quarters of a million unemployed men who do not want welfare, they want a pay cheque.

So we take these factors. We have the space. We have the men. We have the money. The *modus operandi* should be to produce modular housing in these empty plants.

Mr. Speaker, to the leader of the government I would say this. At the time of war we can find the money to kill—to mobilize all of our resources to go to war—but in time of peace we cannot do a simple thing like giving a man a house to live in, or a job.

I say the way to do it is for this government to command all our resources here, take over these empty plants, get the financing lined up and give them modular housing, if we can get modular housing for under \$10,000—a house which will pass any building code. That is the key to the situation—a building code that will be standard across the nation. All we need is coverage on the different climatic and soil conditions to give us a building code that will do that. Here we are, still talking. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales) before this new minister appointed two committees to give us a standard building code.

They built aluminum houses—beautiful homes—on the modular system in Woodstock last year. They could not bring them into Toronto because Toronto had a building code that made them unacceptable.

So the need is there, the answer is there, and this government does nothing about it. We can take all our technology and build complex things like automobiles on the assembly line, but we cannot build a simple thing like a house on a modular plan. Any of you people who are involved in it, and many of them are very successful men—I cannot understand the hon. member for Don Mills who is out for a joyride when he could be doing something. He could have been doing something positive toward putting people to work—

Mr. Haggerty: That is why he is in the back row.

Mr. Sargent: —and filling the need for modular housing.

And that is the answer—we have their approach to housing. It is interesting to see the approach of this government to housing.

I was reading very carefully one day a very lengthy and glowing story about the man they call “Fast Eddie” Goodman. He is a director of the Cadillac Development Corporation, Rio Trust Company, Sussman Realty Corporation, along with a lot of WASPs who belong to the London Hunt Club and the country club of John Labatt Limited.

These are not my words they are in a quotation. It is a quotation from the article in *The Globe and Mail* of February 6, 1971. Now, Mr. Goodman has been the stemwinder for the party for a long time—a king-maker in the party—had it develops that he has been the biggest recipient of Ontario Housing Corporation loans for his clients and for boards on which he is a director. We have a shocking situation that these things happen. No

one will ever know what has gone on in these deals.

We have a loan to Cadillac here for \$23,929,000 for a university site condominium development in Metropolitan Toronto; a loan of \$6.5 million for student housing. They are part-owners of land in Bramalea—fortunes were made in that deal out there where we bought millions of dollars worth of land from them.

“To Bramalea Consolidated Development”—I am not going to read this whole article to the House, but this is an outline of the great power and leverage he had, to make a phone call and say, “Well, these loans are needed by our friends.” The things that bother me are that the men on the inside of this power group have the power to do these things.

It says in a building magazine that 65,000 housing units are needed in this province. With the plan I have suggested, Mr. Speaker, we would never run out of products or market. We would never run out of orders, because we could never keep up with the demand.

It is a matter of record, if the housing industry is booming, the whole economy is booming. The man who does roofing, the man who has the heating, the decorator, the painter, the plumber, the electrician, the lumber man, the brick man—the whole economy will boom if the housing business is booming. That is the key to solving unemployment in this province, but what the government does is coast.

Over the last year, they have been involved in getting set for the leadership campaign and not knowing what the hell was going on in the economy in Ontario. Now they are starting to find out that it might be good vote-getting material to say that they will give 130,000 new jobs through a housing programme; which is pie in the sky, which they know will not work and I know will not work.

In Nova Scotia they are going to build homes for \$10,500 with 3.5 per cent mortgages. Is such a plan available in Ontario? I do not think so. This is a leading story in *The Globe and Mail*, in the business section. They are going to build 55,000 of those homes down there for people earning as little as \$3,900 a year. To get a home under the Home Ownership Made Easy plan one has to earn \$8,000 a year. How ridiculous can we be, when the average wage in this country is only \$4,900 and this government says the floor for earnings is \$8,000.

We had in Hamilton—I watched a TV programme last week—a house that was 25 years old; the lady wanted to buy it but she could not because she does not make enough money. The house has been paid for once in the first 25 years. Now they are going to start her on it a second time and they will not sell it to her, but they are charging her \$135 a month for it. This is the department that the member for Don Mills handled. They have 100,000 people renting—tenants—and they cannot be fair with people and say, “The houses have paid for themselves once; now we will turn around and give them a deal on the houses.”

Mr. Speaker, it is a shocking thing. It is as simple as solving a building code. With one building code we can go to work and give people jobs and give them housing.

It is a truism that we can pay a man to go to war, to fight battles, kill people—they can train them in about five months—but if we want a man to work in a housing project, we have to have three and a half years' apprenticeship or something like that. It is so ridiculous. It has reached the position in this country—I am telling you how serious it is—that *Fortune* magazine two months ago had a story about a group in New York that had the money to build a skyscraper; it had the architects laid on; it had the land and everything. Then the union labour boss walks in and he says, “Now you are going to build this property here but here is where you are going to buy your materials. You are going to buy your steel from so and so. You are going to buy your cement here. You are going to buy your heating, electrical equipment and so on here and here. We will tell you where to buy your materials because if you do not, we will not build it for you.”

That is how far we have come in this country, in this democracy. And it is coming into Ontario too; do not kid yourself that it is not. The very fact that we have—

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): It will not.

Mr. Sargent: The member had better not kid himself that it is not.

Mr. Makarchuk: Is that in Ontario?

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the new Minister of Labour (Mr. Carton)—who, I think, will do a great job—

Mr. Pilkey: I would like to see him document that case.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the minister to find out how much of our money goes out of Ontario across the border to American unions.

Mr. Yakabuski: Oh, shame. Is it still going?

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): The hon. minister might tell us how much comes back too.

Mr. Sargent: It would be very important to find that out. But to go back to the simple fact—

Mr. Pilkey: That would solve all the unemployment, if we can find that out.

Mr. Sargent: It should not be hard to find that out simply because it is wrong. We should run our own show here.

Mr. Pitman: Just try and fight General Motors.

Mr. Pilkey: Why does the government not run General Motors too, then? Why does it not take over Ford, Chrysler and American Motors?

Mr. Sargent: It is a shocking fact that a man can be in jail in the United States, but he can be the most powerful man in America and he can call a strike in Canada if he wants to—from a jail cell in the United States.

Mr. Yakabuski: Is that right? That is terrible!

Mr. Pitman: Has the member ever heard of a democratic union process? By law they vote for a strike, you know.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. member hopes they do. He hopes they do. Mr. Speaker, I think that I have made it amply clear—

Mr. Pilkey: The hon. member was doing well until then.

Mr. Sargent: The member does not have to worry about me. I will do all right.

Mr. Pilkey: The hon. member was doing well until then. He has killed the speech.

Mr. Sargent: I think that I have established the fact that if there was a sincere desire on the part of this very floundering group over there to solve the housing programme in a process by which they could put people back to work and give them jobs—

Do you know a fact? A man came into my office the other day for welfare. He sat back and said: "I did not get my cheque—\$370." We had a job for him. The job only amounted to \$300 a month. He said: "I do not want that job." I said: "You go out and take that job, or else." He leaned back and took out a fresh cigarette and he said: "I know my rights. Get my cheque."

That is how far we have come in this welfare state.

And the government can put people to work and give them the dignity of having a job! It is a shocking thing when these people can walk in and demand a cheque or else, because they know their rights. Who is running this store anyway? A business is not run that way.

Mr. Pilkey: The Tories have mismanaged it terribly.

Mr. Sargent: While I am getting the House pretty mad, I think I would like to take a whack at the boys in Ottawa for a minute.

Mr. Yakabuski: That is right.

Mr. Sargent: We have a story here in February 3 *Hansard*, on the House of Commons debate. Hon. Mr. Sharp was asked a question. He states, Mr. Speaker, that they made a loan of \$207 million to India with a maturity of 50 years at an interest rate of zero per cent.

The shocking thing about it is that we have in this country—40 per cent of the money going into Ottawa comes from Ontario—we have eggheads down there who are running around the world and who have never worked in business. They have always been parasites working for the government, never knowing how to run a business, never having had to meet a payroll; and they have the right to go around the world making loans like this when we have three quarters of a million people out of work.

I suggest to those of you who have been in government, a debenture for a school issue—

Mr. Pilkey: Going from continentalism to isolationism in one step.

Mr. Sargent: —a debenture for a school issue doubles over 20 years because of the interest factor. If we can have the same treatment, if our people in Canada can get interest-free loans in that magnitude, our school buildings would cost us half what they do.

Further, the Premier of this province and the Treasurer took me apart the other day because I questioned the fact that he should not go down to Ottawa and say, "We want the same treatment." I do not care who you are. They decried the fact that I was a poor citizen.

I do not mind foreign aid but I say that charity should begin at home. How can you tell 30 or 40 men who come into your office looking for work that it is going to cure inflation? You cannot do those things. I should suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this government, that our Prime Minister should go to Ottawa and say: "The foreign aid programme is this. Interest-free loans are this." I think it is time we should get our share of the pot.

Mr. Trudeau goes down to Indonesia and he gives away \$50 and \$60 million to countries which have never even heard of Canada. The great largesse of this man!

Mr. Pitman: Oh, for heaven's sake.

An hon. member: What does the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) say to that one?

Mr. Sargent: I think it is high time we had this government of ours go down and lay the cards on the table and say: "We are not in favour of such foreign aid giveaways." If they are reciprocal, if we are getting industry back, then there is merit in it, but a lot of these deals are not reciprocal. They are long-term deals.

Mr. Pitman: Will the member for Sudbury get to his fellow member?

Mr. Sargent: Those of you who are knowledgeable about finance would know that with a \$200 million loan over 50 years the commuted value in interest rate would be fantastic. It would probably be half a billion dollars on that one factor. But no one seems to think about things like that any more.

Where are we going? We argue about thousands of dollars here when they give away millions and hundreds of millions. So it is important that we assess what we as Ontario are giving toward the foreign aid programme.

The total amount, I understand, is \$400 million a year. It is a shocking thing that we do nothing about it from the area we stand in.

Mr. Pitman: It is a good deal less than it should be.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, we have had quite a lot of talk in this Legislature—

Mr. Pilkey: The argument should be that we ought to be able to do both.

Mr. Pitman: And do a better job of it.

Mr. Sargent: They are cutting off our rail systems. Mr. Sharp was in Africa last month. He gave away a \$14 million loan to help them with their locomotives in Africa. We have watched Mr. Pickersgill voting himself a \$41,000 job before he quit the Treasury Board, and now he gets into bed with the CNR and CPR and he figures he will help them cut off their passenger service.

Over the years, we in the outlying parts of Ontario have seen these railroads deliberately discourage passenger service, doubling the rates, running the schedules at awkward times and slowing down the service. It is a matter of record that they made a deal with the people of Canada when they received the millions of acres of land in perpetuity, and they have now reneged. Here we are now without rail service to western Ontario.

I call on this government through the Minister of Highways and Transport (Mr. MacNaughton) to investigate the need for setting up a Railpax service. In the United States, realizing that rail passenger service is not ever a paying operation—in every administration and jurisdiction in Europe, they are all subsidized heavily by the government—so, realizing this, the United States granted to Congress \$240 million to a commission called the Railpax commission. It is time that something was done for my area, western Ontario, for the need for a rail system.

I can go on and deal with this at great length, but the fact is that in every area in Europe the whole economy is geared to a rail system and it is fully subsidized. In Germany they are now talking about having trains that will go 250 to 300 miles per hour. They have 20,000 passenger trains being run in Germany, with 13,000 freight trains daily, fully subsidized by the government.

I think it is time that we had an immediate decision by the government as to what they are going to do. If they are going to go to the people for an election, they can bet their boots, I say to the House leader, that they will not get any votes in the areas where you have cut down the train service because the people cannot assess whether it was their fault or the federal government's. Because the government will not move on it,

the federal Minister of Transport would not take any positive action to appeal the ruling of the board.

Mr. Yakabuski: Trudeau did that!

Mr. Sargent: I do not know whether the hon. member knows what he is talking about, but if he does, sharpen up.

Mr. Speaker, we have watched the arrogance of this government over the years. We have suggested that they set up a purchasing department and every year, they say, "Yes, we are going to do it." In the Province of Alberta, the first year they set up a purchasing department and with their small budget they saved \$5 million.

An hon. member: They are not doing it here.

Mr. Sargent: That is right. The projection here was that it was going to save from \$10 to \$25 million a year through a purchasing department. One day, my colleague from Guelph, who was an old-time mayor of the city and knows what goes on in purchasing in government, asked the Prime Minister, "What about the purchasing department?" The Prime Minister did not even know they had one.

It turned out that the department had a payroll of about \$100,000 a year, but they had not bought anything through purchasing. I guess it was just there, that was all. That is why I think, Mr. Speaker, if they ever put television into this place, it is going to be a circus. When the people see how you operate things—and you have a ball yourself—you would probably get your own quiz show afterwards.

I think it must be embarrassing to be a member of the Conservative government when you see all the ministers now in the back row, demoted. They will have to have some new blood to see if they can make things work. I think what the people of Ontario will do is to say that the Liberals are the only alternative they have.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that a very serious area in my riding is the crisis in farming. We have the case of cattlemen who suggest that the prices farmers and ranchers got for cattle in 1950, compared with what they get today, are about the same. There has been no increase in 20 years. We watched, last week, the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) going to bat for the brooders and the chicken people. Sometimes I wondered, knowing your attitude toward setting up the FAME

programme, that he would not go to bat or give them a loan of \$1 million, which would have solved the needs of the beef cattle industry for many years to come. All they want is \$1 million credit, and this government turned them down because I suspect that Minister of Agriculture and Food and the member for London North were too friendly with the big people like Canada Packers and Swifts.

It was going to set up an empire against the packing company, and this could never happen. But we have here, in this area of farming, a real crisis. The junior farmers loan programme has been cut off. In Quebec, they subsidize at five per cent so that the net cost of a loan there is two-and-a-half per cent. But a farmer in this province cannot get that treatment, so how can he compete with the Quebec farmer?

Why has this government not done anything about a rental purchase agreement for farm equipment, something now afforded in the United States? But nothing like that happens here to help the farmer. Why not think of forgivable loans for farmers? They do it for industry.

Has anyone ever thought of beef crop insurance for beef cattle farmers? It is revolutionary, but a lot of the beef cattle people are thinking and talking about it. But not this government!

Why not standardize farm machinery and parts, with computerized parts departments around the province?

There was an interesting article—the hon. member for Yorkview will be interested to hear I read the *Observer* the other day, the United Church bible. I do not suggest at all that I am religious because I read this magazine but this article says, "The farmer does not get a fair share of the national income." It goes on to say:

Late in 1970 the price of whole milk paid to dairy farmers shipping to Metropolitan Toronto dairies was increased to \$6.85 per hundredweight. This is what the affluent farmer in one of the richest farm areas of Canada receives.

Dairymen shipping milk to cheese factories and to other processors receive \$3.85 per hundredweight. Such a farmer, if he has a good herd and farms efficiently, may be expected to produce up to 400 lb. of milk a day from 15 milking cows on a 100-acre family farm. Most farmers complain that this estimate is too high, but we prefer to err on the high side of it.

This will require his full-time work plus substantial help from a hired man or the family or both. A heavy investment in stock, equipment, land and buildings is required. Fertilizer must be purchased. There will be taxes, insurance, replacements and repairs and all those expenses necessary to carry on a business. All of these factors go into this operation. There will be deductions from the \$6.85 price for haulage, 40 or 50 cents, marketing fees, and so on, and that portion of the milk which is surplus to the farmer's quota will be paid for at a lesser price.

Such a farmer, Mr. Speaker, will gross a maximum—and this is a very generous estimate—of \$25 a day and out of this, his expenses and wages and help must be paid. Based on the average of the above, the gross income for seven days, a week's work, for himself and his helpers, will be \$175. The average manufacturing wage is now \$122. In mining and milling, it is \$154. In construction, it is \$176. As for doctors and lawyers, editors and architects—I could say politicians—but that is something else.

The only way we may expect the family farm to survive is to invent a new kind of miracle cow that will produce double the milk and require no feed. One inescapable deduction is that the Canadian farmer does not receive a fair share of the national income—and this is very true because in my area we have the lowest farm income of any province or any county in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to suggest, in closing, that I have made my points quite clear on the suicidal road we are going along with nuclear power development. We are committed to a \$1 billion programme between Ontario Hydro and AEC. Regardless of how many times we talk about this, no one seems to know the route they are going.

We do know that the target is for more power and that is the reason for the whole operation. But the fact of the matter is that regardless of all the hardships they have along the way in trying to make heavy water, this process, and I have said it before, is the same process they were using before in 10 countries in Europe. It never once did work. They cannot make it work in Nova Scotia; and now we are trying it here in this province with Hydro. The fact of the matter is that the authorities state, regardless of whether or not it works, if it does work the total product will be less than one half of one per

cent of the load needed, so we are 99.5 per cent off target—and it is costing us up to \$1 billion.

I asked the chairman of Hydro at the hearings what happens if he is wrong again; he said, "Then we have lost \$1 billion and we will try something else." The point I am trying to make is can we afford to shoot for a target of power for 1990, when so many of our people are out of work? They cannot get a home to live in yet we are launched into this programme.

This is one of the things that there should be a royal commission to investigate because no one seems to know what is happening. Mr. Speaker, I have told you what the Nixon approach to unemployment will be. I think it will work.

I have not talked to any authority who says it would not work. I have talked to housing people, to builders, to bankers, to businessmen. It would work to put people, all of the people, back to work if we had the desire to do it.

Somebody asked me what was wrong, what was the matter with Queen's Park—

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Too many Conservatives.

Mr. Sargent: That is the time, right now!

I think we could answer that by saying it is nothing that an election would not cure. We are advised, Mr. Speaker, that the budget will be announced on April 22—

Mr. Bukator: April 26.

Mr. Sargent: April 26, I am sorry.

An hon member: They have not got the money right now.

An hon. member: That is just in case the government back-benchers do not know.

Mr. Sargent: All provincial programmes then will come to this focal point, the announcing of the budget. The director of this instrument—I am amazed as to where he gets his knowledge—this man is an authority on everything.

Mr. Haggerty: He is an expert.

Mr. Sargent: I do not know one thing that this provincial Treasurer is not an authority on. He made a hell of a mess of regional government and now we put him in the most important post of government. This man who is floundering—

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): If the member spent as much time doing something instead of criticizing—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: The member knows he does not mean that; he hurt my feelings.

The announcing of the budget, Mr. Speaker, is a focal point. The director of this instrument must estimate the needs and resources, evaluate the programmes and help make decisions about the allocation of funds. That is the essence; the whole essence of government is the allocation of resources. Recognizing that no one should suffer for education because of geography and no one should suffer for a job because of geography or no one should suffer for hospital care because of geography, the job of government is the allocation of resources; and this man is going to have the allocation of funds. In a very real sense, Mr. Speaker, this budget is an instrument of policy as well as an accounting device.

At least, I would regard it as such. The provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker, seems to regard himself as an executive, infallible. In my limited education, I took a bit of Latin. I never got past fifth form in high school, but the word, "executive," is a derivative of the word "executioner." This is the terminology; it means "executus." But he is an executioner, this man. As budget director, and in his lofty opinion of himself, he plays the role well as the executioner. If a budget is the financial expression of a plan—and I again regard it as such—I feel sorry for the taxpayers of Ontario, who have to dance to the tune that he sets for us.

In closing in a kinder vein, I think that all of us are striving for the same thing. I say to all members in a kindly way, that they cannot hope to change the whole world, but they can change the corner upon which they live. While they are doing their area, let us help my area too.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) is right on one point, and that is that this debate has taken on the character of an unemployment debate. Maybe I am just going to take the time to add a little bit more to it on unemployment.

A few weeks ago, or a few days ago actually, I rose in this House and asked the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr.

Bernier) a question concerning the closing of the Cobalt refinery. The question I asked him, in view of the fact that that day was the last day that Cobalt refinery would accept ore, was could the minister give the House some indication of the present status of negotiations between his department and Cobalt refinery and the various mines in the Cobalt area. The minister rose and said, "Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice and report back."

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): It was not put into limbo either.

Mr. Jackson: Well, he did report back. His answer was almost taken word for word from a comment made by the former minister. It is my opinion the former minister actually dictated the answer for the new minister.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: He did not.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): The minister should not argue with him.

Mr. Jackson: But the important thing, Mr. Speaker, the very important thing, is the fact that today the Cobalt refinery is closed. Today, in a town of 2,300, we have lost 90 more jobs with a possibility of somewhere in the neighbourhood of 480 jobs going down the drain.

The minister in his wisdom and the government in its wisdom have decided that, because of the cost of trying to save the refinery and for various other reasons that they have not made known to the people of Cobalt, the Cobalt refinery was expendable. It could be done without, and the people of the Cobalt area could do their own worrying about what they would do for jobs.

I would just like to tell the House some of the facts behind the Cobalt refinery closing. Several months ago, near the first of the year, the Cobalt refinery told all of the mines that were presently shipping to that refinery, that after March 31, it would no longer accept ores at the present rate for refining.

This meant that, as of March 31, because the mines were not willing to pay the extra rate, or could not pay the extra rate, the refinery closed down. Immediately we had the men who were presently employed at that refinery out of jobs. But the most important aspect of it was that now these mines in the Cobalt and Gowanda area that were

shipping to the Cobalt refinery are now forced to ship out of Canada to have the ore smelted.

Several months ago, or two or three years ago, the then Minister of Mines rose in this House and said that he was making certain amendments to The Mining Act, section 106, that would compel companies mining in Ontario to process ores in Ontario; at least to the intermediate step. What he did in Cobalt was to give another exemption to that Act, another exemption to add to the 23 already existing exemptions, and in fact made a mockery of everything he said in this House when he—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could interject on a point of privilege. The member is failing to point out, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to finish my speech, then surely the minister can answer me.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister is entitled to rise on a point of privilege, but not to make a speech. Now if he will state his point of privilege, we can perhaps deal with it. Otherwise the hon. member may continue with the remainder of his speech.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I will not elaborate any further. I would just say that I will speak after the member is finished, but I would ask him to put all the facts on the record, please.

Mr. Speaker: That, of course, is not a matter of privilege. The hon. member will continue.

Mr. Jackson: Just let me go to what the former Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) said. He said his department scoured the possibility of extending government aid to the refinery in the form of grants or loans, and he said this was no answer at all because the refinery is an uneconomic operation. Fine!

He said the refinery holds an uneconomically large inventory of refined and concentrated silver valued at \$3 million. My information says it is almost three times that much money. It must pay a large amount of interest, he said, on the money it borrowed to pay for that silver in the first place.

That, Mr. Speaker, I do not disagree with. The mine was in economic trouble because of poor management, or the smelter was in economic trouble because of poor management. We do not disagree with that point.

Let us go on to say what Mr. Jim Armstrong, a former mine manager in the area and now a consulting engineer, said about that very point. He said the refinery was charging the mines 15 to 16 cents for a contained ounce of silver, and it would need double that amount in order to break even, which would mean 30 to 32 cents. I do not argue with that, but can the minister stand after I am finished, or at any other time in this House, and tell me how those mines which could not afford 30 cents for smelting can afford now to ship their ore to New Jersey to have it smelted?

It may be that the smelter was uneconomical at that point, but the very action of the closing of the refinery has made all of those mines uneconomic. What do we do about them? Do we close them down too? Surely that is going to be the result of the minister's decision to allow them to ship out of the country.

It also says that in some of the letters I received from the former minister and from various members of this government. Like the one I received from the present Premier (Mr. Davis):

"I have received your letter of February 25 with regard to the close of the Cobalt refineries. I want to assure you that I am quite aware of the situation and quite concerned about it. We are trying to do all we can to solve the problem, including reviewing alternative employment opportunities in the area.

I am referring your letter to the hon. Leo Bernier and would suggest you keep in touch with him to keep up with the latest developments.

Yet when I asked that very minister what was being done, he had no answer for me because he did not know.

Is there no communication between the Premier of this province and the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs? That is surely what I get out of that.

Several weeks after the closing was announced I wrote to the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs and asked, in effect, would he show us in black and white that the smelter had to close because they were in economic trouble? Would he show us where he had negotiated or where he had sat down with that smelter, or the smelter management?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It is a private company, the hon. member knows that.

Mr. Jackson: On the basis of that comment, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that there were no negotiations between the smelter management and this government.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There certainly were.

Mr. Jackson: When he says it is a private company, then what he is saying is that they have accepted the company's ultimatum that they are going to close down and they have allowed it. That being what it is, fine and dandy.

But I ask, could this government, could The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs show the people of the Cobalt area—could they show anyone—in black and white, whether the smelter be in New Jersey or wherever that smelter seems to be in the United States, could they show us signed contracts that they would accept the ores from these various mines in the Cobalt-Gowganda area?

We still have not received any answer to that. We have been ignored. The people of the Cobalt area still are up in the air as to what their future is. And when I say the people of Cobalt-Gowganda I mean literally that, because 470 jobs represents about one-fifth of the population of the Cobalt area.

I ask the minister again, Mr. Speaker, through you, when he rises in this House to reply to what I have to say, will he show us in black and white that the smelters in the United States will accept the ores if they are shipped to them? And will he show us in black and white the rates that they are going to charge? Will he tell us whether those rates are comparable with the rates that were asked by the Cobalt smelting company? Will he show us, in black and white, the rail and transportation cost figures from the Cobalt-Gowganda area to the smelters in the United States?

If he can do that and he can convince me that it is cheaper to ship to the United States then maybe he has a point, but at this very moment I do not think he can show us that.

The people of the Cobalt area made a very good suggestion that obviously was ignored. We asked that, in view of the fact that there was a good chance that the smelter would close, that the government, through The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs, would consider expanding the facilities of the Timiskaming testing laboratories. This is a government-owned laboratory that has been profitable over the years and has taken a lot of money out of the Cobalt area from the Cobalt mines. We asked that it would take

over the relevant portions of the Cobalt refinery and operate them, as part of the testing laboratories, to smelt the ore from that area.

We asked, failing that, whether they would go in and do a feasibility study on whether or not the Cobalt refinery could be expanded to handle other ores, other metals, and thus become an economically feasible smelter or refinery.

It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, quite obvious, that the government went up and sat down with the Cobalt refinery—Kam-Kotia—management and when Kam-Kotia said “we are not going to run it any longer, and we are not going to give up any figures to prove that we cannot run it, because we do not care what happens to the people of the Cobalt area, and we do not care what the government says about it,” the government accepted that, and it put out a nice little release which says, “Now we will exempt the Cobalt area mines from section 106 of The Mining Act.”

Mr. Speaker, one might well ask the Conservative government of Ontario when does it really intend to break Ontario into two provinces?

In *The Globe and Mail* of February 11, 1971, the new Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) is quoted as saying: “Northern Ontario could stand as a separate province.”

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to suggest that the hon. minister is in favour of such a division, but it is my intention to suggest that it has become a very real possibility in the minds of many high-ranking persons in the Tory government.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Sopha for the first Lieutenant Governor.

An hon. member: The member will have to stop smoking.

Mr. Jackson: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, economic separation has already begun, as witnessed by the development plans for northern Ontario. The development plans for northwestern Ontario and the plan for the development of northeastern Ontario were done in complete isolation. In no way were they integrated with the plan for south central Ontario, southwestern Ontario, or the Toronto-centred region plan.

In spite of the optimistic statements in the two northern plans, it is quite obvious that the Conservatives intend to promote the growth of the Toronto-centred region by even further exploiting the resources, both natural and human, of northern Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: What does the member mean "obvious?" That is what they said!

Mr. Jackson: I must agree for once with the member for Sudbury—that is exactly what they said.

Mr. Sopha: They said the resources of the north will be manufactured down here—run a test.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Speaker, I do not need the aid of the member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: What we should do is build a Chinese wall and keep you all out. Tell the Prime Minister and his gang to stay out.

Mr. Jackson: Sudbury could do with a member who would stand on his feet and speak.

Mr. Speaker, on page 4 of the Toronto-centred plan it states quite clearly the possibility of increasing the economic role of the southern region by processing resources which currently originate in northern Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: Is that what it says?

Mr. Jackson: Just let me quote from that:

Because of the location within the Great Lakes - St. Lawrence megalopolis, the Toronto-centred region probably can increase its economic role in processing resources which currently originate in northern Ontario—

Mr. Sopha: The Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Wishart) does not agree with that, does he?

Mr. Jackson: Still growing:

—and move to major markets in the Chicago-Detroit-Cleveland industrial area.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what it says to us, and what it says to the people in Cobalt and Gowganda who stand to lose their jobs, you see, is the government does not really care. It does not really care because it intends to move the smelting and refining process out of northern Ontario anyway. In spite of their high-sounding promises they really intend to move out.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): You have to feed those hungry industries in the "golden horseshoe."

Mr. Jackson: Well, let me just quote what it says in the plan for development in north-eastern Ontario. It says that:

These might include the encouragement of further processing of primary products within the region and the establishment of industries to support the export or basic industry.

It is in direct contradiction to what it says in the Toronto-centred region plan. Surely you cannot process resources in the south and process resources in the north and have an integrated plan?

What they are really saying is, "We are going to go ahead with the Toronto plan" and because this is only phase 1 of the analysis, by the time the poor people of northern Ontario find out what they are going to do it will be too darned late.

Let me just quote another little letter I have here—a clipping from the *Northern Daily News* of Tuesday, March 30, 1971. It is the result of an interview between the press and the new Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs. The minister said he will continue to use pressure and lobbying tactics to focus attention of the provincial government on northern Ontario. He went on to say he has used the pressure type of tactics since his election to Queen's Park in 1966.

Mr. Stokes: That is Leo the lion, is it not?

Mr. Sopha: That is the old Bernier before he became a minister.

Mr. Jackson: And he went on to say he had the message about problems facing northern Ontario.

But there is a little bit in between. He said he was prepared to seek the leadership of the Conservative Party last month unless the five announced candidates spoke about programmes for the north.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you he was prepared to seek the candidacy for the leadership of the party unless they promised him a cushy position, which he got. If any pressure was put on for the people of northern Ontario it was for one person in northern Ontario. Because it surely has not been shown to the people in northeastern Ontario that he is working for them.

Mr. Sopha: He became the leader. He is one of them. Well sure, they bought him off.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): That is putting it on the line.

Mr. Jackson: But something else that comes out and illustrates the point even further. He said he still considers the work

of a provincial member for the Kenora riding as his primary job at Queen's Park. "The Kenora constituents sent me here in the first place," he said.

Mr. Speaker, I say that is a lot of baloney. The people of Kenora sent the hon. member here—the people of Ontario pay his wages. The people of Ontario—northeastern Ontario, north-central Ontario, southern Ontario—deserve as much as the people of Kenora from the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs. If he uses a parochial situation such as he has indicated—

Mr. Stokes: That statement was just endorsed by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman).

Mr. Jackson: —to do something for the people of Kenora that he would not do for the rest of the people in this province, then maybe he should step down and let somebody who does look after the overall good of the province take his place.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): They would have complained anyway if a member from the north had not been appointed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Jackson: Just as a little aside, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Sopha: What is the member for Don Mills muttering for up there? Is it true he is the new doorman at the Constellation?

Mr. Randall: The member for Sudbury got the job.

Mr. Jackson: —we have been talking about unemployment in northeastern Ontario—

Mr. Sopha: There is a doorman unemployed.

Mr. Jackson: —and in the *United Church Observer* under the editorial columns there is a little article that says:

Resisting policies which could create unemployment is a church job. We were disappointed a year ago by the lack of response in the *United Church* to our editorials on unemployment. We had hoped that the pulpits would thunder, the presbyteries would echo and the politicians would note denunciations of policies adopted by Ottawa designed to fight inflation, but which it was arrogantly admitted would put men out of work. The only vigorous response came from the Liberals who damned us for criticizing Mr. Trudeau.

Mr. Sopha: Who would dare to criticize him? Who would dare? His wife would not dare do that.

Mr. Stokes: The member for Sudbury has done just that.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Speaker, in going on I say that we are disappointed. We thought that maybe a northern minister would have something on the ball.

We are very disappointed, but surely not surprised. Because for 26 years it has been the Tory platform to ignore us in northeastern Ontario. In "Manpower Review," 1970, December, we have a nice point that says:

In the Kirkland Lake area Upper Canada Mines expect to phase out their gold workings in two or three years. At New Liskeard the Glen Lake mine and the Hi-ho Silver mine have indefinitely suspended their operations. In addition, the Cobalt smelter has cut back staff operations by 50 per cent.

So it was not at the first of this year that the government started to learn. They knew four of five months ahead of time, and they did nothing about it.

In the March/April "Manpower Review" it says:

A better note was recently sounded for the northern Ontario lumber industry, and particularly for the town of Elk Lake in the Kirkland Lake district, when it was revealed that this community was one of two sites being considered by a west German concern for the establishment of a \$50 million forestry complex. The other site is in New Brunswick.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, I rose in the House in the question period and I asked the Minister of Lands and Forests whether his department was in active negotiations with this company—this west German company we are talking about—and what was status of the negotiations at that time.

The Minister of Lands and Forests rose in his seat and told me he knew nothing about them. Yet for weeks before that announcement by the minister in this House, the northern papers had touted the possibility of a pulp complex in Elk Lake. It is in the "Ontario Manpower Review," and yet the minister responsible in this House knew nothing about it. The government knew nothing about it because it wanted to know nothing about it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to belabour the point. All I am saying today is that if this government intends to do anything for northeastern Ontario, it surely has not come through to us.

There is another point that sticks in my mind and bothers me very, very much. Mr. Speaker, in "A Design for Development: Northeastern Ontario Region"—it is a volume of some 300 pages, 296 to be exact. It has various graphs, various analyses of different things in northeastern Ontario; and yet the Minister of Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) is quoted as saying, while still the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs, during an interview at the Conservative convention: "We have not had anyone there to look at the whole problem."

If that is a fact, why do we have this volume that says "Phase I Analysis"? How do you analyze without looking at it?

I can tell you how it was done. It was done by using the 1961 census, which is 10 years too late. It was done by using a survey done by the northeastern Ontario regional development council which used a budget of \$5,000 to send out questionnaires to the people on "what do you want?" with a list of questions that were right out of the Tory guidebook. And then it was put together in this volume—this volume of nothings—to convince us in northeastern Ontario that surely now something was going to be done.

Well I for one do not believe it!

Mr. Speaker, it is not just a question of retaining the young people in northern Ontario. It is a question of attracting new people into northern Ontario. And when the former Minister of Mines says "We have not had anyone up there to look at it yet," the Tories said, "Well, we are not going to send anyone because they rejected Mr. Lawrence at the polls, and are now rejecting the new Mines Minister in this Legislature." In saying so they are rejecting the people of northeastern Ontario and northern Ontario as a whole. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, we will reject the Conservative administration during the next election.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The hon. member had better start working.

Mr. Stokes: I thought the Minister of Northern Affairs repudiated that spokesman for the north?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: He is in some pretty serious trouble in his own riding—this is his last pitch right now.

Mr. Jackson: At the same time, such a statement from the then Minister of Mines makes a mockery of his own development conferences, which he held in Timmins, Sudbury and in the Lakehead, which he now currently admits were nothing but a sham, and of the development plans for all of northern Ontario, in fact, which, Mr. Speaker, are now shown to be the worst kind of election gimmick. There are those of us in the north and in this party who believe in a fully integrated Ontario, in a fully employed Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: That is what the former Premier (Mr. Robarts) used to profess. He believed it.

Mr. Jackson: We believe a fully integrated, fully employed Ontario is possible and desirable.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Have to get rid of Pierre first.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: And Marchand.

Mr. Jackson: We are willing to work, even if the Tory government is not. Mr. Speaker, in closing I would just remind the other side of this House that a strong Ontario is a united Ontario. That is something we have been told by the Tories many times, but they obviously do not believe it themselves.

Mr. J. R. Simonett (Frontenac-Addington): The member should look in the mirror when he gets up in the morning.

Mr. Jackson: This is a fact that the Tories have not recognized, despite their electioneering slogans and visions. I was almost ready to sit down, Mr. Speaker, when I just remembered another little slap in the face we got in northeastern Ontario—

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): There he is across there.

Mr. Jackson: —not a slap in the face, a kick in the face—when the Tory government took a man, who is obviously incompetent to hold two portfolios in this House in my time, and created a job for him because they could not find any place to put him.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Dump him, dump him!

Mr. Jackson: They dumped him—

Mr. Makarchuk: No place to dump him!

Mr. Jackson: And where did they dump him? The same place the Minister—

Mr. Makarchuk: Northern Ontario.

Mr. Jackson: —of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr) was going to dump the DDT, on the poor people of northeastern Ontario and the mines.

Mr. Makarchuk: Better warn those people.

Mr. Jackson: Let me tell you the ONR has not been the most efficient railroad in Canada over the years, but as of now it is going to become less and less and less effective—

Mr. Simonett: The member is going to make it that way, is he?

Mr. Ferrier: Is the member conceding us victory?

Mr. Jackson: —unless, like the Tory government, the people of Ontario choose to dump the same person in the next election. Maybe then we will get some results.

Mr. Simonett: The member wants to watch that he does not get dumped. Do not worry about me.

Mr. Makarchuk: Is that the member's job up there?

Mr. Ferrier: The member is not going to run again?

Mr. Jackson: I would just like in closing to tell the hon. members on the other side of this House, if I am elected again—and I am going to be elected again—it is going to be because of the policies that they have obviously displayed in the northeastern, northwestern, south-central and all through Ontario, their policies for development. They are nothing more than a lot of bunk printed on paper. The people of northern Ontario know this and they will show it in the next election.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate, I first of all wish to congratulate the new Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) and leader of the Ontario government.

I wish also to congratulate you, sir, in your handling of this House and your deliberations on our behalf in most controversial situations, from time to time, and in good peaceful operations at others.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Yes, things have been almost too peaceful with you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I also wish to congratulate the seven newly appointed ministers of the Crown.

Mr. Sopha: Is that how many there were? Seven? Where did the member go wrong?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: The Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Apps), the Minister of Labour (Mr. Carton)—

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): He supported the wrong man, I guess?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: —the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier), the Minister of Revenue (Mr. White), and the three Ministers without Portfolio (Mr. Snow, Mr. Potter, Mr. Dunlop).

Mr. Sopha: Who did the member support at the convention?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I supported my principles!

Mr. Sopha: I did not know he was a candidate.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Mr. Speaker, much has been done towards security for our people.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): What school?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: It is apparent that much is being done to direct this province toward a path of recovery that will provide people with work, that conforms with broad principles of that policy.

The greatest ability present in Ontario to move out of the problem of employable people being now unemployed, in my opinion rests at the local community level. It is here that this government must increase its effort of assistance. The dictates of a sound administration require that every effort be made, in the first instance, toward an increased local one. I, for one, do not believe that this is the only need for this government to infuse dollars into that community, but rather a combination of assistance.

Let us, for one thing, strip from our simple purpose the confusion that results from a multiplicity of detail and from millions of written and spoken words. Among our objectives, I suggest, first, must be the security of the men, women and children of this province. This must remain our first and continuing task and, in a very real sense, every major legislative enactment of this session should be

a component part of it. The security of a livelihood can be secured through the better use of this province's resources, better use of the land in which we live.

Let me point out one instance, in particular, that can affect the area in which I live. This is the uranium ore body in the eastern part of Haliburton county. We have large known reserves, presently in the ownership of several companies. But these are not quite of economic percentage to warrant the creation of a milling operation, on any one part itself. However we have, a few miles away, a mine of high grade reserves in quantity that does permit the establishment of a milling operation. This government, I believe, has a direct responsibility to call together all those groups with a direct purpose of a co-operative development of a mill that would utilize all the ores and work toward a long-range or long-term operation. In this way security of personal investment and public investment by local government can be assured, in the best interest of all the people of the community.

Security against the major hazards of life is a wide area of this government's concern. It must not overlook improvement in the opportunity of our people to direct their working efforts toward a future of their own design and making. We find our population suffering from some old inequalities—little changed or not changed enough.

In spite of our talk, we have not effectively lifted up the underprivileged. In building toward this end, we must take great care we do not destroy or harm ambition. We also must continue to recognize the greater ability of some to earn more than others. Our people now, more than ever, assert that the ambition of the individual to obtain for him and his, a proper security, a reasonable leisure, and a decent living throughout life, as an ambition to be preferred to the appetite for great wealth and great power.

Many of us believe that there must be an up-grading of the place for a person in the image presented of the individual's value to Ontario in being in business so that our young bright minds have worthwhile further direction. I believe it is existing and future industry that will be our greatest help toward the opportunity for people to earn a decent livelihood.

Business in Ontario today is expected to meet social concerns of our people, either directly or indirectly. There appears no end to the challenges to be met. It includes inflation, foreign competition, unsatisfactory productivity, and in many areas increasing gov-

ernment regulation. Rising costs have damaged our competitive position, both at home and in other countries, with some of our production. Business must be protected by our government from new and unnecessary social costs if it is to be the main vehicle by which new and more jobs are created and to take its proper place in relieving unemployment problems.

What sort of business do I mean? Surely, the sort of legitimate and honourable business—that business which is of advantage both to buyer and seller and to producer, distributor and to consumer alike, whether individuals or nations—which makes common some useful thing which has been rare, or makes accessible to the people good things which have been within reach only of the few. We mean that great art of production and exchange which through the centuries has increased human comfort, cherished peace, fostered the fine arts, developed the pregnant principle of associated action and promoted both public security and public liberty.

The third security I wish to make some remarks about concerns the need for decent homes. Whether these are permanent or summer homes only, there is cause for immediate remedy by this government. I refer in particular to the present chaos in land development and planning. The sheer size of this problem in rural Ontario is beyond any one person's ability to conceive at this moment in time.

A recent decision from consideration by a provincial judge in Peterborough, Ontario, on a vendor's and purchaser's application involvement with deeds and severalty has led to this reference of chaos.

Hundreds of titles being filed in registry offices, that are bypassing consideration by our planning branch at 801 Bay Street, must have immediate action, as it really highlights the frustration with the present processing operation of this branch. Why, otherwise, would so many use a process that leaves some doubt as to valid title? This matter I brought to the attention of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) in detail.

Creating homes in the winter season is a problem—but why not consider waiving municipal taxes for the first year or several years on homes so created? Such a subsidy to any homeowner who builds at this time would be a good incentive. Even a basic grant, per home, to the municipality in lieu of taxes to cover this programme is not beyond consideration. One of the ironies about this Legislature has been the millions of words expressed about 12 per cent of our housing—they are

very few in comparison—about having our families own their own homes.

In the limited time I have today, I only touched on the stark fact before us that great numbers are unemployed. A large proportion have been placed in this position by conditions which were not so much local as national.

One national concern is the change-over to the metric system. We, as a province, should look at this future requirement which will face our people, our industry, our educational system and our way of life. It will update our plants, create jobs and improve our export opportunities. Let us take a good look at this with a view to not only what it means to our future, but what it can do for us in the short term in Ontario.

The second national concern that many feel may involve Ontario people is the real possibility that a value added tax may be applied in the United States.

The possible options that may be available to the Americans in connection with their exports could be of great concern to us in competition. It requires us to look into this and decide our policy as a province because we would immediately be involved in joint discussion with our federal people. These are two things we can keep in close touch with that will determine how well we can protect our present employment. At the moment it is just as necessary to keep what we have in jobs, and also requires very great energy as does the effort to create new jobs.

The burden of the unemployed has grown with great rapidity. We have here a human as well as an economic problem. When human considerations are concerned, Canadians give them precedence. Continual dependence upon welfare induces, I believe, a spiritual disintegration, fundamentally destructive to the national fibre. We have only to remember the Thirties or to observe the experiences of other jurisdictions.

Work must be found for able-bodied workmen. If we in Ontario have a choice, let us take the long-range permanent solution; but in any case why not create that choice, if we can, to a far greater extent? And it can be done, Mr. Speaker. It has been done by other nations in the past and it has been done by our own nation. We have had ups and downs in the areas of unemployment and we have, in the end, arrived at a reasonable and sensible solution which has put our economy into motion again.

I say this without reservation, Mr. Speaker, for at this moment, while so many of our people are caught up in the crushing unemployment wave, we in the counties of Victoria and Haliburton are in fact experiencing a somewhat healthy economic life in comparison to some years in a good amount of our area.

Many people have acquired new homes and cottages. Our farms show numerous new silos and barn extensions. New industry and plant extensions are quite visible in several places.

The municipal, county and provincial road programme was an aggressive one. Our municipal street rebuilding, resurfacing and widening of a good portion of the road and street system as planned for this coming year is extensive. Bridges in a good number were built throughout the townships or under the counties' programme by The Department of Highways or by several joint construction policies.

Mr. Speaker: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member unduly, but within the next three minutes would he find a convenient place to adjourn the debate so that the private members' hour may go on time?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Perhaps at this moment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION No 4

Clerk of the House: Private members' motion No. 4, by Mr. Deacon.

RESOLUTION: That, in the opinion of this House the Ontario Water Resources Commission should be empowered:

1. Without entering into agreements with municipalities, to construct the water supply facilities and trunk mains and to develop the sewage treatment facilities and collector trunks required to serve the development of municipalities' distribution systems in Ontario;

2. To sell these wholesale services to municipalities according to area rates which are reasonably competitive with existing rates and which will eliminate the main cost variations that now exist across the province;

3. To embark on the above programmes on such scale and with such scope as to ensure the servicing of building lots in a quantity substantially in excess of the current demand.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): I move resolution No. 4 standing in my name on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Deacon moves resolution No. 4 standing in his name on the order paper.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, about 50 years ago, one of the greatest things happened in this province that had ever happened to ensure its future development. That was the formation of the Ontario Hydro Electric Power system. With that system it enabled communities which up to that time were not in a position to obtain hydro power because of bad location or because of the private enterprise of that time not considering it economic or other things—it enabled those communities to have plants and transmission lines constructed so that there could be development in all parts of Ontario where pressure for growth existed and where economic opportunity for industrial development occurred, and these centres could receive the power that they required.

Back in 1955, the Ontario Water Resources Commission was formed. At the time of its first meeting with some of the people in the financial community, where the programme for the Water Resources Commission was outlined by the late Dr. Berry, we were told that the Ontario Water Resources Commission would be another Ontario Hydro, but an Ontario Hydro that would be serving us with the needs for water rather than hydro because water at this stage is just or almost as important as hydro today. The problem has been that in the period since 1956, when these great words were spoken by Dr. Berry, we find that the government of this province has strangled the Ontario Water Resources Commission by placing upon it onerous guidelines which make it just a financing project with little individual water development and sewage system projects across this province.

It has not the ability to meet the overall provincial requirements for growth and development. It does not have the same concept of providing the wholesale requirement and leaving the retail or the distribution facilities to the local autonomy situation. It puts all the responsibility on the local municipalities including onerous financial burden, including

the impossible engineering requirements of staying within very, very tight geographic limitations that are always necessary if you are not able to deal on a broad scale.

I want to illustrate this major restriction of the OWRC by pointing to distortion in the wholesale price of water to the city of London and the city of St. Thomas. The city of St. Thomas was forced to enter into an agreement for the supply of water from the Lake Erie pipeline at a price nearly three times that offered the city of London from the Lake Huron pipeline, even though these two cities were only 10 miles apart. The fact that Lake Erie's pipeline project did not pay out on as an attractive basis and required these high costs took nothing away from the tremendous problem facing the citizens of St. Thomas in offering incentive to industry when they had to charge water rates greatly in excess of those of their neighbouring city.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook: They had to.

Mr. Deacon: They had to, or show great losses in subsidizing their water rates. Surely we do not need to impose that financial burden on the municipality?

The way they were able to achieve that agreement was of course by stopping any development whatsoever in St. Thomas until they agreed to these onerous terms. Although the municipality fought for some time, the pressures of development were such that they did have to agree to a rate that was between two and three times the London rate.

The other alternative that developing communities face is to have a developer come along and offer them a project without any of these onerous requirements, but of course there are always other ways that municipalities have to pay if such a development goes forward by the developer who in effect is controlling the whole project.

The delay of 14 years in the Lake Huron project, the delay of several years in the Lake Erie project and the delay of six years in the Brampton sewage project all come back to this problem that we have faced, where the Ontario Water Resources Commission is really not carrying out any meaningful function for the future of developing municipalities in this province today. As a matter of fact, it is placing restrictions upon them that are completely unnecessary.

For example, in the case of the Brampton pipeline, in the case of the other pipelines I have been talking about, in the case of any

project that is operated exclusively by the Ontario Water Resources Commission, it requires that an agreement be entered into which, in effect, is a take-or-pay agreement. They have to assure the Water Resources Commission of sufficient revenues to pay off the obligations that are incurred in the construction of the project within, say, 30 or 40 years, whatever is decided for that particular project. And that agreement is considered by the Ontario Municipal Board as the same as a debt or a bond; it prevents the municipality from entering into other financial obligations unless the total financial picture of the municipality, including this Ontario Water Resources Commission agreement, permits them to do so. Yet when the province goes out to borrow the money to build pipeline for the needs of an area, not one penny of that money is dependent on these municipal agreements.

In other words, we are crippling the financial resources of the municipality, and yet the fact that we are putting that burden upon them means nothing to the taxpayers of this province in advantages in the raising of provincial funds. Funds are raised because it is a provincial obligation. The province sells provincial bonds and turns the funds over to the Ontario Water Resources Commission. But those who buy a bond could not care less about these agreements that we force these municipalities to enter into. These agreements are of course the cause of a lot of animosity that develops between the municipality and the Water Resources Commission, because they can see in these agreements that they are not going to be able to do the road paving job or certain work in the town or municipality because they have this agreement with OWRC. We force them to go into these unnecessary agreements, crippling them. Actually it is not helping us one iota.

As a result of this practice of making each project self-liquidating, we not only distort the rates, which I have mentioned as between St. Thomas and the city of London—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): They cannot deny that.

Mr. Deacon: —but it also causes a strangulation of the small communities. If one is in a town like Geraldton, like Fenelon Falls, or Fort Frances—almost anywhere you go in this province—one will find communities where they can have no more development because development has been closed off until they build a sewage plant, a new water plant

addition, or something of that sort. Yet that project is held up because the province forces the municipality to enter into a financial commitment that it is not in a position to undertake, and their taxpayers cannot accept the burden that is imposed upon them.

This is the reason that we must immediately remove this restriction, this obligation that we now require through the OWRC, to make projects self-liquidating. This is why we must take the Ontario Hydro approach, where we look at the overall picture and get rates that are reasonable—area rates—that are required for these towns to go forward and allow them to distribute what we provide wholesale at rates to those towns that are competitive. We will not get situations such as the one my hon. friend from Sarnia faces, where we are in effect forcing higher rates on the municipalities than they now have, and they have no choice in the matter.

Mr. Bullbrook: Double! Terrible! The OWRC are the judge and jury.

An hon. member: No appeal!

Mr. Bullbrook: No appeal. You cannot appeal it.

Mr. Deacon: In addition to this self-liquidating requirement, and the restriction that it has placed upon municipalities and yet not helping us as a province one little bit in our financing, we have the restriction that prevents the overall planning of communities because we think in terms of forcing communities to have their own little projects instead of saying we, as a province, will provide the wholesale services to them. And with the power that the province has, we do not have to be concerned about whether we go into the neighbouring municipalities or whether we drew water through a pipeline from across three or four municipalities to supply them; we have the right because we are a provincial body. With that power we can then plan on an overall basis. After all, services are one of the most important planning tools that we have. We can draw all the pretty pictures in the world, but if we do not have the services that people require in development, then we might as well forget the pretty plans. The province has this power, with the Water Resources Commission, to influence where it wants development to occur by providing services in substantial quantities to those areas.

The ridiculous part is that even when the Ontario Water Resources Commission does have some overall conception for a plan, it

sometimes gets stymied itself by municipal boundaries. Take for example the \$65-million or \$85-million—I do not think anybody knows yet what the cost will be of the latest scheme that has been presented to service the area north of Metro—a 25-mile collector sewer going up hill and down dale, with all types of pumps required because of the difference in land elevation—at tremendous cost, at tremendous expense. By the time the sewage from over in Vaughan gets over to the proposed site for the sewage plant on the Rouge River, it will be septic and it will be impossible to treat, and this is all because the province sees the north boundary of Metro as a wall, just like the Chinese wall or the Siegfried line one cannot pass—one has to go around it. Instead we should put treatment plants on the upper reaches of these rivers and, if the effluent flow is too high for existing streams to take the flow and further treat it down on the lake. Present technology of our Water Resources Commission seems to be it will be handled in the lake anyway in the end.

Here we have an example of where they should not think in terms of being barred by the north boundary of Metro, but where they could think in terms of the geographical conditions—the elevations, the river valleys—and have the sewage take the natural drainage course for the most efficient and most effective way of handling it. Yet they do not seem to feel that they can cross a municipal boundary.

If we had overall provincial planning and gave the power to the Ontario Water Resources Commission to forget about municipal boundaries and just put the whole scheme in terms of where we want development to occur according to our provincial plan, then we would get the most efficient and the lowest cost, the best type of water supply system and sewage treatment system.

This does not endanger the local autonomy, because we are not interfering with the distribution of the collection of sewage in this concept. We are thinking in the same way as transmission lines for Ontario Hydro—you take them to the hydro distribution points and let the local municipality deal with their own people. The main thing we must do is be sure that each municipality in a given area knows that it will be charged similar rates for the services it receives to Ontario Water Resources, to those charged other municipalities. We cannot have a repetition of that St. Thomas-London situation.

The third point I want to bring out is, if we take this concept and put provincial funds

in quantity behind the Ontario Water Resources Commission we can ensure that the shortage of supply of serviced lots, particularly in this area, will be cleared up.

We have all types of problems today that are caused because we have distorted the picture of normal supply and demand in housing. Landlord-tenant relations can be covered by all types of legislation, but unless there is a 10 per cent surplus of empty apartments you will always have troubles. As soon as there is a good surplus, people have a choice and that takes care of an awful lot of the problems that exist under the conditions we have today.

If we have a surplus supply of serviced land we will not be faced with the problem we have today, where land is now getting into a few hands and those people who own the serviced land are able to call the tune and charge whatever price the market will bear. And that is a most unfair situation caused by not having an excess of supply of serviced lots.

Mr. Bullbrook: We just buy the lots from those people who call the tune; right? That is what we do.

Mr. Deacon: Right, we just help them out of their financial problems by giving them cash.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bullbrook: We are room-mates, we can chat together if we want to.

Mr. Deacon: But our present situation means that the ones who can go ahead are the ones that have big projects, can help finance the cost to a municipality of a sewage and water scheme and it removes the opportunity for the small man, who is often the one that keeps the prices under control. We lose that opportunity for him to be competitive, because he just cannot get in with a big deal, the big development programmes.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Would the hon. member acquire public lands to help pay for the trunks?

Mr. Deacon: There is no need for us to get into the land business and own land or have money tied up in land. If we have a surplus of serviced land on the market and we also tax at market value land that is serviced and ready for development, that would soon move it into the market, because no person who owns raw land—or land that has no housing on it or is not being developed—can afford to

hold it very long with taxation based on present market value. We would have many land bankruptcy sales if the province would really go after opening up an excess to serviced land.

There is a fourth area in which things would happen if we would take the new approach of Ontario Water Resources, and that is in the area of research and development. This afternoon up at York University there was a presentation of a critique done by a similar group up there on the Toronto-centred-region plan. One of the points the group brought up that I thought was particularly good, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this major failing of the Toronto-centred-region plan, is that it is based upon 1960 technology.

The plan is based upon having a sewage plant down on the lake and all development within a very few miles of Lake Ontario will use it so that we can make Lake Ontario our sewage effluent lagoon. We fail to recognize that if we put money into research and development and co-operate with other jurisdictions that are doing the same, we would not have to restrict our future plans because of the technology. We will be able to have the technology fit our requirements, making use of the geographical advantages of the land within the area where we want to have development occur.

For example, one of the projects that I gather is making some progress is something called the "Black Box" where all our sewage will be handled on an individual home basis. Apparently, some way they get the residue in a little black box and it is converted into pretty good fuel. Whether that is going to be something considered desirable, or whether it will be the scheme that they have developed in Muskegon, Michigan—where they used the effluent there for producing a three-fold increase in their production of corn, or a very substantial increase in the nutrient value of wheat, or they get the greenest golf course greens anywhere in North America—whatever they do, they use the phosphate that is in the effluent to advantage instead of having it dumped into their water resources, such as Lake Ontario to endanger the future ecology of the whole region.

This is where we need to have research and development occur. If the Ontario Water Resources Commission has the financial responsibilities for putting in a water and sewage plant and has, therefore, the control over what goes in, it will always be trying to get better value out of these plants, it will

be able to do experimental projects here and there to improve the technology so that the future development of our province will not then be controlled by technology. We shall be able to take better advantage of the geography we have.

Local autonomy, cost to taxpayers, all these advantages I have cited we can have if the Ontario Water Resources Commission will be given the power and instruction in the resources to make it the Ontario Hydro of water and sewage in this province.

Mr. Bullbrook: The member for Wentworth is next.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth) I am next?

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes. The member knew he was next.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I somehow thought that the order was that a Conservative spoke second. I want to take a moment to talk about the resolution, because I find the resolution rather vague. I would like to say that we agree with it, if I was absolutely sure what the resolution itself intended.

If the purpose of the resolution is to ensure that pollution will be reduced in the Province of Ontario, and that the province will play an active role in ensuring that municipalities will, indeed, have the kind of anti-pollution resources that are necessary to combat municipal pollution, then we agree. There is no question. But what I worry about is that there are not sufficient safeguards indicated either in the resolution or by the member in his address to make clear to us whether or not the expenditures of money would simply result in pouring of public funds into ensuring that the private developer and speculator would derive more from his investment than he presently derives.

There has to be an effort made by the province, if they are going to embark on this kind of a programme, to ensure that the development that takes place is in keeping with the overall development programme of the province and, indeed, the development programmes of the municipalities.

I am surprised, frankly surprised, to hear the Liberals speak about proposing that the water resources commission should be empowered without entering into agreements with municipalities, because in every single speech that they have made dealing with

municipal affairs they have spoken almost completely about the need for municipalities to have autonomy. Now, how do they rationalize the situation that they are prepared to embark upon a programme—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Deans: —of thrusting down the throats of municipalities without entering into any agreements that they shall develop in a certain way without taking into consideration whether this conforms with official plans; or whether this, in fact, is in keeping with the overall development of the Province of Ontario.

What we want to propose in conjunction with this kind of resolution is that before the government embarks upon the providing of trunk sewer and trunk water facilities, it first of all has to have an official plan for the province. You have got to decide at the provincial level in what areas you want to see development take place.

It is not good enough to turn to the municipality—let us take Niagara, for an example, the regional municipality of Niagara—and tell them that they are going to have municipal autonomy on the one hand while on the other the government turns to the OWRC and says to them: “You are empowered without any agreement by the municipality to push water and sewers in there, anywhere you want to put them, regardless of whether it conforms with the official plan.” That is exactly what has been said. I find that to be unacceptable.

If we are, as a province, prepared to settle down and to draft the kind of economic programme that will insure that the province will be developed in an orderly fashion, and if we are prepared to ensure that this development takes place in such a way that people in this province are going to benefit and that the economics of the province will grow and that employment will be made available, then this is fine. We can then, after having done that, determine where the water and the sewers have to go in order to ensure that the kind of development we want takes place.

But what is happening here—what is happening in the Liberal resolution—is simply that they are saying that, regardless of whatever plans municipalities may have—

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Oh, that is not true; come on now!

Mr. Deans: —the OWRC is going to be empowered—

Mr. Sargent: It is permissive.

Mr. Deans: —to put in trunk services and that those trunk services are not necessarily geared to those lands that are held by the OHC or by Central Mortgage and Housing, or, for that matter, are not necessarily geared to the plans of development that the province has embarked upon.

How can you support that kind of resolution? The member himself said that there was no need for the province to enter into the land business—that he was prepared to use public funds to make the land that is presently held by the developers more profitable. To that end we find that completely outside of our participation. We do not happen to agree that it is proper to use public funds to enhance the already outlandish profits made by the private speculators and developers.

Mr. Deacon: The hon. member does not understand it.

Mr. Deans: The member says I do not understand it, but the fact of the matter is that the resolution is so poorly worded and so vague in its intent—

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): That is because the member does not understand it.

Mr. Deans: How does one interpret section 22 “To sell these wholesale services to municipalities according to area rates which are reasonably competitive with existing rates.” How do you determine that, when in actual fact there are no existing rates? If there were existing rates you would not have to put the trunk sewers in.

Mr. Deacon: Sure you would!

Mr. Deans: “And which would eliminate the main cost variations that now exist across the province.” What does that mean in English?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): It sounds like “Laugh-in” to me.

Mr. Deans: What does that mean in English?

An hon. member: Preposterous.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Cannot the NDP get somebody better than that?

Mr. Deans: The whole thing is—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: —improperly worded and poorly thought out. If the member had introduced a resolution that said: "That OWRC should be empowered to ensure that every municipality has proper sewage facilities in order to cut down on the pollution in the Province of Ontario," then that would be acceptable.

Mr. Good: What does the hon. member think this means?

Mr. Deans: It does not say that.

Mr. Good: He cannot read.

Mr. Deans: If this resolution had said that this province was going to embark on a properly planned programme of economic development and that they were prepared to expend the necessary funds to ensure that development took place in the areas in which it was most needed, and that the money of the Province of Ontario was going to be used to ensure that the publicly held lands were going to be developed in order to keep down the cost of private lands which are available for home purchasers, then we could have supported it. But the fact of the matter is that this is not what it says.

What it says, in fact, is, "We are going to take the taxpayers' money. We are going to make it available. We do not care who gets the benefit of it. We hope that it will accrue to the homeowner or to the home purchaser." But in actual fact it does not necessarily accrue to the home purchaser. Because of that we find the whole thing very difficult.

In the third point, the member obviously tries to rationalize it. He says: "To embark on the above programmes on such scale, and with such scope, as to ensure the servicing of building lots in a quantity substantially in excess of current demand." To be in "excess of current demand" is one thing, but there is no guarantee in that kind of a statement that those lots will be made available at a cost that people can afford.

There is required initially in this province a determination of the kind of economic growth that will take place and also, prior to embarking on this kind of programme, a determination of basic land values. Because this members knows, as I know, that the minute you put in the trunk sewers and the minute they pass through the private developer's lands, that this will increase the value of the private developer's land and he will soak the public. This should be directed solely toward ensuring that the

public lands that are presently available are developed.

If this is the kind of programme that the Liberal Party wants to put forward—if they want to talk about providing public money to fatten up the pockets of the private developers—then that is up to them. But I happen to think that his particular resolution, reading it on its face, is not a very acceptable way to deal with the people of this province.

I do not care what was intended by it. It is what it says that matters. It says, quite frankly, as far as I can see, that it is going to use public funds to ensure that the private developer and land speculator will receive more than he presently gets. It is he who will benefit and no one else. As far as I am concerned, that is totally unacceptable. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ontario South.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Mr. Speaker, I commend the member for York Centre for his interest in the Ontario Water Resources Commission and welcome the opportunity to speak on its functions.

I notice the member who introduced the resolution is not in the House. I hope that he is sufficiently interested that he will show up later for the discussions here.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): He is here.

Mr. Trotter: He is not far away.

Mr. W. Newman: I cannot but marvel at the general philosophy reflected in these proposals. I find it very difficult to reconcile the call by the member for York Centre for a centralized agency, with his party's demand for the true acceptance of the doctrine of local autonomy. I do not know how many times I have heard him stand in this House and talk about local autonomy and he stands up here and talks about a centralized agency here today.

Under the present system that we have, municipalities and the OWRC are partners in water and sewage projects and I would think that the municipalities would want to continue to have a say in these projects which have a direct bearing on the mill rates in their respective municipalities.

The government's contribution in the provision of water supply and sewage treatment facilities is already substantial. In 1964 and

1965 the provincial ownership plan was introduced, providing for the construction and operation of water and sewage treatment plants for municipalities with the cost recovered on a usage basis.

This programme is administered by the OWRC and the plants are operated entirely at cost. Development of these facilities for the province is of much benefit to the municipalities, since the financial burden falls upon the province and is not part of the direct municipal debt.

When the programme was initiated municipalities were required to provide the trunk sewerage and watermains necessary to connect the homes using the services. However, the cost of providing the sewer trunks and watermains proved to be a heavy burden in some of the smaller municipalities. In 1967 this government included these services as well in a provincially financed programme.

Further financial assistance programmes were undertaken by the government in 1969 with the initiation of a plan of assistance to municipalities with high-cost projects. Some communities are faced with unusually high water and sewage plant construction costs because of topography or because of small population or because of a very low assessment per capita.

Provincial assistance is being provided in an attempt to ensure the cost of a water and sewage works in a municipality will not exceed an average home charge of \$100 per year for water and \$120 per year for sewage. The government contributes a maximum of 50 per cent of the total cost of both water and sewage work in such high-cost projects.

As of September, 1970, provincial subsidies approved by the Ontario Water Resources Commission amounted to approximately \$28.7 million. This money will be spent over the next three years as projects are developed. At the same time, in 1969, the government also approved an OWRC proposal that financial assistance be granted to ensure that area projects for sewage and water may be oversized for future development.

Under this plan, oversizing must be beyond the needs of communities initially serviced. The province may contribute 15 per cent of the total capital cost of the work. This programme of provincial assistance was first designed to assist existing communities only and applied to new work. However, this has since been extended to the incorporation of a subsidy for extensions to existing systems as well.

Provincially financed extensions are now eligible, whether or not the existing works are required by the province.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing subsidy programmes are clear proof of the seriousness with which this government views the need to service Ontario communities with adequate water supply and sewage treatment facilities. By and large, the municipalities have the capability to handle the provision of these facilities, and the Ontario Water Resources Commission provides both technical and financial support where required and requested.

Partnership programmes such as these between the provincial and municipal governments are preferable to the imposition of a centralized agency. I, therefore, cannot support the resolution of the hon. member for York Centre at this time.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, in supporting the resolution of my hon. colleague I would like to deal mainly with the matter of the agreement that the municipality must enter into with OWRC before it is permitted the services of water and sewage in its locality.

We know that there are many small municipalities in the province—and I will speak generally of my own riding—which are desperately in need of water services and sewage services, if these communities are not going to come to a standstill and go behind. We know that pollution in our province is a very real and live issue at the present time and that many of these small municipalities are facing this problem very seriously, because first of all they do not have the funds to clean up the matter. Secondly, the people themselves are finding that when they start to investigate how to go about getting sewer and water into the municipality they almost throw up their hands in disbelief at what the cost will be. Definitely, in my opinion, there has to be a better way of providing our small municipalities with sewer and water.

In my own riding, for instance, between the cities of Kitchener and Stratford there is only one municipality that has services. That is New Hamburg. The town of New Hamburg has grown very drastically since they put services in. They are meeting many crises because of this fact, and while they have no funds now to extend their services, they find that their locality is now completely filled to its maximum for services. So we find there is another little municipality along the highway between Kitchener and Stratford called Baden, which is right in the act of putting in

services, and I would like to look at this municipality of Baden. I have with me a copy of the agreement and members will hardly believe what hardship that agreement with OWRC can put on some of the people of the area.

Mr. Ruston: It costs \$700 just to advertise one in the paper.

Mr. Good: The people in the municipality know very well that they have to do something; they have to get services in one way or another or their growth is completely stopped. This has happened. No further building can be allowed in the municipality for the simple reason the water supplies are not adequate. Some are contaminated, and the effluent from the individual disposal beds of the area, is contaminating the whole area.

It was some few years ago the people in the municipality decided they should have sewers and water in their area, so they took some preliminary action and found out that it was going to cost them around half a million dollars. At that time they felt it was much too expensive, that they could not afford it. So things went from bad to worse until it was apparent to everyone that something had to be done.

It was reactivated about two years ago, and OWRC started to talk with the municipal council which in this case happened to be the township of Wilmot. They told them at what stage their reports were; the engineering reports were in and locations were being tested for water supply. Finally, after much consideration, activity began on the actual engineering and layout facility for the municipality.

Eventually the procedures came to the point where the OWRC was prepared to present an agreement to the municipality. The agreement was accepted by the municipality under the conditions which now exist, whereby publication must be made in the newspaper on two consecutive weeks, after which the local residents have three weeks to lodge a protest to the clerk of the municipality and if, of course, any protests are lodged, an Ontario Municipal Board hearing will be held.

The town of Baden was no exception. There were 135 protests to the agreement out of a population of 973. This is hard to imagine—135 people in the village were unable, in their estimation, to afford sewer and water at the cost that was proposed by the agreement. On checking with OWRC, they

told me, "Well, this is not unusual. We have instances where 200 people object to the installation, but we still feel that the municipality needs them so they have to go ahead and get them.

Now, I would like to look into this agreement a little more closely so that perhaps we can understand and sympathize with some of these people.

It is not going to be any problem for some people in the community; they are going to be able to pay the rates. The people in these nice houses along the street that have been built in the last few years obviously can afford to pay the cost of this agreement.

But the part to which many people object is, first of all, the three manners in which costs are allocated. First is the connection charge, then the frontage charge and finally the usage charge.

The connection charge, in the case of the municipality of Baden, is separate for water and for sewage. We will deal first with the water.

The connection charge is \$16.17 per year; the frontage charge is 60 cents a foot, so on a 100-foot lot it would be \$60; and the usage charge for water of an average householder is \$50. So we have a water charge of \$126.17 a year.

But this is only part of it. We then go to the sewerage aspect of it.

The sewerage connection charge is \$18.59 a year. The frontage charge is the same; so that would be another \$60 for a 100-foot lot. And the usage charge is 205 per cent surcharge on the water charge, which is another \$102.50, making a total of \$181.09 for sewage. Added to \$126.17 for water, the average householder has to pay \$307.26 for sewer and water services.

Mr. Ruston: That sounds like the Premier's (Mr. Davis') education costs.

Mr. Good: Now to many people this is fine and dandy, but to 135 people in that little community this is too much. Why are these costs so high?

Well before we go into that, I might just say this; that one can reduce his annual charge of \$307—and, incidentally, one may say, "Well, Good is using a 100-foot lot and some lots are only 60 feet"; well, that is fine, for on a 60-foot lot it is \$259. But let me point out that in many small communities lots are much larger than they are in cities for the simple reason that land was cheap years ago and people had to build on big lots

in order to be able to put in a septic tank. So now they are caught in the squeeze of having to pay the huge frontage charges simply because the OWRC chooses to make the municipality itself responsible for service which the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr) would really know is a social service in this province that has to be provided if we are ever going to clean up our pollution mess.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Is the member allowing for the subsidy there?

Mr. Good: These rates, Mr. Speaker, are in spite of the fact that the province pays up to 50 per cent and in this case they are paid 50 per cent.

If a person wants to reduce his annual charge of \$307, he can, if he has the money, pay in a lump sum. The lump sum payment on a 100 foot lot would be \$1,658. I am sure none of these 135 people who objected has \$1,658 to pay out in a lump sum. On a 60-foot lot it would be \$1,122.

So here we have this impasse, where certain people in the community feel if they are going to progress they have to have sewers and water and another faction in the same community feel that it is going to be a tremendous hardship to them and they just will not be able to stand the financial pressures.

Now bear in mind the figures which I have just given you, and let us hear what the sewer-water rate is in these three municipalities—

Mr. Speaker: I think it might be well to warn the hon. member that he has two minutes left so he can arrange his speech accordingly.

Mr. Good: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Compare \$307, which you are asking the people in Baden to pay for sewers and water, against the average householder in the city of Kitchener, who pays \$60 to \$80 for sewer and water.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is right. That is the problem.

Mr. Good: In Waterloo, \$48 for sewers and water. In the town of Elmira, \$44. Now, how do you ever expect to get sewers and water into the small municipalities of Ontario under agreements such as this?

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, it is the third section of the resolution of the member for York Centre on which I wish to make a few brief comments, for I must think of the resolution as it would affect the constituency I represent.

The township of Sandwich West is on the outskirts of Windsor. It has no sewage disposal system and no sewers. There are many houses, however, that would be built if there were an adequate sewage system planned for the near future. Even as things are, there are many people willing to install septic tanks until such time as they can hook up to a sewage treatment plant, and build a new home under those conditions.

There has been an understandable reluctance on the part of the OWRC to slow building until a good system is installed. A few months ago, about 56 lots were approved by the Sandwich West township council for building homes and the local adjustment committee approved them for severance as building lots. The 30-foot lots of the original township subdivision plan were being divided into 75-foot lots to conform to present-day requirements.

For some reason the then Minister of Municipal Affairs intervened and appealed to the municipal board these 56 decisions of the local government. If there were sound ecological reasons for this move, for this appeal, I could understand and approve the appeal of course. But this does not seem to have been the case, for we find that several of these appeals have now been withdrawn. Fifty-six building lots were tied up, have been tied up for many months, and then some of them are set free.

It is true that a contractor on Golfview, who had a very prominent Conservative lawyer was able to persuade the minister to withdraw the appeals on his lots; and it is true that on another road another contractor, who had another very prominent Conservative lawyer, was also able to persuade the minister, the present Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), to withdraw the appeals.

I have been seeking for several weeks by telephone and by letter to get from The Department of Municipal Affairs an explanation for this strange behaviour. All these lots were open to the same technical objections; all these lots were reviewed by the local board of adjustment; all were approved by the township council; all were suddenly appealed by the minister.

All should have been allowed or all should have been denied. If there were valid health reasons for refusing approval for building homes then so be it, ban all building until adequate sewage systems are assured. But apparently this was not the determining factor in the minister's appeal against these 56 lots.

Now if the OWRC will push ahead, as suggested by the hon. member's resolution, with the development of sewage treatment plants in places like Sandwich West, these frustrations which are now being experienced would no longer be experienced. Political favours of this kind would not be asked and would not be given.

But before I give blanket approval to all sewage treatment plants, let me refer to an opinion held by some people that septic tanks regularly cleaned on a house-to-house basis, perhaps twice a year—which would be relatively inexpensive because as you know now when a homeowner calls, the cleaner has to make a special trip—it takes an hour or so to do one place; but doing it door-to-door would be very inexpensive—

Mr. Speaker, the theory or opinion held by some people is that the best possible kind of sewage disposal plant is the home septic tank regularly cleaned. They argue that the treatment plants, the large ones, eventually pass on to rivers and lakes a considerable amount of partially treated sewage which should be returned to the soil. They argue that the home septic tank can be cleaned out—

Mr. Bullbrook: What is the member doing with it when he takes it out of the septic tank?

Mr. Burr: —and the effluent, after some rather simple treatment, returned to the farms, the golf courses, the gardens and the lawns of the province.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is one country club I would not want to belong to.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Ecoutez bien!

Mr. Burr: I do not know whether this is feasible, Mr. Speaker, but it seems to have a certain logic to it, and I pass on the idea to the OWRC for serious consideration. If this is a valid theory, of course then the proliferation of sewage treatment plants would actually be unnecessary. With this reservation then, I must express general agreement

with the resolution if it will promote and accelerate the best type of sewage treatment and disposal and if it will do this at the lowest possible cost to the people of the municipalities of this province rather than providing a windfall for land speculators, as my colleague has suggested.

I congratulate the hon. member for York Centre for bringing forward this resolution for discussion and hope that the discussion will prove of some value at least to the OWRC.

Mr. B. Newman: The member had the right side of the issue.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few comments about the resolution, I would like first to commend the member for York Centre for his recognition of the need for expanded water and sewer facilities in order to enable the further development of the province at the same, or more greatly accelerated rate, than is now taking place.

However, I am a bit puzzled and concerned by the content of the resolution—the first part, the portion that says, “without entering agreements.” In Peel South, we have achieved something of what I believe he has in mind here, with the agreement of the municipalities.

Mr. Deacon: It took five years, five years. It was an unnecessary delay.

Mr. Kennedy: That shows fiscal responsibility in dealing with the problems.

Mr. Good: That is pretty fast.

Mr. Gaunt: What do the people do in the meantime? Live in tents?

Mr. Kennedy: I believe, Mr. Speaker, in all these instances it is necessary to reach agreement with municipalities over such projects as he suggests.

An hon. member: That is right.

Mr. Kennedy: It is a very sensitive area to go into a county or some larger jurisdiction without having the agreement and having consulted with the people that will be involved right at the local scene.

Mr. Bullbrook: But then you designate it. If you cannot get an agreement, you designate it.

Mr. Good: No more help.

Mr. Kennedy: This government has proposed municipal-provincial partnership. I think this is one area that we must remember, rather than any unilateral action on the part of any body of government. One reason for this, apart from the retention of local autonomy, is that certainly in the built-up areas, such as around Metro, additional facilities must tie in with existing ones. It must take into account the present equity of the municipalities. As the member for one of the Hamilton ridings said, "We must recognize the development plans of the municipalities." Surely, this means that we must work with them.

In the agreement with which I am most familiar, the Peel South one, provision was made to provide basic trunk services—

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): That would be something new.

Mr. Kennedy: —and, of course, to wholesale water and sewer services through the municipalities. The member for York Centre suggested a programme similar to Hydro. The local hydro commissions work very closely with Ontario Hydro and, in fact, the local hydro commissions have an equity in Ontario Hydro. That means that there is a pretty close association.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): We work with them, you work with them.

Mr. Kennedy: Another problem here is, I believe, that though the OWRC can do, and is doing, a good job where the major trunk services have been installed, the local operation of them—the relationship with consumers, the billing and various other aspects of operations—is much better dealt with on a local basis. Again, if the province were to go ahead, or OWRC, and shoot these lines through wherever they thought suitable, I think it would cause a lot of sparks locally. Local people should deal with these problems that are local, that is the final retailing of the water or the sewer services.

Mr. Bullbrook: Right! Exactly right!

Mr. Good: That is the point.

Mr. Kennedy: Well, that is not what the resolution implies.

Mr. Good: It says right there, "wholesale."

Mr. Kennedy: It is not. I think the member has it in mind, but it does not say so.

Mr. Gaunt: It says "wholesale"; it says that.

Mr. Deacon: Move an amendment.

Mr. Kennedy: Yes, I will move an amendment. It is not the policy of this government to take such action. I do not believe that unilateral action by the province would be in our best interests.

Mr. Jackson: It is not the policy of the government to take any action.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: You want another Hydro?

Mr. Bullbrook: You want another Hydro?

Mr. Kennedy: Another Hydro would be great.

Mr. Stokes: The government cannot control the one it has now.

Mr. Kennedy: They mentioned that it was a period of time before OWRC agreement was reached in Peel. It was not all that long. Port Credit, Mississauga, Streetsville, Brampton and Chinguacousy got together and after a series of meetings came up with a very amicable arrangement.

That was completed in 1968; and the programme, Mr. Speaker, has been very satisfactory.

Mr. Deacon: It took five years.

Mr. Kennedy: This despite rapid growth in that area, probably the most rapid growth anywhere in Ontario. Prior to one of these meetings, I thought that the members might be interested in an agenda that was set up and it points up, I think, as well as it can be pointed up, some of the issues that must be dealt with. The first question they asked was how can provincial and local jurisdiction over the supply of water be divided? Where will supply points be provided to the individual and municipal distribution networks? Again, this has to tie in with local systems, so how in the world can you work without dealing and reaching an agreement with local municipalities?

What guarantees can be given regarding the adequacy of pressure at supply points? Will the pressure zones envisaged under the provincial programmes be compatible with those presently in operation under local arrangement? Again, this ties in to the development plans of the various municipalities.

What local facilities are to be acquired by the OWRC; and how will compensation be determined?

What arrangements are to be made for the initial operation of the provincial system following the assumption of the above facilities? Finally, how will the provincial system be expanded to meet increasing local requirements?

I think those terms of reference are the ones that would be needed in any major trunk works that would be installed by the province.

They are answerable. They were answered in our county by the municipalities, and a very satisfactory agreement was worked out on this \$88 million programme. The problems were resolved, but they were not resolved on any unilateral basis.

For the reasons I give, I cannot support this portion of the resolution. We must be very sensitive to the rights of the municipalities; and just before closing, Mr. Speaker, I would commend OWRC for recognizing the essential need for discussion and negotiation with municipalities and for their success in concluding the very good arrangement in the county of Peel.

Mr. Speaker: The private members' hour has now expired. We started at one minute to 5, and it is now half a minute to 6, so this hour has expired.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 19, 1971

Task Force Hydro, statement by Mr. Davis	561
Correspondence re hydro export to Boise Cascade, statement by Mr. Kerr	561
Time limit on Task Force Hydro studies, including rates, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Deans, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Lewis	561
Export of power to Boise Cascade, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis	563
Negotiations with Quebec re farm marketing legislation, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Singer, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Shulman	563
Discussions with Ontario Medical Association re fee schedule, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. Shulman	564
Provincial Secretary and review of liquor law and legislation, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	565
Research grants to Ontario universities from Pentagon, questions to Mr. White, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Burr, Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. Bullbrook	565
Policy re use of studded tires in northern Ontario, questions to Mr. Bernier, Mr. Lewis	567
Producing more graduates from Ontario medical schools, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Lewis, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. Shulman	567
Substantial decrease of oil imports from Alberta, question to Mr. Bernier, Mr. Lewis	568
Establishing wilderness area along Sudbury-Timmins highway route, question to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Sopha	568
Control over wiretapping by police in Ontario, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Singer, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Bullbrook	569
Government people using government planes to fly into Quetico Park, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Makarchuk	569
Investigation of reasons for Americanization of Ontario university staffs, questions to Mr. White, Mr. T. Reid	570
Discussion with federal government re taking over cost of nursing home care, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Ferrier	570
Cutting budgets of health units throughout Ontario, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Ruston	571
Legislation to amend The Wills Act to permit 18-year-olds to make wills, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Trotter	571
Policy re use of studded tires in northern Ontario, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Nixon	571
Preventing car manufacturers from juggling horsepower ratings, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Good	572
Study to determine difference in costs of comparable drugs, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Deans	573
Kedar Mines Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Meen, first reading	573
Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. Ferrier, Mr. Morningstar, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Jackson, Mr. R. G. Hodgson	574
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. R. G. Hodgson, agreed to	597
On notice of motion No. 4, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Deans, Mr. W. Newman, Mr. Good, Mr. Burr, Mr. Kennedy	597
Recess, 6 o'clock	609



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, April 19, 1971
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

CONTENTS

**(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1971

The House resumed at 8 o'clock p.m.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned at 5 o'clock, I was proceeding to tell the members some of the activity in my riding conducted by our own people, and some of the matters that had the constructive exercise of the Province of Ontario's assistance with my people in creating work and creating structures for all in this province.

Park development has proceeded extensively by the municipalities and The Department of Lands and Forests in Victoria-Haliburton. Additional parklands were acquired by municipal people in many parts of our counties. Park plans in several instances are being engineered and applied, and additional facilities were established at provincial parks at Emily, Balsam and Silent Lake. Development of the large water service operation at Emily Park and at Balsam Lake Park was an extensive development. Water control structures were undertaken in several places by The Department of Lands and Forests, with the dam at Omemee being the largest and the one at Billings Lake the second in size.

Major highway planning was undertaken with 10- and 20-year forecasts, a very basic feature. These plans were not only internally within the two counties, but were for all areas surrounding the boundaries. One has only to look at these to realize the tremendous growth of traffic expected to be part of our living in 1980 and 1990. The facilities and major highways bringing and taking away our visitors and residents to and from activities will have a great change and effect on our people.

The undertaking of an extensive examination by a study of the Trent Canal waterway,

both by the federal and provincial governments, and the local people who are involved, will have a far-reaching effect on all our area.

I have had the privilege of contributing many ideas and suggestions, as have the councils and people of this whole vast waterway land. The study of recommendations will be toward a direct involvement by our people in the future concept of this great recreation facility. How we meet this steady challenge will, to a large extent, establish our future in these two counties. Early development and application of the proposed concept will create the future need for much industry and business of all types, and this will be very widespread over the two counties and in the villages and towns.

The large hospital programme, undertaken by our hospital boards and citizens, of new facilities for the Ross Memorial in Lindsay, extension at the Minden Red Cross outpost—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Why are these developments in government members' areas?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: —and the completely new building at Haliburton is certainly the greatest activity we have been able to undertake as a people in this part of our living needs.

I would say to the hon. member that it is basically because our people—

Mr. Sargent: We can tell how good the government has been to the hon. member.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: It is basically because our people in Victoria and Haliburton certainly want to see progress and change and new things for themselves that they have enlisted this government's aid.

The development of water and sewage engineering and planning by Omemee, Fenelon Falls, Bobcaygeon, Minden and Haliburton through the year has been a vital part of the municipal work of these councils or of the corporations mentioned. This consideration and the decisions will be theirs and with them in 1971. Health unit activity of the two

county councils and its board will no doubt be enlarged in 1971. In 1970 the new personnel and existing staff carried out greatly increased workloads and will through this background be able to continue the protection and inspection of our homes, cottages, industry and waterways in the two counties. The awareness of our people and the desire to keep our rivers and lakes free from pollution will place a great responsibility on this part of our public authority.

The responsibility of the undertakings of two large school construction projects—a secondary school building at Lindsay, and the elementary school building at Haliburton—have involved members elected to the county council and the county school boards of Victoria and Haliburton in much discussion and decision-making through the whole of 1970. The fact that both are under construction at present and the necessary changes to the area system operation will continue to be a good part of this local government body in its 1971 deliberations.

Our people's great concern with costs of the school system and its basic considerations of quantity and quality of education will be a large part of the matters of concern for these boards in their area of jurisdiction.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What do they think of the guidelines?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: They have accepted them. They have been right on the dot, and I am going to tell the member that they are working.

Mr. Stokes: Completely unrealistic for northern Ontario.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I live in northern Ontario under very similar conditions.

The changes to The School Administration Act by the Ontario Legislature which provides for the Ontario government to exercise a measure of control over the expenditures of these boards, and the guidelines imposed by the department on such expenditures, have made for serious discussion of an extensive nature in decision-making by board members. The fact they have met this requirement shows the responsibility these members exercise for us.

There is one area which I feel I should bring to the attention of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and that is the ever-increasing problem of litter pollution, particularly in Algonquin Park. I have today two points or recommendations I wish to make which I

feel certainly merit much consideration by the advisory committee on that park.

It has come to my attention that parks which require a travel permit have a definite possible method of control of litter pollution. For instance, each party travelling through the park must take so many tins or bottles in his packs. All that is necessary is that a declaration slip be filled out by the party entering the park.

Mr. Stokes: Is that into the park or out of the park?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: This declaration slip would be checked when the party was leaving the park and a penalty of \$5 would certainly encourage people to bring litter out again. It has cost thousands of dollars to bring this litter out and this is a money-saving project by encouraging the people to do it on their own.

Mr. Speaker, the second recommendation I would like to make is that there be an immediate slowdown of the development of campsites for trailers and overnight sites for campers inside of Algonquin Park. I feel this is extremely important if we are to continue to maintain Algonquin Park as the desirable place that it is intended to be.

There is much alternative land for development by private enterprise, and by the province, of such campsites outside of Algonquin and these are within easy reach of Algonquin, being in most cases no more than 10 miles away.

I suggest that this is the type of development we should encourage in the future, Mr. Speaker, in an effort to preserve Algonquin as it is at the present moment.

I have only touched slightly on the matters in which the province has assisted our people in Victoria and Haliburton and I am sure that if every member here would take a constructive approach, as I have tried to do tonight, I am sure we would find that this Province of Ontario is indeed in good hands.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I am again glad to take part in this Throne debate. I would like to, of course, while starting, offer congratulations to the Premier (Mr. Davis) and the cabinet and in particular to the new ministers who have been taken into the cabinet, and, of course, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my congratulations to you, sir, for the manner in which you have carried out your responsibilities so far.

At the recent Progressive Conservative leadership convention I thought there might be a "new wave." I even feel that I did my part in helping this to be successful. I drove Mr. Bill Jarvis, the chairman of the election committee, from Stratford to Toronto about two weeks before the convention. We thought we would maybe get the election machinery working smoothly, but it did not seem to really help much. However, I do hope that the lesson learned was that it is really people who are the most important.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): We got the man we wanted anyway.

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Speaker, I have several topics I would like to talk about because of the discontentment that seems to be around the province, and I would like to try to bring to your attention some of the comments made by Mr. Public, or in other words, some comment from the grass roots.

I want to discuss two or three points that are affecting most parts of Ontario but, of course, they are of special interest to my constituents at this particular time. One of these areas is transportation, another is regional government and the third is education.

It seems that there has been no co-ordinated proposal for an integrated transportation system in mid-Ontario. The Department of Highways put out a plan called the Lake Huron-Georgian Bay plan which only covered the recreational areas and did not tie in with the business and industrial areas to the east.

MODA, in its analysis volume of July 27, 1970, at page 153, observed, under the heading "Important Problem Issues," that "there is a need to improve highway connections to points within and beyond the region" and it particularly singled out for mention "highway improvements and additions from Stratford to Highway 401 and to the Kitchener-Waterloo area."

Many municipalities responded but on December 22, 1970, the city of Stratford responded to The Department of Treasury and Economics' phase one analysis with an important brief to the Midwestern Regional Development Council on the subject of transportation, and this is what they said:

The phase one report states that a good road system is vital to a region's economy. Generally the roads within the region are quite good, but accessibility to the 401, major metropolitan areas, and the Lake Huron shoreline, needs improvement. We are in complete agreement with the statement in the report that improved highway

connections are necessary from Stratford to Highway 401, and to the Lake Huron recreational area. We also agree with the observation that Highway 8 has a great potential as a recreation corridor along which the communities could develop their distinctive attractions.

Better accessibility from Highway 401 to the Perth-Huron region is also necessary for faster and more economical transportation of goods. It is significant that truck transport rates from Toronto are based on road hours and reduction of time would result in a corresponding reduction of rates. It should also be mentioned that Stratford, as the largest centre in the Perth-Huron counties, with the most manufacturing and with a high rating for growth prospects, should have a better highway connection to the 401.

The report also mentions the additional transportation services on the Great Lakes and the demand that will be generated for fast and regular service. As Goderich is the only port in the region, it would seem that it is vital to have adequate highway facilities to this area.

The report also states that the "golden triangle" shows development toward the Toronto-centred and Niagara regions, while Stratford shows some orientation toward London. The highway pattern should take this into consideration.

It is, therefore, our recommendation that a highway built to present standards should be constructed from 401 in proximity to interchange 34, west to Stratford. Such a road should include a bypass to the south and west of the city to connect with Highway 7, thence to London. Similarly, the bypass could continue west and north of Stratford to connect with the existing Highway 8 to Goderich. This stretch of Highway 8 should be upgraded and improved where necessary to handle the increased traffic which is projected.

Such a highway pattern will be necessary for the economic development of the region, not overlooking the fact that Stratford will undoubtedly be playing a very important part in the Perth-Huron area.

The report designated Stratford as a high growth urban centre which undoubtedly will serve a large rural population. In fact, Stratford has the largest square-mile trading area of any urban centre in the total midwestern Ontario region.

Mr. Speaker, The Department of Highways has started a new road from New Hamburg to the Kitchener-Waterloo expressway, but it has not been tied right through to Stratford and beyond to Goderich, which is the only port in the area.

My leader has suggested that there is likely to be a great new development, involving docking facilities, somewhere between Port Elgin and Kincardine, in association with the Bruce nuclear complex. Even if this happens, I cannot see the former Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) allowing Goderich to die. I am surprised he is not more active in promoting the interest of Goderich than he appears to be from this side of the House, particularly since regional development came under his wing recently.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): I cannot believe that. Did the hon. minister let Goderich die?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): I think the hon. member should leave Goderich to me. I will look after it.

Mr. Sargent: The minister sure has!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Edighoffer: There is clearly no basic overall plan, but rather we see activity in cut-up areas. The Department of Highways does not seem to consider overall planning at all. It just picks up with one section in one area and with another fragmented section in another area. Its main concern seems to be visible all over the province every season. I suggest that this approach is not the most efficient way to go about things in the taxpayers' interest.

Can it be that The Department of Highways has fallen under the spell of what the Aurora *Banner* recently defined as "McKeough's law"? Strictly speaking, McKeough's law can only be applied to the Earl of Chatham's approach to regional government. You see, McKeough's law, simply stated, says:

For any increased combination of people into a new and larger unit of government, it follows, as night follows day, that more people will pay more money for less in the way of services and satisfaction.

McKeough's law also states that the old buildings are rarely if ever good enough—

Mr. MacNaughton: Who wrote this nonsense?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Shakespeare!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He is totally misinformed.

Mr. Edighoffer: McKeough's law also states that the old salaries are insufficient to maintain the bureaucracy in the state to which it has become accustomed; and that broadloom is a symbol of status in the hierarchy.

McKeough's law states that the upper tier is always on top not only on organization charts but psychologically as well. McKeough's law states that all the key meetings involving elected officials will be held at the other end of the region. In fact, McKeough's law states that if it is worth doing, it is worth gathering dust at Queen's Park.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): It used to be known as MacNaughton's law.

Mr. Edighoffer: Although the former Minister of Municipal Affairs has now passed to his reward in the Frost Building, McKeough's law will be his permanent memorial, inscribed on many a wall across the province.

Mr. Speaker, I went a little astray there from transportation.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): The hon. member was right on target. He did not go astray at all. He was right on target.

Mr. Pitman: You are doing badly.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): You sure did.

Mr. Sargent: And the funny part of it is most of them agree with you.

Mr. Ruston: The back rows are pretty quiet.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. member has got the publications mixed up.

Mr. Edighoffer: No, I have not.

Mr. Speaker, on this point I would like to quote *The Palmerston Observer* of April 1 in regard to transportation.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): We have this government under control.

An hon. member: Oh, oh. Shakespeare is quoting again.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I hope he did not write this himself.

Mr. Edighoffer: To continue:

A lengthy editorial in March 29 *London Free Press* dwelt on the passing of rail passenger services in Canada. Their concluding paragraph carried a thought we consider worth repeating:

Rail passenger service cannot be abandoned to history. It must be retained in the public interest—but subsidies are needed to keep it going. The subsidies should not be looked upon—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member is speaking in the wrong forum.

Mr. Edighoffer: No, I am not.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He should be speaking in Ottawa.

Mr. Sargent: The minister should listen and he will learn something. This government did nothing about it and it is not doing anything about it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He is in the wrong House.

Mr. Edighoffer: Oh, the minister has changed.

Mr. Sargent: You will find out.

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William): Put up with Ottawa.

Mr. Edighoffer: To continue:

The subsidies should not be looked upon as handouts to railroads, but as a cost society must bear to fill a social need.

In attempting to reinstate rail service through the development of Railiners, the the railway seemed at last to be on the right track. But the railway equipment designers seemed obsessed with size and weight. Those cars were much too heavy, too large and too expensive. The problem should have been turned over to an automotive or aircraft designer. Something like a medium-size highway bus mounted on rubber would have been ideal. Operated by one man, like a highway bus, and getting many miles to a gallon of cheap fuel, operating costs could have been cut to the minimum. Automotive design would have made available all the presently existing automotive services to them without the expense of their own specially trained staffs and equipment to change a spark plug or put in a new fuel filter. Such service would be available at every stopping place, if and when needed.

Like highway buses, too, they should have a generous and—

Mr. Jessiman: Is he talking about the GO train?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Talk to Mr. Pickersgill!

Mr. Gaunt: I would rather talk to the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I cannot do anything about it. Mr. Pickersgill can.

Mr. Pitman: He is too busy miswriting history

Mr. Edighoffer: To continue:

They should have a generous and readily accessible luggage space slung underneath. Package carrying would come into its own to be distributed from a taxi stand or bus depot on the main street of every hamlet served.

With such equipment we might still get to Toronto or London in comfort in less than four hours for less than five bucks and a package from either city for less than \$6.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister of Transport should be listening to this! He would learn something. This would not cost him \$3,000 to \$4,000 to learn this.

Mr. Edighoffer: The last point, freight transportation—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is all it is worth!

Mr. Edighoffer: —is a sore one for Mr. Arthur Carr, the *Observer's* publisher. In a private communication he writes of a freight charge of \$130 on 2.5 tons of newsprint from Toronto to Palmerston, and he adds:

Sometimes, when I think on these things, I wonder how small towns exist. Were we printers in Toronto that newsprint would be delivered to our door free of charge on wholesalers' trucks, which we in the outlying districts are paying to maintain. In Palmerston, we wonder just how sincere any talk about limiting Metro's growth, and encouraging growth in smaller centres instead, can be.

If I might, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to stay with transportation a moment longer, in order to read into the record the further proposal from the city of Stratford. If the government's Air Ontario concept is more than

just so many words, then this ought to be noted:

While on the subject of transportation we would like to briefly comment on airport development. The larger airports of Toronto and London are fairly accessible to the region for the services they provide. However, the increasing popularity of business aircraft indicates that better airport facilities are needed in smaller urban centres throughout the region. In particular, all-weather landing strips should be developed to accommodate private aircraft and, to a lesser degree, charter and commercial feeder lines. Industrialists, in particular, **object to any appreciable driving distance from their plant locations.** In fact, the proximity of an all-weather landing strip could, in many cases and increasingly so, **have a bearing on the location of a new manufacturing facility.**

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn here to the area of assessment. Again, I would like to quote Mr. Arthur Carr from *The Palmerston Observer* when he says:

We used the 'Books' as a guide, measured all buildings and our assessment was generally considered well in line with county practices. It cost us half a mill. The county took this over, and costs multiplied five times. We are told that equalized assessment over the county will stop southern towns and townships who had, it is alleged, low assessments for years and were thereby getting a free ride at the expense of more rationally assessed municipalities.

But the question is, did the adjustment of assessment compensate for the increase in costs through the establishment of a county assessment office?

Then, too, we have the very definite resentment of folks here, who saw strange young men wallowing in the snow, as they measured every structure in town. Just why the buildings had to be measured in February and March seemed a little obscure. The snow hampered the actions of the men, and we were reasonably sure the buildings would not vary in size between now and next May.

The regional assessment office for Perth and Huron, of course, was set up in Goderich, so perhaps the former Treasurer was looking after his own after all. But what a way to do it—right at the far end of the region. Any unbiased observer will tell you that for efficiency and economy and minimum travelling, this office ought to have been set up in the

centre of the region, at Seaforth or Mitchell, rather than in a town with only the lake on one side of its catchment area. The travelling expenses of the staff are really tremendous.

It also takes much longer now that a community has to submit a form for taxation of property changes to this faraway office. The municipality may actually lose substantially in revenue because of the time lag involved in processing this form. Because of the amount of the assessment in the Stratford area, if the Goderich office is to stay where it is, the present Stratford sub-office should be substantially upgraded and remain open.

There is something very odd about the current review of assessment, which falls short of published reassessment at market value. Could it be that the government is compiling its dossiers by holding back the bad news until after the election? That could be typical: to give out goodies on April 26, to have the dissolution and writ on April 29 and then come back and give the bad news to the people who had voted for the government.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Speaker, on the question of regional government and local responsibility, my newspaperman Carr, who is also a member of council, has these pungent observations to make—I feel they should go into the record—and I quote:

It is my belief that democracy as we try to operate it, must first have an educated public, then it must have communication as intimate as possible between the people and their representatives. In our weekly newspaper we have tried to keep the communication lines between town councillors and the public wide open, and have met with some success.

The unfailing high percentage of voters who respond at each municipal election seems proof of our success. Last year, with just councillors on the ballot, as the mayor and reeve were acclaimed, we had a 66.4 per cent poll. In 1968, with a more complete slate, voting reached 78.8 per cent.

This objective of ours, to keep open communication lines between councillors and electors, will become impossible if the erosion of town council authority continues. It will be impossible to cover a meeting in Guelph, even as we cannot cover your sessions in Toronto. More and more our government will become distant, vague and obscure. This, to me, is a rather terrifying prospect, and to say that I fear regional

government is putting it mildly. I am terrified.

To date I have not voted for any move to take any department, or phase of government from the town or township councillors. Yet more and more it is being taken.

Though I do not, for economic reasons, leave my place of business for a day, I did take time to attend a meeting in Guelph. The Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics, Mr. W. D. McKeough, was the "main course" at the banquet of information. Someone asked if a municipality could remain an entity unto itself, separate, apart and reserved from a regional government. The speaker said, in effect. "Yes, of course. You have that choice if you can afford to do it. You must remember that all grants will be regionally based."

So you people at Queen's Park take five cents off every dollar my little printing plant produces in commercial printing. You also take my gasoline taxes and the other multiple ways you have of getting my money. You give it back in grants that you use as a club to force me to do something that I believe is detrimental to the administration of my town. I do not really like that!

I have, I think, made it quite clear that from what I have seen of regional government, it is not for us. It is too inefficient, too impersonal, too remote and too subject to stupid administration points that, formed by some career civil servant, are absolutely inflexible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the subject of education. During a recent survey I conducted in my constituency I asked the following question, along with others. The question was simply: "Are you satisfied with county boards of education?" Of the first 900 or more replies that I have tabulated to date, 675 said no and 251 said yes.

Perhaps the following anecdote, again from Mr. Carr in his letter, will give some way of explaining the people's disillusionment with the county board system of education.

During the last few years I have watched small town councils, through their school boards, lose all semblance of control of educational costs. Our school administration is now a remote thing. Schools do not appear any more efficient, and we have experienced a cost increase of 14 mills. Things at our schools bother us.

At Norwell High School, administered from 40 miles away at Guelph, the house-keeping staff kept the grounds trim with

a power lawn mower, bought by students through the sale of magazines. Today, the Wellington board sends up a crew of men to pick up the litter from the grassed areas. Then a second crew comes along and cuts the grass.

There are several other points that were mentioned here which also leave one to believe that there is still much inefficiency in this setup. But, Mr. Speaker, the troubles and tribulations do not end at any one end of the educational system. The government, for example, in my area has been promising a new Stratford teachers' college for the last 10 years. It has been an issue in the last two elections; just one more election promise that has been promptly forgotten as soon as this government has been returned to power. This project has been in the Public Works capital works programme at the "approval for preliminary planning" stage for many years, just sitting there. Now that the minister has announced that new elementary school teachers must have a degree, no doubt the facility will be moved to a nearby university. The life of the Stratford Teachers' College as a political football could be drawing to a close.

The furor last week over who shall investigate the best use of provincial funds for education—the committee of the Legislature on human resources or Dr. McCarthy or both—has still left the common ground that costs and priorities will come under extensive and thorough review. Nowhere is this more important than in those marginal areas where the high school, the community college and the Manpower retraining programme overlap. It is possible to get the worst of all three worlds by letting things drift.

Now there has been a proposal that Conestoga College of Applied Arts and Technology, whose main modern campus is at Highway 401 and Doon-Blair Road, just beyond the Kitchener-Waterloo cutoff, should move into Stratford with an academic, commercial and technical series of programmes. Quite importantly, in view of the role of the festival in Stratford's life, a school of drama ought to be tied in with any such expansion.

When and if the teachers' college goes from its present old building, this edifice, which is right next to the Festival Theatre, could be used to house the drama school which Conestoga might then operate. I reiterate the views I have already expressed in last year's budget debate regarding the desirability of such a school, and I commend those remarks to those whose responsibility it will be to look into these matters.

The council of regents of the applied arts and technology branch have, I understand, given their blessing to a new community college building in Stratford. I gather that this project is now at the stage where it is awaiting the approval of, either the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) (who the Premier said was still responsible for CAAT estimates this session), or the Minister of University Affairs (Mr. White), who is showing interest in community colleges, even though he is not yet apparently entrusted with the financial responsibilities that we understood went with this portfolio in this regard.

At the moment, the facilities that have to be upgraded are the technical ones and these are the activities that require the new building. The drama school would do well in the old teachers' college when that is vacated by the present occupants.

There is a very real danger, Mr. Speaker, especially in connection with the adult training courses, paid for by the federal government and operated on contract by a college of applied arts and technology in the premises of a third party, which is the high school of a county school board. I am concerned that the technical equipment is, or could be, old and that, under the circumstances, effective safety-on-the-job training of the kind endorsed on television by the Ontario Safety League, and by the Workmen's Compensation Board is just not possible. Bad habits engineered in the training phase are liable to stick, Mr. Speaker. It would be folly not to have things right in the early stages of learning new skills.

Retraining in Stratford and area with its diversity of industry is a matter of high priority, Mr. Speaker, or it certainly should be. The board of Conestoga College is very interested in expanding in a more meaningful way and tailoring its activities to the Stratford situation which I have just outlined.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have, I believe, a most serious complaint about the way in which The Residential Property Tax Reduction Act is being administered to the disadvantage of those who can least afford to bear the loss in my area; and the manner in which the department is discouraging tenants to pursue their rights, under the law we passed in this 28th Parliament. We were all here and we all recall quite clearly what was intended. The reality, unfortunately, is only a travesty of the Legislature's intent. In one instance, a Mr. Geldhof received a form letter from a senior officer of the municipal subsidies branch, which says, in part:

Dear Mr. Geldhof:

. . . An officer of this department has been in touch with your landlord re your complaint that you have not received payment of your municipal tax reduction allowance. . . . The landlord has been requested to make payment to you or submit an explanation as to why such payment should not be made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, listen to this. It is, I believe, in the form letter and it is just disgraceful in its tone:

If you have not received the tax rebate and wish to pursue the matter through court action, it will be necessary for you to go to London—

the name of the city was typed in:

—and swear out an information against the landlord before a local justice of the peace. You would then have to be prepared to appear in court—

and this is in London again:

—on the date set for trial.

Now listen to this planned discouragement on the part of The Department of Municipal Affairs:

You should appreciate that the case may be remanded to a later date and that you would have to appear a second time.

Incredibly, Mr. Speaker, this is all in the form letter.

In view of your present location, you might not find it advantageous to undertake the above time-consuming steps.

Now that seems to me rather loaded wording. Here, as I continue, is the cinch which loads the department in favour of the landlord:

Accordingly, and before further action is taken, would you please confirm that you will be prepared to devote the time necessary for court action.

I commend this form letter to Mr. Justice McRuer, Mr. Speaker, as being germane to his continuing inquiry. I hope that he will have something refreshing to say about this particular form letter, which I think shows up bureaucracy at its worst, and demonstrates just why the price of freedom must be eternal vigilance on the part of each one of us at all times.

I also have a similar letter where the landlord has refused to pay, claiming that the tenant is in arrears, and one where an older lady is afraid to force her just claim for the rebate because of the threat to put up her

rent by the amount of the rebate. When this happens, as happened to a Mr. Donald Kestle, whose landlord increased his rent by the amount of the tax reduction, the department is equally "helpful."

Incidentally, this one comes under the New Wave, and it is now a Bales and not a McKeough department when the following occurs. This is a letter from Mr. Kestle to the department on March 6:

My purpose in writing is to inquire if there is any way a tenant can protect himself against practices of this kind.

And the reply from a subsidies officer, April 5:

There is no justification for a landlord to increase rents because of the residential property tax rebate programme, but at the present time there is no legislation to control rent increases imposed by some landlords. Therefore, in order to be assured of protection against unreasonable rent increases, a tenant should arrange for a binding contract in the form of a lease.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, the worst cases are those in which the tenant finds it impossible to obtain a lease, but is forced by the shortage of accommodation to take what housing he can get, always on the landlord's terms.

I echo the concern of my colleague, the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer), that things in the landlord-tenant field, given the attitude of this department, are not much better than they ever were in Ontario. The feudal system is still with us, and encouraged by this new government, as by its predecessors, the landlord is still very much top dog.

My final point, Mr. Speaker, concerns the letter sent to me by the corporation of the town of Palmerston on April 13, with a copy to the Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) and a copy to the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Wells), which is self-explanatory and which I will now read into the record.

The council of the corporation of the town of Palmerston was approached at its last meeting by a representative of the Victoria Order of Nurses to assist them in reducing their 1970 deficit of \$19,000 for the counties of Wellington, Dufferin and Perth.

Council is aware that the provincial government, attempting to reduce the soaring costs of hospital care, has endorsed the

home care programme, but now seems unwilling to assume the lesser costs by accepting responsibility for the deficit of the VON.

Inasmuch as the saving effected by using the VON care in lieu of daily hospital rates is substantial, it would seem that the VON deficit should be cheerfully accepted by the provincial government and not be assessed against the VON or municipalities.

The provincial government pays 80 per cent subsidy for VON services provided to the marginal income group, but perhaps this government could explain why it does not assume 100 per cent of the costs to the marginal and all other income groups who return home early and reduce in-hospital daily charges.

Your comments on this matter would be appreciated.

Yours very truly,
R. J. Saunders
Clerk-Treasurer.

Just to show how vital this service is, I have here a plea which I received from a lady in my area and I know that she is typical and who would benefit from such a service.

I would like to bring to your attention a community service that is organized in 15 Ontario counties but not yet in Perth county.

This is a home care programme under OHSC. It is set up under Victoria Order of Nurses in 13 counties, with Toronto and Kingston under other agencies. The enclosed pamphlet is from the North Waterloo branch of the Victoria Order of Nurses. Wellington county, Middlesex county—these counties also are organized.

The VON in Perth are most ready to work toward this setup for our county—they see the very great need there is for such a service.

I am personally concerned for I am a polio quadriplegic and require the services of the VON daily.

It is an injustice, is it not, that a part of Ontario benefits from such a programme, and not Perth county?

I know your awareness of the need for this service in Perth would be greatly widened were you to have a talk with Mrs. Jean Stewart, head of the VON in Perth.

Yours sincerely,
Miss Dorothy Clark.

Mr. Speaker, *The Globe and Mail* saw the relevance of this in its editorial on Wednesday, March 10, of this year, which I will quote because it is very brief.

Mr. Lawrence could put on a real push to develop Ontario's home care programme right across the province. They are excellent. They are inexpensive to operate and they please a lot of patients. But the municipalities have not been pressed to make them available and most people do not even know that they exist.

But then, this seems par for the course because even Walter Blackburn of the *London Free Press* on April 1 observed in his editorial: "In this government's maiden Throne speech, Premier William Davis remained faithful to the pattern." How true.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to end with this observation from the editorial page of the *Stratford Beacon-Herald* of Tuesday, February 16, 1971:

One delegate (to the Progressive Conservative leadership conference), John Stratton, was so concerned with the reaction in Perth to Davis as Premier that he said, "The feeling is that there will be no use running a candidate if he wins. We may as well stay home."

On this hopefully prophetic note, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks and advise that I will fully support the amendment made by my leader. I am sure that many members of the House will do so also in order that the people of Ontario may be better served.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, you will be relieved to hear this evening, in contrast to my previous efforts in the Throne debate, I am going to be relatively brief, the reason being that to my dismay, my favourite targets, the former Minister of Health (Mr. Wells) and the Attorney General Mr. Wishart, have been moved to less onerous posts. The new gentlemen, whose qualities and abilities may or may not exceed that of their predecessors, have not yet given enough opportunity and enough targets really to provide much material for attacks. We will have to leave this for another occasion.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): However—

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Watch the "however."

Mr. Shulman: However, fortunately the Attorney General has given me sufficient material that I think perhaps—I had not in-

tended to but since he is here—I will commence with him.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): His hair is getting thinner all the time.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): He is still smiling.

Mr. Shulman: The new Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, started off with some approval, I must say, from this side.

Mr. Singer: The enforcer.

Mr. Shulman: He suffers, as I do, from speaking over-freely at times, perhaps, and without thinking things through.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Oh, heaven forbid!

Mr. Gaunt: They are both in the same boat.

Mr. Singer: They shoot from the mouth.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: On a point of privilege—

Mr. Shulman: I have had some pleasure in his initial reactions to most things that have come up in the brief time since he has been appointed, but there is one matter that has come up which upsets me mightily. I wish to go into that matter in some detail, because the Attorney General's attitude in this particular field I think is so very wrong, not because the matter itself is that important, although it is important to all the people involved, but because the attitude of an Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, should be always not only to see that justice is done but—and it is an old phrase—to make sure that everyone involved gives the appearance of justice being done. I find it very upsetting that the Attorney General, according to this matter and according to a letter which I have from him in front of me, does not agree with that principle.

The case, Mr. Speaker, involves the tragic death of a young boy—a six-year-old boy by the name of John Glen Arnold. This took place last September, and the family wrote to me because they were extremely upset at what had happened. They live in North Bay, and they wrote me on February 19, 1971, after an inquest had taken place into this boy's death. They were extremely upset about the details of it and they asked me to intervene with the Attorney General, which I did. The circumstances are—perhaps I should read the letter or the important part of it because it is quite succinct and explains it quite simply:

Dear Dr. Shulman:

My son, John Glen, died September 5, 1970, of lindane poisoning. He was six years old on September 4—the day before. I am sending you a copy of the paper's report on the inquest, but with it I will give you a few facts that did not come out in the inquest or the paper.

The night we came home from our camping trip, Friday, around 7 p.m., September 4, the house had been sprayed for bedbugs the day before. When we opened the door, the first thing the kids said was "Oh, it stinks in here."

It did not bother my husband or I—we had such bad colds we could not smell anything. We opened all the doors and windows and turned on the furnace fan to clear the air. The basement and the downstairs seemed to be fine. The upstairs was a mess. It was all covered in oil base. I took all the bedding and sent it to the laundromat. I put the pillows in the dryer for about 20 minutes each. I washed the walls and the floors and the closet in the boys' room and put everything back. The dressers were all oily so I cleaned them also.

I said I would do the rest the next day. I made the beds with the clean bedding and put the boys to bed about 10:30 p.m. and the girls slept in the tent trailer. My husband and I went to bed about midnight.

I will not go on to read this letter in detail, but, to sum it up, they all became ill that night as a result of the lindane which was left from the spraying the day before, and the boy died. It is a particularly tragic death, an unnecessary death, an accidental death, I am blaming no one.

An inquest was held, and I wrote to the Attorney General because the conduct of that inquest to my mind left a great deal to be desired. I will read the letter to the Attorney General. It is very brief; it was sent originally to the then Attorney General. I wrote to him on February 23, 1971.

Dear Mr. Wishart:

On September 5, 1970, six-year-old John Arnold died in North Bay as a result of breathing a chemical used to spray a house two days before for bedbugs.

The inquest was conducted by Coroner Dr. H. M. Wallace, and the family are extremely upset because the inquest certainly did not give the appearance of a fair inquiry. The firm that had sprayed the chemical—P.C.O. Services Limited—hired as

the lawyer to represent them at the inquest the coroner's brother, George Wallace.

I hope you will advise me that a new inquest is to be held.

Yours sincerely,
Morton Shulman.

I ultimately got a letter back from the new Attorney General on March 19, and I am going to read the letter in full—it is brief—because to my mind it sums up a great deal of what is wrong with the coroner's office and, I am sorry to say, what is wrong with the new Attorney General:

Dear Morty:

A report has now been forwarded to me from the supervising coroner's office.

Mr. Gaunt: Pals, eh?

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Was that a personal letter?

Mr. Shulman: It was not marked "personal."

Mr. Gaunt: I can tell the two fellows are buddies.

Mr. Shulman: To continue:

A report has now been forwarded to me from the supervising coroner's office as a result of your letter of February 23 to my predecessor, the hon. Arthur A. Wishart, QC, relating to the inquest into the circumstances surrounding the death of John Glen Arnold, which was held at North Bay on February 11, 1971.

I am informed that the coroner, Dr. Harold M. Wallace, presided at the inquest and his brother, Mr. George E. Wallace, Q.C. acted for an interested party, namely, P.C.O. Services Limited. It is of importance to note that the family of the diseased lad was represented by counsel, Mr. D. C. Doney, and at this time the coroner's office or this office has not been made aware of any complaint about the inquest from the counsel who acted on behalf of the family.

The circumstances surrounding this death are unusual in that the premises where the lad slept the night before his death had been fumigated that day, and this, presumably, was a factor in deciding that an inquest was necessary.

While there appears to be some evidence that he was subjected to lindane spray, an extermination agent, the reports from the independent provincial laboratory of The Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food do not indicate that the lad suffered a lethal exposure to the spray.

I agree it is also of importance to note that Mr. John A. Inch, Crown Attorney for the district of Nipissing, acted as Crown counsel for the coroner at this inquest. It would appear that all the relevant evidence was made available to the coroner's jury, and the fact that one of the counsel was related to the coroner would not appear to have in any way limited the evidence which provided the jury for consideration in this case.

In view of the above facts, and unless you or anyone else has further evidence, facts or material bearing on the matter, I am of the opinion I should not direct that a new inquest be held in this matter.

Yours very truly,
Allan F. Lawrence
Minister of Justice and
Attorney General

I read the letter in full, first of all because of some of the nonsensical things in it. The statement that the reports from the independent provincial laboratory of The Department of Agriculture and Food do not indicate that the lad suffered a lethal exposure would be ludicrous, if it was not so tragic. Of course, the lad suffered a lethal exposure—he died—and, of course, that was also found at the inquest, and supported by the expert evidence at the inquest.

The suggestion that there should be no action taken because the lawyer had not brought the complaint—the lawyer from this small town—to my mind bears no importance whatsoever, and the fact that all the relevant evidence was made available to the coroner's jury may or may not be true. I do not think it is relevant in the slightest. The fact remains that an inquest was held into a tragic death and the appearance was given, to the family, that something funny was going on because the coroner was present and his brother was there defending the firm that sprayed the lindane.

When I was coroner of this city, one of the major problems we had was just this type of thing. I had hoped with a new wind—

Hon. E. A. Dunlop (Minister without Portfolio): Has the member a brother in the law?

Mr. Shulman: I have no brother. If my brother were in the law, I would have enough sense if I were a judge not to let him act in front of me, and if your brother were a judge, I hope you would have enough sense not to act in front of him.

Hon. Mr. Dunlop: I was just wondering why the member had the same problem.

Mr. Shulman: Similar problems! The member for Forest Hill, who I think is a member of the law, must know that no judge, surely, in this country would allow his brother to appear before him as a lawyer for one of the parties?

Hon. Mr. Dunlop: I am not a member of the law.

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry, I apologize. Then I understand the member's ignorance of the matter.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Surely the appearance of justice must be given here also? Surely the Attorney General, a new Attorney General coming in without any debt to anyone involved in this matter, should have enough consideration for the families of the people involved here to order a new inquest, even if nothing else is discovered; even if the very same results are brought out. Because the appearance of justice is just as important in our coroners' courts as it is in our magistrates' courts or our supreme courts.

I am going to leave it at that. I am not going to belabour it any further. I think the Attorney General knows he was wrong. I hope he will reconsider this matter. I hope it is not so terribly important in this case—but I hope he will lay rules down to the coroners' offices. They still have not got through their skulls what should be done in that coroner's office or how it should be done—that the appearance of justice must be given; that in every inquest affected persons should be given the right to have a lawyer. They still do not have that right; it is a privilege which may or may not be given. I hope we will see new legislation in that way, and that this type of small-town abuse which we see in the coroners' offices will not be allowed to continue in the future. I will leave it to the Attorney General. I am sure he will make some comment on it at an appropriate time.

The matter that I had intended to begin with today is a more political matter. It involves automobile insurance in this province and, in effect, I think this case which I am about to tell you about will sum up the reason that my party, for better or for worse, will probably form the next government here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: One of the major issues which is going to take place in the coming election campaign is going to be that of

automobile insurance. The NDP have made their position very clear; they are going to bring this under government auspices. The insurance agents and the insurance agencies have raised a fairly substantial sum of money to get involved in the next provincial campaign to support the party of your choice, be it Liberals or Conservatives, and make sure the NDP does not form the government.

I, somehow, as a result of my recent correspondence with these gentlemen, think that they are determined to produce their own destruction. If any issue is going to result in the NDP being elected, this will probably be it. I am about to tell you of a most incredible case which has just taken place, in the last few days, which involves the insurance companies and which shows the reason we cannot allow them to continue to cause the human havoc which they are causing in this province. This type of thing could not possibly occur under the most ineptly run government plan.

The government plan which has been brought in in other provinces, in other areas, in other jurisdictions, and which we hope to bring in here, is one whereby a fee is paid along with the licence and you are covered automatically. Most or a part of the cost of insurance will come out of the general revenues.

I received a letter just last month, on March 12, which was written by a friend of the person involved because this man does not speak or write English well. This is the type of person who gets caught in the meat grinder of bureaucracy and the meat grinder of government, and the meat grinder of the insurance companies.

This is a man who was fully covered by insurance and I quote from the letter. Briefly the facts are as follows:

On December 1, 1969, Mr. Mateo Perez of 26 MacGregor Avenue, Toronto, was driving along Eglinton Avenue proceeding westward. At the Oakwood intersection he made a left turn southward on the advanced green and in so doing bumped a pedestrian.

A charge was laid against him. He was taken to court. He was found not guilty. He was covered by insurance, he thought, and he gave it no further thought until, in February, 1971, he received a formal notice from The Department of Transport which informed him that a judgement had been given against him in the amount of \$2,263.10, and that until paid, or arrangements made, his driving licence was under suspension.

He has no more chance of paying that kind of money than we have of flying. There is just no possibility. So, in effect, it means that for the rest of his life he is not going to be able to drive. How does this happen when he is covered by insurance?

This is the story. His insurance, which has been paid for, ran from May 27, 1969, to December 1, 1969. The accident took place on December 1, 1969. However, the fine print in the policy—a copy of which I have here—states that the coverage extends from 12:01 a.m. to 12:01 a.m. on the relevant dates. Thus on the afternoon of the accident technically the policy had expired.

Mr. Perez had received his premium notice a few days before from the insurance company—and more about that in a few moments, because they said they should not have sent it out; they sent it out by mistake anyway—and on December 5, Mr. Perez gave the agent a cheque payable to the insurance company to cover the premium. The company deposited it in their bank, cashed the cheque, and then some time after that, some days after that, they issued a new cheque refunding the amount and cancelling the insurance, using as the reason late payment of premium. They dated it back to December 1 at 12:01 a.m.

After considering the merits of this case—the company involved is Continental Casualty—it appeared to me that if ever there was a type of case that they did not want made public in this election year, this was it, because it showed exactly what is wrong with insurance as it is now run, where this type of non-coverage can take effect within a few minutes or a few hours and a person can have financial ruin. Of course, if you were covered through a government scheme there would not be any running out. You would be automatically covered and everyone would get his expenses paid.

Here we have two tragedies—the tragedy of the Perez family and also that of the other family who were unable to collect for their medical expenses.

I wrote to the president of the Continental Casualty Company, of 150 Bloor Street East, on March 24 as follows:

Dear Sir:

Re Mateo Perez.

This gentleman had an accident on December 1, 1969, which was the day that his Continental policy expired. He was under the impression the policy renewed automatically and on December 5 he sent Continental a cheque which was cashed,

but subsequent to this date, you cancelled his policy retroactively to December 1.

The amount involved for the insurance company is not crucial, but for the individual involved it is tragic, and I was hopeful that if I brought this matter to your attention you would see fit to assist Mr. Perez.

Certainly in this day when the very survival of the auto insurance companies is at stake this type of case cannot assist you.

Yours sincerely,
Morton Shulman.

I received a very courteous, very lovely letter back from the president of Continental Casualty Company, and I am going to read some excerpts from this. He says no, of course, they are not going to help Mr. Perez. They are very sorry about it all, mind you; it is really a shame this type of thing has to happen in this day and age, but they are not going to pay out the \$2,200. Let me read you the letter.

Dear Dr. Shulman:
Re Mateo Perez.

Mr. Perez' situation is indeed unfortunate and I am sorry that it has apparently caused him considerable financial difficulty. You might be interested in some of the background of this policyholder. We initially insured Mr. Perez effective May 27, 1969, and his policy expired as of 12:01 a.m. December 1, 1969, for two reasons.

1. He failed to pay the renewal premium prior to the expiration date and in fact payment was only tendered some days after his accident.

2. We were no longer doing business with the agent who represented him. Our contract with Mr. Perez's agent was cancelled on September 22, 1969, and at that time we advised the agent of all his insured who could no longer be renewed because of the cancellation of the agency contract.

As you know, we are not allowed to continue to service business after a cancellation of an agency contract since the agent owns the business and the company does not.

May I intersperse here in the letter, this of course is one of the evils of the present system. I continue the quotation:

Additionally the agent would no longer be licensed to act for the Continental Casualty Company. It then became the agent's responsibility to continue to secure

insurance for Mr. Perez and his other clients with another company. As occasionally happens, because of our IBM billing system, sometimes all the records are not corrected on time and, consequently, a renewal billing was sent to Mr. Perez and three other clients of the agent under our normal billing procedure 30 days prior to the renewal date.

When we found that these billings had been sent out we immediately called the agent and advised him of this.

Again, let me intersperse. You note they did not call the client and tell him; they sent the bill to the client and when they decided there was a mistake made, they phoned the agent. I continue the quotation:

An agent's normal procedure is simply to replace the coverage in another company. In this particular case we have not discussed this question of the agent involved since I do not believe it is our prerogative to do so.

I will leave out some more of the detail, and I go on:

I appreciate your interest in this case, and I certainly share your sympathy for Mr. Perez's situation. However, I think we have been extremely fair with Mr. Perez since he was given every opportunity to secure other coverage and, as you can see from the circumstances outlined above, our obligation was to be certain that we did not inadvertently renew Mr. Perez policy because it was his agent's right to handle the renewal as he saw fit in Mr. Perez's best interests.

It would, in fact, have been quite improper for us to have renewed Mr. Perez's policy. I should point out that all of our actions on Mr. Perez's policy were taken in accordance with our standard office procedures, and well prior to the time of his accident.

I know that this explanation does not provide Mr. Perez with the relief which he is seeking, but I do not believe that under these circumstances we can be of any assistance to him. I hope, Dr. Shulman, that I have given you all of the information you desired, but if not, I would of course, be pleased to discuss this with you further.

Sincerely,
Richard Gilmore,
Continental Casualty Company.

Let us just look at the case. They sent out a renewal-of-premium notice to Perez. They decided that they did not like that, so they phoned the agent and said they should not have done it. They received Perez's cheque, but they did not return the cheque—they cashed the cheque. I have the cheque right here. Then they decided, "Oh, my God, we have an accident here, it is going to cost us \$2,200. Well, better Perez should pay it than us." And they threw the whole thing back in his face, which means he can never drive.

This is the abuse that is going to do in the insurance companies, and this is the abuse that is going to do in the people opposite in the next election.

The president of this company got a chance to get out of this mess by paying this relatively small amount of money. I did not get up and say, "What a stupid bunch of people you are"; I said, "For goodness sake, straighten it out." And what is his reply? "Go jump in the lake. Too bad about Perez." Do you think the public, when they hear about this case—and I intend to mention it on every platform I get on—are going to pay any attention to the hundreds of thousands of dollars that the insurance companies are pouring into this campaign against us?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Not likely.

Mr. Shulman: Do you think they are going to pay any attention to any party that tries to defend this type of thing, or that tries to defend a system under which this can happen? Let us suppose that Continental Casualty is not at fault. Let us suppose that technically they are right. Are you going to defend this system where Perez suffers? Is this not a spot where government should step in? Where is your superintendent of insurance? Well, I tell you, you have picked the wrong issue for this campaign, and if your insurance companies go ahead with their great campaign on television and radio, and if you are foolish enough to stand with it you are going to go down to a resounding defeat and we are going to get elected for all the wrong reasons.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Right, right.

Mr. Shulman: I leave a lot for you gentlemen to ponder over. The minister responsible is in the House. I am glad the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs is here; in a recent case where the insurance companies refused to come across I understand he did

a little arm twisting for one of my constituents, Miss Sylvia Sapiano, for which I am grateful. They did not pay her what was owing to her, but at least they gave her something. She was owed \$4,000. The Occidental Life very magnanimously gave her \$500, and as Ron Haggart said, "Well, there is one election campaign issue down the drain." He is right.

I cannot talk about that one any more, but this is a good one, and unless the minister comes across very quickly and puts a little pressure on some of these insurance companies and knocks a little sense into their heads, they are going to destroy themselves, and they are going to destroy him and the government at the same time.

I would like to turn to The Department of Health and I want to start by complimenting the minister—this is the first time, I think.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): That is a change in a hurry.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, it is a change in a hurry. He is a good minister and he deserves a compliment. We have been plagued here for many years by incompetent Ministers of Health, ministers who either were in above their heads or who did not care. The last man appointed committees. Any problem that came up he said, "I will appoint a committee." He appointed 843 committees, and none of them ever did anything.

Mr. Gaunt: Eight hundred and forty-three problems.

Mr. Shulman: Eight hundred and forty-three problems, but they were all solved with a committee being appointed. Well, two good things have happened in this province in recent months. The present incumbent was appointed the Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence), and the member for Quinte (Mr. Potter) was appointed to the cabinet, and I disagree with some of the other comments that have been made on that. I do not think this will silence this particular member.

I have been pleasantly surprised, Mr. Speaker, in these recent weeks by the reaction of the Minister of Health to the various issues that have come up, and I think perhaps a new day is dawning in that department. We have an open mind there at last, a willingness to have open institutions and finally, if he can persuade the Treasury Board to give him the money that is needed for the institutions that have been so neglected over the years, perhaps we can

have some good things begin to happen within those institutions.

There are three matters which I want to bring up in The Department of Health, and none of them do I bring up to criticize the minister. They are public health problems which I bring up to bring to his attention, and to that of the member for Quinte. I hope that perhaps they will do something with these particular problems.

The first one is a problem that has not been brought to the attention of the public in any meaningful way, and it could be a most serious public health problem. It was brought to me by Mr. Nick Douloff, who is in charge of *Canadian Consulting Engineer*, which is the outlet in this country for engineers in various fields. He was very upset about a situation that is taking place right now in Ontario which he feels could be a very serious public health problem. He has written a lengthy article on it which I am not going to read, but I just want to point out the relevant parts of it and I want to give him full credit for what has been done.

Three or four years ago, and dating back some 10 years ago when municipalities began to add fluoride to the water supplies, there was great controversy. Ballots were taken, much was said on both sides—and I do not want to go into that controversy at all tonight—but while the fluoridation debate raged, literally raged in this and other jurisdictions, other chemicals were being quietly introduced into water supplies until the practice became widespread with no publicity whatsoever.

Unlike fluorides which are put in to protect the health of human beings, these additives are used to protect the pipes through which the water runs. Unlike fluorides which are put into the water by government, these chemicals are put in by private individuals or organizations and municipalities, with no debate, no vote and no fanfare. Amazingly enough, the practice flourished under an almost total blanket of silence while fluoride proposals aroused agonized debate ranging from constitutional law to social ethics.

So quietly did this revolution take place that many leading engineers and regulatory bodies were completely unaware of the practice. In fact, some engineers doubted at first that these chemicals, these corrosion inhibitors, were in fact introduced into the drinking water system.

It took a lot of research to find out exactly what was being done and how widespread

it is. The reason for this is quite simple. When you are building new apartments, you can put piping in in two ways. You can put in copper pipe or you can put in galvanized iron pipe. Copper pipe has an initially higher cost, and when you put it in, it costs more to build the building. If you put in iron pipes, it is much cheaper. There is only one thing wrong with them—they corrode. So in order to save this initial cost of putting in copper piping, most of the apartment houses under construction at the present time are putting in galvanized iron pipe, and so that it will not corrode, they then introduce into the water—constantly from then on, going into those apartment houses—certain chemicals to prevent the corrosion of the pipes.

These chemicals consist of a number of things but their main component is polyphosphates. They are injected directly into the water supply after the water has entered the building. The chemicals are placed in an automatic metering dispenser which is attached to the cold water pipe in front of the system. Most provinces, including Ontario, limit by law the feed rate of polyphosphate corrosion inhibitors to 10 parts per million. But the feed rate, although limited by law to 10 parts per million, in actual practice, is not held there and in the various machines that were examined to see how fast these chemicals were going in, the rate was anywhere from one to 30 parts per million, depending on which company had installed it.

The interesting thing is that copper piping, which costs more to start with, in the long run is cheaper because you do not have to buy these chemicals to be put constantly into the water; such piping does not corrode, copper piping is forever. But if the builders of these buildings really cared about the long-term economics, let alone human health, they would save money.

But they do not; they are interested in a quick buck—build the building; get your buck out and run; to heck with the health of the people involved.

The strange thing is that corrosion inhibitors are banned in this province, but for some reason this government has never exercised the ban. Corrosion inhibitors are under regulation 471 of The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act, part 2, section 24, subsection 1, which states: "No connection shall be made in a potable water system whereby any foreign matter or non-potable water may enter the potable water system."

There is the law. It is against the law. But the builders in this province do not feel that they have to follow the law because the Ontario Water Resources Commission has said, "We are not going to enforce it," and in fact they do not enforce it. There is only one area in this whole province where you cannot put in corrosion inhibitors and that is in North York. They passed a municipal bylaw prohibiting the use of corrosion inhibitors. But in the rest of the province—anywhere—they may be in use!

There is one province, Saskatchewan, which has specifically banned their use in drinking water supply. They exercise and control their law and insist that the law be followed. Here in Ontario there is no control.

I have here the research that was done by the *Canadian Consulting Engineer* and I wish to quote the material on the health hazards:

There are serious health hazards inherent, such as possible synergistic effects. When two or more materials combine to produce a third substance or aggravate the effect of either compound, the permutations become endless. It is now known that two non-toxic substances can be changed into a toxic one during the conventional drinking water treatment process.

With the ever-increasing amounts of toxic materials, pesticides and other materials now being found in our raw water sources, the prospect of toxic conversion is very real and should be on everyone's mind.

Outside of the health aspect, of course, the fact of pouring all these polyphosphates into our water is incredible from the effect that it has on our water system, because polyphosphates of course are responsible for the eutrophication or the death of our bodies of water, our lakes and our rivers.

There is an immeasurable amount of polyphosphates being poured out, neutralizing all of the great work the Ontario Water Resources Commission has tried to do. They sue Dow to prevent this type of pollution or other types of pollution, and yet they allow this to go on to a far greater extent.

There is public health problem No. 1, that, for some reason the government has not been aware of, or if it has been aware of it it has taken no action on it. I throw this over to the minister responsible, and it happens to be the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr) because I guess he is responsible for his laws not being carried

out. If he does not do something about this, he is going to have a serious public health problem which is going to reach the public's attention. I think this is the only time that many of our ministers take action.

The second matter I want to talk about is not as serious a matter. It is not a public health matter, although it is a health matter; it does affect the health of many thousands of people in this province. These are the people with Parkinson's disease.

Parkinson's disease is a horrible, crippling, debilitating disease which affects persons, usually beginning in their fifties, sometimes earlier, and which results ultimately in their complete inability to carry on. It does two things. It gives them a frozen mask—they lose the ability to move their features in the way we are used to—and gradually they develop a tremor of their limbs which makes it impossible for them to carry on even the most simple activities.

There is a cure for this disease. This is one of the ravages of the human race; Parkinson's disease has been known back to antiquity. No one has ever been able to do anything about it until half a dozen years ago when a cure was discovered. I see my medical friend shaking his head, but I am going to quote from *The Medical Post*. I hope he will go along with them. This cure is a drug called L-Dopa. It was discovered by accident. It does not cure all persons with Parkinson's disease, but it does—and I should not use the word cure—it is like insulin in diabetes.

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister without Portfolio): I will buy that.

Mr. Shulman: I see the member is agreeing with me now. It controls 70 per cent of the persons who have Parkinson's disease and allows them to return to normal life.

It has a side effect. It also restores their sexual ability, which has caused some—

Hon. Mr. Potter: That does not always work either

Mr. Shulman: —which has caused some persons who do not have the disease to try it.

An hon. member: The member is not leaving?

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Perhaps the member has gone out to try it.

Mr. Shulman: The problem with L-Dopa—

An hon. member: There is a point of privilege here.

Mr. Peacock: The member for Brantford should take the point of privilege.

Mr. Shulman: The major problem with L-Dopa is the cost. As a result of the extreme cost of this drug, although there are 200,000 Canadians who are now suffering to the point of crippling with Parkinson's disease, only 1,500 patients in all of our country are receiving treatment. There are two reasons for this. One is the difficulty in administration, but the major problem is the cost.

The Medical Post, which I think is one of the major organs for Canadian doctors, on February 9, 1971, wrote an editorial, a very lengthy editorial, on this matter. I just want to read the last paragraph, or the last two paragraphs, because they sum it up pretty well. I quote:

We suggest that the publicity given to the use of L-Dopa and the number of patients who are awaiting treatment has placed this situation in the category of an emergency. Therefore it requires the involvement of both government and the profession.

L-Dopa treatment is costly. The price of the drug will undoubtedly come down as volume increases, but one must remember that it is chronic treatment, and as such could impose an intolerable burden on the patient.

One solution would be to have L-Dopa classified in the same category as insulin and that it be paid for out of Medicare funds, or at least some part of the cost subsidized. A hard look at costs would also be an important item on the workshop agenda.

Are we to deny treatment to at least 100,000 patients suffering from Parkinson's disease, many of whom can be salvaged to lead useful lives, because it is difficult to work out a system of getting the treatment to them?

End of quote.

I will leave this with the Minister of Health. I hope he will go to his cabinet colleagues and say that this is a worthwhile thing. It involves 100,000 votes, at least, from the persons involved, without their families. As such perhaps it merits some attention by the current government.

In any case, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, if it does not receive attention by the current

government, I shall solicit those 100,000 votes for this party on the promise that we will do something about it, if and when the time comes that we are able.

Mr. J. R. Simonett (Frontenac-Addington): If!

Mr. Shulman: The third health matter to which I would like to refer briefly is a more local problem, but it is one that is a minor scandal in this city because we had a solution, and for some reason we dropped it. That is the matter of detoxification units for drunks who are arrested in Toronto.

Some years ago there was a building opened on Harbord Street called the detoxification unit, which was a new idea—a new way of treating a drunk. Instead of throwing him into the cells, let us take him to a place where he can receive proper treatment, proper food, proper care. Let us see if we can get him back on the street and not just throw him in the cell, sober him up and throw him out again to come back again.

And it worked. It was a bold experiment—I give the government credit for it. It was their idea, or their officials' idea. They brought it in. It worked beautifully.

I went through that place twice and each time I came out saying: "Well, they do not do everything wrong. Sometimes they do something right." So what do they do? They close it down.

I have here the official statement of policy from the Canadian Criminology and Corrections Association, which is an organization affiliated with the Canadian Council on Social Development. They write about the Toronto detoxification unit:

Conclusions arrived at after more than one year of operation suggest that detoxification could be done at much less expense, with less emphasis on highly trained medical and paramedical personnel.

So here, they approved of it. Everybody approved of it.

The government approved of it. The opposition approved of it. But they shut it down. The building was needed for something else. Space was needed for something else. The building was torn down.

We came to the Minister of Health, in the estimates last summer and we asked him about this. He said: "Oh we did not shut it down. We just transferred it over. We are not using that building. We are going to have it someplace else. We are going to have it—" let us see, what did he say? "We are going

to have it at Harbour Lights and Seaton House."

Unfortunately, I should not dwell on that overmuch, unfortunately his facts were not accurate. There is absolutely no detoxification unit in Toronto at the present time. Deputy Chief Ackroyd of the Toronto police, when asked at an inquest recently, stated quite flatly: "There is no detoxification unit." There should be; so here we get a nice bold great idea, a new way of tackling a serious social problem—it works and there is no follow-through.

Well, we have a new energetic Minister of Health. He has come into the House now, and I put this idea to him and I hope he will read today's *Hansard* because I have made one or two suggestions for his benefit. This is something that is an emergency. This is something that merits something being done. It is not going to cost anything. That is the funny thing.

If he would just compare the two costs—the cost of keeping the drunks in the cells or keeping them in a detoxification unit, he would find it cheaper in a detoxification unit. So here he can do something without going to Treasury Board or perhaps when we have to reassess the funds a bit, but it is not going to cost him anything more. Here is his big chance to do something. The previous minister talked. He set up a committee to look into it. If this minister does something before the election, I will go out and support him in Carleton East.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): Where is the member's leader?

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Where is the member's leader? He is not here tonight.

Mr. Shulman: Unfortunately, none of the three leaders is here tonight, but fortunately my leader had the benefit of what I am about to say because we consult together. The member's leader and the leader of the Liberals unfortunately have missed all of these great ideas.

Mr. Henderson: The member's leader has lost interest in him.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I hope not. I hope not.

Mr. Stokes: Where is yours?

Mr. Ferrier: The member opposite never got very far with his leader. He is still sitting in the same seat.

Mr. Pilkey: He could not even get a change of seats in the back row.

Mr. Shulman: Well, Mr. Speaker, to reply to the member for Lambton, let me say at the moment I am not making an appeal to my leader because unfortunately at the moment he is not in a position to put into effect these various remedies which are obviously necessary. At the moment—and I say "at the moment" through you, sir, to the members opposite—at the moment it is their ministers and it is their leader who are the only ones who can do anything about this. Now, I do not really think they are going to. I have not got much faith in them quite frankly.

I still have a reasonably open mind. That is why I am here giving them these suggestions. If they put these things and others into effect, they might even be re-elected. But I do not think they are going to do these things and I hate to say it to the member for Lambton, but I am going to miss him next time; I really am, because we sort of sat opposite each other all this time and we smiled across at each other. Next year, as I sit over there looking at the few Conservatives and Liberals that are here, it will bother me not having him here to see the things we are doing that we suggested he do and that they missed their chance. Mr. Speaker, they have had every opportunity. They have the power, they have the members, they have the government, they have got the bureaucracy. They could carry out all these reforms, and if they did it would not please me mightily but I think they would be re-elected. It really bothers me to see people miss their opportunity, to have a chance to carry out reforms and instead throw it over to us and make us do all those things next year. Well, we will do them. We will do those things for them. In fact, I will send them *Hansard* every day to let them know the things as we bring them in.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Say goodbye to the member for Renfrew South, too!

Mr. Shulman: Well, I would like to turn to another matter, Mr. Speaker, and get away from The Department of Health. I would like to come back to the Attorney General's Department for a moment in reference to a bill which has received some publicity but which I have not introduced in the House. This is the bill which has been written up by several newspapers—the compensation for the innocent bill. In case anyone is not aware what this is about, this is a bill to compensate those who end up in jail and are innocent—not, not guilty—but are

found innocent. First of all they are found guilty in court and subsequently, after appealing to a tribunal, it is found that there was an administrative or a Crown error and they were really not guilty, and there have been a number of cases mentioned.

Mr. Makarchuk: Obviously innocent.

Mr. Shulman: "Obviously innocent" is the phrase, and I thank my friend. But another case has just come to my attention which so obviously fits into this pattern; I wish to bring this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and through you, to the Attorney General, because I feel that a bill like this could save a few people a year from financial ruin—not many; I suspect there would be perhaps a dozen, perhaps two. But those few people, for the few thousands of dollars that would be involved, would be saved heartache such as we have seen every now and again in this province which is the type of thing that governments should be attempting to prevent.

I have a paper here from Orillia and I would like to read a quotation from the editorial, rather than going into long details of the case, because it sums it up very well. The newspaper is dated April 7, 1971, and it reads:

WHAT PRICE JUSTICE?

The classified ad section of a newspaper is not always the most exciting department to work in, but it so happened that on a dull day on February 24, 1970, Joan Woods, an attractive girl working at the *Packet and Times* accepted a small ad which was designed to become the most controversial and expensive in the history of Orillia.

The advertisement referred to a 1970 mobile home offered at a subsequent saving of \$1,500 and was published under the name of Sunshine City Homes, Joseph T. Ageus, on West Street South. A complaint was immediately laid under The Combines Act and curiously enough it turned out to be no irate consumer but a competitor named Alex Richmond of Richmond Mobile Homes, also of West Street South, who laid the complaint.

There then arrived in Orillia a certain Mr. T. T. Begin from the trade practices branch in Ottawa, who, for two days, began a grand tour of Sunshine City's customers. Altogether, Mr. Begin flew to Toronto from Ottawa, rented a car and visited Orillia on no less than four occasions.

Mr. Ageus was subsequently committed for trial following a preliminary hearing in Orillia provincial judge's court. It is worth noting here that had he pleaded guilty, he would have been fined probably \$50 to \$100. However, the case was deemed admissible to the Supreme Court and after a two-day hearing early in March which involved a jury, four constables, sheriff's officer, court reporter, a judge and two lawyers, not to mention the star witness, government investigator, Mr. Ageus was found not guilty of misleading advertising after his lawyer presented evidence to prove that the purchaser had in fact paid the \$1,500 when purchasing the mobile home. Altogether, reliable estimates put the cost of this extraordinary tangle of legal boondoggling at somewhere between \$20,000 and \$30,000. Alex Richmond, the complainant, never had to pay a red cent. The taxpayer footed the entire bill with one exception. Joe Ageus, after suffering seven months of slander, gossip and loss of business is now faced with legal fees of \$2,700. What price justice?

Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems like an incredible case and indeed it is. Someone put an ad in the newspaper, offering to sell a home at \$1,500 less than the usual price. We do not know who that someone was. It was a phoned-in ad. Mr. Ageus, the owner of the company over whose name the ad was put in, swears up and down he did not phone in that ad and when one looks through his records of ads, all of which are there, that one is not there. Someone phoned that ad in.

Immediately after the ad was phoned in, or immediately after the ad appeared, by some coincidence Mr. Ageus's chief competitor, a much larger competitor in Orillia, immediately laid a complaint that under The Combines Act he was offering misleading advertising. There then arrived an investigator from the Justice Department who spent two days with Mr. Richmond and with certain customers but never once took the trouble to come to Mr. Ageus to look at the facts and to hear the other side of the story. Then, having heard this one side of the story, he proceeded to lay charges against him in court which ultimately of course were thrown out because they were phoney charges.

Well, the family has suffered literally seven months of horror. I received a letter from Mrs. Ageus and I would just like to read a portion of it; it is very brief because it sums it all up:

Dear Dr. Shulman:

Thank you for your recent private bill on compensation for victims accused of a crime. I wish you every success with it and I am writing to Mr. Smith, PC, MPP, for Simcoe East, to say so. There are so many cases of people being ruined by being charged wrongly. This bill is too late to help my husband's case but perhaps it will help someone else. I had written to you last fall about the case of my husband, Joe Aegus, being charged with false advertising under The Combines Act and you had replied suggesting we contact our Ottawa MP because it was a federal matter. The case is now over after trial by judge and jury.

My husband was the first case acquitted under this Act by judge and jury in Canada. Of course, that is small compensation for the fact that (1) he was not guilty in the first place; (2) the charge was laid by a competitor with intent to ruin him; (3) the lawyer's fees of \$2,710 plus loss of business due to being charged with an offence under the Criminal Code in a small-town city are just about enough to ruin him financially.

The competitor laid the charges. There is no question about that. That came out in court. That is in the transcript which we have.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): That is the allegation—

Mr. Shulman: I thank the member for the legal advice. They laid the charges; there is no question about that; that came out in court. No; that is in the transcript which we have, that came out in court.

Mr. Ben: Well, the member is doing good. I hate to see him do poorly.

Mr. Shulman: "We thank you again for your valuable time, (signed) Mrs. Joe Aegus."

Well, that sums it up. All right, perhaps someone made a mistake; perhaps these charges should not have been laid, but the fact remains they were laid. The man was innocent; the man was found not guilty and there is nowhere he can go for any help, nowhere he can go for any compensation.

If this bill were brought in—it has not been introduced even for first reading—but if this bill were brought in, I hope it will be brought in as a government bill. Let me say I have presented it to members on all sides of this House, to several members in the other two parties, all of whom approved of the bill and believed it was a good idea.

If this bill were to be brought in, the type of case which is represented here, that of Joe Aegus and similar cases which have been brought up in the past—Douglas Woods, McKenna—would receive compensation which very rightly is due to them.

I did not want this bill to suffer the fate of most bills brought in by private members, so I sent it to the new Attorney General and I explained to him what the purpose of the bill was. I explained it had been drawn up by a Conservative, well-known Toronto lawyer, Mr. Arthur Maloney, who, I believe, has the respect of the members of all three sides of this House.

It is a bill that has nothing to do with politics. No party is going to get any benefit from it one way or the other. It is good legislation. I think probably every member of the House will agree with me on that, and I ask the Attorney General to consider bringing this in as government policy.

If he does, it is not going to cost the government millions of dollars or \$1 million a year. It is going to cost some thousands of dollars a year and it is going to save the type of heartache and the type of horror that happens to people like this. Again, I send this plea across to the Attorney General: Do something; bring this in; this is something which we all will be proud of having had a part of.

Now I want to turn briefly to the TAP system, because I have had a most disastrous experience with it. You have heard a great deal about the temporary absence programme which has been brought in by The Department of Correctional Services—great announcements in the House, the wonderful things that are being done,—and it is a good idea, and like so many good ideas, for some reason, the minister involved does not follow through.

I have a most tragic case here, which has just now been concluded, and about which I am still mad, because it shows how the darn programme does not work in the very type of case where it should work. A man by the name of John McKay, a patient of mine for some 15 years, a family man with several children and a wife, worked for Massey-Ferguson for 20-odd years, and had never been in any trouble with the police or anybody else. One horrible night last year, he went to the Rondun Hotel, had too many drinks and punched a policeman in the face.

He appeared in court and was sentenced to 15 days in jail. I believe he served nine days and was let out, and that appeared to be the end of it. Unfortunately, there had

been a lot of attacks on policemen, and the Crown felt that this was too mild a sentence and that all sentences for people assaulting policemen should be heavier. They appealed to the Court of Appeal which in its wisdom raised the sentence to six months in jail.

This was the beginning of December, and Mr. McKay went to the sergeant of detectives and asked if he could have time not to go to jail until December 26, because he wished to spend Christmas with his family. The sergeant of detectives was a very humane man. He said yes, he would be glad to let it go until December 26, if he would give himself up then.

In the meanwhile, I wrote to the then Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Grossman) and I pointed out the circumstances of the case. I asked him if he would please consider putting this man on the temporary absence programme, because if ever a man deserved to go on the temporary absence programme this was McKay. He had never before been in trouble of any sort with the police or anyone else. He was not going to run away, he would go back to his work at Massey-Ferguson, and at night he would go to jail, and he would spend his six months spending the nights in the Don Jail and working during the day.

This way his family would not have to go on welfare and he would not lose his job. The minister acknowledged my letter and said he would look into it. On December 26 McKay gave himself up, and went off to the Don Jail. I wanted to hear what would happen, and a week later I got a frantic call from his wife: "He is not at the Don Jail any more. I cannot find out what happened to him."

So I phoned Governor Whitehead at the Don Jail to ask what had happened.

He said, "He has been shipped to Guelph."

I said, "What about the TAP?"

"It has been turned down."

"What reason was given?"

"No reason was given. We do not give reasons."

I said, "Well, do you know, can you tell me off the record?"

He said, "They do not give me the reason. I cannot tell. All I know is that they turned down his application and he has gone down to Guelph."

I was just incensed, upset, furious. Because if they really believe in rehabilitation in that department—I have grave doubts, I really do—here was the perfect case for TAP. I got

nowhere with the government, so I appealed to a higher source. I went to Ron Haggart, who is a columnist in this city, and he wrote the article up in detail giving the circumstances of what had occurred. Suddenly action took place. Suddenly at Guelph, they called Mr. McKay into the office. They had read the article, and they said, "We had better do something about this." They put a new application into TAP and suddenly, by some magic, the application which previously had been rejected was accepted, which shows where the influence lies in this province.

In any case, meanwhile, unfortunately, Massey was laying people off, so he got laid off before he could be shipped down to start work again. That did not worry me too much, because I knew with his record he would have no trouble getting another job, so I got in touch with them and asked if they would let him out on the TAP programme to look for work. They said, "He can look for work all right, but he has to look for the work while he is in here. Every day he can look from nine to five. He can look at the papers, but he cannot go out and apply, but as soon as he gets the job then he can go out during the day to go to work."

At first I thought they were kidding, but they were serious. The man was granted the temporary absence; he was granted permission to go to work, but he was not allowed time to look for a job. They cannot seriously believe that any convict with the lowest IQ is going to accept that as real serious belief in rehabilitation. It is just sheer nonsense. The men running that programme should have their heads examined.

Finally, I called Massey and I pleaded with them. I told them the whole silly story and the only thing you can do is you have to blow up and explode or laugh. He laughed and said, "Mr. McKay is rehired as of today. We will recall him." So, bang, he was able to go back to work and the whole problem got settled that way, and he went on the TAP programme.

But what would we do if we did not have a fighting columnist like Ron Haggart in the city to write this sort of thing up? He would still be sitting in that jail down in Guelph, and the wild stories he tells about Guelph—well that is for another night. We will save that for another time, as my whip tells me my time is limited.

But the TAP programme does not work. I do not think it is meant to work. It is meant as a great public relations act and that is all it is. They let a few people out to take their pictures—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: Do you want to wind me up again? But they do not seriously pay attention.

There are two other brief matters I want to refer to. One is the matter of alcohol in this province.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member for Thunder Bay is the first man. The member for High Park will not listen to him.

Mr. Shulman: I come from a dry riding, one of the very few that are left in the province; and residents of my riding voted "dry" just a short time ago, and I am the last one to quarrel with their wishes. However, I have come to the conclusion that the people running the liquor laws in this province have completely gone out of their heads. Either someone down there is trying to make us all look like fools, including the minister, the Legislature and the police, or else some lunatic is running the place.

The things they have done recently are most incredible. I have made a list of some of them here and I find them beyond belief. Within this past year, they have done the following things, the inspectors of the Liquor Control Board.

They walked into The Boiler Room one day and said, "There are too many tables in here; take some of them out." So the fellow said, "Okay, we will take them out right after closing time." "No, now. Make those people get up and pull the tables out." Sure enough, they made the customers get out of the chairs and they pulled out the tables and chairs.

Perhaps this was an over-zealous inspector who did not want to wait the 30 minutes until closing time. He felt those people had been sitting there long enough.

In the very same week, they went to Honest Ed's—and I mentioned this here once before; I am coming to some new items, but these are some of the earlier ones—they went to Honest Ed and he was selling hot dogs there at the same time he was serving drinks. They said, "You may not sell hot dogs any more, hot dogs out as of tomorrow or else licence out." Ed said, "What is wrong with hot dogs?" The inspector replied, "They are undignified, we do not allow hot dogs in any of our establishments. Hot dogs out."

Mr. Makarchuk: There may be something Freudian about the inspectors.

Mr. Shulman: The same week they went to Julie's, and they came up to Alex, who is the maitre d', and said, "Do you realize what is going on on the next floor?" He said, "My God, what is going on on the next floor?" "People are drinking standing up! They must not drink standing up. They must drink sitting down." The world is coming to an end, everyone is polluted—somebody should be committed. There must be chairs and tables and no one must drink standing up—always sitting down. And furthermore, that is not all, they must not drink alone, they must eat at the same time as they drink.

Mr. Young: No hot dogs, though.

Mr. Shulman: No hot dogs though. So he said, "Well, that is all right. These are people who have eaten their meal here, in the main floor." "Well, it does not make any difference. They have to eat again. It is a different floor."

Well, Alex was sure that he had misunderstood, but if you cannot drink standing up, you cannot drink standing up. So—

Mr. Stokes: Those liquor laws are really laughable.

Mr. Shulman: —they put up a big notice, there, "No more drinking standing up." Everybody had to sit down and they put in tables and chairs. But he said that he was sure that he must have misunderstood the inspector when he said they had to have two meals. So people were coming in for the first time and went up to the lounge and sat down and they said, "You have got to eat first." He said, "Okay." But for those people who had finished their meal and went up to have a drink, he found it a little difficult to believe that they had to eat again, so he telephoned up to make sure that was the ruling. It is a different floor, a different establishment. They have to eat again.

And that is the ruling today. If you go in to Julie's to have a meal and decide you want to go upstairs to the lounge and have a drink, you order again. You do not have to eat it but you must pay for it. Insanity!

That is not all. They decided, just three weeks ago, that the Greeks in our city were doing something terribly immoral. Do you know what they were doing? The inspectors went in there on a Sunday and people were dancing, and not only were they dancing, they were drinking. They were drinking and dancing! Well, they do that all the rest of the week, and it is all right, but on Sunday

you may still drink, this is all right, and we do not mind you drinking, but you must not dance. Liquor and dancing are okay through the week but never on Sunday.

So Zorba, who ran the establishment, had a bit of difficulty in understanding, but he thought, "What the heck. These are the people who rule this country, and if they say you must not drink and dance on Sunday I guess they must have reason for saying so. We will continue the drinking and stop the dancing." So that apparently would solve the problem.

One of the other places, Nepantha, said, "Look, we do not serve liquor on Sunday. We do not want to serve liquor, so we will allow the dancing and stop the liquor." So they came back this past Sunday and said, "It does not matter, no dancing even if there is no liquor." So he said, "What has this to do with the Liquor Control Board if we dance and there is no liquor being sold here?" "It does not matter, if you ever serve liquor here—and you do other days—you come under our regulations and we insist that you do not allow any dancing on Sunday."

Mr. Stokes: Never on Sunday.

Mr. Shulman: "You do not allow any dancing on a Sunday whether or not liquor is sold. And if you continue to allow dancing on Sunday, which is perfectly legal, under the laws of this land, we are going to take away your liquor licence for the rest of the time."

What are the establishments to do? Are they to fight back? Of course, they gave up. But it was not just these establishments. In midweek, two other establishments, a place called The Scene and a place called Damon's Den were visited by these enthusiastic "Mackey's Insane Marauders" and they were given the same rules. "Liquor in an establishment puts it in a different category than if liquor is never served there. And if you serve liquor in your establishment on Monday, the following Sunday, whether there is liquor or not, you may not dance, or we close you up."

That is not all. They seem to have completely blown their brains about granting licences.

Mr. Makarchuk: No, the member means they have gone beyond that.

Mr. Shulman: This is not bureaucratic bungling such as we used to see so often in various departments of government and

which we still see occasionally. Someone has gone completely off his rocker down there. That is the only possible explanation.

Mr. Peacock: The member has not heard about the \$5,000 fine for the guy who did not serve the sandwich in Windsor?

Mr. Shulman: No, I am sorry. Oh yes, I did read about that. Some troop of agents provocateur came into an establishment and literally conned the waiter into selling them a beer. He did not sell them a sandwich at the same time and the establishment was fined \$5,000. There is something wrong in our law in trapping people. This was not an inspector going in and seeing liquor served without food. He trapped them into doing it.

Mr. Makarchuk: Straight out of Frankenstein.

Mr. Shulman: Just three months ago there was another establishment in Hamilton where the inspectors from the same nutty department came and said, "You may no longer employ women in this beverage room. From now on you have got to employ men." The owner said, "But the women have worked here for years and the government says we should have equal opportunity and there should be no sexual discrimination." They said, "We do not care about those laws. This is the Liquor Control Board of Ontario. We run the establishment. You fire those women or we shut you up."

I want to quote from an article in the *Toronto Daily Star* by Jeremy Brown, about the fair way in which they give the licences, and I quote:

In 1969, immigrant Jean Claude Terrier, then 23, with \$1,000 of his own and \$3,000 in bank loans, started an establishment called l'Omelette, a restaurant specializing in omelettes. After 18 months of successful operation he was finally granted a licence by the Ontario Liquor Licence Board.

Last month he started a branch on Wellington Street East, near O'Keefe Centre, with the same name and the same cuisine. He had been advised by other restaurateurs that an applicant with a liquor licence who planned to open an identical operation elsewhere has reasonable grounds to believe he can open the new premises with a licence immediately, but the liquor board would not even allow Terrier permission to apply for a licence, and so far no reason has been given.

I want to interrupt here. It is not a question of applying and being accepted or rejected.

You have to apply for permission to apply. They refused him permission to apply. I go on with the quotation.

Last month, the Danish Food Centre Tavern on Bloor Street West, owned by Dan Cheese Limited, a company owned by 200 members of The Danish Cheese Association, opened with a tavern licence on its first day. Manager Bjorn Andersen admitted he was a bit surprised when the licence was granted, because the association itself had had no previous Ontario liquor licence.

Mr. Singer: What about Ontario Place?

Mr. Shulman: I am coming to that. Licences are given out capriciously, no reason is given when a rejection is given—places sit for months and years with no licence and no reason given.

Is this a fair way to run government? Is this a fair way to run one of our departments? I think the man who is running it, or not running that department—and the minister must now be responsible. I cannot believe that either the present minister or the past minister was aware of these things, or took any part in them, despite the many faults that these men have, one of their faults is not one of insanity, and this is simply—and there is only one way to describe it; I have used the word before—insanity.

I want to quote George Boukydis, president of the Ontario region of the Canadian Restaurant Association, who, as he put it, is extremely upset by the apparently arbitrary moods of the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario.

The board published the names of five applicants for various liquor licences yesterday, including one on behalf of the Minister of Trade and Development for Ontario Place, which opens in two months.

They are hearing applications for restaurant lounge licences; they have not issued any of them for 20 years. I think it is unfair that Ontario Place applicants get lounge licences when they have not been available since 1950. I have repeatedly asked the board for a list of its regulations, and I have been consistently refused. We do not even know when the rules change.

Mr. Boukydis went on:

I am also upset about the fact that none of the five Ontario Place restaurants is operating and therefore, if licences are granted, they will be able to open up with

liquor, something few private restaurateurs have been able to achieve.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if there is one department in this government where everything is wrong, it is this particular department. Our liquor laws have been made a laughing stock for years, for generations perhaps, but they have been raised to a new height in the past year, ever since the appointment of James Mackey to his new position. He appears to be out to embarrass the government in every way he can. I can only suspect that he must be a member of one of the opposition parties because he is making you look so foolish. You had better whisper in his ear very quickly that what the insurance companies are doing to work you out of office, he is doing to laugh you out of office.

I want to finish on a purely political note. I have tried, Mr. Speaker, in my four years in office never to get into political matters, but always to stay above that and only involve myself in matters which were for the good of everyone. But I think, since this is probably my last Throne Speech for this Legislature, I should be allowed one political indulgence and I would like to take that now.

I would like to talk about the political process and this time I will give the Conservatives a rest. I want to talk about my other friends to my right because I know it will please them to have this on the record. I will try to do what I can to make everyone happy.

Mr. Gaunt: There is one of them walking out now.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you. As you know, Mr. Speaker, you have heard there is an election upcoming in this province—I understand it is to be on June 26.

Mr. Stokes: No, June 24.

Mr. Shulman: June 24?

Mr. Gaunt: Do not bank on it.

Mr. Shulman: I am hopeful it will be June 24. I hope it will not be put off.

In preparation for this election, in some of the ridings of this province nominations have taken place for various parties. I am sorry that the Liberals have not nominated in my riding yet. I am looking forward with some trepidation and relish to see who they send up to the meat grinder.

In any case, they have had nominations elsewhere and one of the nomination meetings took place out in Oakville. It was a

sign of democracy in action and I thought that perhaps the members of the House would like to hear about it.

I must give the Liberal Party credit. They are getting huge crowds to some of their nomination meetings—1,000 people and more. It has given great concern to the other parties and great happiness to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) who is thrilled to see these great crowds come out, who finds this as a sign of democracy at its best and, perhaps, a sign that the Liberal Party is on the upswing and that it will form the next government.

We saw one meeting after another where they had 800, 1,000, 1,200 people, and it is very impressive. Quite honestly, when reading these figures in the paper I was very worried, because if they are able to do this, perhaps they are going to sweep the province. Perhaps they are going to take all 100-odd seats that are available, and who would be there to oppose them?

Anyway, I feel a little better now after the Oakville nomination, because a few reporters went down to cover it and one of them wrote a brief article, which I would like to read into the record.

The heading is, "ROBERT NIXON TOLD THEM 'THIS IS DEMOCRACY AT ITS BEST'." This appeared in the Oakville *Daily Journal Record* on Wednesday, March 3, 1971 at the bottom of the front page:

Charles Crisci of Milton wrote "Blake" in block letters on more than 20 empty ballots within 10 minutes last night at the Halton East Liberal Party's nominating convention. While the candidates were still speaking he was writing "Blake" on ballots, stuffing them into the pockets of groups of Italians and saying, "Okay, good, now do not lose that."

He regularly reported to a group of Blake organizers in the back of the hall which included ward 3 councillor Pete Watters. At one point, Crisci told them, "I got 200 of them." "Good," the Blake man responded.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Well organized.

Mr. Singer: Almost as good as Dovercourt, but they did not have to call it off.

Mr. Shulman: "Crisci also slapped 'Blake'—"

Mr. Singer: Dovercourt was the place where there were more ballots in the box than there were people at the meeting.

Mr. Shulman: It seemed to happen here—several hundred more.

Mr. Singer: Yeah, yeah!

Mr. Shulman: "Crisci also slapped 'Blake' stick-um labels—"

Mr. Singer: How about the nomination meeting at Dovercourt?

Mr. Shulman: Quoting:

Crisci also slapped "Blake" stick-um labels on Blake acquaintances, indicating in Italian that this was the man they were voting for.

During the time he was observed writing "Blake" on the 20 ballots, he was also scurrying around to various groups of observers, grabbing their ballots, placing the ballot on the back of the person or on his thigh and writing "Blake" before moving on to another group.

One woman was asked who she supported. "Black," she said. Why, she was asked? "He change," she responded. Her two elderly acquaintances were asked the same question, but they did not understand English.

At least two dozen other individuals were encountered in a random questioning of the crowd who could not speak any English at all and did not understand the language.

A group of about 20 teenagers from a Main Street pool hall in Milton sat together in the back of the room. They were all voting delegates of the Liberal Party.

One was asked how much money he was getting for appearing at the convention. He laughed and shook his head and would not say anything. "I do not believe you," the reporter smiled. The boy grinned back and nodded.

A second Milton pool hall youth was asked who he was supporting. "Blake." Why? "I do not know." For what position? "Liberals." No, what office is he running for? "I do not know."

The pool-hall group shouted interjections several times during provincial party leader Robert Nixon's speech and got a reprimanding from one of the Blake adult organizers to keep quiet.

When Rud Whiting thanked Nixon for his speech, most members of the pool-hall group started laughing and hooting, imitating Whiting's voice.

An Italian man standing alone after the hoopla was over was asked what he thought of the convention. He shook his head and said, "No. Uh, uh." What candidate were you for? "Oh, it does not matter. I do not care." He spoke English very well.

The conversation continued. The reporter asked him again who he was for to win the nomination. Again he replied, "I do not care. Either one. It does not matter. I am tired."

Several people responded with a point to their Blake stick-um label when asked who they were supporting. They could not pronounce the word, but they knew the label was there.

A young man shouting and carrying a Blake sign was asked what he thought of the convention. "Well actually I am in the NDP but this guy Blake is all right."

An elderly man named Percy Purdy headed straight for the liquor counter when it was opened after the voting had finished. "I have been coming to these things for years," he smiled.

He leaned on the orange counter with shaky hands, grabbed two shots. "Get your mixer down there," the bartender told him.

Robert Nixon told the crowd, "This is democracy at its best. Politics is not just a game."

Two men were asked who they supported. The first shook his head and said something in a foreign language. He gestured to the second.

"Ah, Italiano, no speak," the second said. Who are you voting for, the second one was asked. He pointed to his Blake sticker. Why? "Work. He want jobs."

The defeated leadership candidate David Butler said, "There is nothing to stop the packing of ballots except our constitution."

He said the important part of the campaign took place before the annual convention. He estimated that two-thirds of the delegates came as prearranged supporters of a candidate and one-third came "with an open mind."

Mr. Ben: The reporter was the president of the NDP association.

Mr. Singer: He was the fellow who ran the meeting in Dovercourt.

Mr. Shulman: The worst is yet to come, do not get upset yet; goodness!

Butler stressed the importance of the speeches at the convention, but then admitted that speeches could not persuade the two-thirds. "I do not think it is possible to convert those brought in under those circumstances.

"My own supporters were very aware of the issues. Lots of people are not proficient with the English language but anyone who joins us is eligible to vote. I have not bought a single vote."

Blake said the convention outcome "was a culmination of effort starting in January. We signed people up at coffee parties. A lot came in uncommitted and I tried to sell Liberalism and myself to them.

"I have tried to involve the Greek, Italian and Portuguese communities."

The candidate denied seeing Crisci signing ballots. And someone pointed out that that was not illegal, but helpful. A member of the Crisci family thought the reporter was "from the police."

One convention-goer said, "Two things have impressed me about this convention. Size and action."

Out in the lobby a young member of the Blake band said to another, "Who are we playing for again?"

The kids laughed and looked bored and laughed some more. None of them showed any interest in what was going on on stage.

When the line of Blake girls came prancing by they perked up.

"Now that is some reason for coming," one delegate said to his friend.

Mr. Newman: It that why the hon. member was there?

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I did not want to interrupt the hon. member because this has been the most humorous part of his speech—

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member state his point of order?

Mr. Ben: The point of order is that the rules prohibit the long reading of newspaper articles and letters.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Speaker is well aware of the rules.

Mr. Makarchuk: That is another touch of humour.

Mr. Stokes: The hon. member for Humber is really enjoying it.

Mr. Shulman: Because of kindness I had not wanted to say too much about this matter. I do not want to embarrass my friends to the right, and quite honestly I felt a little better when I learned where they were getting their crowds and the conviction that these crowds had.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): What is the matter with "them people"?

Mr. Shulman: Nothing is the matter with "them people." It is a pity they did not know what was going on at the meeting.

In fact, rather than my making a comment on it I am going to leave it for the *Daily Journal Record* who take their politics very seriously. They wrote a lengthy editorial, which the member for Humber will be pleased I am not going to read, but I just wish to read the first and last paragraphs because they sum it all up so well. It is dated Friday, March 5, 1971, and the heading is "The Halton Liberals":

Standing on the platform of the big Halton Liberal rally this week, party leader Robert Nixon proudly proclaimed, "This is democracy at its best."

He then assured his audience that politics is not a game, not a plaything of people seeking power. He would have us believe politics is people and its involvement.

Mr. Nixon . . . may endorse the politics (and practices) of the Liberal convention—and the exploitation of the group of Italian delegates from Milton. We do not.

What we saw . . . was the worst side of our political system. What we saw are some of the reasons why the whole system is under attack today, particularly under the attack of a young generation that puts people before party. The Liberal Party included.

After seeing what we did on Tuesday night we are ashamed. Not for what we wrote. But because we watched people being treated like puppets and being exploited for the good of the party. Democracy at its best? Or worst?

And on that note, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my address.

Mr. Singer: He never did explain Dovercourt.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I enter into the Throne

debate, may I first commend you, Mr. Speaker, for concurring with the women's liberation movement. I believe that this is the first time in the Ontario Legislature that page-girls have been present. You, Mr. Speaker, in your wisdom, have made some important changes in the selection of pages. This Legislature is now being served by pages from almost every riding in Ontario, and I think it is a privilege well appreciated by those who serve.

Let me begin by addressing myself to the problems of unemployment. I stated in the budget debate last June that I am personally opposed to the federal government's outlook in regard to the working man, and to the government policies in relation thereto. In particular, I cannot support any government policy of deliberately creating unemployment in order to cure inflation. I believe that inflation is caused—

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Where were you when he was in Welland?

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Why do you not tell that to your leader?

Mr. Haggerty: I believe that inflation is caused not so much by people working for a decent salary and by a fair share of the goods and services of this province, but rather through their being unable to obtain employment. Such people—more than half a million of them—are forced to obtain income assistance through such programmes as unemployment insurance and various welfare schemes. However, the federal government, however belatedly, did show some awareness and took some positive correctional steps before the end of June, 1970.

My leader (Mr. Nixon) has already told, in his speech in the unemployment debate, how overtures were made to the Ontario government, notably by Mr. Young and Paul Gerin-Lajoie, who was then a member of the Prices and Incomes Commission, as well as by officials from Mr. Benson's department, and how these overtures were rebuffed by the then Treasurer of Ontario (Mr. MacNaughton) and his deputy Mr. Ian MacDonald, and others from the Frost Building.

Particularly, my leader has shown how counter-cyclical programmes were not adopted in the provincial Public Works Department at a time of full employment, so that there was no major public work to absorb unemployed construction workers when the slack began to show. Consequently, the Ontario government has been reduced to mounting a pitiful but showy programme of dead elm

tree removal—not, mark you, where the trees are worst hit, along the little-travelled side-roads of this province, but rather along the main arteries where the signs emblazoned with the name of the new Premier can be seen by all.

It is like Pharaoh building his pyramids all over again, except that the Premier uses the device to get re-elected. The Pharaohs were dead before anybody dared say anything nasty about them, but the present Premier will get his answers as early as two months from now if he chooses to go to the people of Ontario on the strength of his performance to date, of which this elm tree programme is just one pitiful example.

As I listened to the present Treasurer and Minister of Economics (Mr. McKeough), I realized the government has replaced a cipher with a zero. In fact, he is beyond the zero; he is wholly negative and, more importantly, he comes over as negative to the people of Ontario.

When, at the Tory leadership convention, the Earl of Chatham walked over to the squire of Brampton, it was the kiss of death for the Tories in this province, for here was arrogance embracing indecision, and the people of Ontario did not fail to notice it. As my leader said at the time, it was a good deal funnier than "Laugh-In" on the other channel.

It is par for the course that the Treasurer should stand up in this House and blame everything on the federal government. For him to say that the Ontario government is not responsible is a false statement and one which will not be believed by the people of this province.

We all know that one of the growing dangers to the Ontario economy is companies which shut down one plant in order to operate another economically without regard to the human consequences. When this happens on the international scale, Ontario may be severely handicapped in doing anything about it, beyond demanding statutory notice of closure and all the safeguards that my colleague, the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. De Monte), has proposed.

When it happens as a result of a deliberate policy on the part of The Department of Trade and Development, however, there is absolutely no excuse. The manner in which the forgivable loans programme has been handled—I notice they are called performance loans now to fool the people again—is absolutely scandalous, and I say to the new Minister of Trade and Development (Mr.

Grossman) that if he is worth his salt, heads should roll.

In an effort to get back to the first principle, I turn to the work of Gray, the Owenite socialist who turned into the first disciple of "under-consumption" when he left the doctrinaire socialist field in 1825. He was a Benthamite, of course; or a believer in "the greatest happiness of the greatest number," but it is interesting to see how he moved into what we would now call the Liberal position. I should like, for the benefit of my friends to the left, to read into the record from pages 130 and 131 of "Critics of the International Industrial Revolution.":

Gray's lecture on Human Happiness starts off from the Owenite proposition that man's nature if not interfered with by evil influence, conduces to harmony and happiness. The principle that satisfies man's natural desire to live in peace with his fellows is barter, for example, the giving and taking of equal quantities of labour.

Properly applied this would lead to a condition of equality, whereas under the existing system the workers are robbed of four-fifths of their produce, which is then distributed among the nonworkers. And at this point Gray invokes statistics which demonstrate the rich man, in point of fact, pays nothing and receives everything, while the poor man, in point of fact, pays everything and receives nothing.

We put it to candour of every honest man whether such a state in society as this ought to be preserved. If the non-producers should argue that they live upon their own property, Gray rejoins that property not acquired by labour is held unjustly. Moreover, the present inequitable distribution of wealth coincides to further evils, for the competition among labourers presses down the rate of wages, while competition among employers lowers the rate of profits; were competition replaced by co-operation—as proposed by Owen—the whole of society would benefit.

As the matter stands, production is limited by effective demand, whereas it ought to be limited only by the satisfaction of material wants. The result is that the inhabitants of Britain are in the possession of powers by which they can create wealth without any known limits, and yet one-half of them are in the state of actual poverty. The argument points to lack of purchasing power as the cause of insufficient production.

In his later writings Gray quite consistently comes forward as a monetary reformer, while socialism drops out of sight. If inadequate purchasing power is at the root of the trouble, then the remedy may be found within the terms of private ownership and the market. In this sense Gray can be called a forerunner of under-consumptionists.

Well, in this age of cybernetics and computers, we have moved a long way from the dependence on workers' hands alone for laborious toil, but the consumption part of the equation is still there, although today it is complicated by the problem of pollution. It ought not to be beyond the wit of man to devise some means of building the costs of counter-pollution measures into the cost of structures and the general economic framework of our society.

As my leader said in 1968, it is only the extended production that technology has brought about that has made it possible, for the first time, for man to be able to afford to clean up his mess. We have to recognize that "cleaning up after" is a legitimate charge on the cost of goods and services, and we ought not to let anybody off the hook, or to sidetrack the issue until after the election by mounting a phoney legal battle, as in the case of Dow, where the province cannot hope to win. Court cases under existing and inadequate law are no substitute for new law enacted by this Legislature and firmly enforced thereafter.

I believe the problems of temporary unemployment and pollution in the public sector can be linked together by a massive publicly financed, labour-intensive hiring programme that would result in making Ontario beautiful again. It is clear that, as the factories become more and more automated and as fewer and fewer workers are needed inside the plants, an ever greater percentage of our workers must move over into the field of service of all kinds. I envision a great public sector of service that will continually maintain our countryside, as well as city streets, in an attractive state. And, as my leader has said, we can afford to do it, and we cannot afford not to do it.

Another attack on unemployment should be combined with a massive challenge to the lack of reasonably priced housing. Private enterprise can do the job if the public sector provides the services needed. The latest OHC report shows that one million new homes will be required by 1980, and of these 75 per cent will be within a 100-mile radius of Toronto.

Now whether this should be is another question. The Liberal policy is to decentralize growth around power points: Nanticoke, Lennox, Bruce and sites to be selected in the north. But the Toronto-centred-region plan, which is reliant on expressways and the "golden horseshoe," seemed to forget the vast areas of the province where the government has traditionally shown little or no concern.

Be that as it may, municipalities throughout Ontario have in far too many instances little or no sewage treatment capacity and what they do have is wholly inadequate in the light of their recent growth. I would commend to your attention the resolution on the order paper in the name of my colleague from York Centre (Mr. Deacon) which was debated today. This is essentially the approach a Liberal government would take to the question of providing adequate services.

You will notice also that my colleague, the member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter), has carried this a stage further and related the service problem directly to the housing shortage. I think we have to relieve municipalities further, and at the same time lift a lot of names off the welfare rolls, by offering employment to large numbers of able-bodied men on the provincial payroll. There is no reason why a substantial federal component should not be built into such a scheme, as of course it is into welfare. Some kind of a job corps is urgently needed to preserve the dignity of that very great segment of Ontario unemployed which has retained its pride in the face of all adversity—people who would rather starve than accept handouts from welfare bureaucrats; people who are just longing to do an honest day's work given the chance.

Associated with the need to have a vast provincial involvement in pollution cleanup and services provision programmes, be it through direct employment, in a job corps or by guarantees to private contractors—whichever seems more appropriate in the circumstances—there ought to be a much clearer recognition by Queen's Park of the plight of municipalities in general in this area, and particularly of the lower-tier municipalities involved in the disaster known as Tory-style regional government.

It is often hurled at us across the floor that we supported the concept of regional government years ago and even wrote it into our platform. That may be true, but it is equally true that never in their wildest nightmares did Liberals ever envision anything

like the horror story of the Niagara regional government. We would have run a mile.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on some of the editorials written on the Niagara regional government. Perhaps some of the members are not aware of them. From St. Catharines city council the headlines read, "St. Catharines contends regional government has failed".

The mayor has mentioned that some of the major inequities listed in the brief are that the overall regional council is too large and St. Catharines' representation too small. Transitional adjustments or the sharing of certain costs could cost the entire area and place the city in an unfair financial position—duplication of services and so forth. He goes on to say that tax increases—the brief also notes that property owners this year face a residential tax increase of nearly 16 mills and a commercial increase of 22 mills because of regional government. This creates a rather serious problem in the Niagara peninsula concerning regional government—he goes on to say that the average homeowner will be paying \$50 or \$60 more in taxes this year. It is interesting to note that it has been suggested by the St. Catharines council that they will be presenting a private bill to the Ontario Legislature to secede from the regional government in the Niagara peninsula. It will also be interesting to note which member on that side will present the bill. Will it be the member for Lincoln (Mr. Welch)? Will it be the member for St.

Catharines (Mr. R. M. Johnston) or the member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar)? It is a very interesting question.

I hope I am around to see that. Not only the city of St. Catharines wants to—

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the hon. member could find a convenient point in the next two or three minutes to adjourn the debate so that we may adjourn at 10:30?

Mr. Haggerty: If you wish so, Mr. Speaker. I wish to—

Mr. Speaker: Whatever would be convenient for you.

Mr. Haggerty: All right. I will adjourn the debate then.

Mr. Haggerty moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I should mention that the first order, the reply to the Speech from the Throne, will generally be the routine this week.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 19, 1971

Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. R. G. Hodgson, Mr. Edighoffer, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Haggerty	613
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Haggerty, agreed to	643
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to	643





ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, April 20, 1971
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 20, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon as guests we have, in the east gallery, students from Main Street School, Toronto, and Heydon Park Vocational School, Toronto; in the west gallery from Gladstone Senior Public School, Toronto; and in both galleries from Marlborough Public School, Windsor. Later this afternoon we will have students from Kawartha Lakes School, Lindsay, and Durham College, Oshawa; and later still from Gosfield North Central School, Cottam. This evening our guests will be the 455th and 516th Girl Guides from Islington.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

DISCUSSIONS WITH QUEBEC ON BILL 10

Mr. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture and Food if he has undertaken any further communications with the Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Quebec, or any of the authorities in that province, following the proclamation of Bill 10.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Yes Mr. Speaker, I was in touch with my deputy minister last night, who has been in touch with the Deputy Minister of Agriculture for the Province of Quebec yesterday.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Will the minister communicate to the House the nature of the communication and if in fact the government of Quebec is contemplating any action in response to the passage of Bill 10?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There is nothing more to report than that. We just told him what we have done. We discussed it with them last week when we introduced the legislation. I was in touch as well with the federal Minister of Agriculture last week before the bill was proceeded with. There is really nothing more than that to report.

There was no comment made about any retaliatory legislation being introduced in Quebec whatever. Discussions we have had with the various Ministers of Agriculture across Canada, and in particular with the Minister of Agriculture in Quebec through our deputies, because as members know we can only converse by somebody translating for us, would indicate that their position as far as eggs are concerned is that they felt they wanted to have some type of control over eggs coming into the Province of Quebec due to the fact that their producers were, in their words, being undersold by egg producers in other provinces.

They really have no desire to shut them out and neither have we, but I think one has to look at this whole matter of poultry products from the standpoint of realistic supply type management for the various markets, whether they be in Ontario, Quebec, Manitoba, British Columbia or wherever in Canada they may be.

We think that failing any type of meaningful legislation which would get at the root of the problem—and that is oversupply in certain provinces—this approach is the only type of control that is really meaningful.

Mr. Nixon: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Agriculture and Food then has no information which would indicate that Quebec is contemplating action which might interfere with Ontario's markets for our agricultural produce in that province?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No; nothing other than eggs, Mr. Speaker. Eggs of course were the item of greatest concern to the Province of Quebec. As members will recall, I believe it was in June, 1970, when the Fedco, or the egg marketing co-operative, was established in the Province of Quebec it was for the sole purpose of trying to limit the number of eggs marketed in Quebec to provide some meaningful price level for the producers of Quebec.

There has been no discussion of any type of control other than that, but I would not be at all surprised to see some strengthening in the controls dealing with eggs coming into the Province of Quebec from other areas besides Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Essex South a supplementary?

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Is the minister aware of any retaliatory action being taken yet on an unofficial level—that is by the buyers of agricultural products in that province—against some of the products grown or processed in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: A few months ago, none other than my hon. friend the member for Essex South, I believe, brought to my attention that there was some concern regarding marketing of vegetables because of the single desk selling agency programme that was instituted by—was it the greenhouse board? The visit by the greenhouse board to the various food brokers in Montreal, I believe, relieved the concern. As a matter of fact, that very afternoon I got a telegram from those people who were concerned expressing their delight at the reception they had in Quebec and indicating that their concern had been relieved because of the discussion they had had with them.

I think perhaps the problem evolved in Montreal because they did not understand what single desk selling meant. I believe that once that was explained, to my knowledge everything was relieved and I have not heard a word of complaint since. If there is something new, it is news to me.

Mr. Paterson: Yes. Might I ask by way of further supplementary: There has been no knowledge come to the minister that any retaliatory action has been taken on canned goods that are available in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Brantford a supplementary?

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Could the minister indicate if he has had any discussions with a group of egg producers from eastern Ontario who have hired a Toronto law firm to test the constitutionality of the legislation that was passed in this House?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No I have not, Mr. Speaker.

DRUGS DROPPED FROM PARCOST

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health: Can he explain to the House why he feels it is proper for him to drop certain specific drugs from his Parcost

approved list but not state publicly what these drugs are, so that those citizens who are availing themselves of pharmacists' professional services that do not come under Parcost could have that protection?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): It is not really a question of protection, Mr. Speaker. Parcost is an inclusive programme and not an exclusive programme. In other words, the philosophy behind Parcost is that we list a group from the practical point of view, a group of leading drugs sold by a limited number of drug firms because they are adequate.

In doing so we do not exclude all the other drugs on the market. When a drug is dropped it may be dropped for a vast number of reasons, and permutations and combinations of those reasons.

It may be that an inadequate amount of the drug is sold in this jurisdiction to warrant it being placed on a limited list such as Parcost comprises. It may be because a particular batch was found unsound. It may be because the management practices were found unsound. It may be because we simply did not get the application in from the firm on time.

So I do not want, Mr. Speaker, to be drawn into the defence of a concept which does not include Parcost. In other words, Parcost is not a total assessment of all drugs of all types sold at any particular time in Ontario. It is simply a practical book telling the medical profession and telling the public not what are bad but what are good, and listing available drugs sold in Ontario in large quantities.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Would it be correct to assume that some of the drugs at least are not listed because they do not come up to the minimum quality standards established by The Department of Health?

If that assumption is correct, then surely the minister's responsibility is to make the names of these drugs known for the protection of the citizens who might not be in communities where Parcost—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader is making a statement. He is not asking a question.

Mr. Nixon: —facilities are available to them?

Mr. Speaker: Does the minister wish to reply to the question?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I would say that when one considers the field in which the federal government operates—namely, the assessment of all drugs whether they are largely or widely sold or not and their hazardous or otherwise characteristics—I do not think there is a need for us to impinge upon the discharge of that responsibility at a federal level.

Beyond that, the dropping of a drug is a question that may not relate to its quality at all. There are some drugs that are—

Mr. Nixon: In some cases it does. The hon. minister said so himself.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I can picture this occurring. But if I start opening up the assessment of every single drug that is assessed, then I open up this whole committee's work and would switch the programme around from a positive, inclusive statement of what is good into a total bible of what is bad.

Mr. Nixon: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned: Surely the assessment of what is an acceptable quality should be left to the federal Food and Drug Directorate.

Mr. Speaker: Is that a question?

Mr. Nixon: Does the minister feel that his jurisdiction in Parcost infringes or overlaps this specific authority in the cases where certain drugs are acceptable at the federal level and rejected by the minister?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I would agree that the acceptance of a drug on the basis of its hazardous characteristics or otherwise, happily is one that should be left, and is left, fundamentally with the federal jurisdiction.

All I can add is that insofar as we are concerned that committee will drop a drug not on the basis of having proved that it is unsatisfactory, but on a much wider basis in that it is not at all sure that the management and the operation in general is adequately supported in its supervisory staff, and this kind of thing.

Mr. Nixon: I do not know what that means.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): May I ask a supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

Has an assessment been made by the minister of the department of all the drugs that were dropped in this latest listing of Parcost?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, an assessment has been made. But the word "assessment" is a very loose word.

Mr. Pitman: May I clarify this? Has an assessment of the quality of each drug that has been dropped from Parcost been made by the minister? May I go further? Are the reports available to the public?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: That is a twisted question again, Mr. Speaker. I do not mean "twisted" on purpose. I mean that a lot of these drugs are dropped, not on the basis of quality—

Mr. Pitman: What we are trying to do is to decide which ones are.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Parcost only deals with those which are adequate, effective and popular.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth has the floor for a supplementary?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Are there any drugs that have been dropped because they were found to be of inferior quality?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I personally do not know of any, but there have been a number of drugs dropped because their quality may have been high but their efficacy may have been considered of minimal value and did not warrant being placed in Parcost.

There are other drugs that have been dropped where the confidence of the committee in the management of the firm and its procedures is inadequate to support their inclusion in the Parcost schedule.

Mr. Deans: Might I, by way of one final supplementary question, ask the minister if he would make himself aware of the reasons why the drugs were dropped? If there are drugs that were dropped because of inferior quality will he make the names of those drugs available to the public?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The question of adequate quality of a drug is still, as the Leader of the Opposition suggested, one which is happily and adequately dealt with at the federal level. Whether their quality is high enough or not high enough relates to their inclusion, or otherwise, in the federal index.

Mr. Deans: That is how the hon. minister finds out.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Right! From our point of view, we drop or do not drop a drug in that committee on the basis of the total overall opinion of the efficacy, the popularity of the drug and half a dozen other considerations, even including the confidence of members of our committees in the management and its general approach to its responsibilities as a manufacturer.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary: Does the minister believe that he has the legal authority to second-guess the responsibility of the federal government insofar as allowing drugs on to the market; because that is in fact what his committee is doing?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No Mr. Speaker, the federal government does not take this position either. The federal government is extremely gratified with the Parcost system. They equate on their index—I have forgotten what it is called—but their index is a very large and total index of all drugs that they know to be available to the Canadian people, whether it be one pill of its kind or a million of its kind.

They are not capable of doing what we are doing in Parcost. We are doing, on an inclusionary basis, an exercise that does not conflict in any way with their project in relation to hazard.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, does the minister believe that legal authority exists to discriminate as between specific drugs that the federal department has said are satisfactory to be marketed in Canada?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes Mr. Speaker, I think the jurisdiction constitutionally of this province and The Department of Health is adequate to allow us to have a very wide discretion in this field. But let me underline the fact that as between the federal Department of Health and Welfare and this department there is nothing but co-operation and admiration for the different jobs we are doing, one by one.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Speak for yourself.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, the federal people have told me they are extremely pleased with our Parcost programme.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

CONTROL OF GRAVEL PITS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Mines: Can he report to the House what progress his department has established in preparing legislation for the control of gravel pits; legislation having been promised on two previous occasions by his predecessor?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, my only comment at this time can be that the matter is still under study.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Since the minister's predecessor promised the legislation for last fall and then this spring, can this minister not give us a more substantial undertaking that the House will have an opportunity to consider draft legislation within the next few weeks?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out just a moment ago, as a new minister, I want to look into all aspects of the problem. I intend to meet with both parties, both the operators of the pits and quarries and the municipalities, and in time we will have legislation brought before the House.

Mr. Makarchuk: In that time they will haul the country away!

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peterborough.

PENSIONERS' FISHING PERMITS

Mr. Pitman: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I could ask the Minister of Lands and Forests whether he has received further letters of representation from pensioners who find that it is both inconvenient and difficult for them to get to the regional centres in order to get their fishing permits? Also, they do not wish the delay and possible loss of documents by dealing with his department through the mails.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, this matter has been brought to my attention by our own members, and I hope that within the next few days I will be making a statement whereby it will be made much easier for those people.

Mr. Pitman: If I might ask a supplementary: Would the minister consider using a normal channel instead of those who are already selling fishing licences to get these permits out to old age pensioners?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in my statement which, as I mentioned, will be made within the next couple of days, this whole matter will be dealt with.

EXTRA PLACES AT UNIVERSITIES

Mr. Pitman: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of University Affairs.

Is it true that his department has requested the universities of the province to find places for some 3,500 extra units at the first year level at the universities?

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of University Affairs): There are forecasts undertaken by my department, Mr. Speaker, and by the committee of presidents and we do anticipate a substantial increase in enrolment. I think the 3,500 may be related to the new requirement that entrants to teachers' colleges have one year in university. I think that is not the total increment in student population.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if the minister could indicate what the total increment is expected to be; how many units they will expect to have over what were projected; and how many of those will be teachers who will not have jobs at the end of June this year?

Hon. Mr. White: I will certainly get those figures, although I do not accept the implication of the last phrase.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the hon. minister when the colleges of applied arts and technology are going to be placed under formula financing, due to the fact he will soon be looking after these colleges under his department?

Hon. Mr. White: I would hope this could be done within the present fiscal year. That is to say I hope the plans will be made in the present fiscal year. The intention is to apply the same BIU value to colleges as to universities and rely on a factor to provide the necessary resources for different types of programmes.

Mr. Pitman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the minister is aware of the fact that at Conestoga College they have not given any assurance to the staff as to whether they will be hired for the coming year until some policy on formula financing has been received from the department?

Hon. Mr. White: No, I have not been made aware of that.

Mr. Pitman: As a supplementary, I wonder if the minister would make immediate plans to indicate to the colleges of applied arts and technology exactly where they stand in this particular matter?

Hon. Mr. White: I think that should be directed to the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch), who has this responsibility at the present time.

Mr. Pitman: As a supplementary, could the minister indicate when he intends to introduce legislation into this Legislature which will place the colleges of applied arts and technology under his direction?

Hon. Mr. White: Some time this year, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: Time is running out!

Mr. Singer: Is the member finished?

Mr. Pitman: No. I wonder if I could ask the Minister of University Affairs again whether he has made any decision regarding the nursing colleges across the province, in view of the fact that they too are going to be brought into the colleges of applied arts and technology? Has the final policy been made; and if so have negotiations begun with the various nursing colleges across the province?

Hon. Mr. White: The government policy will be made known in due course.

Mr. Pitman: Could the minister assure this House that before government policy is announced he will make some efforts to find out what the will and desire of the nursing colleges actually is in this province?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, indeed I will. My sister is my primary adviser. She is at St. Joseph's Hospital where she teaches nursing and she preaches to me every weekend so I am keeping informed in this and other ways.

Mr. Pitman: Could the minister indicate in what ways other than his sister—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has asked sufficient supplementary questions.

Mr. Pitman: —will be the means by which he is going to discover the minds of those directing the nursing colleges across this province?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I thought I would invite the head of the college of nurses to have lunch with me one day soon.

Mr. Pitman: Could the minister indicate whether he will be willing to have—

Mr. Speaker: I have ruled there have been sufficient supplementaries on this subject.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: Yes, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: This is getting into a debate. Has the member for Peterborough further questions?

Mr. Pitman: I have a further supplementary.

Hon. Mr. White: On that last question, Mr. Speaker, I have been the principal defender of nurses here for 12 years and I am not going to do anything to upset those nice women and girls.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

CLEANUP OF MERCURY POLLUTION

Mr. Singer: I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

In light of the recent most positive statement made by the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr) to the effect that there is a known scientific system of removing mercury from our waterways, could the Minister of Lands and Forests reconcile that statement with the statement contained in a recent pamphlet called "Fishermen—about Mercury and Fish," that he recently tabled, which states—there are no page numbers in it, but states on the second last page:

The Ontario Water Resources Commission is studying the feasibility of dredging mercury deposits from lake and river bottoms. Other methods, such as physically covering mercury deposits or chemically deactivating them have been proposed but it is not yet known if any of these might be successful. Unless some method of stopping the movement of mercury out of the bottom sediments is developed, the mercury problem is likely to be with us for years to come.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Can the minister reconcile that statement, which is a direct negation of the statement made by the Minister of Energy and Resources Management? Is the point correct? Which minister is right?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): It is not a question.

Mr. Speaker: That is hardly a question to ask one of the ministers under whose authority that statement was made.

An hon. member: Ask both of them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Brantford has the floor.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question! On a point of order!

Mr. Speaker: It is a supplementary question or is it a point of order?

Mr. Bullbrook: I want to ask of the Speaker if the member for Brantford is recognized by way of supplementary or original question.

Mr. Speaker: Original question.

Mr. Bullbrook: I would like to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Lands and Forests. Would the minister advise whether he, or any part of his ministry, was consulted in connection with the words of that pamphlet, in connection with that part of the lawsuit against Dow Chemical of Canada Limited requesting a mandatory order for them to remove the mercury from the bed of the St. Clair River?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, this little pamphlet is a publication of our department, but there was further consultation between The Department of Health, The Department of Tourism and Information, The Department of Energy and Resources Management and our own.

Mr. Bullbrook: A supplementary: Will the minister please reconcile for the members of this House how his department can make a statement that there is no known scientifically proven method of removing the mercury and the request, through litigation of the department of the Minister of Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), to have a company in this province remove it forthwith?

Mr. Speaker: Well of course this is the same question in a little different terms that I ruled was not in order before. The member for Brantford has the floor.

COMPENSATION TO FISHERMEN

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development.

Now that his department is responsible for compensating the commercial fishermen, can

the minister indicate when the Lake Erie commercial fishermen are going to get full and adequate compensation for the damage they suffered as a result of mercury pollution?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I cannot.

Mr. Makarchuk: A supplementary: Can the minister indicate when he can give an answer? We have been asking this question in the House just about every week—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has asked his question.

Mr. Makarchuk: But I have not got an answer.

Mr. Speaker: Any more supplementaries? The member for Oxford has the floor.

EXTENSION OF CAPITAL GRANTS

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): A question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food: Would the minister inform the House if the capital grant system inaugurated by his department will be extended to include the planting of trees and windbreaks to replace those that are currently being cut down?

Mr. Nixon: There is a good proposal.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No Mr. Speaker, we have not given consideration to that. The simple matter is that The Department of Lands and Forests provides trees for windbreaks at a very nominal fee of one cent per tree. I really do not think a person requires a capital grant when the cost of planting the trees is one cent per tree.

Mr. Nixon: That only replaces mature trees with trees four inches high.

Mr. Innes: A supplementary: Would the minister not agree that it seems feasible to replace the ones that he is currently cutting down with new trees?

Mr. Nixon: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of University Affairs has the answer to a question asked yesterday.

PENTAGON GRANTS TO ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, in response to the questions raised yesterday by the members for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis)

and Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr) concerning university research financed by United States government agencies, I have obtained the following information:

1. The committee of presidents has recommended to all the provincially-supported universities that they accept research funds only for academic work that can be published. Universities do not as a rule undertake research of a classified nature, though many of the projects accepted are understandably rather too technical for a layman to understand.

2. A survey of the 14 provincially assisted universities reveals that at Brock, Carleton, Lakehead, Laurentian and Trent, no research has been financed by U.S. government funds. At Queen's the amount is nil or negligible. Guelph has received \$20,600 from the U.S. Department of Health for research on pollution and Waterloo has \$25,000 from two agencies for pollution studies.

Out of a total of over \$6 million in research funds, Western receives \$80,000 from U.S. government sources, including \$62,000 from The Department of Health and \$18,000 from NASA. York receives approximately \$250,000 from NASA and from the U.S. Army and Navy for unclassified research, the results of which are available for publication. As might be expected, the University of Toronto has the lion's share of research projects funded by the United States government agencies, a total of \$491,920 for unclassified research, ranging from a NASA-sponsored study of the molecular dynamics of atmosphere reactions to a Department of Interior project on the role of sludge worms in promoting entrophication.

I have a detailed list from the University of Toronto if the members wish to expand their scientific vocabulary. Reports are still to be received from McMaster, Ottawa and Windsor.

I think, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read into the record guidelines for publication of research established by the committee of the presidents of universities of Ontario. This is a quotation from the Monthly Review of October, 1970.

The guidelines point out the importance for the universities and societies of publishing research results, to ensure maintaining universal accessibility to new knowledge and a free flow of ideas and observations. It is recognized that there may sometimes be legitimate reasons for deferring publication of research findings for a reasonable

period, but this should be subject to an explicit agreement acceptable to the university, the researcher and the research sponsor.

There may also be the need to protect confidentiality of broad data used for research. Again, this should be subject to clear agreement on terms and conditions for publishing data in aggregate form.

On the basis of these considerations, the committee of presidents has recommended to all the provincially-supported universities in Ontario, and to all sponsors of research in universities, as a general guideline:

1. That neither sponsors nor universities attempt to enter into agreements which will formally involve universities in conducting academic work which cannot be published. Any exception to this principle should be subjected to the most formal review procedure between the university and the agency concerned.

2. That the sponsors be entitled to request and be granted a reasonable delay in publication where such delay is in the interests of the sponsor.

3. In instances where university researchers are to be given access to confidential data, the terms and conditions of their use be specified in advance.

This, I think, indicates once again Mr. Speaker, that the universities are able to manage these matters internally in a better way than we could do from a centrally based position here at Queen's Park. In the process, of course, they have kept their autonomy, which constitutes an independent source of observation and critique for society.

Mr. Speaker: In Mr. Speaker's opinion, this is the type of answer to a question which should be a ministerial statement. I will, therefore, add four minutes onto the period of the question time which was taken by this statement.

The member for Windsor West.

Hon. Mr. White: They cannot use the 45 minutes they have!

APPLICATION FOR ODC LOAN

Mr. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Trade and Development, of which I have given notice: Has Ontario Development Corporation received application for either a conventional

or performance loan from a firm located in Tilbury known as Rods and Wires Specialty Limited, or its parent, Stall Manufacturing Company?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for giving me notice of this question.

I am advised by ODC they have no record of any application for a loan by either of the companies mentioned.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex South.

GRAVEL COMPANY PERMITS

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Mines: Is it correct that on Friday last he signed the permits to allow two gravel-taking companies to take sand and gravel from the bed of Lake Erie off Point Pelee National Park and that their areas have been moved further out into the lake, yet the total quantity in cubic yards that they can take has been cut by 30 per cent? Further, has the minister given them the right to explore other parts of Lake Erie for this same purpose?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Paterson: A supplementary: Has the minister, or will the minister consult with The Department of Lands and Forests and the Lake Erie commercial fishermen before making any further moves in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will be reviewing the renewal of this licence in three months and I will certainly consult with The Department of Lands and Forests.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East.

LETTER FROM STUDENTS' COUNCIL

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): I have a question of the Minister of University Affairs. Has the minister received a letter from Mr. G. E. Painter of the Althouse students council at the University of Western Ontario, in which Mr. Painter states that at the time of writing—April 15, 1971—"40 per cent of the students at this college have not found a position for the academic year 1971-1972." This is in reference to teachers, Mr. Speaker. If the minister has received such a letter would he care to comment on that 40 per

cent figure in the light of the remark made by the former Deputy Minister of Education that there was no teacher surplus? Secondly, is the minister intending to attend this particular meeting, the meeting Mr. Painter requested that he or a spokesman attend at the college on Tuesday, April 27?

Hon. Mr. White: I am very sorry—

An hon. member: He did not even know the member was asking him a question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker. I missed that question.

Mr. T. Reid: I have a question of the rather sleepy Minister of—

An hon. member: Boy, what a deadhead!

Another hon. member: Another penalty!

Another hon. member: Instead of cutting dead elm trees they should cut the dead-wood over there.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of University Affairs. Has the minister received a letter from Mr. G. E. Painter of the Althouse student council at the University of Western Ontario—which I believe is in London—in which Mr. Painter states that at the time of writing, April 15, 1971, approximately 40 per cent of the students at this college have not found a position for the academic year, 1971 and 1972. If the minister has received this letter or has knowledge of this letter, would he comment on that 40 per cent figure in the light of the former Deputy Minister of Education's statement, as reported in the press last week, that there is no teacher shortage? Secondly, does the minister intend to accept the invitation from the Althouse student council to participate in a debate there on Tuesday, April 27, concerning teacher supply and demand in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I have had letters on this subject and I really think I have had one from Mr. Painter, in which case a reply is being prepared for him. I would certainly be glad to enter into a dialogue—I do not know that I am in a position to debate the matter because I do not hold a view different from their own. I would welcome an opportunity to have such a dialogue at Althouse or elsewhere.

This is a situation not unique to the teaching profession. In other words, we observe

that the rudimentary state of the arts in forecasting the need for members of various professions and vocations, coupled with the very considerable time lag, results in very serious imbalances between supply and demand.

Mr. Nixon: All the resources of OISE cannot do it.

Hon. Mr. White: I think we must find a way to predict needs for professional and well trained vocational persons in a way which we have not yet succeeded in doing. I am going to ask that this be done, either within my department or by the committee on university affairs, or perhaps by COPSE; I do not know yet. I do want to do that in the very near future so that these imbalances can to some extent be alleviated.

As I say, it is not confined only to the teaching profession, although one observes a critical imbalance in that profession this year.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, if I might: Would the minister care to comment on the steps that his predecessor might have taken eight years ago when he had joint responsibility for education and university affairs, to have forecast this type of total imbalance in the supply of teachers at the secondary school level and the demand for them?

Secondly, if that is too tough for the minister, what steps does the minister intend to take concerning the careers and future prospects of the 60 per cent of the students at Althouse College who do not have a job right now, a job promised or lined up right now?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I think that my predecessor might have been criticized had he known eight years ago that Prime Minister Trudeau and the government in Ottawa were going to plunge seven per cent of our people out of work!

Mr. Pitman: What has that got to do with it?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Answer the question.

Mr. Pitman: What a ridiculous point of view.

Mr. Makarchuk: That is all Edgar Benson's fault.

Hon. Mr. White: It has everything to do with it.

Mr. Pitman: Do tell us exactly how unemployment relates to the number of children in school?

Hon. Mr. White: Because of unemployment we are in the process of foregoing billions of dollars in gross national product and we are foregoing in this province hundreds of millions of dollars in government revenue.

Mr. Pitman: But the kids are still in school.

Hon. Mr. White: We have had to tighten our belts in a way that would not otherwise have been the case.

Mr. Singer: What kind of an answer is that?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough has a supplementary?

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I might ask a supplementary question? Could the minister indicate the exact relationship between inflation, Mr. Trudeau and the fact that 60 per cent of the young people at Althouse college are not going to have jobs next year?

Mr. Deans: Budget speech!

Mr. Speaker: This is not supplementary. The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside has the floor.

Interjections by hon. members.

TOMATO PASTE PRODUCTS

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): A question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food regarding tomato paste products, of which 140,000 tons are being imported into Canada annually: Has the minister considered or explored the possibility of interesting Ontario processing plants—especially in Essex county perhaps—in turning out tomato paste products as a means of expanding our home tomato industry?

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): It is all Lester Pearson's fault.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I did not hear the product to which the hon. member was referring. We cannot hear it over here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Burr: My question is regarding tomato paste products; tomato paste products!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Burr: Has the hon. member the question now? About 140,000 tons are being imported into Canada annually. Has the minister explored the possibility of interesting Ontario processing plants, especially in Essex county I should suggest, in turning out tomato paste products as a means of expanding the market for home-grown tomatoes?

Mr. Breithaupt: Another four-minute penalty.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have given a great deal of consideration to that.

Mr. Makarchuk: The minister did not know anything about it two seconds ago.

Mr. Nixon: Tell us about it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not think there is enough time left in the question period to do that. I understand that the product is coming in from European countries where it is produced under labour rates that are much less than our labour rates, and it is simply not possible to produce the product in this country—so our tomato growers tell us—at those competitive prices.

A great deal of thought was given to this matter and we had hoped, quite frankly, that there could be some arrangements made whereby a good deal of that imported tomato paste could be replaced with home-grown products.

Mr. Nixon: Seize it and burn it.

Mr. Singer: If the minister only had a tomato paste marketing board!

Mr. Nixon: That will be Bill 11.

Mr. Singer: Good idea!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We would hope that something can be done. But we do not have that control or authority, for the simple reason that the Tomato Marketing Board say they cannot produce tomatoes at a price to meet the competition. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Paterson: Has The Department of Agriculture and Food done any surveys among the farmers themselves, say in Essex and Kent counties, to see if they in fact would be willing to grow extra acreage for the purposes of tomato paste production?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friends opposite know full well, we have marketing boards in this province, and included among them is the Tomato Marketing Board. That board has held a series of meetings, and I learned from public statements that have been made by members of the board that the price factor simply makes it uncompetitive; they cannot compete. They have no notion of lowering the price of tomatoes to where they can compete with these imported products.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. Breithaupt: Make succotash!

PURCHASE OF LAND ON MANITOULIN ISLAND

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister prepared to inform the House as to the progress of negotiations between the parks integration board, the ARDA branch, The Department of Public Works and the Ontario Paper Company with respect to the purchase of several thousands of acres of land on Manitoulin Island?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, this matter was discussed at the last meeting of the parks integration board. The boards are very much in favour of this land, which has a lot of recreation and timber values. At the present time we have asked public works to look further into the matter and this is where the matter stands. It is under very active consideration. As soon as we are in a position to give the hon. members information we will be pleased to do so.

Mr. Nixon: Will that be a park or two!

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Farquhar: Is the minister aware that the rumour mill is working overtime right now? It would be very pleasant to be able to advise the local people and resolve the local concern. Is he aware that if the negotiations are not successful, the government will have lost its last chance to acquire or obtain property on the island for public recreation, of which there is none at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I can fully appreciate the concern of the local people, but as the hon. member is aware—

he knows that area very well—we are dealing with a tremendously large area, thousands and thousands of acres, with a large expenditure involved. Under those circumstances it takes a little time to be able to come to a final decision.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

LAKEHEAD UNIVERSITY FORESTRY COURSE EXTENSION

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of University Affairs. Has the minister received representations from Lakehead University to extend the two-year forestry course into a complete four-year course? If so, what does the minister intend to do about it?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, yes, I have received these submissions from the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs and from the member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman)—

Mr. Stokes: Has the minister had any from the university?

Hon. Mr. White: —and from interested parties at the Lakehead. The matter is under review at the present time, and I hope to be able to announce a decision within the next week.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

SWEEP PROGRAMME APPLICATIONS

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests. I wonder if the minister could give the House an updated report on how the programme SWEEP for student unemployment is progressing inasmuch as it affects his department, and whether there is still time for students, from the Port Arthur riding for example, to apply for those positions?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, we would be very pleased to receive names and addresses of students in the Port Arthur area who would be interested in working in the SWEEP programme.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary; May I take it from the minister's reply then that there has not been a rush for these positions and that there is an ample number still available?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, the demand for employment far exceeds the amount of positions available. However we are still receiving applications, and as I mentioned earlier we would be pleased to look after those that the hon. member will submit to us.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sarnia.

ORAL REPRESENTATIONS TO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: Presuming that the Premier is aware that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is the final court of appeal in connection with the setting of rates by the Ontario Water Resources Commission, and presuming that the Premier is aware that the corporation counsel of the city of Sarnia has appealed to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, am I correct in assuming that it is the policy of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, in matters of this nature, not to hear oral representations from the appellants or respondents in this connection?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there have been a limited number of appeals since I have been a member of the executive council. The policy has been that whether the appeal is from the OWRC—the majority of appeals, really, are from the Ontario Municipal Board—the policy has been, and I think properly so, not to hear oral evidence from anyone involved. The decisions have been related to the material that has been supplied to the executive council.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of a supplementary question: In view of the comments recently published by the former hon. Justice McRuer in connection with appeal and trial *de novo* rights before administrative tribunals, would the Premier consider changing the policy to equate it with the normal judicial policy in connection with final appeals?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, of course we are going to look at everything that Mr. Justice McRuer has set out in his report. I should point out, though, I think perhaps there can be some difference established between a normal tribunal and the executive council of the Province of Ontario; and I might even interject here that consideration might be extended to whether appeals should in fact come to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. This, to me, is a matter the government will be taking a look at.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of supplementary, do I understand—

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period, as extended, has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. White moves that the Legislature's committee on human resources be asked to examine the costs of post-secondary education as they are currently reflected in the estimates of The Department of University Affairs and The Department of Education and for which the Minister of University Affairs and the Minister of Education are directly accountable to this House, including the funds provided to universities, colleges of applied arts and technology and related institutions; and that the committee be encouraged to invite officials of The Department of University Affairs, The Department of Education, the committee on university affairs, the council of regents and other interested representatives to appear before the committee as the committee may decide.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few brief comments on the motion put by the Minister of University Affairs, which in a very real sense is complementary and supplements the motion put by the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) on Friday.

I am grateful that the Minister of University Affairs, unlike his counterpart on Friday, provided the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) with a copy of this motion at approximately 2:15 so that I could have a chance to make some short, but thoughtful remarks I hope.

The essential point we wish to make on this side is that there is now even more reason for the standing committee on human resources to have independent research staff resources available to it. The motion put in the House on Friday made it imperative, in our opinion, for that committee to be able to hire people whom they considered to be removed from the vested interests of protecting the various departments of government, and to have those people prepare studies for the committee independent of the civil service, and independent of ministerial control if you like.

I would like to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, because I think we may eventually

have to have a ruling on this, that in the opinion of the Premier (Mr. Davis) in his remarks in the House on March 31, on page 60 of Hansard, that it should be possible, unless I misinterpret him badly, for the standing committee on human resources to hire, and have a budget to hire, independent researchers.

Let me put this into the record. The minister said this:

I would say . . . there is nothing in the initial resolution—

the resolution establishing the committees—that precludes, if the need arises, if it makes sense to do so, the acquisition of staff as it relates to specific situations.

I am going to ask the hon. Minister of University Affairs if this is what he would like to have the committee do as well. The reason I put it this way, Mr. Speaker, is that in this House on Friday the Minister of Education equivocated on this very important issue of the standing committee having independent research staff, and the budget that must go with it, under its control. Because the minister stated, and I am reading this from uncorrected Hansard; I quote directly:

I think the organization of the standing committee on human resources itself, and the staff that it will require, will have to be determined by the committee.

Thus far, it looks as though the Minister of Education is agreeing with what the Premier said on March 31. But then the Minister of Education started shying away from the plea that we are making for an independent research staff. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Education stated this:

Keep in mind that there are very competent people on staff—

by which I believe he meant his department—

—who can be of some assistance if only you will bring them up and help to explain the operation.

He continues:

I can imagine that you would bring before you the head of the grants section to explain the grants system—

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the hon. member we are now debating a motion with respect to the committee on university affairs, not the motion that was introduced and passed by this House on Friday, and I would ask that he return to the motion before the House.

Mr. T. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The point I wished to make very simply is that there seems to be a feeling of equivocation on the part of the ministry that the committee will not be able to have a budget and not have the authority to hire outside management consultants and accountants. So I would like to ask the Minister of University Affairs if, in terms of his motion presented before us today, he envisualizes and welcomes the committee on human resources—

Hon. Mr. Davis: What is this “envisualizes”?

Mr. Nixon: It is a new word; a very good word! Does the Premier not understand it?

Mr. T. Reid: Well I must say the Minister of University Affairs probably had his eyes closed during question period, and I am asking him to keep his eyes open and keep an open mind, if you like.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would just like to know what the member meant by “envisualize.”

Mr. Singer: It is a new word.

Mr. T. Reid: I said “and visualize” the possibility, and does he recommend that we have independent research staff for that committee so that we can check out some of the rather pernicious and misleading research that went on by members of The Department of University Affairs last year in preparing totally misleading documents; concerning, for example, the degree of accessibility of various low-income groups to the university system of the province?

The former Minister of University Affairs appeared in this House last year and presented this political document prepared by a civil servant to justify, in my opinion, his own beliefs in the matter of accessibility. I say to the Minister of University Affairs—

Hon. Mr. Davis: And because the member did not agree with it he did not like it.

Mr. T. Reid: —if I can get over the rather inane remarks being put forward by the Premier and speak to the present Minister of University Affairs, who I think might be a little more sensitive in this area, because he has less to protect—

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is not right.

Mr. T. Reid: I say to him that we in the Liberal Party distrust the way in which the former Minister of University Affairs used the civil servants to do research of a political

nature in this province, and our plea to the present Minister of University Affairs is to stand up in this place and say, in his opinion, it will be right and proper for the committee on human resources to have a sufficient budget and to have the decision-making power to hire independent researchers to assist us as private members of this House in examining the cost of post-secondary education in this province.

I make that point, sir, and I will leave it, but I will present an amendment to the motion at the appropriate time.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: What is the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) mumbling about? Speak up!

Mr. T. Reid: There are two other points, Mr. Speaker, that we want to put before the people of this province, and certainly to the other opposition members in this House.

We find that the motion put before us now, as the motion put before us concerning The Department of Education is still too restrictive to allow that committee to look into the interrelationships between various cost factors of education. I will point out, to give credit where credit is due, that in the motion that the Minister of University Affairs put before us today he recognizes the necessity to examine the cross-relationships between, say the community colleges and the vocational branches of the secondary schools near those community colleges. I say that we welcome that. It is a positive step and we will look into it.

I would like to quote, sir, from this motion, to underline a very specific word that is of concern to us. It says:

That the Legislature's committee on human resources be asked to examine the costs of post-secondary education as they are currently reflected in the estimates of The Department of University Affairs and The Department of Education and for which the Minister of University Affairs and the Minister of Education are directly accountable to this House.

There are two words that bother me. The most significant one is the use of that word "directly." I would like to know what the Minister of University Affairs means by that word, "directly"? Does this mean that if the chairman of the standing committee on human resources believes that something we in the opposition side wish to look into is not directly involved, that cannot be considered by the committee?

For example, tomorrow we are going to have the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation before the committee at 10 o'clock in the morning. Is the chairman going to look at this resolution and the one that the Minister of Education put forward and say that we cannot discuss those things that he, the chairman, believes to be only indirectly related to education and The Department of University Affairs—in other words, rule out areas, if you like, of private financing of universities?

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I would like know what the minister means by that word "directly." Perhaps that word could be deleted from it.

The other word that bothers me there—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Semantics.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to talk to the Minister of University Affairs, because he is listening.

Hon. Mr. Davis: So am I. What does the hon. member mean by the last reference?

Mr. T. Reid: Look, the Premier gave up that job; let me talk to his colleague.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not give it up.

Mr. T. Reid: I have a feeling universities might have someone here who has an open mind, unlike the last eight years.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member will continue to address himself to the resolution on the floor of the House.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to address myself to the resolution and to the present Minister of University Affairs, who has a potential—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will address himself to any minister through the chair.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I believe that your ears are always open and I respect what you say.

The other point in the resolution concerns the wording, "currently reflected in the estimates of The Department of University Affairs and The Department of Education." Why that use of the word "currently?" I would like the minister to clarify what he means by that word.

Hon. E. A. Dunlop (Minister without Portfolio): It means "here and now."

Mr. T. Reid: I think it is a very important word. Mr. Speaker, I think we could end up

with four meetings, for the next four weeks, of the standing committee on human resources in which we just debate these types of things. The chairman will say, "That is not current, that is not direct;" and we will say, "It is current, it is direct." What a waste of time!

I think the minister could clarify for us now, and in fact give direction to the chairman of the committee on human resources, so that the committee will not have this picayune discussion in the standing committee on human resources.

Mr. Speaker, the final point, which is of less importance than the other two points, is that there are such areas as the schools of nursing and their relationship to the universities and to the community colleges or the colleges of applied arts and technology. There are the agricultural colleges and their developing relationship with the colleges of fine arts and technology. There are these types of relationships which I hope are not excluded by the minister's motion put before us right now.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would conclude by saying that I assume the best of motives by the Minister of University Affairs, unlike some other people I know, he is interested—and I am going to give him credit for this—trying to get at some of the complicated cross-relationships or duplications between fragmented authorities in education and manpower training. I give the hon. minister credit for that.

Nevertheless, we feel very strongly on this side that the motion should be amended and so I move, seconded by the member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman), that the motion—correct me if my wording is wrong, sir—that the motion placed be amended by adding the words: "And that adequate budget and independent research staff be provided."

Mr. Speaker: Mr. T. Reid, seconded by Mr. B. Newman, moves an amendment to the motion by Mr. White that the following words be added to the motion:

And that adequate budget and independent research staff be provided.

The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support that change in the resolution. I must say that I too am rather concerned with the way in which this motion has been set out. I would like particularly to hear from the Minister of University Affairs exactly what is meant by the term "currently."

I noticed, for example, that on Friday, April 16, on a motion from the Minister of Education dealing with The Department of Education, that the Legislature's committee on human resources be asked to examine the cost of education "as they are reflected in the estimates"—not "currently reflected," but simply "reflected."

In other words, we have two different motions—one with the word "currently" and the other without the word "currently." The hon. minister might say that we are equivocating and this is simply fiddling around with a particular term. But I think it is more than that. I am concerned that this committee does not simply become another estimates committee.

I would like to ask, if we are dealing with the estimates of 1970-1971, which are before the House at this present moment. They are the only estimates that can be before the House. The budget has not been presented; it will not be presented until Monday, therefore there are no estimates for 1971-1972. One must possibly assume then that the committee will find itself dealing with estimates which are long past and are virtually irrelevant.

If indeed the minister assumes that—he can scarcely assume that, because we are meeting on Wednesday, before the budget is presented. If we are going to be taking next year's estimates, one might well wonder what point there is in having a second estimates committee dealing with the same subjects, going over the same materials, the only difference being that we will have before it members of the various departments, particularly as expressed in this motion, "officials of The Department of University Affairs, The Department of Education, the committee of university affairs, the council of regents and other representatives."

But, Mr. Speaker, we have already been around that course. Two years ago we had just exactly that situation when we dealt with the estimates of The Department of Education in committee, and there were representatives of these various departments. I think that it is incumbent upon the minister to indicate exactly what is meant. What are we dealing with? It seems to me that it is totally outside the expectations of this side of the House if we are simply going over the estimates of the present year or even the past year.

Surely what we should be looking at is what has happened to the costs of education for the last 10 years. We know they have

risen. We know that the people in Ontario are concerned about the rise in cost, and indeed for the next 10 years. In some sense we are overlapping what is going on at the present time in the commission which has been set up—the commission on post-secondary education, chaired by Dr. Douglas Wright, because they are dealing with that as well. One wonders why that commission has been totally left out of this motion as well; although I presume that in the rather narrow expectations of this committee we can scarcely be expected to dovetail anything we are doing with what is being done by that commission, which would have been going on for the last number of months.

At the same time, I do want to hear from the Minister of University Affairs exactly what he reads into the wording, the study and examining of “the costs of post-secondary education as they are currently reflected in the estimates of The Department of University Affairs.”

I am also concerned about the question of function, as I have stated, Mr. Speaker, for some time, on this whole matter of this committee dealing with cost of education. To deal with cost without understanding the functions of these institutions is pointless, and the present Prime Minister realizes that as well as anybody else.

For that reason I am a little concerned about the narrowness of the determination that we should be dealing simply with costs. I would say to the minister who introduced this legislation that we bring in people, not just from his Department of University Affairs and the committee on university affairs, but from the universities themselves, to come before us and tell us what is being done in terms of programme in universities and in colleges of applied arts and technology.

What is wrong in this province is that we do not relate the cost of education to the programmes that are involved in the educational process. What is outraging the people of Ontario is not essentially the cost of education. They just cannot see any general philosophy or direction or purpose for their educational system. Of course, most of all they are outraged by the way we collect educational costs, and I know that is beyond the purview of this resolution.

But I say to the minister that I would hope that he would mean that we could bring before this committee members of the administration of various colleges of applied

arts and technology and members of the administration of teachers' colleges who are not even mentioned in this setting. The nurses' colleges might be useful, too.

I would certainly hope we could bring before this committee, people from the universities and the various departments of the universities, from the post-graduate departments of universities, from the extension departments of universities. Let us find out what the functions of these institutions are and get some kind of reaction as to what the function should be. Then we can determine whether the costs are rational and reasonable; or whether there is duplication, whether there is pointless activity, whether, indeed, these institutions are carrying out functions which have no relationship to what the people of Ontario want or expect.

I would hope that that is what we will do on Wednesday when we talk to the officials of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. I am not interested in going over the budget of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. I am interested in seeing what exactly that institution is doing in the various phases of its programme and how the activities of that institute relate directly to the needs of the teachers and the young people and the parents, the people of Ontario.

Unless this committee is going into that kind of an examination, I say we will do no service to the people of this province simply by trying to find headline-catching sums of money that have been spent by this university or that college of applied arts and technology. I am not interested in that game; I am not interested in that ploy. I am interested in seeing what is being done in education in Ontario, what it is costing and what value we are getting from the particular process.

I would hope that we can take a look, not just in terms of the estimates, but what is wrong with the estimates, Mr. Speaker. Why I worry about this particular resolution is that we can never find out what goes on within those estimates. As the Prime Minister knows we have been trying to find out what really has been going on between the various colleges of applied arts and technology and how it breaks down within these colleges.

I am afraid we will need a great deal more information. That is why I am attracted by the motion of the member for Scarborough East. We do need, I think, a great deal of research. We do need a great deal of information and statistics which are not available

in the estimate books, either currently or past, to refer back to the problem I have already expressed.

So I appeal to the minister to be very specific in the next few moments as to what he means by this motion and what he believes will be the role of this committee, because his words will be listened to very carefully. We intend to use these words when we come before this committee in the days ahead, as he brings various people before that committee, so that we will not be restricted in asking the kinds of questions which must be asked, if there is going to be any real understanding.

Certainly, organizations have expressed their interest to me in having the opportunity to present themselves before this committee and of articulating what they believe to be the needs of this educative society. That is what they want to do. They are not interested simply in playing about with dollars and cents. They are essentially interested in showing how their function relates to the needs of education in the Province of Ontario. That includes the employment needs; it includes the needs of the spirit and the intellect for the people of Ontario.

So I call upon the minister to make some reaction to the remarks that have been made here this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment that has been placed before this House. I think we are living in a new age, and a new province. In discussion or dialogue with the young people of this province especially, one of the great frustrations facing this group is the red tape and the bind-up of our—

Mr. Singer: Revolution raises its head!

Mr. J. R. Smith:—present governmental system. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the new committee structures as they were being introduced to this House would provide a free forum of discussion. One of the most unfortunate aspects of our present committee system is the fact that it divides the committee into two factions. The adversaries are the opposition and, usually, the defenders are the government members. Mr. Speaker, we operate in this chamber—

Mr. Pitman: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. R. Smith:—under the British parliamentary system, whereby the defeat of the government is considered a time for resignation. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have really meaningful government, at the grass roots level, surely at the committee stage of our legislation there should be a free forum for all members of these committees to discuss and present constructive criticisms and programmes to the committee, together with those of the community at large around about us, so we can enter into these committees, whether it is for an afternoon, or a morning or a weekend or whatever it is, tour the province, and have available to us independent advisers and management consultants and so on.

This does not exist at present and so you get this sort of adversary position. We rush into the committees; the whips are there counting heads, checking off lists. All three parties, Mr. Speaker, are guilty of this. The notes go hither and yon through this building, "Bring in the members; there is going to be a vote." It is basic and elementary.

Mr. Peacock: Very eloquent!

Mr. J. R. Smith: This is wrong, because we do not get these grass roots positive suggestions coming forward. Mr. Speaker, one of the major things that really has stirred me was the appointment of a man I hold in very high esteem and regard—

Mr. Nixon: He is going to be a Minister without Portfolio.

Mr. Singer: Put him in early.

Mr. J. R. Smith:—as one of the foremost educators of this century, Dr. McCarthy, to head this special committee. Because, Mr. Speaker, what really bothered me was the fact that here was a man—and I have full respect and confidence in him—who is investigating his previous department.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is now not speaking to the motion.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Mr. Speaker, on the matter of school costs and programmes, what we have done, what we are doing at present and where we are going are of the utmost concern to the people of this province. Unless we, as a committee, are going to be permitted to have independent, objective assistants—not just a secretary who is sent up from the Clerk's department to take down the minutes and a clerk who usually cannot even take it down in shorthand—we are hamstrung.

Basically one of our problems in our society and our parliamentary system is that we as members are ruled by the technocrats of the civil service. This is something that is discussed by everyone. It is not just here in this jurisdiction; this is something that is peculiar to many western jurisdictions—the power of the technocrats. It is no longer the power of the landlords or the scientists; it is purely the technocrats in the administrative decision-making part of our government.

To bring some rebirth, a ray of hope and promise into our province, the committees such as we have in this Legislature need the substance and backing and independent adjudication or thought of some of these resource people. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, we are going to go back into the same old cycle and routine.

Mr. Pitman: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. R. Smith: We want to have an exciting dialogue. I do not want to enter these committees in the position of defending my government, because there are many things—most of the programmes of this government and its concepts, its principles—for which I am very proud to be associated with our government and I am a defender of its leader. But I think that party politics should not enter at the committee stage for every hour, every minute of the debate. We are here to do the people's business; to speak for the people of our constituencies and the general good of the people of Ontario at large and this nation. Anything that can be done to provide us with assistance to help us reach a rational and just decision in our deliberations is to the benefit of all.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I hope that now all three parties have urged on the administration the acceptance of this resolution, that it—

Mr. Stokes: He did not get much support from his colleagues over there.

Mr. Nixon: —will, in fact, be accepted unanimously on all sides. It seems to me that the amendment is the crux of the whole new approach to the committee system. I have had the feeling in recent days that the administration would like at least the appearance of a new approach to effective committee discussion and examination of a number of programmes, either referred to it by the Legislature or initiated by the committees themselves. Still there is the statement that has been made by the Premier

and backed up by the Minister of Education that the research into education costs is going to be conducted under the leadership of the former deputy minister, Dr. McCarthy. There are those who feel, quite rightly and very strenuously, that this sort of research conducted by one of the men leading in the development of the programme itself cannot possibly be as effective as it might be if the examination were undertaken impartially.

Certainly the thought that has been put forward in the last week during these continuing discussions on the committee system by the Premier, that there is ample staff available in the various departments that might come under consideration by the committees, is inadequate. While these people are well motivated, they obviously have a predisposition to argue in favour of decisions that they had a part of and to simply convince those who would perhaps remain unconvinced of the efficacy and efficiency of the programme as it presently is.

My own feeling is that if we are going to consider the committee system as workable and as effective and as meaningful, I would hope that the Premier opposite, and the decision made by him in the next few minutes, would be to support this amendment. I think it is offered with the expectation that it would be in the best interests of the public work that we undertake here in this House and in the committees that we are endeavouring to improve. I sincerely hope that it will be thus supported on all sides.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to enter the discussion? Does the Prime Minister wish to speak before the minister?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, just very briefly to speak to the amendment. The Minister of University Affairs will reply to some of the other matters raised. It is not the intention of the government, obviously, to adopt the amendment to the resolution. Firstly, it is unnecessary; secondly, it is really within the scope of the committee to make these determinations. We went all through this argument some few days ago, and as I stated, Mr. Speaker, at the time the initial resolution was introduced, there was nothing to preclude the committee moving in the direction that is being discussed.

Mr. Stokes: The member for Hamilton Mountain does not think so.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Just a minute.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, before the member for Scarborough East wished to make some further observations, I was in the process of saying that my remarks earlier in the session indicated very clearly that the initial resolution, or the resolution that we are discussing today, did not preclude the committee, if it so determined and wished, from moving in this direction. I should also point out, Mr. Speaker, it has to relate to the desire on the part of the committee, and the committee has to make this determination. I think this is obvious.

Mr. Nixon: The House should specifically give them this power.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest as I listened to the member for Peterborough, who tended to support this resolution, but who took, I think, a very different approach as to the function of the committee and the desire to get into the relationship and function of some of the educational institutions—not just related to cost matters—surely this is, hopefully, something the committee will do, because to me it is completely relevant and, with great respect to the amendment moved by the member—

Mr. Stokes: The member for Peterborough is always relevant.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly, I have always said that.

I have always said that, but I will not answer for the Minister of University Affairs to the member for Scarborough East as to an interpretation of the wording. I would only observe, having read it here, that it is abundantly clear there is no question as to what is included.

I would say to the member for Peterborough, when the term "current" is used, this is in the resolution partially to resolve the problem as it relates to the present position of the community college programmes within the existing estimates of The Department of Education which are in the process of transferral into The Department of University Affairs. So the resolution is so comprehensive that there can be no debate whatsoever, surely, as to the desire to have all of these institutions available for discussion by the standing committee. So, Mr. Speaker, as I say—and I had the words quoted to me by the member for Scarborough East—there is nothing in the resolution here, that has not

been presented by the Minister of University Affairs. So the government quite obviously will not be supporting the amendment.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier missed the point too.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No I did not.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: I would like to ask a question. I suppose it should be of the Prime Minister—perhaps it could be answered by—

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister, having spoken once in this debate, is not entitled to speak again.

Mr. Peacock: I understood, Mr. Speaker, that a question is always in order.

Mr. Stokes: We give unanimous consent.

Mr. Peacock: As there are no estimates now before the House, which year's estimates is the Prime Minister, or the motion, speaking of?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the rules permit me to answer that in the form of a question, I would say that my interpretation of it—and I would not, of course, indicate anything other than a personal interpretation, Mr. Speaker—is that it would include 1970-1971; and when the budget is introduced next Monday, this obviously would extend to 1971-1972.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further discussion? The minister has the floor to close the debate.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister has said, the word "currently" was added to that particular sentence, which mirrors the resolution passed by the House on Friday, simply to make it obvious that, at the moment, these various types of post-secondary institution are in two different departments, that is The Department of Education and The Department of University Affairs. Quite frankly, I would have no objection to removing the word at all, if I thought it was going to stand in the way of a full and free investigation of this matter by the committee. I will be quite willing to do that, although with this assurance perhaps it will not be necessary.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a question? Is it in the mind of the minister that we will be able on that

committee to discuss virtually the cost of post-secondary education over an extended period of time, or is this the "currently" which is stated here and which I recognize is linked with what the Prime Minister brought before us just a moment ago in relation to the shifting of institutions from one department to another? Is that word "currently" not going to have a restrictive effect upon the debate in that committee?

Hon. Mr. White: When this was worded by my officials and I yesterday the initial draft had a word other than "examine". When I saw that word was different from that in the resolution passed on Friday, I said let us use the same word that was used on Friday. Otherwise, the opposition is going to be worried that we have in some way altered the nature of this examination.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: When we came to this word "currently" and I became aware that it was not in Friday's resolution, I said let us take this out too. It was explained to me that the word was in there simply to make it clear that these two types of post-secondary institution are in two different departments now. I will be very glad to remove the word, if it is going to keep the hon. gentlemen up late, awake, tonight.

Mr. Pitman: It will.

Hon. Mr. White: Or it may be that my assurance given to members now—that it will in no way inhibit your examination—may set their minds at ease. It certainly does not restrict the committee to this year or next year or last year. I quite agree that one cannot examine costs without having some kind of comparison over time and over space. I quite agree also that one cannot make an assessment of the appropriateness of cost without seeing what one is buying for those moneys, so in this way the quality, let us say the benefit from the cost, can be in some way examined, no doubt.

Mr. T. Reid: How about the word "directly?"

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I do not think—I certainly know it has no secret mysterious meaning—

Mr. T. Reid: What does "indirectly" mean?

Hon. Mr. White: I do not know if the example chosen by the member for Peterborough is particularly good, but surely if

they want to question the OSSTF in some fashion, I suppose that is within their purview—I do not know; that is not my department, and I think I should not express a government position on it. But I would like to make some general comments here, Mr. Speaker, before this matter is put to a vote and I would like to set the background, if I may.

The member for Scarborough East's initial remarks cast some reflection on my predecessor in a way that I think may not have been parliamentary. However, I recognize that he needs no defence from me as the Gallup poll in last Toronto Daily Star would indicate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: From my earliest days in this Legislature I have been very interested in the work of committees, and I am going to substantiate that if I may take just a moment or two.

In 1960, which was the first session after the 1959 election, I found myself, as a complete neophyte, the chairman of the committee on government commissions. That was one of the better committees in those days because it was a newsworthy committee and we probed into liquor and prostitution on Jarvis Street. Mr. Farquhar Oliver was very interested in that subject and I think Mr. Reaume was very interested in pursuing that.

At any rate, it was a very interesting committee for one to head, and I recall vividly that the subject of night racing became a matter for discussion, at which time I invited Mr. Farquhar Oliver, seconded by—it may have been the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald)—at any rate, I invited these opposition members to express formally, in the form of a motion, the recommendation that night racing be permitted here in Ontario.

I was told that the committee on government commissions had never made a report to the Legislature. But that precedent, I thought, did not bind us, and in fact we did get the information to Mr. Frost, who was good enough to call me that night.

An hon. member: He having said there would be night racing in this province over his dead body.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Frost having said that there would be night racing over his dead body, called me that night and I pointed

out to him that the committee felt obliged to give him this kind of guidance. And, as a matter of fact, within a period of just a few months, night racing was permitted.

Mr. Nixon: Funny he never took the minister into the cabinet.

Hon. Mr. White: So the next committee assignment I had was the standing committee on education.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the House is very interested in this history of committee work, but I wish the minister would come back to the motion on the floor.

Mr. Peacock: He was much better as a neophyte.

Hon. Mr. White: I am trying to substantiate my claim, Mr. Speaker, that I am not going to be party to any attempt to muzzle legislative committees. It will not take me very much longer.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, what the committee does will depend on the committee and not the minister, I presume.

Mr. Pitman: Touche, touche!

Mr. Stokes: Do not bet on it.

Hon. Mr. White: As the chairman of the education committee—as my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition has been good enough to mention—we set up a very vigorous programme which thoroughly explored a wide variety of matters. This was done with the co-operation of the minister of the day and of the department.

Mr. T. Reid: Where did they get the budget?

Hon. Mr. White: Then, Mr. Speaker, you may recall that the following year, as chairman of the committee on conservation I set a new precedent and took the legislative committee through western Ontario where we examined conservation developments of every kind.

I find myself in substantial agreement with the member for Hamilton Mountain, although—

Mr. Nixon: Is the hon. minister going to vote with him?

Mr. Stokes: The minister shares his apprehension.

Hon. Mr. White: —the difference in the congressional system, with its checks and

balances, and the parliamentary system must be recognized; and this essential difference must, I think, be reflected in the constitution and the operation of legislative committees. I do not think you want an elaborate explanation from me on that somewhat philosophical subject, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps at some later time we can get into it.

Having said that, let me point out that when I was chief government whip the amounts of money made available to several caucuses was very small, and in fact there was no money made available whatsoever to the Conservative caucus, not a nickel. There were very rudimentary services provided through Mr. Speaker's office, which seemed to me to be inappropriate, and—

Mr. Speaker: I must ask the hon. minister to come back to the motion before the House. He has not been on it for the last five minutes.

Hon. Mr. White: —now, Mr. Speaker, there are tens of thousands of dollars being made available for research within these caucuses, and the—

Mr. Bullbrook: He does not pay attention. I pay attention.

Hon. Mr. White: —and the amendment offered by the Liberal Party by implication, or inference—inference on my part certainly—would indicate that there were no such research funds or research staff, and in fact there are very generous funds.

Mr. Nixon: Very convoluted train of reason.

Mr. T. Reid: We do not get any money. We do not get any staff.

Hon. Mr. White: I for one would not want to establish some kind of alter government with the enormous cost or originating research and duplicating material of every kind available now from primary sources within my department and from other governmental agencies.

Mr. Nixon: Let Dr. McCarthy examine himself!

Hon. Mr. White: By that I mean, Mr. Speaker, I think there is a tremendous temptation for us to spend a great deal of money on original research when the material is available, if one cares to look for it, at a very small fraction of the cost.

Mr. Pitman: It is not available.

Hon. Mr. White: And so I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that large sums of public moneys are being expended within The Department of University Affairs, within The Department of Education—

Mr. T. Reid: One and a half million dollars.

Hon. Mr. White:—within the committee on university affairs, within the council of regents, and all of these sources are mentioned specifically in the resolution which I offered to the House; and so we find a second source of research in addition to the very substantial public funds being made available to the several caucus offices.

The member for Peterborough mentioned the committee on post-secondary education and thought that it should have been called. I think in fairness to them, Mr. Speaker, that this would not be appropriate. They are straining every nerve to complete an interim report early next fall; they are called upon by the terms of reference to have a second series of public meetings after that interim report is published—or I think it may be called a draft report, a draft final report—and they are trying very hard to have this report concluded for us early next year.

I think it would not be quite fair, Mr. Speaker, to call upon the committee while its information is incomplete, and while its ideas are half formed. I think the purpose can be accomplished by the committee by using these other sources without interfering with that particular project.

Mr. Pitman: One meeting with them might be useful. Just one meeting with them might be useful.

Hon. Mr. White: I certainly would not object if the members feel it is necessary and it is embraced by the phrase “other interested representatives.”

So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude by pointing out the resolution is very broadly worded; that the history of the committees in this Parliament of ours has been to give very free rein; that very substantial public moneys are being made available now for research within the several groups mentioned here, and through the caucus offices; that there is no intention on my part to let a word like “currently” in any way impede the committee’s activities; and that I speak for the government in saying we welcome the observations and conclusions which this resolution will enable the committee to produce.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Mr. White has moved that the Legislature’s committee on human resources be asked to examine the costs of post-secondary education as they are currently reflected in the estimates of The Department of University Affairs and The Department of Education, and for which the Minister of University Affairs and the Minister of Education are directly accountable to this House, including the funds provided to universities, colleges of applied arts and technology, and related institutions; that the committee be encouraged to invite officials of The Department of University Affairs and The Department of Education, the committee on university affairs, the council of regents, and other interested representatives, to appear before the committee as the committee may decide.

In amendment it has been moved by Mr. T. Reid seconded by Mr. B. Newman that the following words be added to the motion: “and that adequate budget and independent staff be provided.”

We will, of course, vote first on the amendment.

The House divided on the amendment which was negatived on the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Breithaupt	Allan
Brown	Belanger
Bukator	Bernier
Bullbrook	Boyer
Burr	Brunelle
Davison	Carruthers
Deacon	Carton
Deans	Davis
De Monte	Demers
Farquhar	Dunlop
Ferrier	Dymond
Gaunt	Gilbertson
Good	Grossman
Haggerty	Guindon
Innes	Hamilton
Makarchuk	Haskett
Newman	Henderson
(Windsor-Walkerville)	Hodgson
Nixon	(York North)
Paterson	Jessiman
Peacock	Johnston
Pitman	(St. Catharines)
Reid	Johnston
(Scarborough East)	(Carleton)
Renwick	Kennedy
(Scarborough Centre)	Lawrence
Ruston	(Carleton East)
Sargent	MacNaughton
Singer	Meen
Smith	Morin
(Hamilton Mountain)	Morningstar

AYES	NAYS
Smith	Morrow
(Nipissing)	McKeough
Stokes	McNeil
Trotter	Newman
Worton—31	(Ontario South)
	Potter
	Price
	Randall
	Reilly
	Reuter
	Robarts
	Rollins
	Rowe
	Rowntree
	Simonett
	Smith
	(Simcoe East)
	Snow
	Stewart
	Villeneuve
	Welch
	Wells
	White
	Whitney
	Winkler
	Wishart
	Yakubski
	Yaremko—53

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 31, the "nays" 53.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost. We will now vote on the motion by Hon. Mr. White.

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye".

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day today I think it would be perhaps proper for me to report to the House in respect to a matter which was raised a week ago.

Last week I was asked to look into the question of the powers of the new standing committees of the House as authorized by order of the House dated Wednesday, March 31. Before specifically referring to the new committees, it seems desirable to review to some extent the powers and duties of the committees prior to the new order, with general reference to the committee system under the Parliamentary system.

Committees, both standing and select, under the Parliamentary system, as opposed to the congressional system, have always been confined in their activity to matters referred to them by the House. I draw your attention to the wording of the motion authorizing the committees in previous sessions, which said:

Which committees shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon.

In a limited number of cases this reference was automatic, for example, the public accounts of the province stood automatically referred to the standing committee on public accounts, as this was the purpose of the committee's appointment. Similarly, when in recent years a new committee was established on government commissions, after specifically referring certain boards and commissions to the committee at several sessions, it became a practice of the House to regard all boards and commissions as standing automatically referred to that committee on its appointment.

When the new committee on regulations was established by statute in 1969, that statute specifically provided that all regulations stand referred to that committee on its appointment, with certain limitations, but also provides that the committee, "Shall deal with such other matters as are referred to it from time to time by the assembly." It will therefore be seen that under the previous system, while the limited subjects heretofore alluded to were automatically referred, any other matter required specific reference by the House before a committee could examine or report thereon.

It has been alleged several times that committees instituted programmes on their own initiative. This suggestion is not accurate. Committees did, from time to time, have informal programmes, provided by the departments, for the information of members, but these were, as stated, informal, and could not in any way be described as investigations, nor did they carry any authority to report.

Coming now to the new committee setup, as authorized by the order of March 13, 1971, when the proposal for this new setup was drafted for the standing orders committee, last session, two distinct types of reference were recognized. First, the public accounts and regulations committee remain unchanged and reference is automatically as previously mentioned.

Secondly, to replace the previous government commissions committee, boards and commissions reporting through designated ministers were automatically referred to three of the four main committees, that is, the legal administration committee has automatically referred to it all boards and commissions coming within the scope of The Departments of Financial and Commercial Affairs, Justice, Labour, Municipal Affairs, and Provincial Secretary and Citizenship.

The human resources committee has automatically referred to it all boards and commissions within the scope of The Departments of Correctional Services, Education, Health, Social and Family Services, and University Affairs, and the natural and physical resources committee has automatically referred to it all those boards and commissions coming within the scope of Agriculture and Food, Energy and Resources Management, Highways, Lands and Forests, Mines and Northern Affairs, Tourism and Information, and Transport.

All other matters—and I quote—“may be referred in the discretion of the House.”

This appeared to be clearly understood when the resolution to authorize the committees was debated at considerable length on March 31, and unanimously agreed to. In any event, on re-examination, the provisions of that resolution do not appear to be open to any question; they seem to be abundantly clear.

To summarize in brief, the boards and commissions of the named departments are referred to the committees without further action by the House. Any other matter requires specific reference. However, I must say, and I consider this very important, that I can see no objection to a committee, by a majority, passing a motion asking the House for authority to investigate a certain matter, or have a specific matter referred to it. It would then be brought into the House as a specific recommendation from that committee and could be debated and decided in the House. If decided in the affirmative this would, of course, constitute the necessary referral of the matter to the committee.

Mention has been made several times of the action of the natural and physical resources committee on Wednesday, April 14. It appears on information from the chairman and clerk of the committee that no formal motion was, in fact, made. Simply, on the suggestion of the member for Huron-Bruce, it was agreed to ask the Ontario Food Council to come before the committee.

In any event, whether or not there was a formal motion, the Ontario Food Council is, I take it, one of the boards which comes under The Department of Agriculture and Food and therefore stands automatically referred to that committee.

On a point of order it was asked why the human resources committee did not report the motion passed last Wednesday. Had the motion been worded as I have suggested, to ask the House for authority, it would of necessity have been brought to the House as a recommendation from the committee for decision by the House.

However, as it proposed action by the committee without reference to the House, there was, I suggest, nothing to report. It is not the practice to report every motion passed in committee, but only those that make a recommendation to the House or require some specific action by the House.

Finally, the member for York South quite vigorously insisted I should state whether or not the Prime Minister has the right to make a unilateral ruling as to whether or not any matter is in order. The answer is obvious—neither the Prime Minister or any other member has any such right, but, when the Prime Minister or any other minister is asked a specific question in the question period, he has, of course, the right to answer such question as he sees fit.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If you will permit me, sir, in the statement that you put before us there are two matters which I think should be made clear. The first has to do with the assignment—

Mr. Speaker: May I point out the Speaker's rulings are not debatable and this is not the proper time.

Mr. Nixon: A point of order, sir?

Mr. Speaker: A point of order.

Mr. Nixon: To continue correctly with the ordered work of the House, I would draw to your attention, sir, that The Department of Trade and Development is not listed in your assignment of departments as listed here, or in the assignments of departments in the original committee resolution.

Mr. Speaker: That is indeed so. The Clerk advises me that undoubtedly that was not included in the resolution or in any referral order, and therefore is something that would require the resolution of the House to refer it before the committee. That is something, I think, that requires a little looking into.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Sounds like a conspiracy.

Mr. Speaker: I will be glad to have it looked up and advise the House what the situation is.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister of Trade and Development was editing the first motion.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification, would you explain whether it is possible for a committee to request the permission of the House to call one of the boards or commissions of the three major departments not assigned to appear before that particular committee—for example, Treasury, Public Works, or Trade and Development? Is it possible for any standing committee then to ask the permission of the House to have the boards or commissions of that department appear before it?

Mr. Speaker: It was unfortunate, of course. It was a very long statement and the hon. member for Wentworth did not have a copy of it. But, among other things that were in there was the statement that any committee, by a resolution passed, by a majority of course, could ask the House for either specific authority, or have somebody in it who may do so; but it must come from the committee to the House.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To continue with the Throne debate this afternoon—after the adjournment of yesterday—I was referring to the problems of Niagara regional government. Not only the city of St. Catharines has stated it wishes to secede from the Niagara regional government, but also the city of Niagara Falls would follow. The town of Fort Erie is also preparing a brief to present to the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) on the inequities of regional government.

Their major complaint is the red tape involved in trying to implement ecological projects in the town. Delay in approval of such projects no doubt will triple the original

cost of the proposed programmes, originated in 1967. The present rigid budget set by the regional government municipalities, apparently endorsed by the Ontario Municipal Board, will stall and hamper all future and further development within the Niagara region.

The Niagara regional government has been instructed to seek assistance in the form of outright grants on ecological projects from the federal and provincial governments.

In a recent article in the Evening Tribune of February 19 the mayor of Welland says it is getting to be too much for real property owners to handle. Mayor Pitts of Welland explained: "The province gains 14 per cent a year in income and the municipality through assessment gains only two per cent; we are justified in going to the province for help."

What is needed financially for towns like Fort Erie—which is in such a mess now as a result of the former Minister of Municipal Affairs' (Mr. McKeough) centralist policies and arbitrary will—is a federal-provincial loan bank. The time is surely past when municipalities should enter the money market without the backing of the provincial credit needed to pull down the interest rates to a reasonable level. Where is the Province of Ontario Bank and what is its purpose, if any, today?

Mr. Speaker, further to the comments dealing with regional government, an article from the Fort Erie Times, April 14, 1971, states:

It was surprising, therefore, when Ontario Premier William Davis stated last week he was too busy to spend some time with members of the St. Catharines council despite their 9 to 2 vote to secede from a regional government system. Mr. Davis tactlessly offered to send down one of his underlings, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and made it quite clear he could not be bothered discussing something as trivial as the future of the city of St. Catharines. In fact it was not until the Niagara Falls mayor, Franklin Miller, told the press his city would follow St. Catharines' lead in seceding.

About two months or a month before this letter to the paper here, the Prime Minister with his colleagues were in St. Catharines trying to tell the local municipal officials that everything was going to be well if they went along with them. But apparently by this article the Prime Minister cares less about the problems of regional government in the Niagara peninsula.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): As a matter of fact the government does not care at all.

Mr. Haggerty: That is right.

I am faced with a barrage of complaints from my constituents who got caught in the high first-mortgage situation of 18 months to one year ago, and who now have a millstone around their necks to the tune of 12 per cent in many cases, in some cases higher, and not always compounded annually either. Not all these mortgages are renegotiable, or they are renegotiable upward every five years, but downward only with the greatest difficulty because of the weakness of the individual borrower in the face of the lender's strength. I see that the lenders are even taking a poke at Louis Rasminsky when he chides them about not following the lead set by the Bank of Canada.

I would like to read into the record this clipping from the Free Press Weekly of March 6, 1971.

Designed in part to stimulate business activity and employment, on February 23 the Bank of Canada dropped its interest rate to 5¼ per cent from 5¾ per cent just nine days after the latter figure came in force.

It has been interpreted as strong federal pressure on banks, trust and loan companies to respond with pared down lending charges as quickly as possible.

The prevailing prime rate charged by chartered banks to their most credit-worthy customers—a guide to other rates—went down only to seven per cent in nine months from 8½ per cent. Mortgage rates moved slowly down in the last nine months to about 9¾ per cent from just over 10½ per cent for conventional agreements and to 9¼ from 10¼ for those insured by the government under The National Housing Act.

If we try to force interest rates down by regulation we all know what will happen. The supply of mortgage money, particularly first mortgage money, will dry up. So the government has got to do much more than just have a token love affair with the five chartered banks; to establish a fair market for first mortgages, possibly with lower and upper ceilings, and mandatory renegotiation every five years at the outside, so that people are not crippled by 12 per cent mortgages or higher for up to 40 years.

In this connection, I wonder how many people realize that the total repayment, even of an NHA approved \$25,000 mortgage, com-

pounded annually at only 9¼ per cent with taxes, comes to the astronomical sum of \$97,800 over a 40-year term? That is, almost four times the amount of the loan has to be paid back. That means that for many people, a modest home including down payment will involve a lifetime repayment of over \$100,000.

In Toronto, where houses are running around \$30,000 to \$40,000 now, this figure is even higher. Ought we to be paying this kind of money for shelter? Ought this huge proportion of our incomes to be spent in this fashion? If not, what are the root causes of housing costs being so high? We can trace most of the problems to the taxation and municipal policies of the provincial government rather than to Ottawa.

My next area of concern is the failure of the government to work with industry to set provincial goals and priorities in production. I think that far more can be done than is presently being done in this regard. I have the example before me of the Japanese industrial-government committees. One result is that on the roads of Ontario today every fifth or sixth car you see is a Datsun or a Toyota, and these two brands have now caused Volkswagen to drop into third place in car imports.

The government should show leadership at Oshawa, Oakville, Windsor, Brampton and Talbotville, move in on the Canadian auto industry and tell the companies to stop their outdated practice of making essential items options. There are 20 or 30 items on a Datsun or Toyota that are basic on the Japanese cars. Yet the same items are optional extras on the Canadian cars.

Similarly, in television, even though the set may bear a department-store brand name, it is likely to come from Japan, perhaps mainly assembled there and finished here, or wholly assembled there. Name brands such as Sony and Panasonic have swept the home electronics market in both price and quality.

The third feature—service after sales—is also good because these companies have set up training schools for Canadian technicians.

Meanwhile, the government has shown no such leadership toward our own industry, and we find Dunlop closing and then Westinghouse ceasing home electronics production. The sad tale goes on and on.

In the same vein, I have this report on a predicted rise in the cost of steel of 24 per cent by Stewart S. Cort, chairman of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation. This comes from the Buffalo Courier-Express:

Steel prices will rise 24 per cent in the next three years if present wage patterns are extended to the steel industry.

This was the estimate made Monday by Stewart S. Cort, chairman of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation in an interview with *Iron Age*, a steel industry magazine.

In outlining the consequences of present wage trends, Cort said, "We have taken the can settlement that has been made by the United Steelworkers," he said, "The way we figure it, the additional cost could require us, Bethlehem Steel, to institute across-the-board general price increases of approximately eight per cent a year through the life of the contract just to stay even."

New contracts of United Steelworkers of America with major can companies have been valued at \$1.75 an hour, or 30 per cent over three years.

The price estimate would cover direct wage costs plus "the effect on the cost of materials and services," said Cort. Regarding the chances of warding off these costs, he makes no prediction, but he called attention to these factors:

Union demands: "The steelworkers look on themselves as being behind the parade and fully entitled to catch up."

Company resistance to demands: "I do not see where a strike gains anybody anything. We are less favourably positioned than we were in 1959—the year of the last steel strike. Anything is possible if we have to do it, but it is a different kind of world."

Government intervention to prevent or halt strikes: "You know, they have a very good reading on the financial condition of the industry. I do not think there is any misconception in Washington about this."

Government intervention to moderate demands: "One question in the government's mind is likely to be: How successful would government intervention of any conceivable kind be? Government really cannot afford to lay its power on the line unless it is pretty sure of being successful," he said. "I am sure the government is aware of the problems that all union leaders face today and they pretty well know the state of unity of the major unions."

Steel price outlook: "How can we be an island unto ourselves in an inflationary economy? The original January increases did not anticipate one cent of increase in wage rates beyond the existing contract."

Inflation and pollution clean-up costs: "The administration has decided that industry is not going to get any help in meeting their bill. The feeling is that you pass it on to the consumer. Well, I do not think some people realize what they are talking about because the bill is enormous," Cort said.

We all know how a change in the price of steel sets off another round of inflation. Yet we ought not to have a gun held to our head by management about counter-pollution costs. This jump in price to cover pollution measures would surely be a once-and-for-all deal. We should be firm about that.

On the other hand, I do not want to hear voices from the left arguing that the alternative is nationalization and socialism, because that approach has been proved bankrupt. Let me read members this March 6 report from Sweden. It is an eye-opener:

END OF A DREAM

The Swedish socialist dream collapsed last week when 30,000 servants were locked out by the government; doctors, dentists and local government officials went on strike; railways ground to a halt, and electricity and gas workers organized sudden stoppages that disrupted supplies at peak hours.

The government of Premier Olof Palme, the young man with a mission determined to bring yet more egalitarian socialism into a country where the state has already become a bad-tempered, domineering nanny, has lost the battle against inflation. It is in dire financial straits and being a minority government, depends in Parliament on the support of the 17 Communist deputies.

Inflation is rampant, and to fight it and pay for the mounting costs of the government cradle-to-grave services, the government has introduced a 17.65 per cent sales tax on all goods and services and an extra 10 per cent tax on gasoline, electric power, wines and spirits. The government has also doubled the employers' payroll tax, a device aimed at eliminating feather-bedding and making companies more efficient. This, in turn, has infuriated the unions which demand wage increases to offset new taxes and has lost Mr. Palme the sympathies of the business community which until 1969 was a tolerant partner of the Social Democrats.

Indeed, polarization has come to Sweden where the radicals are all found within Mr.

Palme's party and where outside it the great mass of Swedes are fed up with the taxation that kills all incentive. People retire early because it is not worthwhile to continue to work when after taxes, their take-home pay is little more than retirement pay. Married women find the combined income tax so high that a couple actually loses money when the wife works.

That almost sounds like the province of Ontario. So wives stay at home frustrated at having their skills sacrificed to the utopia that has now collapsed. The Swedes have never been idealists and the cries of the young radicals, who dominate the youth wing of the Social Democratic Party, for more equality leave them cold. The majority, who voted for the splintered non-socialist party, a split that brought Mr. Palme into power, desire the good things of life and this means better wages for lower-paid workers and more money in the pockets of those who make it.

To solve this dilemma, Mr. Palme had recourse to Gunnar and Alva Myrdal, that curious reincarnation of the gullible British Fabian couple of the 1940s, Sidney and Beatrice Webb. Alva Myrdal has indeed obliged with her report on equality in the seventies.

It would be recalled here that Gunnar Myrdal had to leave Sweden in 1947 because of his pro-Communist leanings, and while in Geneva at the United National Economic Commission for Europe, he never ceased to praise the great economic progress of the socialist countries of eastern Europe and the great economic difficulties of western European democracies. In 1969, he said in Winnipeg, "Labour strife in Canada will be greatly reduced when this country has achieved 100 per cent trade unionism," such as exists in Sweden where "a labour conflict would bring everything to a complete stop."

The conflict has come and Sweden still functions and it is quite probable that Alva Myrdal's projections will have no more validity than all those forecasts of her professor husband, who for years prophesied that communist Europe would overtake the west. Premier Palme has tried to graft a utopian concept upon a highly pragmatic country. He almost lost the last election. His own dream of becoming the Nehru of the 1970s, self-righteously exposing everybody else's wickedness, if it has not collapsed already in last week's labour strife, may well vanish together with the Myrdal utopians, when his

minority regime faces the irate electors next time around.

Now switching to another topic, you will recall that it was we Liberals who demanded mine safety rules last year and we know what we wanted. We were right again and we were ahead of our time, as this report from the March, 1971, issue of *Steel Labour*, regarding the United Steelworkers' submission to the Saskatchewan Department of Mineral Resources shows:

In a mid-January submission to officials of the Saskatchewan Department of Mineral Resources, the steelworkers' union also urged certificates of qualification for people in supervisory capacity and a legal requirement that safety committees include union representation.

In a report to local unions in the province, following the one-day hearing, union spokesman Ken Smith pointed out that this had been the "first real effort to have a say in the amendments to the mines regulations" and it was clear that the safety committees had a big job to do before the next hearing. One of the objectives, Smith stressed, was to "force management to come and discuss union proposals in front of government representatives rather than dealing through the back door."

Perhaps, I should, Mr. Speaker, read into the records once again for the members to my left what the amendments were. I am sorry to see the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) is not here for he opposed such a resolution by this party on this side.

A safety committee shall be established for every mine, comprising equal representation from management and labour and the committee is responsible for ensuring that the safety provisions of this Act are complied with and shall forthwith notify the minister and the district mining engineer of any accident or injury to any workman occurring in or about the mine.

The other amendment, Mr. Speaker, was dealing with the mining Bill 2:

The engineer and any person authorized to act on his behalf and members of that safety committee, as defined in section 151(4) of the Act as amended, are entitled to be present and to examine or cross-examine any witness at an inquest held concerning a death caused by an accident at the mine or plant; and if the engineer, or someone on his behalf is not present, together with at least one management, and

one labour representative of the safety committee, the coroner shall, before proceeding with the evidence, adjourn the inquest and give the deputy minister not less than four days' notice of the time and place at which the evidence is to be taken.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the NDP did not support these resolutions. I read again from this labour magazine regarding the safety programme:

The company proposed a co-operative safety at a joint union-company safety meeting held in December at Falconbridge. The company spokesman said that they were interested in developing a sincere effort toward co-operative safety.

Another article, Mr. Speaker, is from Steel Labour of January, 1969; I quote:

MINE SAFETY IS UNIONS' OBJECTIVE

No one has a greater right to initiate, to participate in and to exercise responsibility in mine safety programmes than the miner himself. The decisions which must be made, the investigations which must be carried out, should be made by committees of the miners' peers. It is the miner who is hurt. It is the miner who is killed. It is the miner who should have pre-eminent rights in mine safety.

To continue with it, Mr. Speaker:

The full mandatory recognition sought by union safety committees is that the worker advocated and participates in all aspects of safety programmes.

It is also noted, Mr. Speaker, in an article from a union paper, The Canadian Independent Labour News of February, 1969:

NORTH YORK HOSPITAL GETS SHOP STEWARDS AND SAFETY COMMITTEE

At a general meeting held Wednesday, February 19, the following employees took over their duties as shop stewards at North York General Hospital:

I will delete the names. It goes on to say:

The safety committee will be composed of six employees and six hospital representatives. They will make recommendations in an effort to ensure safe working conditions in every area of the hospital. The following members will represent the employees in the various departments—

So you can see, Mr. Speaker, that we Liberals have given every thought to the labour problems in the Province of Ontario and we are forerunners in that field.

Mr. D. A. Patterson (Essex South): We have more than 50 per cent of the vote.

Mr. Haggerty: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Now we are always being lectured from the left, so I am glad of the chance to turn the tables. Here is paragraph 10(a) of the NDP sub-amendment, moved April 7 by the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis):

The failure of the provincial government to establish a Crown corporation for mine exploration and development, and to force the pace of expansion through public enterprise and, if appropriate, engaging in joint ventures with private enterprise already active in the mining sector.

How does this jibe with the news report on the federal NDP in the March issue of Steel Labour?

"The federal government's proposal to establish a Canada Development Corporation is a disastrous retreat from the government's own proposals of 1963. The entire concept has been distorted and it is a complete sellout to private enterprise."

This was the first and heated reaction of New Democratic Leader T. C. (Tommy) Douglas to a bill tabled in the House of Commons, January 26.

Will it be different, I wonder, when the mantle falls on daddy? Or will there still be two generations of NDP policy?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Where are the two points? Where is the relevance of the two points?

Mr. Haggerty: Just listen and the member will learn.

Mr. Deans: The member's research is poor.

An hon. member: The NDP might even give the member three or four points.

Mr. Deans: The member's research is really poor.

Mr. Haggerty: The member will understand it if he reads it in Hansard.

Mr. Deans: Read it in Hansard? I am listening to it. It is incoherent.

Mr. Haggerty: Turning to the question of trade unions, the February issue of the Canadian Textile Council Bulletin had this to say:

For years, the American unions have tried to tell us that they were always spending more money in Canada than they were taking out.

Here are the facts!

Since 1962, the federal government has required all unions to report to Ottawa upon their incomes and expenditures. The report under The Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act covers all receipts and all expenditures of the American unions in Canada. This includes what they spend on strike benefits, welfare, pensions—as well as fat salaries for their agents here.

This report, then, covering a period of only five years—from 1962 to 1966—shows that the American unions made a net profit on operations of over \$50 million.

Here is the summary—

Mr. Speaker, I will not get into the total year by year expenditure, but the total income was \$130,904,000. Total expenditures were \$80,137,000. The net profit to the U.S. was \$50,767,000.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Boy! No income tax on that either?

Mr. Haggerty: The report concludes: "We can do with \$50 million here in Canada. Let us stop the handouts."

I have often heard in the House, Mr. Speaker, usually around election time, that the Liberals and the party on the other side here are rich or wealthy and so forth. But I can tell you this much: With this \$50 million going to the United States, we can be darn sure that there is going to be a great amount of it come back to feather the nest of the NDP. The point that I want to raise, Mr. Speaker, is—

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): We will be looking forward to it, as a matter of fact.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): If there is any left over, let us know.

Mr. Haggerty: There is a present trend in the NDP nominations to nominate union representatives, and the point that I want to bring up to the House here about all these persons, if they are to be elected to the Ontario Legislature, is: Are they going to act on behalf of Canadians or are they going to be directed by American unions?

From the other side, one thing that is now dragging the wage earner down and impairing his purchasing power is the revolving credit card. You will have seen in The Globe and Mail's business section this week that all the major banks are sharpening up their credit card practices to their own advantage and once again the workers will pay.

Unsolicited credit cards are the road to ruin for those who have no training in their use. Particularly serious is the revolving charge accounts of the big stores, on which sometimes over \$100 a year is taken in interest. Regarding the Chargex type of credit cards, one bank says of its credit card: "This is the area where we obtain the highest rate of return in the use of funds anywhere in the bank."

Here is part of a speech given to the 1969 annual conference of the Charge Account Bankers' Association:

To generate the major sources of income, card-holders must use their credit cards more and more often, from more and more merchants, for more and more purchases, for larger and larger amounts and on more and more extended terms.

"Activate the credit cards," is the cry. "Write your income tax owing on this certified cheque and we will charge it." "Sign this vacation cash advance slip for the amount you want." "Just fill in this Christmas card bonanza form and forget your money worries." "Buy this direct-mail offer, on which we do not make any profit, but which turns your unsolicited credit card into an active one."

One man with a gross salary of \$7,200 a year was found, on investigation, to have these monthly commitments: \$93.50 for a new car; \$38 repayment to one loan company; \$68 repayment to another loan company; \$26 to a department store revolving credit account; \$25 to a bank credit card; \$37.50 to another bank credit card; and \$37.60 to a furniture store.

Together with his rent and his insurance, the young man was committed to \$436.50 of his total take-home pay of \$475, before he even bought a mouthful of food.

We must urgently control the credit card business and the use of credit cards generally in Ontario, so that people are not trapped in a web of debt in the process of helping keep the wheels of industry turning through consumption of goods and services.

My leader has made the position of this caucus quite plain on the question of automobile insurance. We favour a privately-operated no-fault plan with some retention of tort rights for bodily injuries above an amount to be determined. I am looking forward to seeing the government bill in this area, and am maintaining a file, so that at the appropriate time I shall be ready to criticize it constructively.

Of course, if, as may happen, the Premier is foolish enough to go to the people in June, then we will come back as the government and introduce our own bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am far from satisfied with the staff of the environmental health branch of The Department of Health. This branch has a staff of only 52 field personnel for the whole of Ontario. This is a time, for example, when the cancer rate among workers in the mining industry is soaring.

There seems to be no research going on anywhere to relate cause and effect here. A provincial programme that stresses research on the efforts of the inplant exposures and of the means of protecting workers is required now in the Province of Ontario.

For some time, Mr. Speaker, I have been speaking on the question of the Province of Ontario obtaining parklands on the north shore of Lake Erie. I have raised questions on different occasions in the House here. Perhaps I should recall to the members on June 20, 1969, on page 5953 of Hansard:

Mr. Haggerty—Enquiry of the Minister of Public Works: (a) Have offers to purchase been made by The Department of Public Works in connection with land acquisition for a park site in Bertie township in the county of Welland; (b) How long have the negotiations been taking place; and (c) when does the minister anticipate that the negotiations will be completed?

Answers by the Minister of Public Works:

(a) No. (b) Negotiations have gone on since December 14, 1967. (c) It is not known when negotiations will be completed.

Again, on October 20, 1970, I raised the same question with the Minister of Public Works:

Will the minister inform the House concerning the expropriation of some 300 acres of land for a provincial park, lying west of Point Abino on Lake Erie, in the town of Fort Erie, as to when this transaction will be completed?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I would have to get the information for the hon. gentleman. I do not have it with me this afternoon.

And a supplementary question followed:

Mr. Haggerty: Is the minister aware his department committed itself once and then cancelled options to purchase the land in the area and that it has now left the door open for land speculators to be involved in the purchase of the options dropped by his department?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, again that would be information that I would have to get from the department. I am not aware of this happening, but I will find out and report back.

To this day, Mr. Speaker, I have not received a reply from the minister or from his department. It raises another question. This same announcement made by my hon. friend

from Welland (Mr. Morningstar) in September, 1968, said that the Province of Ontario, through the Minister of Lands and Forests, was going to buy a park site, in a location I have mentioned here, Point Abino. Until this day, nothing has been done.

I can tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker: When this next election is called—perhaps it will be very shortly—the Conservative government has not a chance in my riding. This is one promise that they have not lived up to, and they will hear more and more as we get into the campaigns in my riding.

There are some other small problems that I would like to discuss, Mr. Speaker, and one is the problem of the Welland Canal—the old Welland Canal, after the St. Lawrence Seaway was completed. The new canal, which will be completed supposedly by 1972, raises the question, “What are we going to do with the old Welland Canal?” The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority wishes to pass this responsibility onto local municipalities, onto the regional government, onto the city of Welland, or onto the local municipalities. In fact, I talked to the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) about the matter, and I know they have asked the provincial government if they want to take it over as parkland. I told the minister at that time about a year ago that I do not think this is the responsibility of the provincial government, nor is it the responsibility of the local municipalities. They should not have to bear the upkeep and maintenance of this old canal.

There are a couple of things that perhaps the government should be looking into: It could be used for recreational purposes under a national park; the other is that it could be used for transportation purposes. There are some rumours that the canal will be plugged off at both ends and of course it will be a channel that will have no water in it. Perhaps I should suggest to the Minister of Highways and Transport (Mr. MacNaughton) that a study should be made to see if it could not be used for a rapid transportation system in the Niagara Peninsula. It could connect with the city of Port Colborne, the city of St. Catharines, to tie in with Brock University, with the Niagara College, and with all the industries along the Welland Canal. I suggest that the minister take this as notice and get into a study on it. The other suggestion I think it could be used for—

Mr. Bukator: The Ontario Northland Railway may be good for that transportation.

Mr. Haggerty: That is right! What we need in the Niagara Peninsula is a rapid transportation system. It is one of the poorest areas in the Province of Ontario to get out of.

Mr. Makarchuk: Okay, we will arrange for the member's removal in the next election.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): Is there any place you would rather be?

Mr. Haggerty: I can tell the member for Brantford he is on his way out. That is for sure.

Mr. J. R. Simonett (Frontenac-Addington): Where is the new broom?

Mr. Haggerty: The other suggestion, Mr. Speaker, is that it could be used for docking facilities for an industrial park. These are some of the suggestions that I put to the House here. Perhaps some study should be done on it, but I do not wish to have it referred back to local municipalities and have them bear the cost of the maintenance of this waterway.

I was interested to hear the minister here the other day initiate a programme called SWEEP, a programme to initiate programmes for the students of Ontario.

There is an old saying that a new broom sweeps clean, Mr. Speaker, and on this side, this party has a new broom. We are going to sweep the province in the next election and we will be sitting on that side, carrying out the programmes that are needed to meet the needs of this community in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brantford.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join in the debate, particularly after listening to the member for Welland South (Mr. Haggerty) verbalize his mental hallucinations through the Throne debate.

It is very interesting to see him trying in his dreary way to extricate himself from the boner he pulled while we were discussing the mining bill in committee, where we tried to introduce an amendment. We had an opportunity, because the Tory members were not present in committee at that time, we had an opportunity to move an amendment which would have provided the workers with some meaningful say—not much, very little—a meaningful say in the safety committees in the plants and in some of the things that go on in the plants.

Of course, the vote was lost with the assistance of the member for Welland South who voted with the Conservative Party—

An hon. member: Shame, shame!

Mr. Makarchuk: Now he comes to his defence and tells us that the resolutions he introduced when the bill was being read in the House. We have argued about it before and it was a patsy resolution. The member knows it and we know it.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Read it.

Mr. Makarchuk: We read it. The introduction of Gunnar Myrdal—they are trying to smear somebody of note as Gunnar Myrdal is an economist that is held in high esteem all through the world, in the United States, in Harvard and so on. They are trying to smear him as a communist or something like that. This is absolute sheer stupidity.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): He is bringing everything down to a new low level.

Mr. Makarchuk: We certainly expect something greater than that—the introduction of Sweden as a country that is really falling apart. They had a strike there and a lockout.

Mr. Haggerty: It is gone.

Mr. Makarchuk: It is the first one in something like 30 or 40 years. There is no mention of this. There is not a mention of the fact that Sweden has not had an unemployment problem for the last 30 or 40 years in comparison to what we have here in this country.

Mr. Haggerty: They have it now.

Mr. Makarchuk: Or the fact, Mr. Speaker, that at one time Canada had the highest, or the second highest, standard of living in terms of production per person or gross national product and has been displaced by Sweden. Under the Liberal stewardship we moved from second place to fourth place and now we are being surpassed not only by Sweden but also by Switzerland.

So I would suggest if the member is going to bring in these facts and other arguments, he should give both sides of the story. I am sure that then perhaps there may be some reasons to argue on this point. There may be some credibility. As it is what he is saying is nothing.

The attack on unions, of course, is the standard procedure. I would like to inform the House that Goldfarb Associates, who

also work for the Tories, were doing a survey for the Liberals in our riding before they called the by-election. We had the opportunity of doing part of the survey for them so the results relayed are rather dubious. But one of the questions on the survey, besides asking about what they personally thought of certain candidates that we may run, was "Do you think unions have too much power or do you think unions do not have too much power?"

I would suggest to the member that we saw the results before he did, as a matter of fact, and the results the Liberals got are not the results that were the real results. But I will tell him this. The people did not buy that garbage.

Getting back to the government, I would like to congratulate it on the Throne Speech. It was, I think, the first Throne Speech that was brought in and demolished in two days. I think if anything it should be congratulated on establishing the instant credibility gap. This is part of the new wave, I presume.

I would like to comment on certain matters dealing with both social and economic matters in Ontario, I would like to quote first from Professor Leonard Gertler. I imagine the new Minister of Highways and Transport (Mr. MacNaughton) knows him or has dealt with him in the past but, in any case, he is the director of the school of urban and regional planning, University of Waterloo. He is writing in trends and possibilities for urban development in central and southern Ontario, a study that was commissioned by the Ontario Economic Council. He says:

We have an opportunity to shape the urban regional environment of Ontario in response of our needs and life styles. And we can do so with environmental advantages and built-in hindsight of our "frontier" position. But the pace of our development and our continental position suggests if we do not choose to do so as a deliberate and sustained public policy, that opportunity will be foreclosed and our province as a place to live may fall short of our aspirations.

What the professor is trying to tell us, of course, is that we still have time. He refers to us as frontier society in comparison to the United States society to the south. And he is telling us that time is running out; we do not have too much time left to do the things which have to be done in this province.

The leader of our party has covered the various plans—so-called plans, I should more

accurately describe them—that the government has introduced in the House, the various designs for development for various areas, Toronto region and so on. And from all that we can gather only one thing, that unless we have a change of government we might as well stop talking about our destiny—it will be decided for us and it will be decided by the corporate sector of our society. The decisions there are not made on the basis of benefits to people but they are certainly made in the interests of profit.

I would suggest that some of us should perhaps look to the south. We have a very good social laboratory going on there, an example of what happens when the corporate sector sets the priorities and decides which way society moves. You have to be either completely insensitive or obtuse, or both, not to recognize that there is a very perilous future. And it is not a matter of just salvaging some sovereignty, to be able to say what is going to happen to us in our place, but I think it is the last chance that we have as citizens of Ontario to put the quality of life ahead of the quantity in life.

To the members of the government sitting opposite I will say this, that they have had their chance, they have been in power for the last 28 years or thereabouts, and they failed miserably. There is not a single area in provincial planning where one could look and say that they have really done something, that they have really moved ahead in any kind of consistent or organized way.

The only tangible result, of course, is that you have numerous reports which exist all through the province, which are handed out over here. You have the Design for Development, as an example, for the Niagara southern Ontario region.

I will just read some of the quotations in the report. It states the obvious. It is nothing new, but I think it should be stated. This is dealing with the Design for Development: Niagara (South Ontario) Region, and it says:

There is a high proportion of slow-growth industries in the region, particularly in Brant, Lincoln and Welland counties. The economic base of Haldimand and Norfolk counties lacks diversity. At the time of the survey of manufacturers, there was a reported shortage of labour through the region.

I may add that since the stewardship of the new leader of the Liberal Party has changed, that of course, that statement is not true.

The presence of several high wage requirement industries such as farm machinery manufacturers, particularly in Brant and Lincoln counties, has created labour recruitment problems for many other industries. This is especially true of medium-size establishments that are prepared to pay a moderate wage.

Again, the argument here is that there are social costs involved which accrue to a municipality or to an area where you do not provide the kind of service or you do not provide adequate pay for the people that work in an area. It also says:

There is a lack of co-ordinated development of public and private services and facilities. There is a serious problem of road congestion at Niagara Falls. Areas having prime recreational potential have been under-utilized. These areas are to be found throughout the region and include the Niagara escarpment, the Lake Erie and the Lake Ontario shorelines and the Grand River valley.

This matter has been raised in the House—the possibility of cleaning up the Grand River itself and of making it a recreational area. Again there is very little action. All the government is talking about is that it is going to build dams in this area.

There is talk, of course, of industrial development moving into the Nanticoke area, but the report says that the existing road, rail and harbour facilities serving the Nanticoke areas are inadequate.

And so it goes on, stating very much the obvious—that really the problems are still there, that as a result of the government we have had in power nothing has really happened, or changed.

As an example it says another of the problems is the student-teacher ratio:

Haldimand and Norfolk have the lowest proportion of children remaining in school until grade 13, and on this basis these counties should be given high priority for educational improvements.

And it suggests:

A lower student-teacher ratio could improve the quality of education by permitting greater individual attention, but there are exceptions.

And, of course—one of the first things that the new wave, or the new government did when it moved in was to try and chop this up. It is actively trying to increase the

student-teacher ratio. The first thing it has done is to change that.

The report states the obvious. The miniscule recommendations in the report are either not being acted upon, or are being directly opposed as in the case of education.

It is very hard for us on this side of the House to feel that the government is really concerned about what is going on in Ontario. As our leader has pointed out, there is this crisis of leadership. I do not think that the members over there have really any faith in the people of this province.

Let me demonstrate by a speech made by one ex-cabinet minister right now—the member for Don Mills (Mr. Randall), who has a habit of talking from the hip and shooting from the mouth. Anyway he said, and this is quoted in the Toronto Daily Star of February 9:

Canadian ownership would not produce new customers, will not improve old machines and methods, will not make products salable, will not make salesmen more vigorous—

I am not sure to what he was referring there, but anyway—

—will not reduce costs, will not convert losses into profits and it will not create more jobs.

So there you have it, fellow Canadians. There is nothing you can do that somebody else cannot do better.

This is the kind of thinking that permeates the party that sits across the way. It is a case of what could be called a sort of mental sterility, and the Throne Speech adequately demonstrates it. There was nothing in the Throne Speech.

In terms of trying to order our own economy, order our own affairs, we have the member for Don Mills replaced by the new Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman); and of course there is an article in the March 17 Globe and Mail by Irvine Lutsky which says that: "The new minister has a very tough act to follow."

I suppose he was referring to the member for Don Mills because of the one-liners he was using. I would imagine some of them could, sometime, be entered into a book.

The role that the new minister will play in the cabinet, of course, has not been completely defined and we would like to see that it would take some kind of shape. In the Throne Speech he did say that he would be making a statement on what kind of shape. If I may quote from the Throne Speech:

Immediate steps will be taken to enhance opportunities for Canadians to participate in the development of Ontario. The government will give preference to Canadian-owned businesses seeking grants and loans under the various incentive programmes. To further encourage Canadian enterprise and ownership, a venture capital fund will be established to assist in the financing of small businesses . . .

We have been waiting for this statement—this imaginative statement—this new report from the minister. So far he has refused to come out with anything. I feel that that particular portfolio, imaginatively handled, can play a significant role in the life of the people of this province.

The minister's statement to the press—this is referring to the *Globe and Mail* article—did not indicate the minister is really prepared to act. Or is it the case that there is nobody in the cabinet that is really listening to what is going on? On the matter of Canadian ownership—of course, there is lip service paid to it in the Throne Speech. The government is going to call a conference on it and this is nothing more than an effort to try and defuse the situation.

The minister in that same article says that Canadians are concerned about control of our commerce, industry and trade by non-Canadians. He says something should be done and he will be presenting his own proposals to his colleagues. As I said earlier, one would have hoped that these proposals would have appeared soon. As usual with everything that the Tories do, they do have an out in this case—the minister does say: "Of course we do have to take into account that we cannot do very much in Ontario. It is a federal problem, so in case we do not have anything done we can always blame it and slough it off on the federal government."

I think we should make it clear to the hon. members opposite that it is not so much the concern about foreign investments as what really stems from foreign investment. It is the other factors and what flows from foreign control. These are the ones that are of real concern to the people of this province. I think we should look at the United States where society is corporately controlled; it is violent, it is dehumanizing and it is brutal. It is destructive of its environment and its own people. It is unable to resolve the inequalities.

If you look at reports, for an example, from Detroit; the murder rate—in the last six months, they have had something like 200 murders, which is fantastic—an unusual, rather grim story of what is happening to a society. You have growth, of course. They indicate that that is all they are interested in

—industrial growth and not any kind of social growth.

It seems to me that the philosophy there is the philosophy of a cancer cell, that it continues to grow until it destroys the body within which it exists. This is something that we are not particularly interested in. We do not want to be sucked into that kind of vortex, into the American vortex. The arguments that have been advanced earlier by the hon. members on the other side that we need American capital have been demolished by the speech of my leader.

The figures, of course, have been supplied by the United States Department of Commerce. We should also bear in mind there are countries in the world that do not exist on or need foreign capital and they manage to get along very well. They have a higher employment rate. They limit the amount of foreign investment—an example of this would be Japan. I am reading an article from a leaflet put out by the Canada-Japan Trade Council and it says:

There is a strong feeling against foreign takeovers of Japanese corporations. There are constraints on foreigners achieving any voice in the management of these firms. Nevertheless each round of capital liberalization has brought an easing of the limitations of foreign stock ownership so that new automatic ceilings set on September 1, 1970, are as follows.

It goes on to list the ceilings:

The automatic maximum total foreign ownership of a company with stock listed on the Japanese stock exchange is now set at less than 25 per cent per enterprise. This should be compared to the number of companies that exist in Canada where ownership is completely foreign.

The rule concerning foreign stock ownership of restricted industries—that is principally public utilities and banks—has been maintained at less than 15 per cent. Also there are other restricted industries besides the banks which we have—of course we have our restrictions—but they do include things like mines, they do include things like gas utilities. These are the industries that we, in a sense, are prepared to sell out and have been selling out.

The other point is that the maximum limit for any single foreign investor is continued at less than seven per cent. The point here, of course, is that any corporation that controls about 30 per cent or 40 per cent of the stock, in effect, controls the whole company.

The Japanese have prevented this by ensuring that no single group or no single corporation or company controls more than seven per cent and therefore is prevented from having effective control over the company.

The other point on this is that Japan does not have an unemployment problem. In fact, it has a serious over-employment problem. In fact it is putting out an alarm. It says, "A shortage of labour in general and of young workers in particular is posing a major problem in Japan."

Compare this to our situation where our younger workers are almost completely locked out of any possibility of obtaining employment and our older workers—about 75,000 of them—are wandering around looking for jobs. The tragic part about this is that, of course, we have debated this matter in the House. As was said in the House earlier, we have discussed it. The workers are still out of jobs and the government has got itself off the shelf. The federal government was accused in certain cases, but there is no doubt in my mind that both governments are to blame in this particular aspect. It is a very serious situation.

In Brantford, where the White Motor Company is operating, something like 500 people were employed by the firm. They have not worked now for something like six months. When we tried to get some answers out of the Ontario Department of Trade and Development to find out what the company is going to be doing or what the plans are for the future, the government of Ontario did not know what was going on. It just refused to find out.

We had a case where Westinghouse—another plant—without consulting with anybody—decided to close down completely. It was another foreign-owned corporation. There are 275 people who will be thrown out of jobs. The reasons given were that the plant was operating at a loss because of the up-pegging of the dollar.

This, Mr. Speaker, may be correct, but I think it is the responsibility of the government to find out whether the company is telling the truth or whether the government is quietly acquiescing to a corporate giant. It would be interesting to know, Mr. Speaker, just how much money in royalties, managerial fees, consultants' fees and so on, were paid by the company in Brantford to the parent company and charged to the Brantford operation. Were these justified expenses? This is something that the province should know and we do not know.

It would be interesting to find out whether there were inflated prices paid for the components that were purchased from foreign corporations or from outside of Canada and then kickbacks paid to the parent company in the United States. This may not be so, but on the other hand it may be so. These are the things that an effective, alive and concerned Department of Trade and Development should find out and should have the answers to.

The point, of course, is that nothing was being done. When we tried to find out, we put out press releases and we asked that something happen; nothing happened! We could have examined and possibly saw to it that perhaps the plant could have been kept operating for a longer period of time. It may have needed some subsidies. It could have gone into manufacturing some other lines, but again there was nothing done on the part of that government sitting over there to try to save jobs.

When the plant was shutting down, I put out a press release. I suggested, following the discussions with Trade and Development, that a plant closure task force be established in Ontario. It would consist of economists and business, accounting and other specialists. It would be empowered to examine the books of corporations that plan to shut down.

From the information they would be able to decide if the company is telling the truth. I suggest that we should bear in mind the Hawker-Siddeley plant in Nova Scotia and whether it is a matter of a multi-national corporation deciding it can make greater profits by manufacturing somewhere else. The task force would also be in a position to recommend and take whatever action is needed to keep the plant operating, either manufacturing the original products or switching into some other lines. If necessary financial assistance, either in straight loans, equity loans or forgivable loans, should be made available by the government. Naturally the new wave did not move. The only thing that one could say about it was the fact that it was very calm in those days.

Another example of this kind of activity—the kind of action that is taken by the foreign corporation—is in the matter of Mason and Risch in Scarborough and Sterling Actions and Keys in Brantford. Both of these companies are owned by Aeolian Corporation in New York. The decision again to close these two plants was made in the United States. Over 200 jobs were involved.

Again we tried to question the government, the Ontario Department of Trade and Development, to find out what they are doing. Have they examined the books or is there a possibility that there could be some kind of rationalization or a consolidation of these two plants in order to save the jobs? Perhaps not all the 200 jobs that are involved but maybe 100 jobs. Again, nothing was done; the plants closed in the last few days.

How can we sit down here and hear this government say that it is responsible, that it is concerned, and ministers get up and talk about unemployment, when the possibilities are open to them to do something about it? When they can take action, they do not take action; they go along. They say that it is a matter of foreign ownership and they leave it at that.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have to set goals for this province; we have to decide and say specifically where we are going and how we are going to get there.

The Department of Trade and Development has developed econometric models of the Province of Ontario—rather the Treasury Department has developed econometric models. These are techniques for economic planning that have been used for at least 10 or 15 years in other countries. We have just started using them. But we do have a rather important economic tool for making predictions, and by varying the various inputs and so on we could arrive at some of the answers as to what the effects would be on the economy if there are changes in either public or private investment in the province.

As an example, we could find out certainly what tax cuts could do to the economy. We could find out what an increase in house building will do. We could find out what an increase in public construction could do, or what effect the elimination of grade 13 would have on the economy.

From what I can gather—and this is from the recent series of articles in the *Globe and Mail* dealing with the ODC or how growth fund subsidies conflict—it would seem to me that The Department of Trade and Development does not talk to the Treasury Department and consequently, shall we say, there is no horizontal integration in this government; and one arm seems to be going one way handing out money.

It is rather interesting to note in this article that in the eastern Ontario village of Summerstown they have handed out \$278,000. The total population of the area is 71 people

or roughly 14 families, which amounts to about \$20,000 per family. Perhaps we should consider subsidizing the families by about \$5,000 each; they would be very happy to move out of there and we might be spending our money in a much more useful and effective place.

There should be much greater emphasis placed on research in this province. The report of the science council is very critical of the research that is going on in Canada. I think the Ontario government has a responsibility to get involved and not just in the minor way that the Sheridan corporation is operating, but certainly through the universities and various public and private institutions. We should be spending money in attempting to find out the needs of the people of Ontario, finding out the things we can best do in Ontario with our natural resources and people who are available to us. We should try to be original instead imitative or just copying what somebody does just south of us.

The results of course will provide useful work for our talented and trained people; we can enhance our economy by applying new technology, and we should certainly fulfil the desires of the Ontario people to a better life.

A certain field where we should look is the field of public transportation. The equipment we have now appears to me to be more of a covered wagon with a stainless steel coating, and if anybody uses some of the trains, you will find out that they are rather heavy, bulky and noisy, despite the fact that they are new. Perhaps this is one area that the Ontario government should enter into.

We have manufacturing facilities in Ontario that can build this equipment. We certainly do a lot of research. A lot of countries—Japan again, for example, and France and Germany—are coming up with very new and very modern public transportation equipment. In Ontario we are doing very little. We have a certain expertise existing in this province in the field of STOL—this is, the short take-off and landing aircraft—and again the provincial government could possibly be involved.

We say that maybe it is a federal matter but perhaps this could be done in conjunction with the federal and provincial governments. I am sure The Department of Trade and Development have not even looked into that sector or discussed the matter to see how

we could increase that kind of industry. We can even look into the matter of providing more effective snow-removal. After last winter I think some people would be very interested in finding out how we can become more efficient.

The matter of metal fabricating is another area which should be expanded. We have discussed the possibility of a Crown-operated smelter, either totally owned by the government or else operated in partnership with private enterprise. Perhaps this is a start; this will be phase one. The second phase would be, of course, to have these companies fabricate the metals in Canada.

A good example of this is that Inco takes Canadian copper and it takes Canadian nickel to Huntington, West Virginia, where it operates a fabricating mill which employs 3,000 people and contributes something like \$40 million a year to the payroll of that area. This is the kind of money and these are the kind of jobs that should have been in the Province of Ontario. We certainly could use them.

We can examine and look into things like recycling of waste. There are certainly many more suggestions that we can provide, but the point is that most of these would provide substantial jobs—not the kind of pots-and-pans industries that the last minister was setting up around the province, which employ a minimal amount of labour and also pay minimum wages.

The other point that we should bear in mind here is that most of the industries in Canada—Canadian industries, small Canadian businesses—that are located in Ontario are located in major urban centres and they are prepared to expand. They will grow, provided they have the capital.

One of the things I did a couple of weeks ago was take a survey in Brantford. I mailed out a questionnaire to various industries and asked them, if money were available to them, would there be expansion of jobs and so on. The replies were very interesting.

Not all of them said they wanted expansion. Not all of them said they wanted to have anything to do with the government. But at least 30 per cent of those industries replied and said that they could use extra money and they could expand.

I will not mention the names, but I will read one of the letters.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Who could not use extra money? Use common sense; we all could.

Mr. Makarchuk: Why does the hon. member not go back to sleep?

Mr. W. Newman: I might as well.

Mr. Makarchuk: To continue:

Dear Madam:

Re business prospect survey—please find answers to your questions.

For all business the Ontario government policy is poor.

This is a manufacturing business.

We can see no effort at all to support small businesses in areas that are not designated for aid.

Investment capital shortage is the biggest obstacle to growth in our business. We are continually expanding already, but lack of capital restricts us to those investments which will not put any more workers on our payroll.

If government aid were available we would then be able to buy equipment which would then generate jobs. We estimate about one job for each \$12,000 to \$15,000 invested.

This is in comparison to the figures being kicked around by the last Minister of Trade and Development, who said that you need \$30,000 to create a job.

The kind of aid we visualize would be a loan at low or no interest, say for 10 years, the total amount to be supplied by the government but with the condition that the recipient partly or wholly match the same amount during the term of the loan.

Again the companies are quite willing to put up their share of the money.

We are not in favour of any outright grants against the issue of shares to the government, for the following reasons: If the government holds a majority of shares the company in effect has changed hands. In the case of minority interest, and the company never declares a dividend, the taxpayers' money is down the drain. We feel that a loan will expand business, jobs, profits and the increased revenue from these sources should be ample remuneration for the government.

And they have a good point there. It is a lot easier and a lot more economic to keep people working than to have them on welfare. The letter goes on:

We now have five employees and can create one job for each \$12,000 to \$15,000 invested within one and a half years.

Thereafter a natural growth will create many more jobs. We estimate that a \$75,000 government loan would result in about 10 to 15 jobs within five years. We are a manufacturing type of business.

The other questionnaires were very much in the same line. They did mention that there was too much red tape involved in dealing with the Ontario government. They say they would like investment that would pay, in this particular one, up to about 75 per cent of the total investment and they feel that they could provide jobs for 10 to 12 people.

Another one says, in answer to the question: "How satisfied are you with the present Ontario government policy toward businesses?"—they say they are poor. The reason for major obstacles to growth of business is a matter of market conditions. They could use capital and they would like to get the capital at eight to eight and a half per cent, something in the 10-year period.

Anyway, basically the answers are the same. The point is that there are businesses in Ontario right now—they are located in the urban centres, for good reasons—which can expand, which would like to expand, but the point is that they cannot get the capital that they require from the banks and the usual sources. And if they have to pay something like 10 per cent, then they just cannot operate at that cost. They cannot get that kind of capital and they are looking to the government to provide some assistance. The government is in a better position to raise this capital on the bond market and provide it to these people at lower than current interest rates.

I may point out that Manitoba has done certain things, and as an example has set up a small loans body for small businesses. These are businesses where the risk is high but the possibilities of growth are very good.

The other point I would like to make, and this is out of the *Globe and Mail*, and it says:

The annual report for the year ending March 31, 1970, tabled in the Legislature by Industry Minister Leonard Evans said loans receivable more than doubled in the 1969-1970 fiscal year, increasing by more than \$69 million from the previous year.

The Manitoba government has given out something like \$69 million in the matter of a year to businesses to promote business growth in the province in terms of loans, etc.

Now compare this to the total that has been given out by the Ontario Development

Corporation, which is roughly \$30 million. Taking into account the fact that our population is at least seven times as great, on the same ratio the ODC in Ontario should have been handing out something like \$300 million in loans to increase business.

It should be significant that Manitoba is the only province in Canada where the unemployment rate has been cut back, and where the welfare rate has dropped, and where jobs have been provided as a result of a direct government policy to direct and encourage economic growth. It also is the only government that up to now has spoken up to Ottawa about the fact that the policies followed in Ottawa are to the detriment of the country, and it has spoken out very strongly.

I notice the last Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) has come out with some public statement to this effect; and our friends to the right—for publicity's sake and nothing else of course—have also attacked the federal Liberal government's policy. But it is funny that when the federal Prime Minister appears out in the hustings they gather around him like fleas around a dog you know, congratulating him, shaking hands, reminding him how great he is, telling him what great policies he is putting through in the country; and then over here you see them coming out with their rather hypocritical messages that they are concerned about the growth, that they are concerned about the unemployment, that they are concerned about the lowering standards of living—

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Of course, the member is the only one who thinks about these things.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): You holier than thou!

Mr. Makarchuk: If members are so concerned, the only member who spoke up was the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent). The other day he did so specifically. I have not heard anyone else criticize the policy and criticize the people who are implementing these particular policies.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): In fact, they are defending him.

Mr. Ferrier: They are defending Trudeau.

Mr. Makarchuk: And it is strange, when this—

Mr. Martel: By their silence they are defending him.

Mr. Makarchuk:—matter comes up, when the questions of lower standards of living or a matter of foreign investment comes up, the standard reply from the federal government, of course, is that if we raise the employment level, we will have to lower our standard of living, which I find very difficult to try to understand.

The other argument, Mr. Speaker, that they were using, was the fact that if we put our people to work, we are not going to have money to fight pollution. The third argument they used in Brantford was that we have to impose a totalitarian government in order to provide full employment. What really amazes me and annoys me is the fact that every civilized country in the western world has managed to lick the problem of unemployment. They may have unemployment up to a three per cent level, but it is a lot lower than that, and they do not have raging inflation. They do not have the problems, and furthermore they do not have the resources, that we have, but they do have governments that are prepared to get involved, governments that are dedicated to the idea that people should have jobs.

Government members are not dedicated. If they were, we would have seen some action.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): If all five of the hon. member's men got in as leader, they would still have fewer than 20 seats.

Mr. Gaunt: A little more substance and less froth.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): How many seats has the member's party in Quebec?

Mr. Ferrier: How many government leaders have tried to create unemployment like Trudeau has?

Mr. Makarchuk: If they were so concerned about unemployment, I would have liked to have seen them come up and say specifically what particular economic policies they would like to follow. But no; they come up with these remarks about the leadership campaign. It is a very good leadership campaign. We have got more people running there. We have some very excellent people running for the leadership.

I wish hon. members opposite had some people like that running. I notice that Mr. Hellyer may be contesting the leadership, besides the member for Grey-Bruce. I should not forget Mr. Hellyer's statement.

As far as by-election in Brant county is concerned, we will take care of that when the time comes, and I can assure members they are not going to get elected there.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): They are jealous about our leadership convention.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Why does the member not go down to Ottawa and straighten them out?

Mr. Ruston: They had Lewis there for years, and Tommy Douglas and they are not getting anywhere.

Mr. Makarchuk: It is funny, Mr. Speaker, about the devious ways that the Liberals went about before they floated this by-election in Brant county. I am referring back to the Goldfarb report. Some of the questions in the report incidentally were, "Do you think the NDP is contributing to separatism?" Again, the people did not buy that.

The last candidate in that campaign was a chap by the name of Derrick Blackburn. They asked the people these questions: "Please finish the following statement: 'I like Derrick Blackburn because—'" The other one was: "I dislike Derrick Blackburn because—"

Hon. members are really interested in issues in that! It is quite obvious they are really interested in issues. They are not concerned about personalities! They should be ashamed that they use those techniques—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Makarchuk: No wait—using those techniques to try and float a campaign and fight a campaign ignores the gut issues. They ignore the fact that there are people unemployed in Brantford, something like 4,000 people. The fact that they have destroyed their dignity and the fact that they have destroyed their self-respect: they do not really care.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): The hon. member has helped them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member will address the House through the Chair.

Mr. Makarchuk: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party has—

Mr. Ruston: With a member like that in Brantford, no wonder they have unemployment. The member scares all industry out.

Mr. Makarchuk: —the statements that they have made about unemployment, Mr. Speaker, I consider as completely hypocritical.

An hon. member: That is irrelevant.

Mr. Makarchuk: And what we are trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is that we intend to move over there and when—

Mr. Gaunt: I told the hon. member he was afraid of us, otherwise he would not give us so much attention.

Mr. Makarchuk: —we are going to plan our economy, the planning is going to be done by the people, for the people, because that is what government is all about.

We are not going to let them play patsy for the corporate sector. The corporate sector will have to take second place to the needs of the people and the needs of this country.

Mr. Speaker: I think that it being so near to 6 o'clock, I will consider it as such and allow the next speaker to have full flight without interruptions.

The next speaker is the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Gilbertson).

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Communication with Quebec authorities re Bill 10, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Paterson, Mr. Makarchuk	647
Dropping certain specific drugs from Parcost approved list, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Deans, Mr. Singer	648
Legislation for the control of gravel pits, questions to Mr. Bernier, Mr. Nixon	650
Pensioners' difficulties re obtaining fishing permits, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Pitman	650
Universities requested to find places for 3,500 extra units, questions to Mr. White, Mr. Pitman	651
Feasibility of dredging mercury deposits from lake and river bottoms, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Singer, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Makarchuk	652
Compensation to Lake Erie fishermen for pollution damage, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Makarchuk	652
Capital grants system extended to include planting trees as replacements, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Innes	653
University research financed by Pentagon, questions to Mr. White, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Burr ..	653
Application by Tilbury firm for loan from Ontario Development Corporation, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Peacock	654
Permits to take sand and gravel from Lake Erie near national park, questions to Mr. Bernier, Mr. Paterson	654
Students at Althouse College not receiving teaching positions, questions to Mr. White, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Pitman	654
Processing tomato paste products in Ontario, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Burr, Mr. Paterson	656
Purchase of several thousand acres on Manitoulin Island, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Farquhar	657
Extending Lakehead two-year forestry course into four-year course, questions to Mr. White, Mr. Stokes	657
Progress report on student unemployment SWEEP programme, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Knight	657
Policy on oral representations to Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Bullbrook	658
Motion that human resources committee examine costs of post-secondary education, Mr. White, agreed to	658
Speaker's ruling on powers of standing committees	669
Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Makarchuk ..	671
Recess, 6.00 o'clock	687



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, April 20, 1971
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 20, 1971

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to have this opportunity to participate in this Throne debate.

First and foremost, I want to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Davis)—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum.

Mr. Speaker: Will the Clerk Assistant conduct the count?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): It is so unusual to see the member for High Park.

Clerk Assistant: There are 17.

Mr. Shulman: Okay.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The member for High Park is in his place.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Gilbertson: First and foremost, I want to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister on becoming—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The member for High Park ought to be in Ottawa trying to choose the new leader.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Gilbertson: —our new leader. Also, those members who—

Mr. Shulman: That is not until Saturday.

Mr. Gilbertson: —were so fortunate in receiving cabinet positions. I wish each one of them every success.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): We were pulling for the hon. member for Algoma.

Mr. Gilbertson: I feel that the government's calling of a special debate on unemployment has given us all the opportunity to

have a good look at how we can assist in improving the economy of our various ridings. As the representative from Algoma riding, I am naturally not only concerned about the general economic conditions and welfare of our country and province, but also very deeply concerned about that of my riding.

I realize that the government is doing a lot to help out the economy with various grants and loans. But I cannot help thinking that we do overlook the little, energetic individual who wants to try to initiate a business. I talk to many such energetic, hard-working people who have projects they would like to get off the ground—

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex-South): That is right!

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): We will look after them.

Mr. Gilbertson: —but, unfortunately, it is almost impossible for the small guy to get started in business these days.

Mr. Shulman: It will be easier after the next election.

Mr. Gilbertson: That is what the member for High Park thinks.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Is the member saying that it is going to be more difficult?

Mr. Gilbertson: I think we must stop to realize that it is this type of person who has helped build our province and that we must give them the sort of encouragement that they deserve.

Mr. Sargent: Get to the honeymoon again!

Mr. Gilbertson: I feel the establishment of loans of a few thousand dollars at low interest would be the answer for these people. By helping a lot of individuals, we would be giving the economy a giant shot in the arm. A great deal of assistance to a great many small businessmen can be as important as a great deal of assistance to one big industry.

I also hope the government will see to it that the small industries that are trying to

get established in Algoma get the grants they are requesting so that they can start operating soon. In line with this, I also hope the government will give Algo Craft in Thessalon and other industries in my area the necessary money to keep their very worthwhile projects going.

Mr. Gaunt: How is the bridge coming along?

Mr. Gilbertson: Why?

Mr. Gaunt: That bridge has been coming for 20 years.

Mr. Sargent: That bridge will make a good election theme.

Mr. Gilbertson: You will be hearing about it. Just listen.

Mr. Sargent: Next week?

Mr. Gilbertson: Mr. Speaker, in Algoma and other northern ridings, you cannot have all your eggs in the one basket.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): We want some eggs though.

Mr. Paterson: At the price of eggs?

Mr. Gilbertson: You must have a variety of things to do.

Mr. Ferrier: You must have some eggs, though!

Mr. Gilbertson: In the summertime—Mr. Speaker, I hope that you will keep order in the House and keep the opposition lined up.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gilbertson: In the summertime, we have a large tourist trade because of our area's many attractions, but I think we must also consider building up the northland as a winter vacationland.

One thing that has helped our economy and revitalized the winter recreation is the snowmobile. Some call them the ski-doods, but there are so many different varieties that I will just call them snowmobiles. Practically every family in the northland has a snowmobile and some even have two or three. I feel that one thing the government could do would be to help in making trails through the woods so that the lakes would be more accessible for those people who like to go ice-fishing.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, it could be a good summer work project for students.

It might also be a good idea for the government to concentrate a little more on restocking the lakes and on making fish available for privately owned fish farms or fish ponds to buy. For example, it would only take a day or two to dam up little creeks and make private ponds on privately owned land that would be ideal for speckled trout. This project would not be too expensive either, and it would certainly benefit the tourist industry.

We could also build up the north's economy through capitalizing more on two of our delicious resources—blueberries and maple syrup. Now, these things may sound insignificant but, as I said before, it takes many little things to help build a strong economy. In addition, in many other enterprises you have to spend a lot of money in order to harvest them, but blueberries grow wild and are there for the taking.

We could employ many of the students looking for summer jobs in picking the acres of blueberries in the north. They could then be sold at roadside stands along Highway 17 and other northland highways and also in other parts of the province where there are no blueberries.

Mr. Speaker, some of the members were wondering when I was going to get to the maple syrup. Well, I am going to get to it now.

Mr. Gaunt: What is the wholesale price this year?

Mr. Gilbertson: All right, I might say, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps next week I will be bringing some samples for the members.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gilbertson: Mr. Speaker, that should help to sweeten up the opposition.

Mr. Shulman: What do we do for the government?

Mr. Gaunt: Takes a lot to sweeten us up.

Mr. Gilbertson: The maple syrup could be sold both in liquid form and as a sugar candy in various souvenir shops and places of business along the highways. If they were packaged attractively as Canadian souvenirs, I am certain they would be snapped up by the visitors from the United States and other parts of our own country.

Mr. Speaker, so far I have been dealing with the northernmost parts of my riding. But there are other sections which are more adapted to farming, and this is something I feel students could also get involved in during the summer. This would be both very educational and financially rewarding. You know, the people say that the younger generation are not like they were years back, like the fathers and the mothers of the past—but I do not believe that.

I think that the young people are energetic and enterprising and would like to be able to do things on their own.

Mr. Stokes: I think they are a lot smarter.

Mr. Gilbertson: And I think with all the land we have got in Algoma that is not being productive now, it would be a good thing for a lot of the students. We hear that there are going to be thousands of students travelling on the highways this summer and going to and fro looking for work. I think we should try to initiate something to help these young people to do something for themselves.

While I am talking about student summer employment, I want to praise the government for its efforts in assisting students this summer through its hiring of 14,000 students and its summer activity programmes. I think the employing of 2,000 of the 14,000 students in cleaning up our environment is a very constructive idea.

Many people today, I reiterate, say the boys and girls today are not like they used to be, that they do not want to work and that they just want to use the summer months for fun. But this is not true. There are many young people today who are every bit as energetic and conscientious and hard-working as their parents were in their youth, and who want to pay their own way. That is why I am so pleased that the government is spearheading programmes that will foster their initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I am also very concerned about shoring up the economy of Blind River. I have voiced my concern many times about the need to establish industries to replace Domtar, which ceased operations a couple of years ago. I know that two or three small industries are trying to get established in Blind River and I hope that we can see this accomplished before very long. The people are getting very anxious and the economy has gone rapidly downhill—

Mr. Stokes: The government will not help them.

Mr. Gilbertson: So I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that the government will help as much as it possibly can to get something going in Blind River. I hope that the cabinet ministers are listening to this—

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): They are all listening.

Mr. Gilbertson: —because they are the ones who can do something about getting the show on the road.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): That is what the hon. member told them last year. They are not listening at all.

Mr. Gilbertson: Now I appreciate what has been done.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gilbertson: There has been considerable done but there is more that needs doing.

An hon. member: He is right; he is right.

Mr. Gilbertson: And I am sure the cabinet ministers are listening and will do something about it.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): Where are they?

Mr. Martel: They might be listening. They have been doing that for three and a half years.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): They probably are where the hon. member's leader is.

Mr. Brown: In Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Probably. Which leader is the member talking about?

An hon. member: They are doing as much for him as they are for the fishermen.

An hon. member: Or for housing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gilbertson: I must say that the people in my riding appreciate the many projects the government has undertaken there. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have been very concerned about this situation. This government has also given great assistance toward the construction of a new composite school for central Algoma which should be completed within a year or so.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The member for Thunder Bay is leaving too.

Mr. Gilbertson: I am also pleased about the various road projects that have been completed and those that are currently in the mill. These include the construction of Highway 631 from White River to Hornepayne which will give the people of Hornepayne an outlet to Algoma.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see more passing lanes built on the grades on our northern highways. This is something I hope the government will include in its reconstruction of Highway 17 from Sault Ste. Marie to Sudbury. One place where this would be particularly valuable is at Laird Hill about 20 miles east of Sault Ste. Marie on Highway 17.

I hope the Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) is in the House. If he is not I hope he gets the message anyway.

An hon. member: He is not here.

Another hon. member: He is out to dinner.

An hon. member: If he has not got the message before, how does the hon. member think he is going to get it now?

Mr. Gilbertson: This is a rather dangerous spot because of the long grades.

While I am speaking about transportation, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to point out the need of Algoma for small airports. I understand that the government is already helping in this area by assisting in the construction of airports in the north. This will mean people from such American cities as Detroit, Grand Rapids and Chicago, as well as many other places, will be able to fly up to our area for the weekend.

Until now many of our American neighbours have been unable to make weekend excursions to our area because of the long hard drive. But with quick plane trips now being possible, I am certain we will get many more visitors and this in turn will also help boost our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to use this opportunity to bring the need for a health clinic for central Algoma to the government's attention. At present we have two small hospitals, one with about 10 beds and the other with about 20 beds and each with only one doctor in our area. One is in Thessalon and the other is on St. Joseph's Island.

This simply is not sufficient medical care and I feel a central clinic would help meet the health and welfare needs of our people. I would like to see such a health clinic, which would have three doctors and a dentist, built in central Algoma.

Mr. Martel: Have the Indians build it.

Mr. Gilbertson: Another health service that my riding and all of the province needs badly, Mr. Speaker, is more facilities for the chronically ill. In this regard, I am pleased that the government is giving serious consideration to the question of extending OHSIP to cover all nursing homes.

An hon. member: For five years they have been giving serious consideration.

Another hon. member: Wait until they get into the planning stage.

Mr. Gilbertson: For 28 years the government has been giving good service to the people of Ontario.

An hon. member: Why has the hon. member got that list of things he needs then?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gilbertson: I do not believe any government is ever going to see the time when everybody's needs are completely supplied.

Mr. Brown: Just wait until the New Democrats get in.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): We are going to wait a long, long time.

Mr. G. Demers (Nickel Belt): Do not hold your breath.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): We have been waiting 28 years for that new government and it has not got in yet. There must be something wrong with the government.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): All good things come to those who wait.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gilbertson: Mr. Speaker, I would now like to turn briefly to the important area of education. We have heard a lot of criticism from the opposition—

Mr. Deans: It is justifiable.

Mr. Gilbertson: —both the NDP and the Liberals, about the cost of education.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): And the member for Hamilton Mountain (J. R. Smith).

Mr. Gilbertson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to these critics that their children would not be growing up to be such fine young men and women, well equipped to

meet the challenge of life, if it were not for our province's fine education system.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Did the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) write that paragraph?

Mr. Brown: No, the Prime Minister.

Mr. Gilbertson: I would like the opposition to know that this is my own homespun speech.

Before the former Minister of Education initiated the idea that there would be equal educational opportunities for everyone, no matter where they lived in Ontario, there was a lot of criticism from people in small towns and rural areas, complaining that their children did not have equal educational opportunities with those in the big cities. I must congratulate the former Minister of Education on his bold step, which has made Ontario's educational system one of the best in the world. Now that the challenge of meeting the postwar baby boom has been met, The Department of Education has moved to cut down expenses while still making certain that the quality of education is not decreased.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that this will be a very productive and worthwhile session and I know that the government will continue to assist my area, as it will help all of Ontario, during the session.

Mr. Makarchuk: That is why the unemployment rate is so high up there.

Mr. Sargent: A successful year.

An hon. member: Now we will get the facts.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, sometimes one wonders really what is going on here in the House—and I speak of the lethargy of the government in these opening weeks of the Legislature. There has been the reshuffling of the cabinet; some new faces, but the same old group groping for answers during the question period.

We are all concerned there is nothing on the order paper. We had government members voting with the opposition, we had cabinet trying to frustrate the work of the committees, and after considering all this, I said to my colleague, the hon. member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) today, "What do you suppose the strategy of the government really is? And he replied, "Well, in my considered opinion there is no strategy. They simply do not know what they are doing."

Mr. G. Demers (Nickel Belt): Why does the member not stick to the text? Go back to the text.

Mr. Good: This is perhaps the most astute assessment of what has gone on in the first three weeks of the Legislature that I have heard from anyone.

An hon. member: Welcome back.

Mr. Good: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government realize the hopelessness of their confusion and go to the polls as quickly as possible, and let someone go over there who can accept the responsibility of government.

Mr. Speaker, there are really only two matters with which I want to deal this evening. The first matter which I would like to discuss is the section on municipal government reform. Let us consider the idea that the underlying or generic nature of urban problems is usually that they involve a great deal of uncertainty and risk. To me the uncertainty with municipal problems and government problems is of three basic types.

First there is the uncertainty of the knowledge of our environment; this would involve the social and economic and physical conditions that affect the people of Ontario. There are also the functional areas of the environment, such as transportation and housing, which also affect us very greatly.

Undoubtedly this uncertainty usually results—I am sure the members of the cabinet would agree—in the politicians saying we need more studies, we have got to find out what the problem is so that we can deal with it. The social and economic problems of our urban society are very difficult to research and come up with definite answers. Scientific research, of course, is much more definite but things that deal with people are much harder to ascertain.

The element of change, of course, is inherent in our social problems and these demand bold and positive solutions. We cannot afford to operate this province within a straitjacket of the status quo. It is, however, these problems which most seriously affect the quality of life in this province, and in many areas I feel we have had enough studies and the time is here for bold, new action, which we have not been getting.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, there is the uncertainty as to the future intentions or potential actions of related fields of choice. By this I mean that, for instance, if The Department of Municipal Affairs does "A", how will that

affect The Department of Treasury and Economics? Or more specifically, how will The Department of Treasury and Economics react to some action of The Department of Municipal Affairs?

This basic problem usually results, I suppose, in the bureaucrat or technocrat saying we need more and better co-ordination. This, of course, is very true. However, I think it is a very basic problem, one which has no easy solution in our present provincial government structure, but one which must, and will, have to be faced and solved if the province is to develop in an orderly manner, and the environmental problems are going to be met.

When The Department of Treasury and Economics brought forth phase 2 of its Design for Development, the Toronto-centred region, it was immediately apparent that many previously announced schemes and potential developments did not fit into the concept of its plan. I am sure The Department of Treasury and Economics, as an example, had no hand in the Ontario Housing Corporation land assembly in Waterloo county, nor of course did they have any hand in the planning of Century City, northeast of Toronto.

Presently, we had the condition where almost every minister in government is trying to get into the act of giving handouts from his department. Municipal Affairs has recently started new programmes of the old age tax reduction grants and the grant of tax reduction for farmers. They also administer the basic shelter tax reduction programme.

The Department of Trade and Development looks after Ontario Housing Corporation and senior citizen housing, as well as the questionable Ontario Development Corporation. The Department of Agriculture wanted to get into the 25 per cent rebate to farmers—and these, Mr. Speaker, are just a few. Is it any wonder that the people of Ontario are confused as to where to go for their help when they need it, and also confused as to who is actually doing the planning of our future here in this province?

What we really need is not a patched-up programme of more handouts, with one department trying to outdo the next, but a complete overhaul of our taxation system and a guaranteed income with built-in work and educational incentives to replace the multitude of social and welfare benefits now being promoted by each department. It must be apparent too that we do in fact need more co-ordination among the departments.

Thirdly, we have the uncertainties—and I think this is very important—as to the value judgements or value commitments when decision-makers make a decision in their particular area or policy, and these policy choices, as I say, affect one department and the other. For example, I can hear one minister say to himself, “Well now, what would be the trade-off for me and my department doing something which could be detrimental to the political life of another minister, or even negate the effect of another programme?” This, I am sure, must cause the people who are doing the analysis for the government to say, “Well, we have to have more policy guidance.”

In any government I feel that the process of solving these problems must be one which recognizes the high degree of uncertainty. Local government structures must adopt and innovate; flexibility is essential. This requires, then, that implementation of provincial government policy in the forms of new legislation must meet the needs of the municipality as well as be acceptable by the people of the community.

Too often, Mr. Speaker, this government in recent years has forced new legislation onto the people of Ontario that had no degree of community acceptability and did not fulfil the purpose for which it was actually intended. The government accepts advice from policy analysts which, I feel, has not been shaped and modified into the proper framework so that it can be implemented and help the people of the province.

It is apparent that the government of Ontario lacks the control mechanisms that would be responsible for adapting the various programmes to its own internal needs and the needs of the people of Ontario. And here I would like to give an example: An internal need of the government might be to create with meaningful and complementary incentives within a department of government. If, for instance, it were the overall goal of a certain department of government to prevent the destruction of older homes and to increase the inventory of such older homes, which are being torn down by the thousands within the province—if this were an overall goal of one department, then it is apparent that the provincial market value assessment programme, which gives low assessment for housing that is poorly kept and run down and higher assessment for housing that is well-kept and would bring more on the real estate market, then it is in fact an incentive that is detrimental to the overall object of maintaining

older houses for refurbishing. So we have many instances where one department of government is in fact creating situations that work against another department.

I would now like to look closely at the efforts of this government at municipal reform thus far. The need for reform is apparent to all of us. We know that as our cities have grown, annexation has not been a satisfactory solution in many areas. The urban tax base is inadequate. Property is not the proper basis for such a high share of education costs and other social charges. We know that services are needed in many towns and villages which cannot afford them, and this was proved and shown yesterday during the private members' hour.

The fact is that the government of Ontario has distorted the whole programme of municipal reform. I feel that the studies, the government proposals and the legislation have concentrated too much upon boundaries—where they will be, the number of tiers of government, the division of responsibility between these tiers, the abolition of special use boards and commissions, the appointment of the super-mayors and chairmen in regional government and the retention of control by Queen's Park over almost every phase of municipal operation.

In my view, I would like briefly to state what two major concerns of the proposed municipal reform should be, first, the development of local government management structure which will have the capacity and would be given the power to adopt and innovate, rather than the capacity to function only under stable and fixed straitjacket control from Queen's Park.

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order.

Mr. Whitney: Is it proper that members of the opposition should turn their backs on the whole Legislature and engage in a conference while the business of the Legislature is going on? I am very sorry; I apologize to the present Speaker, because I have no fault to find there, but I do notice—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What about the conversation going on right in front of the member?

Mr. Whitney: I do notice that two members of the Legislature were staring at the wall—their backs to all the rest of us—and they were engaged in a conference. I must

say that I do not think it is the proper thing to do in this Legislature; that that sort of thing should take place.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): The opposition should resign.

Mr. Good: Let me reiterate. The two major concerns of the proposed municipal reform should be the development of a local government structure which will have the capacity and would be given the power to adopt and innovate, rather than the capacity to function only under the straitjacket control from Queen's Park.

Secondly, I feel very strongly that government reform at the local level must include financial and tax reform with sufficient analysis done, prior to the implementation, so that the people involved will know what the cost or savings, if any, will be when they are asked to accept municipal reform.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): There have been no savings up to the moment.

Mr. Good: No. Dealing with the first point, let me say the need to develop local government management structures which have the capacity and authority to innovate and be flexible to changing conditions—for example, Mr. Speaker, the elimination of special purpose boards and commissions—has been recommended by everyone from Jones to Fyfe. All commissioners who have made studies of the restructuring of local government have found enough weaknesses and disadvantages in the use of special-purpose bodies to recommend their abolition.

However, it can be proved that the government of Ontario has not given the necessary attention to what would be needed to improve the management capabilities of local government councils and administrations where, in fact, the special functions must ultimately rest, if the boards and commissions are going to be done away with. One wonders if, in some cases, the fragmentation of the local government resulted years ago from the inability of local government, because of Queen's Park control, to manage and control a complex system in the midst of a changing environment. To overhaul local government and to neglect the total reorganization of management structures could be a grave shortcoming.

Mr. Speaker, I contacted the municipal organization and administration branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs and was told that no special studies are in progress to consider this key component of local

government reform. There is, I was told, an on-going departmental committee that, from time to time, considers changes in municipal administrative structure. With the monumental task that confronts each regional government in the province, one can hardly believe that no reports are available and no in-depth studies have been made by the municipal organization and administration branch on this important subject.

The municipal research section of The Department of Municipal Affairs, however, is starting some research to ascertain if municipal governments need restructuring or, perhaps, only strengthening. Because of this lack and uncertainty it would appear that it will be a long time until special purpose bodies are eliminated and the control is placed back in the hands of elected officials. Now, if the reorganized municipal government is to have any real meaning, it must be given sufficient authority to adapt to changes. Flexibility at the local level is something that the provincial government has not permitted. This lack of local authority is put forward very clearly in the recent brief presented by the city of St. Catharines to the provincial government and I would like to quote briefly from it:

Reference has already been made to the need for a review of the total government structure, greater interdepartmental co-ordination and improved management skills. We have also indicated the need for a redefinition of the role of "the city" and its relationship with the province. Since our organization deals from time to time with most government departments and agencies, it is not possible to set out here all administrative practices that merit review. It may be useful, however, to give two or three examples.

We are concerned with the duplication and time required in processing subdivision development to the stage where homes can be provided.

Another example of an administrative procedure that could be improved is that which is involved in processing a local improvement sewer up to the time of installation.

And two appendices are attached to this report which spell out in detail the 20 or 25 sets that are required before these procedures can be met, simply because of the adamant position of The Department of Municipal Affairs that their hand must be in every turn of the cog of the wheel at the municipal level.

These two examples are good illustrations of the cost and time involved in obtaining approval of a relatively simple matter, through a complicated system of duplication and red tape. The cost incurred by the developer, due to delays, is passed on to the homeowner, while the costs of processing are passed on in the form of both property and income tax. Surely these procedures could be simplified and streamlined considerably. These are areas where greater authority should be turned back to local government, which should work within standards or guidelines established by the province.

Another area which should be improved is that of shared-cost programmes. It is understood that there are close to 100 different forms of grants available to municipalities to assist in the cost of various specific works or services, administered through various departments of government or agencies. Considerable administrative costs are involved at the local and provincial levels in processing applications for approval.

These shared-cost programmes also tend to create artificial, rather than true, priority programmes of works or services. Municipal governments are naturally attracted to programmes for which there are large provincial grants.

There are several advantages to the elimination of the present grant-in-aid programmes in favour of unconditional grants.

It would considerably reduce administrative costs at both levels of government.

It would allow local councils to establish true priorities on the basis of need and with this increased responsibility there would result more direct accountability to the public.

There would also be considerable savings in accounting and policing costs. At the present time, audit forces from various government agencies are in the municipality almost continuously, attesting to the accuracy of grant claims. In so doing, they are also covering the same ground as is covered by the local auditors in the conduct of their examination.

Mr. Speaker, the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) made much of the return of local autonomy under new regional governments, but in practice this autonomy has not materialized. Instead of

giving more authority back to the municipalities, it appears that Queen's Park is centralizing more and more.

A Liberal government in Ontario is committed to the extension of local authority, and its first task will be to create a framework within which the local municipality can operate with more flexibility. This, of course, is something that the socialists could never accomplish as their whole ideology is based on central government control.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): What woke the member up? What about the rest of these guys; they are not paying attention.

Mr. Good: As long as the government is paying attention, that is the main thing.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): As long as the minister is listening, that is the main thing.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member's own colleagues are not listening. I am trying to.

Mr. Good: In discussing the second matter, we must not only discuss the need for municipal tax reform but also the need for in-depth studies and projections in matters of financing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Good: These studies and evaluations should and must accompany any proposal for municipal change.

Now we are all aware of the fact that the present government has changed its Minister of Municipal Affairs for the simple reason they want to cool this whole subject across the province. There is no doubt about it. But believe me it is far from cool in many areas.

The biggest complaint when the regional municipality of Niagara was created was that there was no indication of what the cost would be. No one knew what the creation of a regional police force, for instance, would cost. As a stab in the dark The Regional Municipal Grants Act offered \$1.50 per capita grant for police purposes. We all know how this amount was far from adequate, and because of the financial difficulty experienced the government was forced to rescue the whole operation. Similarly, the administrative costs and the levies on the area municipalities were unknown quantities, and this, more than anything else, has caused the present problems in the Niagara Regional

government, resulting in St. Catharines wanting to opt out of the region.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk now about the government proposal for Waterloo county.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): The member is all in favour of it?

Mr. Good: Last October, during the consideration of the estimates of The Department of Municipal Affairs—

An hon. member: I do not know which is worse, the Waterloo government, or that bridge down in Port Dover.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Waterloo government is going to be his Waterloo.

An hon. member: It is his Waterloo, all right.

Mr. Good: I do not think so.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): That bridge will be the government's Waterloo.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And I will miss the member for Kitchener.

Mr. Ruston: That bridge in Port Dover is the one.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): The Premier will not have to worry about that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, yes, we will.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The Kinsmen Club are filling their hats on that.

Mr. Good: Last October during the consideration of the estimates of The Department of Municipal Affairs—

Mr. Innes: Has the Prime Minister picked out his seat over here?

Mr. Good: I suggested that when the government proposal for Waterloo county was released, the minister should be prepared to back up his proposal with the necessary facts and figures which would show the people of Waterloo county the advantages of his particular proposal.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Good: Now to date, Mr. Speaker, the greatest criticism of the proposal is its lack of detail. I know the minister will probably defend this by saying that this is intended so that the local people will have a chance to reply to this proposal.

Well now, listen to this; I know Mr. Speaker, and every cabinet minister across the floor knows, that except for some minor boundary changes which the government might allow—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What would the member think if they did not have a chance to respond? He would really get excited then.

Mr. Good:—the basic pattern of the legislation has already been established.

An hon. member: Get on with it. I have work to do on my speech.

Mr. Good: Let me repeat this. There is no indication, and we have no reason to believe, that the regional government legislation creating a two-tiered system—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Participatory democracy, as invented by Pierre Trudeau.

Mr. Good:—of government in Waterloo county will be any different from that in the regions of York, Niagara, Ottawa-Carleton or Muskoka.

Knowing this, which you know and which I know, the proposal has glossed over many essential facts and details which should have been made known at the time the proposal was submitted in the middle of March.

Now the people of Waterloo county need municipal reform; their elected councils have been working hard for many years to bring about this reform. I have supported it, and I still support it, but I think that the government of Ontario is not being totally honest by not divulging the exact details of how its proposal will affect the financial pictures of each of the newly created areas.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It will.

An hon. member: Quiet there.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Who needs it?

Mr. Good: They will—just listen. There is only one page in the proposal devoted to the explanation of the financial matters. This one page in the proposal deals with the regional levies and the provincial grants—and the matter of transitional adjustments is only given one brief sentence. I consider these items to be of the utmost importance. On checking with The Department of Municipal Affairs, I find it unbelievable that no one as yet has figured out what the equalized assessment for each of the new areas in the proposal would be.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal declares that regional levies will be raised from the area municipalities in proportion to each area's share of the regional assessment; what the minister probably meant was each area's share of the ratable equalized assessment. Surely, one would have thought that to substantiate the effectiveness of each new area boundary The Department of Municipal Affairs would have taken tests on the assessment base of each of the new proposed areas. Well, when I inquired, I found that no one could give me any figures on this matter. No one knew what the new equalized assessment would be on these new proposed areas.

We all know it too well through what happened to county school board implementation, that the levies were made on equalized assessment and they can, and do, and did create hardships in some areas of the larger county school board regions. The Waterloo Board of Education has always had trouble in this regard, and we know that the equalization factors are not a foolproof method of levelling out levies from one jurisdiction to another.

To substantiate this further, and especially for the interest of the previous speaker, may I just point out a headline of April 13 in the Kitchener-Waterloo Record: "Four Townships Face Further 20 Per Cent Hikes in School Tax Costs." This is after 20 and 15 per cent increases in the last year—simply because the government's equalization levies do not work.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): But it is appealable. The member can appeal it if he does not like it.

Mr. Worton: Where is the member going to get the money from?

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, let me repeat my utter amazement that The Department of Municipal Affairs has not done preliminary work to ascertain what the equalized rate of assessment would be in each of the proposed new areas. It is unbelievable that the government would ask us to comment and accept the proposal on which they have not taken any tests to see if these new boundaries do in fact serve the purpose.

Mr. Worton: The member had better check up on that stuff.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What is the member going to be doing a year from now?

Mr. Good: Without this information there can be no meaningful assessment—

Mr. Gaunt: We might be running an election.

Mr. Good: —of the new government proposal. We know, Mr. Speaker, that it costs the province almost \$50 million in supplementary school grants to bring some degree of equity to a chaotic situation when regional school boards were set up.

Unfortunately, the province is not ready to bail out the city of St. Catharines, which is now paying 47.6 per cent of the regional government costs of Niagara region when they have, in fact, only 29.9 per cent of the equalized assessment.

Mr. Innes: How about that? No wonder the hon. minister will not go down there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have been there. I was there three weeks ago. Very pleasant. And does the member know something? We will win that riding.

An hon. member: And does the Premier know who will win his riding?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We might win all but one seat. Every riding but that of the member for Huron-Bruce is up for grabs.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Does the member see how we get along over here?

Mr. Good: The regional levies, based on assessment, are only part of the picture. Let us look at the paragraph in the proposal dealing with the provincial grants. "The region would be eligible to come under The Regional Grants Act."

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member had better read Hansard to understand your meanings.

Mr. Good: Now, this could mean that the basic unconditional grant in cities would increase from \$6 or \$6.25 in the case of Kitchener, to \$7.50 per capita. In rural areas, the increase would be from \$5 or \$5.50, depending on population, to \$7.50 per capita.

Over a month has gone since the proposal was released and no one—

An hon. member: How long?

Mr. Good: No one has come forward from the minister's department, not even the minister himself, to explain these important

items. How on earth can the minister expect reasonable and rational comment on his proposal when no one gives the local people any information? My guess, Mr. Speaker, is that the government purposely tries to keep everyone confused and in the dark until after the event takes place.

Continuing with the provincial grants, a very important part of The Regional Municipal Grants Act is the density grant which is \$5 per capita to certain qualifying municipalities. Would you not agree, Mr. Speaker, that a \$5 per capita grant is a very important item? This grant varies with the population density, and to be figured out, the number of acres in each of the new area municipalities must be known. Mr. Speaker, you will not believe this, but once again when I contacted The Department of Municipal Affairs—

Mr. W. Newman: Listen and find out.

Mr. Good: —I found that no one had thought it important enough to figure out the acreage of the proposed new area municipalities.

An hon. member: How about that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No wonder the member for Scarborough East used the word this afternoon—"envisualized."

An hon. member: That is a new one.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, I think this is just so important that the Premier should listen to what I have to say. I am going to repeat—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am listening very carefully.

Mr. Good: The grant varies with the population density, and to be figured out the number of acres in each of the new area municipalities must be known. You will not believe this, Mr. Speaker, but once again on contacting The Department of Municipal Affairs I found that no one had thought it important enough to figure out the acreage of the proposed new area municipalities.

Mr. Innes: That is par for the course.

Mr. Good: How could anyone expect a municipality to accept or reject the proposal when no one knows whether or not, for instance, the new area municipality of Galt-Preston-Hespeler, with a population of 62,000 would qualify for an additional \$310,000 density grant?

The same situation prevails in other areas of the county and until some answers are

received no intelligent assessment of the proposal can possibly be made.

Mr. Spence: Hard to believe.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, to offset and to make up for the complete lack of co-operation by the province I have asked the heads of municipal councils in our area to use their own treasurers and other administrative people to figure out for themselves the answers that should have been supplied with the proposal by the government of Ontario. This government has so frustrated the good intentions of so many people and I consider this subject so important that may I respectfully solicit the minister's co-operation in this matter, even at this late date?

Presently the county of Waterloo has a very good system of co-operation among existing police forces. With the establishment of a regional force we will, of course, be eligible for the \$1.50 per capita grant under The Regional Municipal Grants Act. Many of us are hoping that this will almost or fully cover the extra operational expenses for a regional police force. But surely we should be able to expect some provincial financial help with the setting up of the structures and the necessary communication equipment?

Another matter of considerable concern to each municipality in the region has been that of roads. The problem here of course results from the fact that The Department of Highways and Transport may, under The Highway Improvement Act, delegate to the regional municipality responsibility for any roads which may presently be in the jurisdiction of The Department of Highways and Transport. The regional municipality then has no alternative but to hand some of these roads down to the area municipalities.

Now the Minister of Municipal Affairs in his proposal says this—

Mr. W. Newman: Which minister? Tell us which minister?

Mr. Good: The Minister of Municipal Affairs in his proposal says—

Mr. W. Newman: Which one?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): There is only one.

Mr. Good: —that a great deal of negotiation and co-ordination with The Department of Highways will be needed but that it can be worked out. This is what they told

Niagara, too. We certainly hope that the regional government in Waterloo will not be saddled with having to take over the large mileage of provincial highways that the Niagara regional government had thrust upon it and which caused part of its problems.

An hon. member: They did a pretty fine job in Thunder Bay.

Mr. Good: I realize the government proposal is open for discussion by the inter-municipal committee and the municipalities. However, Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that until such time as proper and definite information is given concerning the equalized assessment and the grant system no intelligent evaluation can be made of the government proposal. At all costs, we want to avoid a duplication of the dissatisfaction that has arisen in the city of St. Catharines.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Disaster.

Mr. Good: This, I think, can be accomplished if the minister is prepared to sit down and discuss it in complete frankness with the necessary data at his disposal to let the people of Waterloo county know the answers to many of the problems that bother them at the present time.

In an article published in the Kitchener-Waterloo Record, April 2, 1971, I recommended that a study of the financial aspects of the regional government proposal be made by the treasurers of municipalities in the county. It is gratifying to note that the inter-municipal committee appointed to study the government proposal has set up three sub-committees composed of experts from within our own county to look into the planning, administrative and financial sections of other regional government legislation. I have offered my services to assist in any way that I can when these committees start to study existing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the extra effort being put in by the people of Waterloo county to compensate for the lack of detail provided by the province, will mean a better and more effective regional government for Waterloo county.

Mr. W. Newman: What do the members want? What do they really want over there?

Mr. Good: If the hon. member would listen he might learn something.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): The member for Brantford (Mr. Makarchuk) has not achieved much for his riding.

Mr. Good: The second section I would like to deal with briefly is water supply for a growing municipality. The supplying of fresh, pure water to our growing cities in the Province of Ontario is of vital concern. Where such a city is situated adjacent to a large body of water the problem is somewhat more simple; however in dealing with cities such as Kitchener and Waterloo, or in fact the whole "golden triangle" area which includes Galt, Preston and Hespeler, and Guelph as well, the supplying of water is becoming an increasingly difficult problem.

Over the past 20 years it has become evident that the large quantities of water needed from the ground to supply the growing cities of Kitchener and Waterloo has caused the water table to drop an estimated 11 feet. In the back of everyone's mind, of course, is the thought that some day our area will require a pipeline from one of the Great Lakes to supply an ever-increasing need for fresh water. Whether this pipeline comes from Lake Huron, Georgian Bay or Lake Erie has been one great controversy, with the thought of water from Lake Erie being very repulsive to the people of our community.

For years the public utilities commission in both cities of Kitchener and Waterloo has lengthened its pipelines and gone farther and farther into the rural areas for new sources of ground water. Various studies show that short-term and intermediate sources are still available from ground water supplies, but that eventually a pipeline would be required.

It was in August of last year that word came from the Ontario Water Resources Commission that the community must make up its mind by September of last year whether or not it would accept a pipeline from Lake Erie. The reason behind this hasty decision was that savings could be realized if the intake being built by Hydro at the present time for their new station in Nanticoke on Lake Erie was enlarged sufficiently to supply both Hydro as well as the pipeline. It was, of course, not realistic to suggest that suddenly the community should be ready to make this decision, when in fact it was really OWRC's responsibility to put in the intake for Ontario Hydro at whatever size they considered necessary to take care of future water requirements for this area.

Local leaders, of course, refused to be hurried into a snap decision for Lake Erie water. It is interesting to note that when the

Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr) presented a speech at the annual meeting of the Grand River Conservation Authority early this year he acknowledged that the pressures of last fall for a quick pipeline decision were in fact an unreasonable request.

It now appears that there is a reasonable period, perhaps 15 years, when our area can be satisfactorily supplied by ground water development reasonably close to the city. This alternative, which is quite acceptable to the cities of Kitchener and Waterloo, carries with it, however, great concern on the part of the farmers of Wilmot township who have seen their water tables diminishing year after year.

The concern of the Wilmot resources association and also that of the township of Wilmot council and the local federation of agriculture has been dealt with by the OWRC officials in the following manner. These people have been assured that their rights for adequate water supply are being protected. Before the city is allowed to pump any water it must do so under permit. The permit restricts the pumping to a certain amount for each well. Any interference with an adequate water supply resulting from the taking of water under permit requires the permittee to restore the supply in a manner satisfactory to OWRC or to reduce his taking so that the interference is eliminated.

On the surface this appears to be quite a reasonable approach. We know that in the interest of full development of water resources we must be prepared to permit interference with certain supplies as long as that supply is subsequently restored. If this were not allowed, then of course the ground water development would be to the extent that the poorest well in the area would allow.

To restore an uninterrupted supply, the city or the water commission, whichever the case may be, is required either to deepen the well for the farmer, put in a deep well pump, drill him a new well at another location, or as a final resort give him a water supply from the town or city's water as it goes by his farm. After much dealing with the people who had been affected by the taking of water by the city, I find that in spite of what appears to be a reasonable approach to their problems they are far from satisfied.

When one discusses with them the actual disruption to their way of life caused by the interference with their water supply, one begins to understand that additional safeguards must be provided immediately. In the case of test pumping or regular pumping

under permit, a farmer will notify the city of an interruption to his water supply. In some cases, a few days may elapse before very much is done.

This, of course, means hauling of water, sometimes for a considerable distance. It means the disruption of facilities around the farm, a pipe probably brought in to the house from a water tank in the yard, taking cattle various places to be watered or bringing water to them, bringing in additional equipment, disruption of fences and grass in the area, and in some instances it has been shown that the death of livestock has occurred from lack of water caused by this disruption.

While it sounds very reasonable to say that water must be restored to the farmer, there are many inconveniences and costs borne by the farmer over and above the restoration of his water supply.

Mr. Speaker, the first recommendation of Mr. McRuer in his latest report on the royal commission inquiry into civil rights, states that section 18 of The OWRC Act should be amended to make it clear that the commission is liable to restore the lands, buildings, etc. of a person who may have been disturbed. The commission should also be liable to pay compensation for any damages to property which cannot be repaired. I stated to these farmers, long before this report came out, that compensation given under our new Expropriations Act should also apply to farmers who have been hurt by interruption of their water supply.

It is coincidental that Mr. McRuer also covers this point in his recommendations. He says that provisions of The OWRC Act and all other provisions of the Act dealing with matters relating to expropriation which conflict with The Expropriations Act should be repealed.

On closing, I would like to make this suggestion, Mr. Speaker. I personally feel that our Expropriations Act which we passed in 1968-1969 is very good legislation. May I respectfully submit that this government should look very carefully at the idea of extending to individuals who have received damages because of interruption to their water supply the same compensation as would be received under expropriation? Presently, OWRC acts as an adjudicator between an aggrieved farmer and the city but nowhere is there any provision for any compensation, other than to have the interrupted water supply restored for use by that farmer. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is important that this must be extended to cover damages received

by that farmer because of the interruption to his water supply.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, one had to admire on Saturday night the latest star of the television screen, namely the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis), the method in which he expressed his deep concern for the unemployed people of Ontario, and the way he again tried to deviate from the failure of the provincial government to act and laid the sole responsibility for unemployment on the federal level. Certainly I agree that the federal level and Pierre Elliott Trudeau are primarily responsible for the crisis which exists in Canada today. When a federal government deliberately manipulates and precipitates a recession, one has to ask oneself what kind of idiots the people of Canada have elected to govern the affairs of this country.

One merely has to look at the Prime Minister and his attitude to understand how a government can adopt a policy which affects people in every field. It includes those groups who are always hardest hit—the young, the recent immigrant—but this time around it includes a lot more people. It includes professionals; it includes skilled tradesmen and university graduates. There is just no one who has been missed. And through it all, you know that a financially hard-pressed, indifferent, arrogant, cold, 18th century aristocrat flits around the country, making tremendous news copy with outbursts against the Lapalme workers, the Talbotville workers, and, in the House, the odd fuddle-duddle. To show the height of his contempt—

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): He is talking about the Liberals' leader.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Not our leader—the Prime Minister of Canada.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All the Liberals defend him.

Mr. Ruston: And 60 per cent of all the people of Ontario—

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, if that is not adequate, the demonstrations that the press has gone around performing would do it! I think the height of contempt shown by Trudeau was when they were going to have an emergency debate and he went skiing. They were going to debate unemployment. He had had a full weekend before, just previous to that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: At his age I am not sure.

Mr. Speaker, if I could get back into the swing of things, we are going to hear all kinds of apologies. They have been apologizing for two and a half weeks, three weeks, except for the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) What I want to come to is what has the government done? Despite all of the warnings of what was coming by economists, the fact that the federal government refused to budge, the provincial government, that motley group over there that calls itself a cabinet, did absolutely nothing except create 1,200 jobs cutting dead elm trees along Highways 400 and 401—

An hon. member: What is wrong with that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is a great improvement.

Mr. Martel: I would hope the Prime Minister would stay because I have some letters to his office on projects that would have created 16,000 jobs! I wish he would stay here and answer.

An hon. member: He is going out to paint some more signs saying "William Davis is responsible for the elm tree project."

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Another hon. member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is a great improvement.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): More signs saying "William Davis."

An hon. member: It is a good project.

Mr. Martel: In fact this government was so oblivious to what was going on with the people who were becoming unemployed, that the supersalesman who now sits in the back row, if members will recall last fall, was spending \$800,000, I believe it was, advertising "Where else would you rather be?" I suggested that the \$800,000 that was spent—

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): Right here!

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): And it is still true as far as the member for Sudbury East is concerned.

Mr. Martel: —and I will just tell the hon. minister—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It is absolutely true as far as he is concerned.

Mr. Martel: —except for the 800,000 people and the 220,000 in Ontario who are unemployed. The government might have utilized that money to employ some people, rather than for some phoney advertising campaign for the next provincial election, that is what it might have been doing. But the government ignored the people of the province.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: But that is a lie.

Mr. Martel: Ignored them in totality.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Nonsense!

Mr. Martel: And what we find in this House, Mr. Speaker, as we go on, is that the Tories spend half of their time trying to find election issues. If you will recall last year it was the Benson white paper and the deep concern the government had for the small businessman. It did nothing then and has not in the last eight years.

And then, this year it is the unemployment crisis, and the government does nothing about that. And when we talk about Indians it has reasons why it cannot help them.

An hon. member: We are helping them in my riding.

Mr. Martel: And it goes on and on, as it looks for reasons to go after the federal government to hide its own lack of action, and that is the problem. If this government can create the atmosphere that the federal levels are responsible, that enables it to maintain the sitting on its hands which has gone on for the last year and a half while the unemployment crisis has developed.

Mr. Gilbertson: That is not what the Indians tell me up in my riding.

Mr. Martel: What do the Indians tell the member up in his riding?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The hon. member opposite has the floor.

Mr. Martel: I will not tell the joke, but it ends with a lot of oompah, oompah, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Better not.

Mr. Martel: What positive action has the government taken to date? Twelve hundred jobs cutting down dead elm trees on Highway 400.

An hon. member: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Martel: They might have taken time out of that five-ring toy circus that went around the province and held meetings that were all closed to the general public and they might have looked at the situation of unemployment.

The then minister, the new Treasurer of Ontario (Mr. McKeough), made the point in the Soo that by summer we will have the unemployment resolved. That was while the circus was touring the province.

I believe that the policy of the Tory party during this whole session could be best compared to an overdrawn bank account. It is empty.

Mr. Speaker, starting on May 19 last year, I wrote the super-salesman, and now the man who has followed him, in an effort to resolve the worst housing crisis in Ontario, in the Sudbury region. A minimum of 3,300 families are on the waiting list of the Sudbury housing authority—a minimum. There is a vacancy rate of zero in the Sudbury area.

I am going to read to you, Mr. Speaker, some of the correspondence I had with that department to show you the manner in which they tried to put off resolving this problem. Better still, I will finalize this part of my talk on housing, Mr. Speaker, with a letter that I addressed to the Prime Minister, on February 2, asking him to resolve the housing crisis in the Sudbury area and reduce unemployment.

We need at the present time at least 4,000 units. Using the figures of the new Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman), those 4,000 units, using 4.7 men per unit, would have created in the neighbourhood of 16,000 jobs. That is more, Mr. Speaker, than the entire bureaucracy of the minister has been able to create to date. More in one project—one project of building 4,000 units of housing, more jobs than this whole government has been able to create for the unemployed, because the figure is about 12,000.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): I was listening to the hon. member for a while. I thought he was going to say something.

Mr. Martel: Well I am. I wrote the minister's predecessor on May 19, 1970, Mr. Speaker, and I suggested to him that he might consider some condominiums in an effort to resolve the housing crisis, and I am just going to quote an excerpt:

I want to draw your attention to several facts with respect to the critical housing

shortage in the Sudbury area. One of those facts is enclosed in Mr. Alt-Fuldish's letter, that being that at present there are over 3,000 families in Sudbury who live in hotels and motels. Certainly no people can expect to live in this type of expensive dwelling and support a family with dignity.

Besides this, and of equal if not more pressing concern, is the fact that the mining industry in the Sudbury area in the next year and a half intends to increase its work force considerably. Let me point out that United Steelworkers of America indicated that it is anticipated that within a year and a half to two years the number of men employed at Inco would rise from the neighbourhood of 17,000 to 23,000. I simply do not know where the housing facilities are to come from to resolve such a situation. It appears to me as though Mr. Alt-Fuldish has probably hit on the matter or a method for resolving the problem we are confronted with.

Some two months later I got a reply, a rather evasive reply, from the director of the Ontario Housing Corporation in which he stated:

As you mention there are some 3,800 applications on file as of July 16, 1970. While the OHC programme under way in Sudbury will provide 406 additional family and 206 senior citizen dwellings of rent-geared-to-income housing, it would therefore seem clear that the remaining need will be considerable, even if one makes allowance for the fact that some applicants will refuse units for various reasons.

Well that was put off, and on July 28 I wrote the chairman of Ontario Housing another letter and in it I stated:

It is indeed unfortunate that the initiative for development must come from the city, as is outlined in your letter, because in fact at the present time it would take roughly 4,000 units to meet the need, and one must also take into account the fact that Inco will be bringing in a good number of employees in the immediate future. What is even worse is that if the city should decide to request an additional number of units there would be a two-year minimum time lapse from the time these were requested to the time they were completed. This will not relieve the situation. What would be needed is the immediate construction of the required number of units to at least house the people who are on the waiting list.

Well I got another reply and I must say it was another rather evasive reply. So on November 30 I wrote the minister's predecessor a rather lengthy letter:

Recently I questioned you regarding a satellite community in the Sudbury area and subsequently I wrote to you re this matter. The situation is critical. No housing is available and rents continue to rise as a result of the shortage. This problem is so great that it warrants immediate attention. I am not certain how much attention or study has been given to my request for a satellite community; I am aware that much planning would have to be undertaken to establish such a venture.

Therefore, I would like to draw to your attention that there is a solution at hand. Some years ago a "nickel basin" planning study was conducted re the Sudbury basin. Since then Blezard, Capreol and Hanmer townships have come together to form Valley East township. There is in existence an official plan for this very large township. In 1971 construction of a water and sewage system will begin.

In other words, with an official plan in effect zoning the entire area, with considerable amounts of land available and with sewer and water to be undertaken within six months, I believe that much of the planning is completed.

Therefore, I would urge that your department consider purchasing much of the land and undertake the construction of the variety of subdivisions in the community primarily for sale to people. These could be condominium, row housing, etc., dispersed throughout this rather large township of Valley East.

When one considers that your department has been active in such projects in other areas, such as Bramalea, then I would urge as strongly as possible that you be involved immediately in the Sudbury area.

I realize that the Ontario Housing Corporation is doing a study of the area and its needs. I am concerned, however, that the reply to this request will be that OHC has to wait for a request from the municipality before it undertakes geared-to-income housing.

As outlined above, I am talking about the government undertaking action to alleviate the crisis here by purchasing land, building through whatever agency is responsible and then selling to prospective

tenants. If the municipality should desire some geared-to-income housing, they can make their request known. I am specifically interested in housing the 900 men in Inco staff village and the over 3,300 families on the waiting list in Sudbury who need accommodation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that was followed up with yet another letter from the OHC and in that letter I was advised that the sewers and water would not be started; the sewage system would not be ready until December, 1972. Well, I checked with the Ontario Water Resources Commission people, as I got to know most of them over the past three and a half years in working on the sewer and water project in the valley, and they indicated that they thought they would have a delay. But through a series of tests they assured me that the sewage system in Valley East township would be completed no later than December, 1971. So that excuse was out the window.

Then, Mr. Speaker, something rather fascinating happened, because the companies in the area got a little fed up with my b'aming them solely for the housing crisis. I felt that they should have contributed through their profits and so on, because they were bringing in the employees to develop the houses. I still feel they should. But, interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker—and this will probably twig the government a little—four years ago the officials of the International Nickel Company and Falconbridge Nickel Company met with officials from the Ontario government and advised the Ontario government of their five-year plan for expansion. And what did the government do? It sat on its hands, knowing full well that there was no accommodation available for the expansion by the companies at the time of the proposals to the government. And what did they do to alleviate it? Nothing! Absolutely nothing!

And I wrote to the minister again and someone was finally sent in from the Ontario Housing Corporation and we have had some major discussions now.

What did the hon. minister do for four years, or the government? What did the government do, knowing of this expansion programme to ensure that there was going to be housing for the people in the Sudbury area? Absolutely nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I read in the newspaper about the Prime Minister's dead elm tree project. On February 2, while the member for London North (Mr. Robarts) was still Prime Minister—

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister without Portfolio): A damn good one!

Mr. Martel: Oh, it was a tremendous programme. It showed tremendous competence in developing that programme.

Mr. Gilbertson: A good healthy job for them to cut those trees down.

Mr. Martel: The imagination of the bureaucracy of government—

Hon. Mr. Potter: It should have started sooner.

Mr. Martel: —really came to the fore in that.

Anyway, on February 2 I wrote the then Prime Minister of Ontario. If you will recall, Mr. Speaker, during the debate which evolved around the Throne Speech the Minister of Trade and Development asked the leader of the New Democratic Party "if he wanted houses, like tomorrow, to get under way."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not ask if they would like it.

Mr. Martel: Right, this is February 2. This letter was—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I asked if they thought we could give it to them.

Mr. Martel: Not like tomorrow, but this letter was dated February 2. The original letter was dated May 19, 1970. That is just around the corner one full year.

I wrote the Prime Minister and I said:

Dear Mr. Prime Minister:

Recently I read a press release regarding your efforts to create employment in the Province of Ontario. I would like to put forth and request that you consider the following suggestion.

In the Sudbury area at the present time there are over 3,300 families on the waiting list for housing. The situation is critical. Rents continue to skyrocket and the vacancy rate in the Sudbury area is approximately 0.03—

At that time. It is now zero I am told.

I have exchanged a good deal of correspondence with the hon. Mr. Randall and the Ontario Housing Corporation with respect to a major project to be undertaken in Valley East township to alleviate the housing crisis which at present, in the Sudbury area, has to be the worst in Ontario if not Canada.

Such an undertaking would not only create jobs but would fill a great need. I have even suggested it not be a subsidized programme of geared-to-income housing but rather that the government undertake to service the land and immediately build houses. The government could then sell the houses to these many thousands of waiting families without the province losing the funds—

If that is what they wanted.

—which I can appreciate are rather short at the present time.

I would envisage a project of some 3,000 units at minimum. You can well imagine the number of jobs that this would create while at the same time solving the housing problem.

I have sent an entire file to the Ontario Housing Corporation outlining the reasons for my suggestions. Hopefully you will have a representative of your staff check out the possibility of such a project.

I have a reply somewhere. It is rather sparse. Yes, here it is. I got a reply two days later.

Dear Mr. Martel:

Thank you for your letter of February 2. Your suggestion is of course not greatly different from that of our HOME programme but it does offer a slightly different wrinkle and I shall be glad to have this examined.

Mr. Speaker, this department and this government has created 1,200, maybe 2,000 jobs at maximum to resolve the unemployment problem.

Using the minister's figures of 4.5 or 4.6—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Four point four.

Mr. Martel: —per house, on 4,000 units, Mr. Speaker, that would be 16,000 jobs.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member agree with the figure?

Mr. Martel: Four point four?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Martel: Oh, 4.4, 4.5—what is the difference?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member agree with it?

Mr. Martel: No, I know the hon. minister is trying to lead me into a trap because the hon. minister and my colleague had a little argument the other day. I forget the actual

ratio. I am using the minister's figures for the benefit of the doubt.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member's leader said it was 0.07.

Mr. Martel: I am using the minister's figures and if we want to use his figures to his advantage the hon. minister now has an opportunity to create 16,000 jobs.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I just asked if the hon. member agreed with it. I just wanted the hon. member to confirm them. I have a great deal of confidence in the hon. member's ability.

Mr. Martel: Do not run a red herring into it. The project is there. The government knew four years ago. The government has been requested for almost a year to resolve the housing crisis there. It was asked 2½ months ago to use some of its capacity for resolving unemployment and at the same time to resolve the housing crisis and what has it done?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Exactly what we are doing.

Mr. Martel: What is that? Might the hon. minister tell me what it is that the hon. minister is doing to resolve the housing crisis in the Sudbury area?

Mr. Makarchuk: Tell us Stanley Grossman.

Mr. Martel: I will take my seat if the hon. minister wishes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is Allan J. Grossman.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): What about the Minister without Portfolio?

Mr. Martel: No, nothing—a lot of platitudes. What do you see in the paper regarding Toronto?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): If the minister cannot do it, why does he not resign?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The opposition could not get along without us.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: November 24, from the HOME plan: "374 condominium dwellings at the intersection of York Mills and Victoria Park." Is that not nice? Toronto. You have got a vacancy rate at least in Toronto. You do not have one in Sudbury.

The Toronto Daily Star, December 10, 1970: "300 condominiums, North York."

Monday, August 31, 1970, from the HOME plan: "1,416 condominiums, Crescent Town project in East York." What is the government doing for the rest of the province?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member just told us we were not doing anything about cleaning out—

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, the minister does not understand very well.

Mr. Sargent: He never did.

Mr. Martel: Those are 1970 figures. The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is the government is building houses in Toronto where there is a vacancy rate and we have an area where there is no vacancy rate and there are families living in basements.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the member saying we do not need houses in Toronto?

Mr. Martel: I am saying we need houses in Sudbury.

Mr. Speaker, do you realize that there are people in the Sudbury area who are living in old converted buses and in the back of station wagons? Five hundred people in a hotel, 950 in Inco staff village living in rooms 10 x 10, two per room, with their families 2,000 miles away in the east coast, and there is not a facility to bring them here.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Shame!

Mr. Sargent: Shame.

Mr. Martel: And the federal government and Inco, through Manpower, advertising to those people from the east coast, "Come to Sudbury, there are lots of jobs, there are houses; they are expensive, but there are houses."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): Is the minister not ashamed?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the member see my face red?

May I ask the hon. member a question? I have not listened to all of the correspondence; I was in and out of the House. I just began to realize he was talking about housing. In a nutshell, is the hon. member telling this House that there is serviced land available in Sudbury and the Ontario Housing Corporation is not taking advantage of it to build housing?

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I am telling the hon. minister that sewer and water will be started in the Valley East township. There are nine contracts ready to go now. The first sewage lagoon will be finished by December of this year, and I am saying that if you people were really sincere you would build the houses so that they would be finalized at the same time that the sewer and water would become operative, and people could bring their families from the east coast to move in with them.

We would not have all of these men living in the most deplorable places and they would have their families with them. They have been used by the federal government and there is just no place, Mr. Speaker, that they can bring their families, absolutely no place. There is vacancy rate zero.

The other problem that has been created as a result of this is that rents for dingy little apartments are \$200 and \$175. I had a woman phone me on the weekend, Mr. Speaker, she has got five kids, she is on welfare, she is getting \$319 a month—\$200 is rent. She is using half her food allowance to cover the rent.

Mr. Deans: Shame!

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Shame!

Mr. Martel: And I can name case after case. In fact I wrote the Minister of Social and Family Services two months ago and I suggested—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Ruston: Sit down; the member for Sudbury East is giving the speech.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member invited me to engage in this dialogue with him. Am I right?

Mr. Martel: Right.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. minister wishes to ask a question he may do so. Otherwise, the hon. member for Sudbury East has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He invited me, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I do not care what he invited you to do. The rules of the House do not allow it. The hon. minister may ask a question, otherwise—

Mr. Makarchuk: I would not take him up on any invitation.

Mr. Speaker:—the member for Sudbury East has the floor.

Mr. Makarchuk: Watch out for some of the invitations he gives.

Mr. Martel: I wrote the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Wells) recently to have this investigated because nearly everyone who is on welfare is having large sections of his welfare allowance, over and above that allowed for rent, being used up to cover the rest of the rent. I know family after family on diets of porridge and bread and very little food of sustenance.

What did I get? You talk about the heartlessness of that group over there. What did I get for a reply? Not from the minister, but the deputy minister, Mr. Borczak, who told me: "Oh! You are wrong."

He did not even have it investigated. I checked it out to see if I was right. He did not even have the decency to phone the Sudbury offices—whether they be provincial, municipal or district welfare—to find out if I was right. He sloughed it off. The last letter I wrote to him he did not slough off because I do not like it when I get home on the weekend and find a mother on \$319 welfare paying \$200 a month rent. Those kids do without!

If you wish me to illustrate another case, there was a woman who came from Elliot Lake. Her husband left her. She came to Sudbury to work at the university for \$265 a month, cleaning. She cannot find a house. She has her four children boarding with another family. She pays \$160 for their room and board. She took an old house, just big enough for her and an older child. They were kicked out last week because they are tearing the house down for urban renewal. She has to pay \$60 a month to store her furniture. So she has now taken a second job. She cleans offices at night from 6 until midnight. Now there is a woman who demonstrates tremendous courage.

I wrote The Department of Social and Family Services for a little bit of assistance to cover her drugs and her hospital. The department said that she was earning too much money. She is earning too much money. The fact is that it is more than \$300, but the fact also is that she was paying \$160 and did not have her family with her, the fact is that she had to take a second job because she did not want to have her kids see welfare,

and you could not even get a supplementary assistance out of this government for a woman demonstrating that kind of courage so that her children would not see welfare. Now what kind of a government is this?

Mr. Deans: This government.

Mr. Brown: Lousy.

Mr. Sargent: Why does the member not get to the heart of the subject?

Mr. Martel: The whole thing boils down, right from the beginning, to the lack of housing. If we had houses—

An hon. member: The hon. member needs a tranquilizer.

Mr. Martel: I do not need a tranquilizer. I live with it.

An hon. member: That is terrible.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): He never had it so good.

Mr. Martel: Yes, I never had it. I want to tell you, the situation is critical in that particular field. I would like to tell you something else, Mr. Speaker. One of the big unions up there—the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers' Union—came down to Toronto and for two years—

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: The member used to be able to keep himself under control.

Mr. Martel: —they have been trying to develop a piece of land with 152 acres so that people would have houses. Houses would be there for their workers. The red tape of that minister's department is so bad, and it is so difficult to get money, that they eventually gave up.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Which minister's department?

Mr. Martel: The minister's department. The housing department.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not my department. I just sit in the Legislature for it.

Mr. Martel: The bureaucracy runs it. The point is, the Mine Mill union offered the government 152 acres of land. Two years ago they tried to develop the land so that there would be no housing crisis for their members. Do you know what? The town of Lively—and you know who controls the town of Lively—had the sewer and water but they could not get permission to cut into

that sewer and water. You know who owned that land, eh?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: The member talks with his hands.

Mr. Martel: At least I talk.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Yes, and he talks with his hands too.

Mr. Martel: That comes by background.

Mr. Deans: The member opposite should be glad he has moved.

An hon. member: The member is not doing too badly with his mouth.

Another hon. member: Who controls Lively?

Mr. Ferrier: Is the member prejudiced?

Mr. Martel: Who controls Lively? I am sure the ministers all know who controls Lively—The International Nickel Company.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know who controls Lively. Tell us.

Mr. Martel: The International Nickel Company!

They do not want the water cut in there and the sewer cut in there. It would disrupt their service. It would disrupt them controlling another town.

Mr. Ruston: The hon. Minister of Trade and Development will have to be quiet.

Mr. Martel: I just want to quote from a brief that was presented to the Ontario Housing Corporation recently by the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers' Union:

It is quite evident that Inco decided to put its weight behind private speculative builders and entrepreneurs to fill the housing gap. Falconbridge, on the other hand, opted for a company-oriented plan that would deliver better houses and lower rents with an employee option to purchase after five years.

Inco-supported new housing units have been commanding rents of \$170 to \$200 a month plus services. Falconbridge units have been renting at \$147 to \$190 a month plus services.

Private speculative builders have been selling three-bedroom houses for prices of \$21,000 to \$27,000; carrying charges per month run from \$225 up.

When it is realized that 75 to 80 per cent of the Sudbury basin's wage earners

receive less than \$8,000 a year, it can be readily understood why the present answers do not satisfy the question.

According to the local CMHC experts, 2,200 units per year for the next four years are required to meet housing needs, arising from the projected expansion of Sudbury industry.

That is what is projected. That is what is needed over the next four years. We are not talking about the backlog yet.

The \$30,000-up housing needs are more than satisfied. It is in the \$14,000 to \$25,000 bracket where the real shortages are found.

The fact is that 75 to 80 per cent of Sudbury wage earners cannot afford to own or rent even that kind of private housing. The private sector of the building industry simply cannot fill the bill.

That is crucial! If the private sector is not going to do it, then the government must.

Public low rental housing is indispensable for the big majority. In a survey of 2,000 apartments last December, there were only eight vacancies. (These were probably filled before the ink was dry on the report.) Last year, of the approximately 850 rent-geared-to-income units under the Sudbury Housing Authority, some 4,300 applicants competed for the right to occupy. We note in the remarks of James Snow, MPP, at a housing symposium, in Sudbury, June 10, 1970, the following: "1970 may see OHC emerge as the biggest single producer of housing on the continent . . ."

I guess we are still waiting.

Mr. Ferrier: Not much of a prophet!

Mr. Martel: To continue

This year it is expected that OHC will complete eight per cent of the semi-detached production, 60 per cent of the town houses and 15 per cent of all apartments in Ontario.

How far short did we fall?

Hon. Mr. Snow: How far short?

Mr. Martel: To continue:

At the present time the average rent paid by families in Ontario Housing is \$84.

Compare that to what the welfare recipients or the wage earners in Sudbury are paying in the private sector. Compare that.

Mr. Deans: The minister blew it again!

Mr. Martel: Now they offer an interim measure, this union.

As an interim measure we propose that Ontario Housing Corporation take emergency steps in conjunction with district municipalities to meet immediate and pressing housing needs.

We strongly believe that the present satellite communities, which lie close to a man's place of work, are the most rational type of community. Schools and shops are close by. Costly roads and transportation are cut to a minimum.

There are large areas of empty and good building lands adjacent to mines, mills and smelters. Much of it is owned by the mining companies. We propose Ontario Housing acquire this land which should be made available at nominal cost, develop and service it. Most of it should be reserved for private sale to workers to build their own homes under CMHC standards.

In this regard, the Sudbury Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union, local 598, have some 155 acres of land available for such a development. This land is excellent for building and lies adjacent to the Creighton mine. We are particularly interested in this land being developed in anticipation of the housing needs in the immediate future for Falconbridge's Lockerby mine. We are ready to discuss any practical proposal that would benefit our members.

There you are, Mr. Speaker. We have offers, we have land, we have supplies, we have unemployed people and we have a government that knew for four years that the industry was going to boom. What is the minister going to do about it?

If you think that is the only problem that has developed as a result of the expansion, there is yet another very serious problem that has developed in the area, that of hospitals. There are two problems: there is a long-term problem in the Sudbury area and a short-term one. The government's recent announcement of some \$21 million to three hospitals will partially alleviate the long-term problem—and I say partially, in that the original plans called for \$30 million of expansion in 1967, not 1971 when the population has gone up almost 10,000 but based on the figures for 1967, while the Ontario Hospital Services Commission, using its axe, has blithely cut its way through \$9 million, which was necessary in 1967. And when the

proposed hospitals are finalized in 1974, Mr. Speaker, we will be confronted with hospitals that were inadequate in 1967, that had their budgets cut by \$9 million, that have seen population expand considerably. Consequently, we can anticipate that our long-term problem will not really be resolved.

If we look at the statistics in the government's own little book, this treasure chest that the former Treasurer was so proud to display back in January, I think points out the dire need for beds and for doctors in the Sudbury area.

I refer to page 82 of this wonderful document, table 38, "Hospital Services for Northeastern Ontario." If we look down the list, we see that Algoma with a population of 113,000 in 1966 had eight general hospitals, 736 beds, and 65 beds per 10,000 population. Cochrane had 97,000 population, 10 general hospitals, 608 beds and 62 beds per 10,000 population. Manitoulin had 10,000 population, two general hospitals, 73 hospital beds, and 70 beds per 10,000 population.

We look down at Sudbury, Mr. Speaker, and we see interesting statistics. Sudbury had a population in 1966 of 174,000, six general hospitals, 866 hospital beds, and 50 beds per 10,000. Let us compare that with the provincial average.

The Province of Ontario had 6,960,000 people, 272 general hospitals, and 67 beds per 10,000 population. In other words, based on the 1966 figures, as outlined in the Design for Development, the Sudbury area was 17 beds per 10,000 shy of the provincial average.

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is a pretty healthy part of the country to live in, is it not?

Mr. Martel: Seventeen beds per 10,000 shy of the provincial average. I think it is a disgrace what the government has done, because it has just cut back on a \$30-million expansion; it has chopped off \$9 million—and that was to satisfy the needs in 1967, and this is 1971. Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Gilbertson: The member is stretching it.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I am not stretching it. I have the hospital's report before me. I am delighted that the member put his foot in it. This is from the report of the Sudbury and District Hospital Council on the status of hospital construction in Sudbury as of March, 1971. What does it say in here? It says:

Within the \$21 million constraint, the hospital council has agreed with OHSC that the money should be allocated on the following basis: building of New Laurentian, \$14 million; renovation of Sudbury General, \$5 million; renovation of Sudbury Memorial, \$2 million.

Additions and renovations at the Algoma Sanatorium had to be temporarily postponed. Originally in 1967 it was agreed that the council funds would be shared as follows; Sudbury General Hospital 23 per cent; Laurentian 48 per cent; Sudbury Memorial Hospital 25 per cent; Sudbury Algoma Sanatorium 2.37 per cent.

This apportionment is still the accepted basis of sharing except it is now applied over a longer period and will include the postponed phase of expansion at the Sudbury Memorial Hospital and the Sudbury Algoma Sanatorium building programme.

These are not my figures. They come from the hospital council and they are the latest figures. It indicates that because they chopped \$9 million we cannot even meet the needs in 1967. The population will expand considerably and we have got \$9 million short now. What is it going to be like in 1974? We are not going to have the problem resolved.

What is even worse is the short-term problem. I checked with some doctors in the Sudbury area over the weekend, Mr. Speaker, and one of the orthopaedic surgeons at the present time has 100 cases waiting. Some of them have been on a waiting list for over six months. The heart specialist in the Sudbury area, Dr. Field, has 74 patients on the waiting list. Some have been on for over six months.

The eye, ear, nose, throat specialist has over 100 patients on the waiting list and cannot get them into an active treatment bed. One general surgeon has over 100 patients on his waiting list and the average for 12 doctors is somewhere around between 40 and 70 patients, the majority of whom are on a waiting list which has been six months long already.

I made a suggestion here two weeks ago to the Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence), and suggested that it just might be possible for the government to provide funds so that the hospital commission in Sudbury could rent some portable classrooms on a temporary basis, renovate them, put bathrooms in them. We could take 10 or 12 of them and have each of these rooms hold six

convalescent patients, which would then free the active treatment beds.

We know that some of the people who are in active treatment beds will be there for three months, and need not be. I had a case from the orthopaedic surgeon the other day of an elderly woman who broke her hip, and he anticipates that she will be in hospital for three months, whereas, if we would take—

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): How old is she?

Mr. Martel: About 70. What difference does it make how old she is?

Mr. Kennedy: Quite a bit.

Mr. Martel: When you have got this type of statistics, Mr. Speaker, from at least 12 specialists in the Sudbury area, it means that there has got to be an emergency programme undertaken. I suggest that we rent portable classrooms, renovate them—

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Did he consult the member for Sudbury in this?

Mr. Martel: —as they have done at Cambrian College. They did it at Cambrian College for classrooms and they did a first-rate job. We could get the floors all carpeted, we could put in washroom facilities and put them right at the Algoma Sanitorium which has plenty of space, and having them face to face, Mr. Speaker, with a hallway built in, we could run an entrance right into the hospital.

At the Algoma Sanitorium there is medical care already and there are kitchen facilities; there is the whole gamut which would be necessary to take the active treatment patients out of the Memorial, out of the General, and out of St. Joseph's and have them taken to the Algoma Sanitorium and in this type of facility where they can convalesce and thus could relieve a lot of beds.

As I stressed, some of the patients who occupy active treatment beds could be removed. In the interim we might have five or six patients, active treatment patients, who could be treated in that one bed over a period of two months. All it is going to take is to have the government make a minor change to cover convalescent treatment and provide a little funding.

What are we going to do? Are we going to allow people with heart conditions, with the need for orthopaedic specialist treatment, for neurosurgeons and the whole bit, to go on waiting six, seven, eight months before

they receive active treatment? The government sits again and it will consider it. I heard the member for Algoma praise the government—they were thinking about it. That is a real benefit to people who lie around at home for five or six months waiting for treatment to know—imagine the comfort in knowing that the government is considering it! They have been considering it for five years and it must be of some solace to them to realize that it is being considered.

I would have been moved if they had said it was receiving active consideration at least. That would have meant two or three years from now. I can only implore the Minister without Portfolio, Mr. Speaker, to continue to pursue it and possibly, invite him to visit the area and bring back to the government the extent of the crisis which exists.

One final point, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with that, of course, is the lack of doctors. There is a tremendous shortage and I want to quote from an article written recently by a Dr. Gross. I see the minister was not quite sure, but I want to quote from an article written by a doctor, commenting on an editorial which appeared in the Sudbury Star on April 1, 1970, so it must be rather recent insofar as the shortage of doctors is concerned. He quotes:

The present situation primarily as far as the family physicians are concerned is simply tragic. At the present time, 48 general practitioners in metro Sudbury serve a population of 150,000. One general practitioner for every 3,125 people, the general practitioner population ratio being one per 1,500 to 2,000.

So we strike out again and so has the government. The only way the government is going to resolve it is the same way that it is going to resolve the high school teacher shortage in northern Ontario and, that is, to build a faculty of medicine somewhere in northern Ontario so that people who are educated in northern Ontario will stay in northern Ontario.

It has been proved in England that graduates from a teachers' college tend to stay within a jurisdiction of 50 miles of the college of education from which they graduate. I am sure the same applies here, and I am sure the same applies in the field of medicine. Consequently, the only solution is the establishment of a faculty of medicine in northern Ontario.

In talking over this matter with the doctors, of those 48 general practitioners,

I am told at least 24 are originally from the Sudbury area. That being the case, we have to rely heavily on doctors from either Europe or from southern Ontario. Mr. Speaker, I can only urge that the government give this active consideration.

I want to deal directly with the Throne Speech for a moment. On page 8 it says:

To accomplish this objective, the existing Departments of Highways and Transport and the facilities and services of the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission will be brought together in a Department of Transportation and Communications. The new department will develop and employ ways to move large numbers of people and goods and stimulate the economic growth of the province, while being more sensitive to the environmental and aesthetic sensibilities of our people.

That has come a long way for this government—a long, long way. It was two years ago, and then last year, that I called for one department, The Department of Highways and Transportation, or call it whatever you might. Interestingly enough, after the shuffling of the cabinet ministers over there—everyone moved one seat to the right—we had a Department of Highways and Transportation.

Lo and behold, before the ink was even dry we now have a Department of Transportation and Communications. We are really moving over there.

I doubt the sincerity in which it is done, because if the government is developing a Department of Transportation and Communications I fail to understand how it could have developed last year a communications network, a line to The Department of Mines, which was supposed to provide adequate information for people in northern Ontario.

The government creates a Department of Transportation and Communications and leaves the communication section back in The Department of Mines.

Where is the sincerity in this supposed realignment of portfolios and responsibilities when, with a new Communications Department it does not bring in the Northern Affairs offices? I think it just spells out the frantic effort by that government to convince the people of Ontario that it is doing something.

All it is is window dressing; it is a sham—more window dressing.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): They do not look frantic; they are asleep.

Mr. Martel: They are not asleep; they are dead.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that is unparliamentary.

An hon. member: That is what the opposition thinks.

Mr. Bullbrook: Got to watch that fellow.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, two years ago and then again on May 6, 1970, I made the following suggestion to the then Minister of Highways, and I am quoting from Hansard, page 2425:

Last year you recall, Mr. Minister, I spelled out that this department must adopt an entirely new approach and adopt a new philosophy for highways. Possibly that is coming, but I am convinced that they have to get involved in a philosophy considering the complete transportation avenues and modes in general. I am disturbed, Mr. Speaker, when the deputy minister talks about the diversification and overall policy of transportation and then you see the Ontario Northland Railway turned over to the ombudsman for the north. Then air transportation stays with the Minister of Transport. The Minister of Highways ends up with GO and highways. How can we really talk about an overall transportation system involving highways, and so on, and the various modes of transportation when we continue to keep the transportation means fragmented?

So I see the government has come quite a way in accepting the proposals we advanced for the past two years of making a complete Department of Transport. It has moved transportation and highways together and has taken Ontario Northland and thrown it in with The Department of Transport and Communications, except it has left out the communications development which it had.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech goes on to say, "The government is going to use the new department for the economic development of the province."

Well, what has it been doing for years over there with respect to the economic development of the province? And, I ask, how does this government intend to do it?

Again quoting from what I have said earlier:

What do I mean by goal-oriented philosophy and how do we achieve our objectives? The most basic tasks of the provincial government are to stimulate and guide the economic growth of the province and to consider and influence the distribution of the income of the province among socio-economic groups and regions. To conduct these tasks effectively, it is essential that all of the policy measures available to the government be co-ordinated toward a consistent comprehensive set of goals.

Transportation is one of the most important policy variables in the determination of the regional growth patterns.

Well, the government has moved that far. However, because of its own haphazard number of plans with respect to the development

of the province I am afraid that no one believes it. It has a study which I had here earlier called, Design for Development: Northeastern Ontario. After five years of study the government has told us what is wrong in northeastern Ontario. It has got one as well for northwestern Ontario, and it tells us all the problems that are in northwestern Ontario.

Then, of course, the crunch comes, Mr. Speaker, in this whole document. A number of my colleagues have quoted from that one famous paragraph:

Because of the location within the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence megalopolis the Toronto-centred region probably can increase its economic role in processing resources which currently originate in northern Ontario and move to major markets in the Chicago-Detroit-Cleveland industrial area.

I think what that does is indicate that all of its studies are not worth a row of beans. If the government's transportation policy is to be linked with that type of development, heaven help us! We are in for some rather bad times, because not only has it not got the policies, the plans or the interest, it has not got the ability to do it. Whether it be the Liberals or the Tories, they have got to rely on the whims of the free-enterpriser who is going to locate only where he wants, when he wants and when it is most economically sound to him. If we rely on that, then there is absolutely no way that we can have sound economic development, because we cannot rely on their whims. It is about time governments got off their knees in front of the corporate giants and said, "Look, gentlemen, this is good for Ontario, it is good for the people of Ontario, and we think you should locate there, and by God if you do not want to, we will do the job for you."

I just put a couple of examples forward. The former Minister of Mines and the federal government played a great game; they gave Texas Gulf \$20 million to locate a smelter in Timmins. We paid them to locate in Timmins. Now why did we not just tell them to locate in Timmins? "It is good for our people. You have a \$2 billion orebody that you are sitting on; you are going to make your return. We need it because the gold mines are closing. We strongly suggest you locate there." And if they do not want to follow the suggestion, then let them go and the government can move in and develop the smelter. Because if we gave them \$20 million and a smelter cost \$50 million, all we needed was another \$30 million and we would have

owned the smelter. One does not have to be much of an economist.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, an interesting thing that happened just recently. After the government announced its great plan for northeastern Ontario, we had occasion to enter into a debate with the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) and the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers). Just before going on television the hon. member for Sudbury indicated to us that the Liberal Party, at its last convention, had turned down a resolution moved by Mike Meehan, a solicitor in the city of Sudbury, with respect to developing natural resources in the area from which we are extracting. Interestingly enough, when the hon. member for Sudbury got on television, he made the following point: "When we form the government we will develop the natural resources at their source." How is that for duplicity? The resolution was defeated at the Liberal convention and the member of the Liberal Party is spouting policy that they would develop it at its source.

An hon. member: They overruled it.

Mr. Martel: Well, I guess he became the new leader or something overnight, but that is the type of duplicity we hear all the time from over there.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Oh, come on.

Mr. Martel: Well, I suggest to the member for Downsview that he go and ask them to rerun the tape and he will see that his—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Well, it is interesting. The Liberals have got instant policy. It is like the handbook; they have got instant policy wherever the situation prevails. Make-up a new policy if it is convenient.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, if I might, I want to tell you the crunch to this.

Mr. Singer: Tell us about the policies passed at the NDP convention about taking over all the resources. Tell us about that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, what was interesting about that situation was that the member for Sudbury was trying to corral the member for Nickel Belt because at that time, if you will recall, the white knight—

Mr. Singer: Tell us about the NDP policies.

Mr. Martel: Does the member want the floor?

Mr. Singer: No. Tell us about your policy.

Mr. Martel: You will recall, Mr. Speaker, it was just about that time that the white knight was trying to defend the provincial government's policy about allowing Falconbridge to locate a smelter in Quebec, and Sir Lawrence—

Mr. Makarchuk: You mean Lawrence of Ontario?

Mr. Martel: —Lawrence of Ontario was trying to blame the federal government, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Where is the member's leader?

Mr. Martel: I do not need a leader. All I need is the hon. member for Downsview to be quiet.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member for Downsview having asked his question 17 times, will now give the speaker the floor.

Mr. Martel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I want to make that point, that in effect what was going on on that occasion was that Lawrence of Ontario was blaming the federal government for allowing Falconbridge to locate a smelter in Quebec. And we had argued the point. My colleague from Timiskaming had contacted the Minister of Mines; he was blaming the federal people and the federal people were saying no, they had no involvement.

And what the member for Sudbury, of course, was trying to create was the impression that the Liberals would have kept it in Sudbury, by God, if they had been in power, but they had turned it down at their last policy conference, so how could the member for Sudbury have kept it in Sudbury, when he was making instant policy, because it was great political stuff on the news media.

Mr. W. Newman: The member would not pick on someone who is not here, would he?

Mr. Martel: We said that we told them they had to locate there. I make that point again. We would not play games with them; they would locate where it was beneficial for the people of this province; that if private capital did not want to do it, we would do it for them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: I suggest that if you watched the Prime Minister in Manitoba in The Pas after a Tory government had given \$90 million away he moved in rather heavily to protect the interests of the people of Manitoba and he did not back off.

Mr. Singer: When are the NDP going to take over all resource industry in Ontario?

Mr. Martel: We are not going to take them over; we are going to develop new ones. We have not suggested we will take them over.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: I am enjoying it here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: I am doing well enough. What I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that if we are going to get involved in a policy of transportation which is going to open up this province for the benefit of the people in it, there are occasions when you are going to have to take the gloves off with the entrepreneur who develops solely when it is economically feasible for him, which might not be good for the province.

He might also want to locate only where it is good for him and not good in areas such as I mentioned—Timmins—where a smelter must be built. In this overall policy we have to deal with two or three things; one being highways, the other railways. These are the two I want to speak about only very briefly.

In highways, Mr. Speaker, if I can find my sheet here—there we are—

Mr. Singer: Laxer wrote that next page.

Mr. Martel: I do not know the man.

Mr. Singer: The member should get to know him. He passes resolutions at your convenience. He goes to all the resource industries—

Mr. Martel: Does he? At least he is democratic. At least they are democratic.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, if I could continue.

Mr. Singer: Probably not.

Mr. Martel: Two things I think are vital. We have to improve the quality of roads. I want to make a couple of suggestions, and

it is unfortunate the Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNanughton) left. I happened to go to Nova Scotia this past summer. With two-lane highways that they have down there to speed up traffic—which ultimately cuts costs of transportation—they have paved all the shoulders and they put passing lanes on all of the hills, so in effect when you are driving along if a truck and you are on two lanes the truck driver just pulls over to the curb where it is paved and he allows you to go by and he continues at his speed.

If we had this type of highway development we would find that transportation would move much more rapidly, thus reducing the time factor in transportation and ultimately reducing the cost of transportation. We would also, as a result of that, Mr. Speaker, be able to reduce the destruction of our highways because in the final analysis, the destruction of highways is a result of moisture in the roadbed. If the roads were paved right to the edge of the shoulder, there would be very little moisture that would get underneath and we would ultimately reduce the destruction of roads—

Mr. W. Newman: The member's leader said to cut down on highway expenditures, now he is—

Mr. Singer: Will the member tell us how he is going to—

Mr. Martel: It is helping! They are paying their share according to the statistics that are available anyway.

We might also consider, Mr. Speaker, some innovations in highways that this department has refused to do. I have suggested for the past 3½ years that we should start to use slag from the various companies for road base, but we cannot even get an examination of it.

Mr. Singer: The member's innovations are not acceptable.

Mr. Martel: The CNR is hauling slag 1,200 to 1,300 miles now—

Mr. Singer: How much is the member going to pay to take over International Nickel?

Mr. Martel: —and has found that the roadbed for trains does not shift at all with slag. I suggest that if we were to try slag as a road base, which provides good expansion if there is ice and water, we would then be in a position, Mr. Speaker, probably—

Mr. Singer: How much is the member going to pay for Falconbridge?

Mr. Martel: —to determine if we could ultimately cut down the repairs which occur every four or five years. This is another improvement we could consider.

The last I am not going to comment on because of the lateness of the hour and simply because I want to talk about another subject for a few minutes so I will leave transportation.

There is one subject I want to discuss, Mr. Speaker, very briefly and it is almost a comedy—this little strike in the Sudbury area of 35 to 50 employees.

Mr. Singer: Is the member going to take over Abitibi too? How much is that going to cost?

Mr. Martel: They have been on strike now for 2½ months. When they attempted to organize it—it is interesting who the man is who is head of this company. His name is Fielding, Cecil Fielding. He ran against me and he ran on a policy—with big buttons—“Cec Fielding, the friend of the working man.” They had been on strike for 2½ months. Let me tell you what he offered in a five-year contract. He offered \$1.50 this year and \$1.60 next year, which is less than the minimum wage in Ontario.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A \$1.50 increase?

Mr. Martel: No, no, a 10-cent increase. Up to \$1.50 in the first year, \$1.60 in the second year, \$1.70 in the third year, \$1.80 in the fourth year, and \$1.90 in the fifth year. So that is a pretty good contract, a five-year contract.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): What do they work at?

Mr. Martel: —Lumber—making pallets for the International Nickel Company.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, after that offer went through, they went on strike, and he really believes in collective bargaining because he paid his scab labour \$2 to \$4 a day more than he paid his own employees.

Mr. Singer: Is the member taking over International Nickel?

Mr. Martel: And let me tell you another interesting factor, for the women working in an industrial plant like that, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: Is that part of the member's policy?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I am beginning to wonder what he used to do.

Mr. Martel: The women working in an industrial plant, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member may perhaps, in view of the lateness of the hour and the noise in the chamber, adjourn the debate and finish his speech.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, this will take only about two minutes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a provocative speech.

Mr. Martel: The interesting part in this little strike is that it involves men and women.

Mr. Speaker, in this day and age, he has outdoor facilities for the women and, 400 yards away, in the offices are facilities for the inside staff, the female staff, and they cannot use those facilities. I went to The Department of Labour and The Department of Health and said, "Could you at least look into that aspect, that there are indoor facilities? Why should these women have to use outdoor facilities in winter in northern Ontario?"

Mr. Gilbertson: That is lumberjack style.

Mr. Martel: The answer was that they sent an investigation team in, and do you know whom they interviewed? The manager. They did not interview one employee. The Department of Health and The Department of Labour interviewed the manager. He told them they took it upon themselves to use the outdoor facilities in winter because they had to walk 400 yards to an indoor facility. The women tell me that is a lot of nonsense.

Do you know why they cannot use the indoor facility, Mr. Speaker? The woman who is on staff indoors is afraid that those women in that community will cause her to have venereal disease from the toilet. We cannot even get the two departemnts over there to find out the facts. I have the health report right here where it says that they interviewed the son, or the manager—the manager of the plant.

Mr. W. Newman: Too bad they did not interview the member.

Mr. Martel: Oh, why does the member not go and blow up? He is nothing but a windbag tonight.

I have the report, Mr. Speaker, and two departments of this government could not even find out the facts. There has been a whole series of firings. They have all gone to arbitration and the unions have won every arbitration case. That is the type of friend of the working man you people tried to run. If that is the attitude that you people have toward government, you are dead in Ontario.

Do you want me to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member would adjourn the debate, if he is not finished.

Mr. Martel: I am finished.

Mr. Ruston moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, we will continue with the Speech from the Throne on Thursday.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. Gilbertson, Mr. Good, Mr. Martel	691
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Ruston, agreed to	719
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to	719



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, April 22, 1971
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon we have many guests in our galleries. In the east gallery are students from Romney Central School in Wheatley; in the west gallery from Brampton Centennial Secondary School in Brampton; and in both galleries from Mill Street Centennial Senior Public School in Leamington. Later this afternoon we will have students from the Waterford District High School in Waterford and from Orangeville Secondary School in Orangeville.

We will also have, this evening, the Delta United Church Scouts from Hamilton; the 22nd Humber West Scout Troop from Weston; the Business and Professional Women's Club from Hamilton; the Bendale 20th A Cub Pack from Scarborough; the Agincourt Scouts and Cubs from Agincourt; and I believe this afternoon we also have representatives of the Scarborough East Women's Liberal Association.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon it affords me great pleasure to be able to announce that we have as guests and to introduce to you, sir, and to the members of the Legislature, a very distinguished group of visitors from the United Kingdom.

Ten of the members of United Kingdom young farmers' clubs are in your gallery, sir, accompanied by members of the staff of The Department of Agriculture and Food. With your permission, might I ask them to rise and take a bow and be acknowledged by the House. We are delighted to have them here in Ontario.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): On a point of order, the group from Scarborough, sir—

Mr. Speaker: There are no speeches and no discussions by private members concerning visitors to this House. If there is a distinguished group from outside the country or a distinguished parliamentarian, **then they are** normally welcomed by a member of the government.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order if I could: The group referred to is the Scarborough University Women's Club and not the Scarborough East Provincial Liberal Association.

Mr. Speaker: I stand corrected. I had the pleasure of meeting the ladies in the company of the member for Scarborough East and I presumed that he would be seen in the company of his own ladies. I apologize to the ladies; but not to the member for Scarborough East.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have two very brief statements relating to certain news stories I observed this morning, as they relate to the issuing of licence plates for automobiles and, I assume, other matters.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize those from the socialist group have to make a lot of noise today to make up for their lack of members. Certainly we would not in any way want to inhibit—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We certainly do not want to inhibit in any way the dynasty-creating function going on in the nation's capital at this precise moment.

But I may have fun with that later today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): I am sure he will.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well I will try.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): We are witnessing the end of one over there.

Mr. Pitman: Two prime ministers from the same family.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not familiar with the details of course. I am informed that the

present decentralized system has been designed to provide an appropriate level of service and convenience to all parts of the province, with both efficiency and economy. I would assure this House that my government is always interested in promoting efficiency in every aspect of government administration.

Mr. Pitman: Efficiency!

An hon. member: A nice long line-up.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have issued instructions that a full review of the existing system be carried out and that alternatives and improvements to the existing system be examined thoroughly.

Mr. Pitman: Patronage replaces efficiency.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Never. Efficiency always comes first.

Mr. Pitman: The coalscuttle of this government.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: The Premier has really got it opened up.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I should like to announce the appointment of Dr. James McPhail Gillies as chairman of the Ontario Economic Council.

Dr. Gillies, who will assume his new responsibilities on June 15, succeeds Mr. William H. Cranston, whose retirement after almost eight years as chairman of the Ontario Economic Council was announced earlier this month.

A native of Teeswater, Ontario, Dr. Gillies has been a member of the Ontario Economic Council since last September.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): And the Conservative Party.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is he really?

Mr. E. W. Sopa (Sudbury): Tell the member for Peterborough he is a Liberal.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is he?

Mr. Sopa: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Really?

He is a graduate of the University of Western Ontario. He earned his MA at Brown University and received his doctorate in economics from Indiana University—and I would assure the member for Scarborough East he is nonetheless a Canadian.

Dr. Gillies is the Dean of the Faculty of Administrative Studies at York University. He established the faculty in 1965, following 14 years as a member of the faculty of the University of California at Los Angeles, where he was professor of urban economics.

Mr. Sopa: He is not a Rhodes scholar?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, that is one—well perhaps I was going to say something, Mr. Speaker, that I would regret; I will not. After all, the member for Scarborough East has guests here on this occasion and I would not want to embarrass him in front of his guests.

Mr. T. Reid: No chance!

Hon. Mr. Davis: And I will not even mention the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there are students here from Centennial High School in Brampton. I would not do that, Mr. Speaker. I would not welcome—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Why does the Premier embarrass himself in front of them?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Dr. Gillies has served in an advisory capacity to the government of Canada, the state of California, the city of Los Angeles, and laterly the government of Ontario. He is the author of a number of papers related to industrial development, municipal management and economics; is a weekly contributor to the financial pages of the Toronto Telegram; and has extensive experience in the business community.

I am sure I express the support of all members of the House in welcoming Dr. Gillies to his new responsibilities as chairman of the Ontario Economic Council. This is a challenging and important position and we all look forward to what I am confident will be positive and constructive guidance in the development of our province.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make—

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Bonaccord is going to do a review of the system of dispensing agencies!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, singularly enough it is not. I say to the hon. member for Peterborough—

Mr. Pitman: That would fit this government's pattern.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: My statement has to do with studded tires. The proponents of studded tires have made extravagant claims regarding the safety benefits they offer in winter driving.

Mr. Stokes: They are using the minister's figures.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: As Minister of Highways and Minister of Transport, I should like to put this matter in proper perspective for the members of the Legislature.

I will willingly agree that studded tires make driving easier on icy surfaces under certain conditions. However, Mr. Speaker, extensive research carried out by my department and under other independent research authorities, such as the Canada Safety Council, have shown they offer no advances over snow tires in snow or slush and they actually lengthen the stopping distance on wet or dry concrete or asphalt road surfaces.

There is, as yet, no evidence—

Mr. Stokes: There is no slush in Northern Ontario in the winter time.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member for Thunder Bay, who is interested in this matter, would like to hear what I have to say before he interjects any more?

Mr. Stokes: Be factual!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what I am trying to do if the hon. member for Thunder Bay would listen.

Mr. Stokes: Tell me any place in northern Ontario where there is slush from November to April.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: When members are ready.

Mr. Stokes: Continue.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Thanks very much.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Now if the galleries cannot be quiet, we will have to clear the galleries and if the floor of the House cannot be quiet, we will have to take some other action here. Perhaps we can do that, too.

Perhaps the hon. minister will proceed with his statement and he will be given the courtesy to which he is entitled.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will proceed.

There is as yet no evidence that the use of studded tires has reduced either the number or severity of road accidents in winter.

Research studies by the state of Minnesota and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec have failed to establish any such evidence and additional studies are now being made by the Cornell Aeronautic Laboratories on behalf of the American Association of State Highway Officials in a further attempt to do so.

Keeping in mind that the claims regarding the safety benefits are unproved, we have considerable evidence that any potential contribution to road safety as a result of the use of studded tires in winter is more than offset by the hazards they can create on a year-round basis.

There is no doubt that studs cause severe wear on both concrete and asphalt surfaces. This has been established by our own measurements and confirmed by the work of others; notably the special tests made by the American Oil Company under the joint sponsorship of eight of the northern states, which also proved that wear caused by regular and snow tires in the presence of salt and sand was negligible when compared with wear by studs.

It is obvious to anyone who drives on our highways that the use of studded tires has been one of the main contributing factors in causing the elimination of safety lane markings from our heavily travelled roads, and the rutted pavements which result from their use obviously constitute a serious traffic hazard.

Mr. Stokes: That is 10 per cent of our roads in the province.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Thanks very much for that contribution.

In my opinion the overall standard of safety on the paved road system in Ontario is lowered by the use of studded tires in winter and on this basis alone the prohibiting of studded tires is justified.

Since it was established that the general adoption of studs as an aid to winter driving would cause serious damage to paved highways, many references have been made to improved stud designs which should result in greatly reduced damage to highways.

Although the tire stud industry has implied that my department has not taken into account information provided by the industry,

in fact there have been many contacts over the past few months which have allowed the industry every opportunity to present further evidence and the only relevant information we have received has been the modified design of the new studs.

To date the industry has provided my department with no evidence of the reduction in pavement wear claimed for the new stud design. In fact, the most recent indications from the supplementary tests of this design in the United States are that the actual reductions in wear are very small.

While we have extended our observations of pavement wear and the premature removal of safety lane markings this past winter and have kept in close contact with our neighbouring provinces and states, no new information has come to light which would justify a review of the decision to prohibit the use of studs at the end of this month.

In fact, our inquiries and further studies have served to confirm the evidence on which that decision was based. The validity of our earlier work and projections has been substantiated by the further extensive studies made by other authorities.

There is an indication that many drivers gain a false sense of security of the effectiveness of studded tires in general driving conditions; and in some cases, studded tires may have actually contributed to accidents. There is considerable evidence that cornering and steering efficiency—cornering, I might say, would be manoeuvrability of the automobile—is reduced with studded tires.

The Legislatures of the states of Minnesota and Michigan are now actively considering recommendations from their highway commissions that they should ban studded tires.

The following is an extract from a press release dated April 8, 1971 issued by the office of the state highway commission in Michigan:

The state highway commission called today for a ban on the use of studded tires on Michigan highways. The commission's position was based on an extensive research project which showed that snow tires equipped with metal studs cause extensive damage to highway surfaces and, most of the time, provide less safety protection than standard tires.

We are also informed that the state of New York is moving in this direction.

As I mentioned in the House earlier this week, the Canada Safety Council has recently completed further performance testing on

studded tires and alternatives to studded tires, including the new stud designs.

The Canada Safety Council tests will be evaluated and all relevant evidence presented in the future will be given every consideration.

However, I must repeat, Mr. Speaker, there can be no compromise with safety on Ontario roads and any review of our decision will be based on factual information from any source and not on the emotional arguments put forward by the tire stud industry in their recent campaign.

Mr. Stokes: I take it the minister is still open-minded?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: About that much!

Mr. Speaker: Statements?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, in the Toronto Daily Star yesterday a story appeared on page 3 in connection with an interview I gave regarding government policy on vehicle purchases. I would just like to make some further comments on this subject and set out clearly the government's position.

In January, 1971, the Treasury Board placed a temporary ban on the purchase and replacement of cars and other vehicles affected by the elimination of the American auto industry's discount policies for big volume purchases. It was decided that all orders in the hands of the manufacturers would not be affected by the ban, and that all tenders in the hands of manufacturers would be received in the normal manner. However, no action would be taken on the placing of future orders and no further tenders would be processed.

Today we have relaxed the freeze and authorized tenders for 140 vehicles which are urgently needed by the Ontario Provincial Police.

On March 9, the Prime Minister set up a cabinet committee on fleet discounts following a discussion in cabinet on March 1. The members on the committee are the Minister of Highways and Transport, myself, and the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough); Mr. Howden of The Department of Highways, Mr. Higham of the Treasury Board; and Mrs. Mogford, who is the secretary.

The first meeting of this committee took place on April 15, and at that meeting the committee concurred with a Treasury Board decision to approve the purchase of 45 diesel snowploughs, since: (a) The vehicles would

not be purchased from the big three manufacturers, and thus would not be affected by the purchasing ban; and (b) because only immediate ordering of these snowploughs would ensure adequate snow removing equipment for the winter of 1971-1972.

The committee also agreed that its function is to recommend government policy in the event there is no relaxation of the big three manufacturers fleet discount ban.

Our information suggests that the elimination of discounts will involve additional expenditures to the province of approximately \$750,000 if we were to continue our policy of purchasing from the manufacturers at the retail list prices which they tendered on last fall rather than the previously discounted prices. I might just observe, Mr. Speaker, that to my knowledge it is unusual for anybody to buy an automobile, an individual or a group, at the manufacturer's suggested retail list.

We further agreed that Chrysler, General Motors, Ford and American Motors would be invited to send representatives to meet with our committee at separate meetings, which would enable them to explain and confirm the exact nature of the present situation with respect to fleet discounts. Some press reports have stated that the manufacturers may be forced to reinstate discounts on purchases for municipal and provincial governments, but that the discounts would probably not be as great as those discontinued.

We will also invite the automobile dealers' council to send representatives to meet with our committee. I think the members might also be interested to know that the first meeting between the committee and, in this case Ford, has been arranged for May 12.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, before the oral questions I have a point of privilege; not really a point of a member's privilege being taken away but perhaps added to.

I am sure the members of the House would be glad to join with me in congratulating the hon. member for Sudbury, because it was announced today that he was elected as one of the benchers of the Law Society of Upper Canada.

An hon. member: What was the member's platform?

Mr. Sopha: I had no platform.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): He did it the hard way; I got in the backdoor.

Mr. Pitman: No more speeches on the Law Society. The voice is silent.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The hon. deputy leader has the floor for questions.

PATRONAGE IN DISPENSING OF LICENCE PLATES

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transport.

Could the Minister of Transport advise us, in view of the Premier's statement about the dispensing of licence plates, if he still believes that \$3-million patronage is part of our way of life in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I find it difficult, Mr. Speaker, to relate the substance of the Prime Minister's statement to the question asked by the hon. member for Downsview.

The whole purpose, as set out by the Prime Minister in his statement as far as the issuing of licences is concerned, is to provide a level of service to the public with efficiency and economy—and I am repeating the Prime Minister's words. That is the basic substance.

If the hon. member is referring to some of the statements that I made in the press I have no intention of withdrawing them.

Mr. Singer: I did not ask the hon. minister to withdraw them. I asked him to justify them.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will justify them but, first, I will not withdraw them.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): It is an editorial question anyway.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is a rhetorical question.

I am satisfied, at this point in time, that the delivery of services to the people of this province is being conducted in the most efficient, economical manner possible.

Mr. Singer: A supplementary: I wonder if the Minister of Transport would not agree that at least in our big cities—Toronto, Hamilton, Windsor, Kingston London, Sudbury and others—where there are already in existence provincial buildings and/or provincial offices, the dispensing of automobile licences could be done there with efficiency and at much less cost to the people of the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot affirm that statement. There are a number of Department of Transport examination centres across the province and some of these are equipped to issue licences. Others are not.

When time is taken to examine the efficiency and the cost factors that are associated with the proposal or suggestion of the hon. member for Downsview, it does not quite stand up in terms of economy and efficiency.

First of all, if—

Mr. Sargent: That is pretty shaggy.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: How does the hon. member know? I have not fully answered the question yet. How can the hon. member reach that determination? How can the hon. member make that observation when he has not heard the answer? I ask the hon. member, Mr. Speaker?

I would like to draw one simple example. Even where driver examination centres exist—and recognizing that some of them offer the licence issuing service and others do not—I suggest for several reasons it would be still less economical and certainly less efficient to add civil servants to the staff of these driver examination centres to perform the service than to do it by licensed agents.

It would take, in most circumstances, at least the addition of one member of staff from the civil service, maybe two. I would have to suggest to the hon. member that the commissions that are paid are substantially less than the salaries that would be paid to one or more civil servants. I suggest that, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I make one more—I am not quite through yet, Mr. Speaker—I make one more suggestion to the members, that there is a level of service offered by these individual agents across the province beyond the normal hours of the civil service working day, when access to service can be provided and is provided.

I have one more observation—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If we were to confine the licence issuing service to these departmental agencies rather than have the local agencies situated very closely to each other, I suggest neither the purchaser of automobiles nor the vendor of automobiles could attain the service that is required in the interests of the public.

Mr. Singer: By way of a supplementary question, could the minister advise us if any progress has been made at all to implement the often-made promise by his predecessor that a system of selling all automobile licences was going to be inaugurated shortly, and it would operate out of the headquarters of The Department of Transport here at Queen's Park?

Mr. Speaker: That question is not supplementary, but the minister may answer if he wishes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I can offer no such assurance to the hon. member or to the House that that can be implemented immediately. I have examined the process. We have a target date goal of determining whether this is a viable or efficient operation, and it is 1973. I have grave doubts at this time whether the report that will be submitted to me by 1973 will convince me, if I am still there, that it will be a better service than is presently offered to the people of the province.

Mr. Sargent: We are going to change all that.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peterborough, a supplementary?

Mr. Pitman: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: In view of the lack of information which an employee of his department has—Mr. Humphries, who is quoted as saying in relation to the agents, that he doesn't know where the names come from—I wonder if the minister could indicate to Mr. Humphries just where the names do come from?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Peterborough, I think that is a fair statement as far as Mr. Humphries is concerned. Quite frankly—and I am not being brutal about it—I do not think that needs to be any of Mr. Humphries' concern.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, it is the concern of this Legislature. I wonder if the minister would mind answering the question and telling us where the names come from?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. member for Peterborough read the story in the Globe and Mail this morning and he would be able to discern certain elements of the advice he is seeking from that story.

The minister may—

Mr. Pitman: I would like it right from the horse's mouth.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right! Now the member is going to get it from the horse's mouth; that is where he is going to get it from.

Mr. Sopha: Be careful about the end of the horse.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would reply to that, Mr. Speaker, by saying that if there is anyone who is familiar with the wrong end of the horse, it might well be the hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: I concede; I give up.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That could well be construed, Mr. Speaker, as the north end of the horse going south.

Mr. Singer: Go back to licensing.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Back to our national way of life.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Now back to the question asked of me by the hon. member for Peterborough: I would like to think that he and every member in this House would agree that there are certain levels of determination left to the minister and certain levels of determination left to those who serve the minister; and that is the way it is in The Department of Transport. But let me pursue that a little bit further, because this is a very important matter. There are certain people who advise the minister on a variety of things—

Mr. Sopha: Like Ernie Jackson, for example.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am inclined to take the advice from time to time of people whom I know I can rely on and whom I respect. However, Mr. Speaker, let me go that far and say that all the determinations that are made as to who are appointed as agents are not of one political stripe; they are not. There are other reasons why people are appointed to these offices.

First is their ability to conduct a proper basis—a proper performance of their duties. That is number one.

Number two: There are many situations where people are not able to conduct any other form of employment but they can perform this one. Those matters are taken into

consequence. There are many situations when the advice that comes to the minister comes from Legions and people representing veterans. This is taken into consequence. But there are other areas where, of course, the normal flow of advice comes to the minister through sources that my hon. friend will be familiar with, and Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to take it.

Mr. Pitman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister table in this House a list of all the agents who are selling licences only and their gross incomes for the year 1970?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): The hon. member will never make a leader.

Mr. Sargent: Only a tip of the iceberg.

An hon. member: We are disappointed in the member.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, in terms of sensible responsibility, it is public information—

Mr. Sargent: Tell us about the payoff to the car dealers.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: These agents are paid from public funds. I have no compunction about tabling this information in the House. The figures that will be shown in each circumstance will be gross figures.

Mr. T. Reid: They are gross-indecent-figures?

Mr. Sopha: Gross misconduct!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would remind the hon. members that they are gross figures. The agents, whether they are in small communities with minimum gross figures, or large communities where they are larger, provide for all expenses; including staff, facilities—whether they are rented or owned—everything that can be characterized as an expense except the forms. The government provides the forms for the sake of uniform reporting of course.

So if these figures are tabled they are gross figures. The only way the cost factors can be determined is to go to each agent and ask him. We have not done that. It is possible I could provide a few examples to the House later on, examples across the province which will indicate the gross figures and the net figures. But to do it with 250 agents would be a very difficult task.

Their expense factors are known only to themselves. They do not have to provide these figures to the House. But I say to the hon. member for Peterborough that the figures are basically shown in gross terms. The net terms are very, very different.

Mr. Pitman: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the minister might clarify a statement he made this morning in relation to the town of Walkerton, where there is a testing centre and where there is also an agent. The question was asked, I think, as to why the testing centre could not deal with the giving out of licences. The minister replied: "There is probably some good reason."

Has the minister yet discovered what that reason is? Would he not say that the reason is that this government puts patronage ahead of efficiency in this province?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

The hon. member has asked his question.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): A horse and buggy government!

Mr. Speaker: The member for Niagara Falls has the floor. This will be the last supplementary on this question.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Fire all the civil servants who are not socialists.

Hon. E. A. Dunlop (Minister without Portfolio): That is what the leader said.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, is the minister acquainted with the fact that Quebec mails out the licences? Licences are purchased through the mail in the Province of Quebec. Would the minister consider selling licences to people in the Province of Ontario if they wanted to purchase them by mail?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, for the record, anybody can buy a licence by mail in the Province of Ontario today. The other facilities are provided for local convenience as well.

The members of this House, or any member of the public in Ontario, can submit their cheque with the proper forms to headquarters in Toronto and their licences will be mailed to them.

Mr. Sargent: How many people know that?

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): The member did not know it?

Mr. Sargent: If the minister is so smart why is he not in the front row?

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): What a motley bunch over there.

Mr. Bukator: In view of the large amounts of money spent by the department to advertise, would the minister not consider the possibility of advertising to the people of the province and acquaint them with the fact that they can purchase by mail and eliminate a lot of these patronage offices?

An hon. member: That is a good question.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: First, Mr. Speaker, you can misconstrue patronage. I have no intention to eliminate some of the things the member referred to.

As for the people's knowledge as to how they can buy licence plates, a programme of information starts three months in advance of the deadline date to purchase licences—by radio, television, press, bulletins; by every means. Three months' notice is provided as to when the deadline date approaches; during that process everybody is advised of the deadline date and it is indicated to them that they can go to their nearest agent or they can buy their licences by mail. So if the hon. member—

Mr. Sargent: This is the first time the minister knows what he is talking about. I did not know that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Then the hon. member does not listen to or read the media. There you are. The member knows now.

Mr. Speaker: The deputy leader of the opposition has the floor for further questions.

FARM MARKETING LEGISLATION

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food, if I could get his attention.

Would the Minister of Agriculture and Food care to comment on the statement yesterday of Monsieur Toupin, whom I am advised is the Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Quebec, that in view of the enactment of Bill 10 by this Legislature that his province is now going to enact retaliatory legislation in answer to the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I am very well aware of the statement—I read it myself—and we have also had conversations with Monsieur Toupin through interpreters. We know what his intentions are and he knew what ours were well before the legislation was ever introduced. As a matter of fact, he asked us if we would send him a copy of the legislation and—

Mr. T. Reid: What has that got to do with it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart:—we are very glad to do just that.

I do not think there is anything wrong with what we have done and I am sure nothing is wrong with what he proposes to do. If we are going to have legislation—

Mr. Sargent: It is tearing down confederation.

Hon. Mr. Stewart:—in these provinces, then I think we have to have people in all provinces who respect the legislation that pertains in other provinces.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Agriculture and Food advise us what was his response to the suggestion by Monsieur Toupin that Bill 10 be rescinded?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I was not aware that he had even suggested it.

CLEAN-UP OF MERCURY POLLUTION

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Would the minister care to comment on the conclusions in the pamphlet tabled by his colleague, the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle), called "Fishermen—About Mercury in Fish," which pamphlet was tabled on April 2, 1971? In it the Minister of Lands and Forests said there is no known way of getting mercury out of the water and that if we do not find a way that we are going to be in serious trouble.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Well Mr. Speaker, I do not necessarily agree with the conclusion as set out in that pamphlet.

This pamphlet, as the hon. member would realize, was put together some months ago and subsequently printed and then made available to us. We feel that there is a known way to reclaim mercury from the bottom of lakes and from river muds.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, if the minister is not necessarily in agreement with the contents of this pamphlet and it is presently being circulated to the people in the Province of Ontario, what steps, if any, is the minister going to take to have the pamphlet withdrawn from circulation or in fact corrected?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well Mr. Speaker, I do not think the phrase, or the submission, that the hon. member refers to really affects the importance of that pamphlet. The pamphlet is mainly for fishermen and for public consumption, as far as the mercury situation is in the Province of Ontario and the areas that may be contaminated. I do not think that editorial comment at the end of the pamphlet really affects the value of it.

Mr. Singer: I do not know how one separates editorial comment—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. deputy leader.

THE LORD'S DAY ACTS

Mr. Singer: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Attorney General. Could he tell us what action, if any, he has contemplated in relation to the recent report by the Law Reform Commission about Sunday law and generally the observance of The Lord's Day Act, Canada, and The Lord's Day Act, Ontario?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, government policy in this regard will be known in due course.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Is the member for Downsview praying there, or just asking?

USE OF STUDED TIRES

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport.

I wonder if the minister could tell us, in view of his latest announcement today, what he intends to do with cars which will be crossing the border between Manitoba and Ontario which will have studs? Does he intend to use the provincial police or some kind of an army at that border?

Mr. Yakabuski: Pick them up and run them in.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I think I would have to say that we will have to find reasonable means to do that if the

ban continues, and I have no reason to believe it will not as yet.

Whatever is required to stop the influx of automobiles with studded tires from other jurisdictions to provide protection for safety purposes and to prevent wear and tear on our roads will have to be developed.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Arm the border.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have had telegrams and communications with the hon. Mr. Borowski from Manitoba.

Mr. Pitman: I would like to see those.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have had an exchange—yes, I found them very interesting.

Mr. Pitman: I was sure the minister would. They are earthy, I think the term is.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: They are probably not printable, that is all.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not think I will table them in the House in the interests of Mr. Borowski, although there is no reason why I should protect his interests.

Mr. Pitman: Oh, that is interesting. By all means table them.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I do not think I will. But I have communicated with him very recently. His last communication was in response to one of mine where I indicated we have a very good film that is a complete portrayal of the damage that is done and the extent of the danger factors with studs vis-à-vis the safety factors. He asked me for a copy of the film and I have agreed to send it to him.

Mr. Pitman: I hope the minister has a nice long session with him.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I hope that enlightens him, if that is possible.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question of the minister: Is the minister prepared to have inspectors at the points of entry from the United States into Ontario to prevent those individuals from visiting our province simply because they have snow cleats or snow studs on their tires?

Mr. Pitman: That will do the tourist industry a lot of good.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I think my answer to the hon. member for

Peterborough more or less answered that question. If the ban on studs is to be continued as far as the people of Ontario are concerned, I do not know why people from other jurisdictions should have special privileges.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister prepared—

Mr. Speaker: We are now back in the same discussion that we had earlier in this matter. This will be the last of the supplementaries on this question, because there are many other more important matters that have to be discussed.

Mr. Sargent: Is the minister going to turn visitors back?

Mr. B. Newman: Is the minister prepared at some time in the future to go into an extensive advertising campaign in the United States to inform our American visitors that they will not be allowed entry into Canada if they have studs on their tires?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I regard that as a hypothetical question. I do not think I shall answer it, sir.

Mr. Sopha: What is hypothetical?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough has the floor for a new question.

Mr. Singer: This is the Ontario border; no studs or broilers!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Watch your language.

Mr. Singer: They are going to add to the list later.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

AUTO LICENSING AGENCIES

Mr. Pitman: I would like to direct a question to the Prime Minister in relation to the stories that came out this morning in relation to the licence dispensing agencies. I wonder if he will comment on his statement.

Look, if the only criterion were the colour of your political stripe, then I am prepared to say it (the system) is not the best. But I know it's not altogether that way.

Perhaps the Prime Minister could first indicate what are the criteria; and second what he means by his statement "he will look into it?"

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think that my statement at the beginning of the session this afternoon was very clear—hopefully it was understood by the hon. member for Peterborough—and will constitute, I think, a very excellent answer to the question that he has just asked. I will send him a copy of it if he did not hear it.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary!

Mr. Shulman: Yes, a supplementary: Is the Prime Minister aware that at least one of his Conservative appointees as a motor vehicle issuer was so carried away during the last issuance of licences that he put on his bulletin board—the public bulletin board—advice to the public that one of the political parties in this province should never be supported?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Depends on which party.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of it. If the hon. member for High Park is referring to the party with which he is sometimes associated, I could only observe that—perhaps not in that particular location; nor am I necessarily condoning it being put there—perhaps it was a point of view that might be expressed by other people in many other places for many reasons, including myself right here.

Mr. Shulman: A further supplementary: Would the Prime Minister intervene with the hon. Minister of Transport who refused me equal space on the same bulletin board?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Shame!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it now becomes obvious from the hon. member for High Park's supplementary question that it was the party with which he is sometimes affiliated that was referred to on the bulletin board, and of course I am somewhat interested in this. I question whether in fact I have the capacity—even with the assistance of the Minister of Transport—to see that equal time and space is provided. However, I will look into it.

Mr. Stokes: Just confirms our suspicions.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peterborough.

LIQUOR OUTLET PATRONAGE

Mr. Pitman: I would like to ask a question, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the statement that the Prime Minister made regarding the

Liquor Control Board. I think the statement was: "I asked some people in my riding if they know of anyone who needs help."

I wonder if the Prime Minister is aware of the fact that there are people on this side of the House who also know people who need help; and whether he would be prepared to give us the list of those to whom we should assign those who need help in our ridings?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No way!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, before ever becoming a minister of the Crown and knowing how some of the members opposite operate, I know—

Mr. Pitman: No way. The Minister of Transport says, "No way!"

Hon. Mr. Davis:—without any question there are a number of people without any particular political persuasion who are employed by the Liquor Control Board stores during the summer and winter months. I can say without any question that there are a number of people who are not necessarily known supporters of the party that I represent who are so employed, Mr. Speaker. I can only go back to my own experience in the former department when I—

Mr. Pitman: I have never been asked for any names.

Hon. Mr. Davis:—have had requests, from the member for Peterborough in particular on one or two situations, relating to certain situations within his own constituency where, as Minister of Education—

Hon. Mr. Dunlop: Advance them. Find out who are in need and advance them.

Hon. Mr. Davis:—I endeavoured to be helpful on one or two occasions, which really constituted the paying of a grant to a very worthy group of young people, who in fact were referred to me by the member for Peterborough. We are very non-partisan in the approach to these situations.

Mr. Pitman: Thank you. I think the minister refers to institutions.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will go one step further. I have had requests from the member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: For what?

Hon. Mr. Davis: For what? To assist in a certain teach-in at York University and Glendon College—

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): That is not—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not saying I should not have. It was quite—

Mr. Pitman: Would the Prime Minister please answer my question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: What was that?

Mr. Pitman: In relation to the Liquor Control Board jobs, I think to clarify this, I have always requested on behalf of an institution.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

The hon. minister has answered the question and he is entitled to answer it in any manner he sees fit. He has answered it. We will move on to another question.

Mr. Pitman: All right, Mr. Speaker, if I could ask—

Mr. Speaker: No more supplementaries. We will move on to another question.

AMERICANIZATION CONFERENCE

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Another question: I wonder if the Prime Minister could indicate to the House whether he has secured the assistance of Mr. Eddie Goodman in relation to the conference on Americanization he intends to hold this spring, in view of Mr. Goodman's well known views on Americanization and the fact of his status in the Conservative Party?

Mr. Sopha: What status?

Mr. Singer: Never heard of him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of people being involved in the discussion of the formation of this conference. I have made a mental note that the member for Peterborough completely endorses the views expressed by Mr. Goodman, and he himself—

Mr. Pitman: I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Did the member not?

Mr. Pitman: I find it very interesting and very different from what I heard over there, though.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I assumed, by the fact the member asked the question, there was some endorsement of his point of view.

Mr. Pitman: Yes, I think he is better than the member for Don Mills (Mr. Randall).

Mr. Speaker: Order! This is not a debate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would only say this, Mr. Speaker, that there will be many points of view expressed at the conference that is being convened. I must say this, there is some doubt in my mind that one Mr. Waffle will be invited necessarily to present his point of view. Although in a public situation he may decide to—

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Watkins.

Mr. Pitman: The Premier means Mr. Watkins.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —Watkins, rather—present his point of view.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? Any supplementaries?

Mr. Pitman: A final question, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Randall: The mad professor.

LABOUR DISPUTE IN NIAGARA

Mr. Pitman: In view of the very real concern, I wonder if I could ask the Prime Minister whether he would ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Carton) to intervene as quickly as possible in the dispute which is now taking place between the Niagara Board of Education and the supporting staff? And would he find out whether one of the major issues is The Equal Opportunity Act—that is the refusal of the board to pay men and women employees the same rates for what is virtually the same work.

Mr. J. R. Simonett (Frontenac-Addington): It happened in Ottawa yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would be quite prepared to discuss this with the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The member for Renfrew South.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT LOAN

Mr. Yakabuski: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Prime Minister. I wonder if the Prime Minister could tell the House about the \$17 million loan that was made available by the federal government to the province to stimulate work projects? Was this loan interest free; and if not what was the rate?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I really could say that I am glad that question was asked. I would say to my good friend and colleague that if he is patient, as the Throne Speech develops here in this House today there may be some very specific reference and an answer to this question in the wind-up of the Throne debate itself. I would not want to leave that out of my contribution this evening. The answer will be in that.

Mr. Sopha: I am not going to announce it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know the member is not, but I am just telling my colleagues that I shall.

Mr. Singer: Is the Premier going to take part in that debate?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: It is a point of personal privilege, sir. Did the Prime Minister in his jesting remarks to the deputy leader of the NDP state or imply that I had intervened with him to get someone a job at York University? Because I did not.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am just saying that there have been a number of occasions when members opposite have requested assistance from the ministry, as they should, relating to certain situations and projects which they hold dear to their hearts. I recall very specifically the member for Scarborough East speaking to me about assistance for a certain symposium at Glendon College. I do not say he should not have—

Mr. Pitman: For institutions. That is surely different from a job?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but I am just saying that these requests come from all sides of the House, from all members.

Mr. Trotter: Does the minister consider that political patronage?

Mr. Singer: It is better than a patronage appointment.

Mr. Speaker: The member has made his point; the minister has answered it, therefore it is not a question for debate.

Mr. Sopha: The leader of the NDP got his father-in-law a job. He got his father-in-law a job with The Department of Welfare.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce.

LOANS TO MEDICAL STUDENTS

Mr. Sargent: A question of the Minister of Health: To aid in the search for doctors—there is a shortage of doctors up our way—the State of Michigan is giving advanced medical students \$2,000 a year at three per cent for four years if they will pledge themselves to a small community to work as a GP for a year. Would the minister advise the House if there is such a plan available to give us more doctors in our area?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I cannot recall the details of our programme as I stand here at the moment, but we have a similar programme in operation and have had for a number of years in relation to special subsidies for doctors who will pledge, in return, service in particular small communities—mainly in the north I believe, but small communities generally, I think, can qualify.

Mr. Sargent: Would the minister send me the information on that?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, I will.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Trade and Development has the answer to a question asked by the member for Brantford.

ODC LOAN PROGRAMME

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Brantford asked, on April 6, and I quote:

Can the minister indicate why ODC loans to fishermen are made only on the basis of economic viability when in fact legislation passed in this House was to provide loans to fishermen on the basis of injury to the fishing operation?

Mr. Speaker: I believe the legislation referred to by the hon. member is The Fisheries Loans Act, 1970, which was passed in May, 1970. This House was advised on April 2, 1971, of the government's intention to revise and continue this programme. This Act is administered by The Department of Lands and Forests and is not the legislation under which the ODC loans are being made.

I will return to the ODC loans in a moment, Mr. Speaker, but The Fisheries Loans Act was the result of a federal-provincial agreement to make funds available on an interest-free basis to persons engaged in commercial fishing in waters where the taking of fish was prohibited because of contamination of the fish resulting from polluted waters.

The purpose of this assistance was to provide temporary aid for the fishermen while they sought compensation for those responsible for acts of pollution affecting their livelihood. I should mention, in passing, Mr. Speaker, that after the first year the federal government has opted out of this agreement and the provincial government is carrying on on its own.

Returning now to ODC loans to fishermen, Mr. Speaker, may I say first that it is a fundamental principle of all ODC loans that they are made on the basis of economic viability. The ODC loans to fishermen, including the group at Erieau, are intended to assist the fishing industry on a long-term basis to adapt to changing conditions and to restructure their operations so as to take fish species that are not polluted, in waters that are not as seriously affected as those where fishing has had to be prohibited entirely. We believe that this is a very practicable approach on a long-term basis.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that these two programmes are complementary.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question?

Mr. Stokes: May I ask a supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: In the absence of the member for Brantford (Mr. Makarchuk), yes.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister table a list of those companies that have been assisted under the terms of reference mentioned by the hon. minister?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South has the floor.

Mr. Ferrier: My minister has gone out of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Then the member for Sudbury East.

TABLING OF DEATH CERTIFICATES

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): A question of the Attorney General: In view of the facts that on four occasions last year I asked the Attorney General's predecessor to table death certificates related to Indians, that I have not received them to date and that they have not been tabled, is the minister in a position to indicate if in fact these death certificates do exist and when he intends to table them?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, were these all relating to deaths of three, four, five, six, seven years ago—none of them closer than four years anyway?

Mr. Martel: Several were within the last two years, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I will take a look at the matter and report to the member.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

SANITARY LANDFILL FOR TORONTO WATERFRONT

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management: Since his department's waste management branch and the Ontario Water Resources Commission appear to believe measures can be taken to protect water sources in the Kleinburg area from contamination by the proposed sanitary landfill project there, does the minister now consider that the same principle can be applied to the development of the Toronto waterfront so that garbage can be used there as fill?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I would not want to draw a conclusion like that submitted by the hon. member. I have had no opportunity to discuss a comparison such as this with members or representatives or officials of my department. It is quite possible that the conditions for putting fill in the Toronto waterfront area would be quite different from that of the Kleinburg area.

I wish to reiterate, however, that the officials of my department are satisfied that the proposed site in the Kleinburg area is safe from all their particular responsibilities and interests, but I would not want to comment on the analogy as put forward by the hon. member.

Mr. Deacon: A supplementary: Is the minister aware that the Toronto waterfront proposal put forward by authorities there included the construction of a dike and impervious liners and drainage basins for the landfill project so that all seepage could be collected and fed through the sewage plant to avoid contamination, and therefore, the same principle is applicable in that situation? Should there therefore be reason not to—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is asking a question!

Mr. Deacon:—allow the garbage department of Toronto to dump down there?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I am aware of the facts that were submitted in the hon. member's question regarding what is to be done in the Toronto waterfront. I am aware of that, and I am aware of the features of that proposal. I am not aware of the comparison.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Bukator: Is the minister aware of the fact that Buffalo has done just this kind of a job along the Niagara River across from Fort Erie? They put in a retaining wall, back-filled with garbage and as a matter of fact, burned some off. Is it possible that we could use that method here too? If they are using it in international waters it must be all right.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That method has been used in Ontario up to now.

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: This will be the last supplementary.

Mr. Sargent: Will the minister advise now if the fill now going in around Ontario Place is a continuing programme? Where is the money coming from to do this? Is it part of the Ontario Place programme? Is the Harbour City programme now in full flight?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: All I can say to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, is that ain't pollution.

Mr. Sargent: All I want to talk about is where the money is coming from.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: Where is the money coming from for this continuing programme of fill?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's question is not a supplementary.

Mr. Sargent: They are stick-handling.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of University Affairs has an answer to a question.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is free, gratis!

FORESTRY COURSES AT LAKEHEAD UNIVERSITY

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the question was asked a few days ago concerning the application from Lakehead University to extend the forestry course at that institution from years

one and two to a full four-year programme. I am pleased to announce, at the urging of the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) and the members for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman) and Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Wishart), the government has agreed that this course should be extended to a full four-year programme.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Prior to making this decision I invited the comments of the president of the University of Toronto. He was not completely satisfied with this proposal, but was good enough to indicate to me that there might be some internal reorientation of the University of Toronto which would make this government policy change acceptable, or at least endurable, to that great university institution.

Mr. Speaker, as you will remember, I provided a very lengthy answer to a question concerning U.S. financing of research in Ontario universities, the day before yesterday. I can now complete that, rather briefly I am glad to say, by reporting on Ottawa, McMaster and the University of Windsor.

The University of Ottawa receives \$2,000—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order!

May I ask you, sir, if it is within the purview of the minister to keep answering a question at his leisure, day after day? I understood that it was the rule of the House that he could take the question as notice and deign to give us an answer again. This is the third time he has risen to acquit himself daily to answer this question. Is this within his right?

Hon. Mr. White: Speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The first of the three times I simply said I did not know and I would find out, which does not, I think, constitute a lengthy reply. On the second day I gave 90 per cent of the information, which I can now complete.

In point of fact the question should never have been asked here. It should have been put on the order paper.

Mr. Bullbrook: Speaking again to the original point of order, if I might—I did not particularize in questioning the Speaker. May I ask the Speaker again if a minister has the liberty of rising day after day—notwithstanding the fact that he does not take the question as notice—and of continuing to answer the same question?

Mr. Speaker: First of all I would point out to the hon. minister that the course of action he suggested lies with the ministry and that is that if it should be a question for the order paper the minister may direct it there, and I would suggest that in future this might be done.

Secondly, so far as I am concerned, if the hon. member has asked a question and wishes information, and the minister answers it to the best of his knowledge and ability at that time or the next day, then I think he is perfectly entitled, if he obtains other information which is of value to the House, or which he thinks is of value, to bring it and to give it to the House.

I would rule as far as I am concerned that the minister may complete his explanation. The question period has now about a minute to go.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, the University of Ottawa received \$2,000 from the United States Information Services for a conference on their campus. They have two on-going projects—\$13,112.98 from the U.S. Army for chemical research into electrolysis, and \$18,000 from NASA for chemical electrolysis research.

McMaster, nil.

Windsor has an on-going project on the interaction of radioactive rays in the upper atmosphere which has been in progress for about five years at \$30,000 per year, and which is partly sponsored by the U.S. Air Force.

In addition, "projects from military-type American companies" at the University of Toronto and York University: neither of these received a single cent.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has now expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Wishart presented the report of the companies branch of The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs with respect to the licences issued to extraprovincial corporations for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1970, as required by section 359 of The Corporations Act.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko presented the following reports:

The annual report of the Ontario Stockyards Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970;

The annual report of the Minister of Agriculture and Food for the year ending March 31, 1970;

The report of the Co-operative Loans Board of Ontario for the year ending December 31, 1970;

The annual report of the Ontario Food Terminal Board for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1970;

The annual report of the Ryerson Polytechnical Institute for the year 1969-1970;

The annual report of the Minister of Lands and Forests of the Province of Ontario for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1970;

The 50th annual report of the Public Service Superannuation Board for the year ending March 31, 1970.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson from the standing private bills committee, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr1, An Act respecting the City of Brantford.

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting Protestant Children's Homes.

Bill Pr4, An Act respecting Huntingdon University.

Bill Pr6, An Act respecting Reliable Plastering Limited.

Bill Pr10, An Act respecting Zurich Life Insurance Company of Canada.

Bill Pr13, An Act respecting Hillbrook Investments Limited.

Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the Abbey Life Insurance Company of Canada.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill Pr2, An Act respecting Protestant Children's Homes, and on Bill Pr4, An Act respecting Huntingdon University.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I table herewith, pursuant to subsection 5 of section 6, of The Expropriations Act, 1968-1969, copies of orders-in-council which have been granted by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, exempting the inquiry provisions from being applied in certain expropriations. I would emphasize to the House, Mr. Speaker, that an exemption of this nature does not prohibit the application of any other provision of the Act.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence presented the annual report of the Fire Marshal for 1970.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Arrangements have been made for all members to receive their copies today, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

CONSUMER CREDIT REPORTING ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the Control of Credit Reporting Agencies, the Collection of Credit Information and Credit Reporting.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, perhaps a brief word as to the purpose and import of this legislation.

The short title is The Consumer Credit Reporting Act. The full title of the bill, I think, is quite descriptive—An Act to provide for the Control of Credit Reporting Agencies, the Collection of Credit Information and Credit Reporting. Briefly, what the bill proposes to do is to provide for registration of credit reporting agencies, controlling the information that may be stored for credit reporting or included in a credit report, requiring the use of a credit report to be disclosed on request and disclosure of the information that is contained in the report, requiring that that information stored in Ontario, and a provision for correcting such information if it is found erroneous.

Mr. T. Reid: Just like my bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Probably a little improvement thereon.

Mr. T. Reid: Oh yes.

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. MacNaughton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amalgamate The Department of Highways and The Department of Transport.

Motion agreed to; first reading the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, this legislation will create The Department of Transportation and Communications as proposed in the Speech from the Throne. The Act will amalgamate The Departments of Highways and Transport. It will transfer, or permit the transfer, to the Minister of Trans-

portation and Communications, the legislative powers and duties now performed by the Minister of Highways and the Minister of Transport. This includes administration of such legislation as the Highway Improvement Act, The Highway Traffic Act, The Commuter Services Act, and The Airports Act, along with many other responsibilities of the two portfolios.

Without pursuing the details, I can indicate that amalgamation will provide us with significant opportunities to develop a comprehensive transportation service to the people of Ontario and to incorporate efficiencies and economies in planning and operations.

As His Honour suggested, the objective of the new department will be to provide a functional, integrated and balanced transportation system, embracing both public and private transportation, to serve the needs of each area of the province. Our principal approach will be the consideration of all forms of transportation as an entity of service for the movement of people and goods rather than a competitive network of individual modes or facilities. Our concerns will relate to the appropriate balance between public transit, commuter services and motor vehicle traffic, as well as rail, air and water services throughout Ontario.

While we will give emphasis to the comprehensive transportation needs of larger cities and their commuter neighbourhoods, we will also concentrate on the provision of adequate and economical transportation for our rural and remote areas.

We believe that improved service will result from the decentralization of our operations with the strengthening of regional offices across the province. In each of these regions, the director will report directly to the deputy minister and will have the authority to resolve many questions without reference to head office at Queen's Park. In addition to more prompt services to local people and municipalities in each of the regions, the decisions will reflect more accurately the specific conditions and needs in local communities.

We anticipate substantial economies from the consolidation of facilities and of support services to the operations now being carried out by the two departments.

The planning and research functions of both departments will be brought together to co-ordinate all our efforts toward improvement in transportation. In the field of traffic safety, for example, we can co-ordinate all

considerations toward the reduction of road, vehicle, driver and passenger hazards. Similarly, in pursuing improvement of air services across the province the amalgamation will enable close co-ordination of ground transportation requirements which are essential to convenience and efficiency of air services.

We can facilitate the planning and development of service corridors for transportation and communication needs to achieve economies in land use and investment. We will be able to co-ordinate and intensify our emphasis on aesthetic and environmental planning in the continuing improvement of our road system.

As previously indicated, the new department will be given responsibility for the operation of the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission whose services will be incorporated into our comprehensive planning.

I will be reporting to the House at a later date on our involvement in telecommunications services across the province. We are developing the appropriate policies to ensure that the interests of Ontario are represented fully in the many developments taking place in this field.

MINING TAX ACT

Mr. Bernier moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, most of the sections of this bill are of a housekeeping nature although it should be pointed out that section 3 repeals the annual tax on the production of natural gas because it has been determined by Crown counsel that this type of tax is ultra vires to the province.

The annual tax collected ran from \$60,000 to \$70,000 and for this year there is no amount forecast for the revenue proposed. The only other significant amendment is provided for in section 4 and this will permit the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to establish interest rates on overdue taxes or on a refund of overpaid taxes at the current rate of interest instead of the established six per cent rate presently provided for under the Act. Sections 10 and 11 also provide for increased penalties for non-compliance with the Act to bring the penalties in line with the present-day value of the dollar.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex South): I wish to join in this debate today—I believe this is now my fourth one since I have been here in the Legislature, being my first term, and I have had the honour to participate in all of them. I am looking forward to different circumstances, probably, when the next one comes up.

I think it would be an opportune time now to congratulate the new Premier (Mr. Davis) and wish him well in that office, inasmuch as it may be quite brief. We will still wish him well as head of the government of Ontario.

It was interesting, Mr. Speaker, when I attended the convention to view the proceedings and the choosing of the leader of the Tory party for Ontario on Thursday evening at Maple Leaf Gardens. I went in with a friend of mine and as we went in on the main floor I met the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs—as at that time he was; now the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough)—and wished him well. Since he is a resident in my riding, I thought it was only proper that I should do so. I did not join in with him when he went on the floor with his parade but did go up into the gallery and watch the proceedings from there.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Was the member impressed?

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): A very intelligent move.

Mr. Ruston: I noted with interest that night the rousing speeches that were going on. The Minister of Municipal Affairs gave a rather rousing speech in my opinion and said that he would fight the opposition head-on. I think he made mention that the New Democratic Party was his opposition but I think in the last month or so he has changed his mind on that matter. The present Premier took it a little cooler as is his custom.

The maverick candidate, now the Minister of Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), was in his

usual style shooting from the hips—or lips, whatever you want to call it—anyway he was shooting. The present Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) gave a stirring speech, but I believe he should have had Billy Graham standing in for him. Perhaps he would have shown a little more class for the type of speech he gave.

Then came Friday night on TV. The man who still played the old party line—and probably the most conservative of all the candidates—in its true form was the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough). I had already predicted to friends, as we viewed the proceedings that night, that the present Minister of Education would be Minister of Education under the present Premier, and the Treasurer would be the provincial Treasurer. They questioned my authority on that but it turned out to be the facts. I suspected that the Treasurer would not support the Minister of Justice since he had one way to go and that was with the party faithful.

It would seem rather odd that the Treasurer, coming from a semi-rural riding with strong opposition to the Premier, would have the nerve to walk over and say “this is the man,” and hold his arm high in the air with that of the Premier. The real kingpin behind the Treasurer was Richard Walker, QC, known also as the Conservative kingpin in Essex county. He was the engineer of this brave step.

However, Essex county and Windsor was not able to elect a Conservative member in the last election. So it appears that Mr. Walker ensured the election of all Liberal members of the area in the upcoming election.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I have a few other remarks but I just want to make a note here on one that was up on the question period today and which is in the paper today about “Patronage: 50 Cents an Auto.” In my opinion that is peanuts compared to the Liquor Licence Board of this province. I think it is the most corrupt of any government agency in the Province of Ontario, and I defy anybody to show that anyone can get a licence unless approval comes from someone in the hierarchy in the Conservative Party of Ontario.

There are many areas of concern to me, some of which overlap one with the other. We have today a rather strange economy. On one hand we have unemployment at a

rather high scale, while at the same time we have the continued pressure for higher wages and the greed for higher profits in a few areas of industry.

In my humble opinion, one of the causes of the inflation cycle was the ridiculous rise in interest rates in the past three years. The banks, mortgage lending companies and finance companies took advantage of an opportunity they saw to make high profits and this reflected on the cost of everything we bought. Let us face the fact that we are living on borrowed money in this day and age and if interest rates go beyond reason, we are bound to have it reflected on our everyday living.

In essence, the control of interest rates is a must and the restraint of the public is necessary if we are going to keep these rates in line with the ability to pay them. I have here a letter from a constituent who signed a contract to borrow money from Avco Finance Company. The interest rate is 21 per cent; apparently they did not read the fine print or did not even bother, as many only look at the amount of the monthly payment.

I believe our education system should have a course in our schools from grade 7 up explaining the system of interest as it pertains to our financial structure and the results of it on our everyday lives.

The cost-price squeeze and wage controls are matters of some discussion at this time. I have here a survey made in my own riding; one of the questions was, “Are you in favour of wage controls and price controls?” I found that out of 1,850 replying, 1,400 voted for wage controls and 1,294 for price controls. There is little difference in the numbers for price controls and wage controls and part of that reason was that a large part of my riding is rural and some of the farm people are very reluctant to vote for price controls when their prices now are below the cost of production.

If we consider the benefits now available under welfare allowance, one can see the reason why some people try to avoid working for a living. It is most unfair when one can collect more from welfare than working on a low-wage job. The ridiculous part of it is that one must pay income tax on money earned working, and yet the welfare allowance is not taxable.

In other words, under the present regulations one can work for eight months of the year and if he spends it as fast as it came in, regardless of how much he makes, and

he is then laid off and can prove to the welfare worker that he has no money, they will give him full allowance for the rest of the year, tax-free. In the meantime, at the end of the year the income tax department will refund him a sizable amount because he did not work the full year—and of course his income tax was deducted while he was working on the ratio of working the year around. In other words, it is to his advantage financially not to work year-round under our present system of handouts.

This in itself is some reason for a high amount of registered unemployed, especially to a certain group that has very little initiative to work. I do not think we can afford to continue the handout system without some form of work involved for those medically fit.

We read in the newspapers only recently of \$250,000 paid to millwrights in Nova Scotia for not performing work. We have to pay for this in the end in the cost of the products from this company; and to add salt to the wound this company received a large incentive grant from the Nova Scotia government to compete against tire manufacturers now in Canada.

Only recently the State of New York passed legislation that employable welfare recipients must work for benefits. It means the state will make work for those unable to find jobs elsewhere. One wonders if this is the answer.

An hon. member: That is a beautiful way out.

Mr. Ruston: I find, in my own conversations with the working man today, that he is very reluctant to give benefits to those sitting on their behinds.

As for prices of goods for farm commodities, one wonders where justice is when the farmer must sell eggs for 20 cents a dozen. The cost of production of a dozen eggs generally combines feed costs amounting to about 20 cents per dozen, the cost of the hen bird balances out about nine cents, and the building and labour costs from four to five cents, for a total cost of production of about 34 cents per dozen.

I noticed in the supermarket the other day that the price of eggs was marked as a special for the weekend, "Three dozen grade A large, \$1." When one considers the high food value of eggs it is probably the lowest-priced article for the shopper today. Even if the price was 50 to 60 cents per dozen it would be an excellent buy.

The price of pork products is another area of despair to many farmers at this time, when one is forced to sell 150 pounds of dressed pork for \$33.75. I doubt if anyone can raise and feed that animal up to a selling weight for less than \$45 as a very minimum.

One wonders when you see what people in other areas of our country are paying for items at this time. I have here a report from *The Globe and Mail* of April 14, 1971. It is an account of the living conditions of the Metis in Brochet, Manitoba. In the Hudson Bay store the price of eggs was 85 cents per dozen, bacon 95 cents per pound. Perhaps what we need more than anything is a system to distribute our surplus food products to the areas of real need in our own country.

In discussing our education system and the vast amount spent on it, one wonders just who the people are planning and administering it, and of their actual capabilities.

I notice in the public accounts for the year ended March 31, 1970, that there were 460 employees with The Department of Education with salaries over \$15,000; the average of these was about \$18,500—and they vary from \$15,000 to \$20,000. This group is in the K-13 formal education classification. These are not teachers; these are in the administration staff. We look at public accounts March 31, 1967; there 210 were in supervision division earning \$15,000 or more; curriculum division, 22 over \$15,000. In other words there were 232 in the head office receiving over \$15,000 in March, 1967, while in March, 1970, there were 460—an increase in three years of 228 officials in one department alone receiving over \$15,000 a year.

This is going on even with the county school boards in operation, which are supposed to be self-administering. When a director such as the one in Essex county board is allowed to carry out his own ideas the way he has, one really wonders where we are going. These boards were set up with one idea in mind, and that was the structure of them was to be centred in the director as the key man with most of the power vested in him. It will take legislation to rid the boards of this type of control and return it to the elected people.

For instance, in the decision to build a new school in Sandwich West township, regardless of the conditions of the site the director insisted on the location even if it meant \$300,000 in extra footings due to soil conditions. Perhaps we should call the

pilings and extra cement work the "wood foundation" or the "wood mausoleum."

In Ontario, we educate about 365 medical doctors a year, while in Quebec 600 are graduating a year. We have people with degrees and PhDs walking the streets, but not enough doctors and dentists to look after the needs of the people of this province. Why do we put government funds into graduates who have no future in the labour field when we have shortages in the very important fields of medicine and dentistry? Let us put the priorities where they belong and subsidize students that will go into the medical school and dental field to see that our needs are met right here in Canada. In the Province of Ontario last year there were 743 doctors licensed, and as mentioned previously only 365 graduated here in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly on The Department of Highways and, especially as it pertains to the recently retired minister (Mr. Gomme). He was, in my opinion, the most ill-advised minister I have ever seen in my few years in this House. I attended meetings with him and people from his department and Essex county road officials and the complete lack of knowledge he had was incredible. He allowed his assistants to put words into his mouth and some of them were telling half-truths but the minister with his blank look would say nothing.

Thank goodness he had the sense to retire, but due to his lack of knowledge of some of the decisions he made, the people of Essex county will be paying increased local taxes. I believe the province should take over the balance of the county road, north of Highway 77, in order that we would have a provincial highway running north and south, and this would then service the new provincial park on Lake St. Clair at Pointe aux Roches. The Department of Highways must also take over the Howard Avenue route to Holiday Provincial Park from the county as this services the border crossing from Detroit out to the park.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): I am right behind the member there.

Mr. Ruston: With the returning of Highway 2 from the province back to the county for 16 miles, this has forced or directed many trucks into the heavily built-up area of the old Highway 39 and this has caused a great many problems. This Highway 39 was partially constructed—there were a number of villages all the way through it. Now with the signing of Highway 2 going in through

there, an awful lot of trucks go in there and it is really causing a lot of congestion and problems with people in that area.

Another thing, with provincial Highway 98 turned back to the county, the county has seen fit to lower the speed limit to 50 miles per hour and on the portion we have of Highway 2. The county did it to try to get the main traffic or the through truck traffic off the road, but we find that the traffic is still as high as ever on those roads. Yet the county is paying for the upkeep of them, so that is one thing that a new government in Ontario will do; it will certainly straighten out the road system in Essex county.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Right on the button.

Mr. Ruston: The county roads needs study that was just recently sent to the Essex county council—the member for Essex South has mentioned this before in some of his remarks and I think we brought it up in The Department of Highways estimates last year—recommended that one of the top priorities is a road into Point Pelee National Park. Yet the province has not seen fit to take any interest in that up to now.

I would hope that with the new minister, the situation may be rectified in some way. We are looking forward to those improvements in the near future. Mr. Speaker, since the Throne debate is a wide-ranging topic, I will touch on only a few items and very briefly on them in order to allow other members to speak on it.

The Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr) has the control of the Ontario Water Resources Commission. At a time like this, I think it is very imperative that he should pull out all the strings and all the stopwatches and everything on the Ontario Water Resources Commission and look at their files. I imagine he has there, over 100 of them probably, partial plans of sewage disposal systems and water projects, particularly, sewage disposal systems. I know in my own area there is a number of them that have been on the drawing boards for years.

Even if it takes some minor pieces of legislation, speed them up. I think he should get busy at them and put them in. This is the time they should be going in. He is asking for a cleanup by 1973 of the phosphates. Go out and do it now.

I am glad this minister is here, because in my estimation I think that he is capable of having this done. He might have to push

some other fellows around a little, but this is the time that this should be done. It has just been going on too long—four and five years—what with the red tape, contracts they must have between the municipalities and the OWRC, and Ontario Municipal Board approval. There has got to be an easier way than this. I have mentioned this before in the estimates. It is almost unbelievable the length of time it takes them, from the original thought of even having sewage disposal until the final work is done on it.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): He is big enough to push them around, too. He will take on any three at one time, he says.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch on a subject of interest at this time and that is the automobile insurance field. I wish to point out that I have no association of any form with any type of insurance of any kind. I believe that the automobile insurance industry should continue to be a part of the private sector, with all of the advantages of the competition which this gives the consumer in both rates and service. It is the duty of the government of Ontario, representing the public interest, to see that this competition is real and apparent, and further that minimum standards in service and equitable premiums are maintained.

I believe that no motorist in the Province of Ontario should be licensed to drive on our roads unless his automobile is covered with suitable minimum standards of liability insurance. Since this makes automobile insurance compulsory, then rate and policy changes of a significant nature affecting large groups in the province should be justified before public hearings of the appropriate standing committee of the Legislature. I believe that the substantial reduction in costing and time-consuming litigation and other benefits should justify the implementation of compensation-without-fault insurance.

The State of Michigan is now considering a no-fault insurance bill that would provide up to \$8,000 settlement immediately without regard to which driver was at fault. After the settlement is made, an arbitration panel would then decide which insurer should pay. The panel's decision would be binding. At the same time, the superintendent of insurance who now oversees all insurance companies in this province could be given the power to examine the books of such insuring companies to assure the public that all income, whether interest or investments or premiums, would be included as income.

The superintendent in the past has been in close touch with many insuring companies in a similar manner, and there is no reason why this type of examination cannot be done; at the same time the company would have to show cause, if it requested a raise in premium, not only to the superintendent but to the previous committee mentioned.

I cannot see any reason at this time why we should form a complete new government bureaucracy for automobile insurance. What happens if the government sets this system up, as recommended by the NDP, and after one year or two years there is a loss? We can be pretty sure then they will not raise the premiums. They will take the funds from the general tax structure in order to hide it—and this could go on forever.

If we look at the Saskatchewan rate for automobile insurance, they charge \$85 a year for \$200 deductible and \$50,000 public liability. We must remember that Saskatchewan is a rural province and the amount of traffic does not at all compare to the Province of Ontario. The rate in Ontario for a farmer outside the metropolitan area is \$90, and this includes \$50,000 public liability, \$250 deductible and \$25 deductible comprehensive all-peril. This is also 10 per cent less with five years' accident-free driving.

Let us compare apples with apples in looking at auto insurance. The average car in Ontario is driven many times more a year than the average car in Saskatchewan or Manitoba and traffic is much more congested in Ontario.

The present system of removing chronic dangerous drivers from the road is far from satisfactory in Ontario. We should be pressing for more driver education courses in our schools, probationary licences for one year for all new drivers to ensure that the general public will be protected from the dangerous driver.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept the concept of yet another government agency at this time. We now have over 60,000 civil servants in the Province of Ontario and this is increasing by thousands every year. Plus there is more than 22,000 in the Ontario Hydro system. It is our duty as legislators to see that the public is aware of the pitfalls of yet another government bureaucracy, as I feel the people of Ontario as a whole may end up paying for car insurance when they themselves may not even own or drive a car. This ends my remarks.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, rising to speak in the Throne debate, I would first of all like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on the excellent and capable manner in which you preside over the deliberations of this House. I know that at times we, the members, make your job very difficult.

I would also like to congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis), on being elected leader of the Progressive Conservative Party and Prime Minister of Ontario. I know that he will serve as Prime Minister of this province for many years, in spite of some of the statements that have been made by the previous speaker.

I would also like, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate those members who have been elevated to the cabinet. I trust that they enjoy many years of service to the people of Ontario.

In participating in this Throne debate, I want to deal with a matter of vital importance to all segments of society in our province. It is a matter of agriculture—the very soul of our existence.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I should preface my remarks with the fact that I do not necessarily choose to speak on this matter simply because I am a farmer. I intend to speak on other issues as well. However, I feel that the role of agriculture is so critical to our people that I should undertake to outline some of the significant factors which, it would appear, have failed to command the attention of the members sitting opposite in particular.

It is a known fact, Mr. Speaker, that the increasingly urbanized society of our province continues to place a greater dependence on our farms today than at any other time in our history.

As a result, each farmer in Ontario produces food for at least 40 other people. A substantial portion of our province's labour force—estimated at 18 per cent to 20 per cent—is employed in industries and services related to agriculture—either marketing, processing or distributing food products, or providing the services and inputs necessary for efficient production.

Statistically speaking, the output from Ontario farms has increased in the past 10 years, although the number of farms and the number of farmers have declined. Cash receipts from farm operations have increased from just over \$850 million in 1960 to well over \$1½ billion in 1969. At the same time, the average farm was 150 acres in 1960 and it increased to 175 acres by 1969. The selling price received for many farm products has

not increased in the last 20 years. Farmers have survived because of their efficiency. However, I would question how much longer this basic industry can continue to survive when our costs of production are increasing every year and our selling price either remains static or becomes lower.

It is rather interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the capital investment in the industry has swelled from \$3.7 billion in 1959 to \$4.25 billion in 1969.

Mr. Speaker, this government has continued to acknowledge the critical importance of our farms as related to our province. It is this government's intention to do everything in its powers so that Ontario agriculture shall continue to progress and move ahead, building on the foundations that have been established and the progressive policies that have been provided.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Nonsense!

Mr. McNeil: The role of The Department of Agriculture and Food in this province should be to provide programmes that will help the farmer help himself.

We have developed and provided a variety of programmes in an effort to assist our farming community so that this very important segment of our society will continue to function—to provide food and all the other necessities of life for not only the people of this province but for export as well.

To mention a few of these projects, I refer to such programmes, Mr. Speaker, as ARDA, agricultural extension farm management services, veterinary services, tax reduction and others. The latest of these included the provision of capital grants programme as announced in the Speech from the Throne. A few days later, the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) outlined the important aspects of these grants—and important they are indeed.

The increase in the maximum amount of grant available from \$2,500 to \$3,000, and the provision under which a farm partnership would be eligible to receive up to \$6,000 is most welcome in any farming community and particularly so in mine.

The basing of capital grants on a straight 40 per cent of the cost is another logical move. Previously, the base carried varying percentages.

Then, too, the expansion of the classification of farm drainage and farm structure is most welcome, for now farmers can include such works as maple syrup structures, various

equipment, bulk milk tanks, fixed livestock scales, fixed wastage disposal systems, electrical wiring and natural gas installations as well.

Farming today represents a large investment in land, buildings, machinery and livestock. One of the great problems which we face in agriculture is the amount of capital required by young farmers to enter this business. No industry, Mr. Speaker, can survive without vigorous additions and replacements and this can only be provided by our youth.

I have always felt that the junior farmer loan programme was the best means of encouraging young men to enter agriculture. Unfortunately, because of the tight money policy, our government was forced to discontinue this programme, feeling the farm credit would be able to service this need adequately. It would appear that such is not the case and that a great deal could be accomplished in agriculture if we could develop plans to help finance young men interested in entering this field of endeavour.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Why did the member's government stop the junior farm loan?

Mr. McNeil: Because the federal government had a tight money policy. That is the reason.

Mr. Ruston: The member's party cut it out.

Mr. McNeil: That was the federal government. The opposition sat there and did not do a thing about it.

I commend the government on the removal of dead elms. Although the dead elm problem is perhaps not as acute in my riding as in others, Mr. Speaker, this government's programme of such removal has provided winter employment for many people in my riding—employment for people who—

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): It is a good thing.

Mr. McNeil: —may have been on welfare rolls otherwise.

Mr. Gaunt: It is a good job we have a federal government. The hon. member has somebody to blame.

Mr. McNeil: We in Elgin county have benefited greatly from the capital grants programme, Mr. Speaker. During the period from April, 1970, until the end of February, 1971, The Department of Agriculture and Food approved a total of 106 applications

for construction; the total amount of grants was \$68,945. Seventy-four applications for drainage were approved for a total of \$43,402. Thirty-two applications for farm wells were approved and these amounted to \$17,064. There were 22 application approvals for farm ponds for a total of \$12,940 and 43 application approvals for field management for a total of \$8,346.

To sum it up, Mr. Speaker, Elgin county received payments totalling \$150,699 as a result of 277 application approvals for capital grants.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that there are few in this Legislature who will not agree that the government of Ontario has indeed a great interest in the future and development of our farm lands.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. McNeil: However I wondered, since those hon. members sitting opposite have always been so vocal on just about every issue there is, what they proposed to do for our farming community?

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): Everything!

Mr. McNeil: Of particular interest to me are several of the New Democratic Party agricultural policies approved last fall during their leadership convention. This party calls for legislation to give farmers direct and equal representation on the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Board.

Mr. Brown: Good idea.

Mr. McNeil: Everyone knows, Mr. Speaker, that the organized marketing of farm commodities in Ontario is carried out under the authority of two pieces of legislation, The Ontario Milk Act and The Ontario Farm Products Marketing Act. The Ontario Milk Act is administered by the milk commission of Ontario, a body which is appointed by order-in-council. It supervises the operation of milk marketing agencies in the public interest and acts as a court of appeal on matters of concern to those who own the industry.

The chairman of the commission is a civil servant, Dr. K. McEwen, who acts as director of our total dairy section. His qualifications are the fact that he is a veterinarian, a specialist in public health and dairy husbandry.

The vice-chairman is an economist from the University of Guelph, Professor S. Lane.

The three members of the board are George McCague of Port Elgin, a farmer with a long background in co-operatives and marketing; F. A. Stewart of Almonte, a farmer; and W. T. Murchie of Toronto, who has a lifetime experience in the dairy processing trade.

It would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that farmers are well represented on this commission.

At a marketing level, the Ontario Milk Marketing Board and the Ontario Cream Producers Marketing Board are both made up entirely of producer-elected members.

Here is the story of membership on the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Board. The chairman is Mr. E. Mighton, a civil servant and a marketing specialist. The vice-chairman is a civil servant and an agricultural extension specialist. The members of the board are: Ray Loughheed of Barrie, a farmer, dairyman and producer of poultry, a former president of the United Co-operative of Ontario; Ed Hutton of Guelph, a farmer and poultry producer; and Don Paxton of Brighton, a food and vegetable producer.

Again, the majority of the members of the board are farmers—and good ones, too.

I do not mean to take anything away from the NDP, Mr. Speaker. They do have a good idea, except that this government made it into law some time ago.

Another policy of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, calls for the formation of a Crown corporation to distribute farm machinery. There is nothing new about this policy, this has been suggested before and rejected on a number of occasions. It was rejected because there was no evidence that substantial savings would result, as the NDPs would have us believe, or that the international suppliers would indeed be prepared to service the Ontario market under these circumstances.

I am sure the hon. members are aware too, that the farm machinery industry has been subjected to a federal royal commission, a report that is being eagerly awaited.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Said farmers could save \$15 million on the inefficiencies of the distribution system right now.

Mr. McNeil: The NDP are merely second-guessing the royal commission's findings but they should be second-guessing that the whole of Canada would impose such a policy, not just this province.

The Ontario Federation of Agriculture is presently involved in the importation and distribution of farm machinery and we believe that this is the logical group to realize any savings that might occur, at least to this point.

Still another policy of the NDP calls for a divided municipal tax rate. Surely the farm tax rebate on rural education tax in 1970 fulfilled this requirement, Mr. Speaker, in the commitment made by the Minister of Agriculture and Food and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) last fall.

Yet another policy calls for the outlawing of foreign ownership farms. Let me assure this House, Mr. Speaker, that foreign investors are looking for high profit investments in Canada certainly, but agriculture is not one of these. The vast majority of our farms are owned by farm families and this will continue to be the case.

I would like to have dealt also with some of the Liberal policies on farming, Mr. Speaker. However, in searching through their policy statements I have been unable to find anything until just recently. Within the last week they came forward with a publication known as "The Blueprint for Government." Looking over that policy, Mr. Speaker, it reminded me of trying to sort out wheat from chaff. There was very little wheat but a lot of chaff in their policies.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Put it to them.

Mr. Ruston: The hon. members are all chaff over there.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: Give it to them.

Mr. McNeil: Another very important issue, one that concerns every citizen of our province, Mr. Speaker, is that of the economic and unemployment conditions in our country. Certainly there has been a great deal of talk on the matter in the past months. It is only a short time ago that we carried a special debate on this matter in this House.

Mr. Ruston: We never finished it.

Mr. McNeil: This debate went on for two days, and will probably be resumed once it is possible to provide additional time. However, all the talk—particularly by the Liberals and the federal government at Ottawa—has done very little if anything for those hundreds of thousands of Canadians who have found themselves suddenly out of

work. It is little comfort for the family whose breadwinner is out pounding the pavement looking for work, that Mr. Benson boldly states that at last we have broken the back of inflation. And I say this, for a few days later reports showed an increase in the unemployment level.

At the same time, I am advised that there has been some relief in the unemployment situation. But let us not get overly excited about this, Mr. Speaker—this trend is primarily due to the fact that the hard winter months are over and a great number of seasonally unemployed have returned to work.

The government of Ontario has, in my opinion, contributed tremendously to easing the unemployment situation. Recently the Ontario cabinet approved a provincial-municipal programme to provide some 7,500 new jobs across Ontario in the form of grants to municipalities towards the cost of eligible projects. This put Ontario's employment programme at a total cost of \$16.9 million so far. An estimated 12,000 new jobs have and will result.

The government has also increased the student summer programme from 11,000 to 14,000 this summer so that our student population will not only have an opportunity to earn money, but also to gain valuable knowledge and experience as well.

Beyond this, the province is dedicated to policies that eliminate all unnecessary government expenditures and at the same time stimulate the private sector of the economy where there is sufficient flexibility in the provincial budget to allow this.

Aside from continuing to fight the present deplorable condition, Mr. Speaker, this government also continues to provide a variety of other assistance and services to municipalities across the province.

In my own county of Elgin, for example, there has been a great deal of activity in the way of educational assistance. The general legislative grants for the Elgin County Board of Education during the past year totalled over \$7.5 million. This breaks down to \$3,660,000 for public schools, \$900,000 for separate schools, and \$2,980,000 for secondary schools. With the grants being increased by the department and with an excellent school board operating in our county, our mill rate for education has been kept in line for the year 1970.

The Department of Education has informed me that the allocations of funds for the 1971 capital programme for the Elgin County Board of Education includes a new senior

school which will cost \$750,000 and an addition of \$200,000. I am told that The Department of Education's share of the cost of these two projects will likely be in the vicinity of \$500,000 for the new senior school and \$60,000 for the addition.

The separate school board in the county has provisions in its 1971 programme for the replacement of a school at St. Thomas and its location on a new site. The total cost of this structure, I am told, is about \$425,000. This government will pay somewhere in the vicinity of \$350,000 towards the building and the new site.

The board of education has made an addition to Port Stanley Public School which was at an early stage of approval on January 1 of this year. The total cost here is estimated at \$639,000, with a grant approval of about \$500,000. This project will likely reach the construction stage during this summer.

From the point of view of social services, The Department of Social and Family Services has undergone many changes on welfare allowances and some supportive services. The department has branched into the full range of social assistance and social services—services which emphasize prevention in the context of both family and community.

In 1967, The Department of Public Welfare became The Department of Social and Family Services. This was a significant change, for it represents the new directions taken by the department in the last decade. In all programmes—from day nurseries to care for the aged, from child welfare to services related to social assistance allowances—there has emerged a new emphasis on prevention and rehabilitation through guidance and counselling. From the former emphasis on the individual and his particular needs, has come a greater awareness of family needs.

In 1971, family benefits and general welfare assistance allowances take into account the entire family budget, not just the budget of the individual recipient. In 1971, the Children's Aid Societies make every effort to work with the children in their own homes, trying above all to keep the family together. In 1971, the day nurseries branch encourages and assists day care centres which serve the family, both the child's need for an enriched environment and the mother's need for employment.

All of these changes are reflected in the social services available to the people of Elgin.

We are proud of our homes for the aged in this riding with accommodation for some 357 elderly people. The newest of these homes, Valleyview, is located in St. Thomas and was opened in 1970. Valleyview was built with the help of the department and the city of St. Thomas, and has the distinction of being the first home in Ontario with a drop-in centre for our aged. This drop-in centre is providing a great service to the senior citizens of St. Thomas.

Three private day nurseries in St. Thomas provide day care for 50 children. All are licensed and supervised by the day nurseries branch of the department. The Margaret Ostrander Nursery and the St. Thomas Nursery both have agreements with the city of St. Thomas through which the city subsidizes the costs of day care for the children of families in need of assistance. Under The Day Nurseries Act, The Department of Social and Family Services pays a subsidy of 80 per cent of these costs. The Little Friend Nursery also provides day care for 10 retarded children.

Recognizing the needs of retarded and handicapped adults, the Friendco Adult Workshop and Training Centre in St. Thomas provides a sheltered environment for 35 trainees. The centre provides both assessment and on-the-job counselling for the trainees, and is working to help them develop their capacities to the greatest degree. Like the other 121 workshops in the province, the Friendco Centre is eligible for both capital and operating grants from the department. In 1970 the province raised its grant towards the operating costs of all workshops from \$20 to \$25 per month per trainee.

The needs of children and families in difficulty are met by the Elgin County Children's Aid Society. It is one of 51 societies in Ontario, and it provides counselling, preventive and supportive services, in addition to the protection of children through foster homes and the placement of children on adoption.

During the past winter, Mr. Speaker, many municipalities with small assessments have been experiencing a great deal of unemployment. Many of these people are employable and could be employed by the municipality in the roads department. However, if this is done the municipality receives a 50 per cent grant, whereas the municipality is subsidized by 80 per cent if the individuals are receiving welfare. It would seem to me that it would be advisable for the government to develop a programme to subsidize the municipality to the extent of 80 per cent if the welfare re-

ipient is employed by the municipality. This would, in my opinion, work to the benefit of both the municipality and the individual.

Finally, the direct services of The Department of Social and Family Services are available to the people of Elgin constituency through its London regional office and the St. Thomas sub-office. The department provides field workers, rehabilitation counsellors and legal aid assessment workers to meet the social assistance and social service needs of the area. In the fiscal year ending March 31, 1970, the province contributed a total of \$1.1 million toward the costs of assistance and services in this county.

The Department of Health, Mr. Speaker, has always played an important role in the county of Elgin and the past year has been no exception. For example, the St. Thomas-Elgin General Hospital, which has received \$1 million in assistance toward capital construction programmes, continues to receive annual provincial assistance in support of operating costs which amount to some \$5 million.

There are a number of proposed projects in the making for this hospital and you can be certain that this government will take financial part in these projects.

While only one facility lies in Elgin county, with respect to mental health, the needs of the county are met by other facilities that service this area. The 1970-1971 fiscal year budget figures for the St. Thomas Psychiatric Hospital alone are set at \$1,725,000, and there are a number of hospitals and centres in the surrounding counties which require millions of dollars in provincial assistance.

These, Mr. Speaker, are some of the programmes of assistance and policies of our government. These are only a few of the many that this government has undertaken to assure that this province continues to enjoy growth and development as it has in the past.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, in order to speed up the ending of this Throne debate I have cut out a few sections of my speech, but I must include a few words on the oral question period, especially since it has been reduced to 45 minutes.

Even when we had a one-hour period on Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays, there were many days on which back-benchers

could not get a question asked. Like other members, I have been prepared every day since March 30 to ask a question, but on only four occasions have I succeeded—and I have probably been more successful than most members.

The conclusion I have reached is that the two opposition-party leaders should be restricted to one question each, waiting their turn for a subsequent question until all other members who wish to ask theirs have spoken. Wars have been fought on the slogan, "One man, one vote." I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the back-benchers should unite in a campaign—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Hear, hear!

Mr. Burr: —based on the cry, "One member, one question."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): No questions at all. That is what I am for.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is right. No questions at all. No right to know.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Too many supplementaries.

Mr. Burr: In making this proposal, Mr. Speaker, I am not criticizing either opposition-party leader, unless they disagree with me. I am merely criticizing the question period as it has now evolved. I happen to have saved a few papers relating to the question hour, now 45 minutes long, and the following comments may be of some interest. They refer to what happened after the two opposition-party leaders had finished their questions.

April 7—Three of our members succeeded in asking a question.

April 8—One Liberal asked a question and we were shut out entirely.

April 13—Three of our members got in a question.

April 15—Our leader was able to ask only two of the five questions he intended to ask. All the rest of us were unable to get in at all, except on supplementaries.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a most unsatisfactory situation and I trust that the procedural committee will review the whole matter of the question period. When we first came here, the written question period, whatever its shortcomings, enabled every member to ask a question, subject only to the absence of the appropriate minister. Only on rare occasions was the question period unduly

lengthy. Now the question period ends after 45 minutes, leaving usually about a dozen members frustrated.

I should like to make a few observations on the recent behaviour of the government members opposite. Since the 1970 session ended they have acquired a defeatist attitude.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is true.

Mr. Burr: It has been very noticeable since this session began on March 30, 1971, that Tory back-benchers are practising their future role as opposition members by actually asking questions in the question period. On occasion they ask questions—

Mr. Singer: What will they think of next?

Mr. Burr: —which the ministers seem not to be expecting. At least, none of the ministers has yet read a prepared answer in reply. Even the cabinet ministers who were candidates for their party's leadership were practising throughout their campaigns, the gentle art of criticizing the government. The papers were full of these criticisms. I shall not repeat them, but every one of them—except the eventual winner—had apparently been listening to the NDP members of this House during the last session, for they often sounded very much like New Democrats during their leadership campaign trek around the province.

They were obviously practising for their coming role as opposition spokesmen. Although the new provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) has been perhaps the loudest doom and gloom speaker, or spreader, nevertheless the most defeatist attitude displayed by any member of the government was that displayed by the former Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) when he was being coaxed just before Christmas by the news media to announce his candidacy for the Tory leadership.

His excuse for delay was couched in those immortal words, "This needs careful thought. I do not want to become the Premier with the shortest term of office on record." Well Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that the new government—

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Prophecy, sheer prophecy!

Mr. Burr: —would be more generous in small matters, and less extravagant in large matters, but so far there has been no evidence to show any change of heart.

Mr. Pitman: There is a better audience elsewhere.

Mr. Burr: They are still combining extravagance with stinginess. I should like to give you one example of this. Most members could duplicate the examples I am about to give.

The Throne Speech on page 3—and I may be establishing a precedent by referring to the Throne Speech in the Throne debate—says: “The ministry will listen closely to the problems of the people and will act swiftly to resolve them. Policies will seek to expand and nourish individual initiative.”

Who could quarrel, Mr. Speaker, with such noble sentiment? But the first time I put them to the test, however, I found that the new ministry was no better than the old.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): We are better.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): A lot worse.

Mr. Burr: I am being gentle. A group of Sandwich West citizens in my constituency have banded together to form a little league baseball club for the boys of the community and to take on a king of big brother role for those boys who need extra attention.

They raise their own money and have just purchased a property which they are making into a ball diamond suitable for their purpose. They have built a field house and pretty well exhausted the funds which they had gradually collected.

Because the land is near Turkey Creek the edge of the property is swampy. The other edges of the property are also such that a fence is needed to enclose at least three sides of the field. About 1,500 feet of fencing is required—an expensive undertaking for a non-profit enterprise.

They appealed, Mr. Speaker, to The Department of Highways for permission to borrow snow fencing for the baseball season. Their appeals have gone right up to the minister. They are willing to transport the fencing and return it in condition as good as or better than that in which they receive it. They would even be prepared to post a bond. It would cost the Department of Highways not one cent. Yet they have been refused because—

Mr. Pitman: Would the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport (Mr. MacNaughton) do that?

Mr. Burr: —the department’s policy is not to lend snow fences.

This is not “listening closely to the problems of the people.” This is not “nourishing

individual initiative,” which this club has shown. This is not “nourishing private responsibility” which this club has assumed.

This so-called new government is even worse than the former one. A year or so ago I sought a \$75 monthly grant to subsidize a monthly bus trip for poor and elderly Windsor citizens who wish to visit friends and relatives in the Ontario Hospital at St. Thomas. These particular citizens could ill afford the train, bus and taxi fares which non-motorists must pay in order to travel from Windsor to St. Thomas.

The Minister of Health of that day (Mr. Wells) wrote me a sympathetic letter but said that funds were simply not available “no matter how worthy the cause.” This is arrant nonsense, of course. Consider the extravagance the government indulges in in what I am about to show you.

I have in my hand a recent government publication called the sixth report, 1969-1970, of the Council for the Arts. This is not a propaganda publication designed to lure tourists into Ontario or to encourage investment in Ontario. It is a simple report—a report in which only a handful of people in this province would be remotely interested.

Ten of the 32 pages are virtually blank. I am not referring to the covers. They are blank, too, except for a little on the front. Ten of the 32 pages are virtually blank. I took the trouble to cut up one of these books and to reassemble the type. The type all went on 11 pages, 10¼ to be exact. I have it here in my hand. It goes in quite nicely in 11 pages.

Yet this report is spread over 32 pages. I have ignored the four pages that constitute the cover. If I included these there would be 10 completely blank pages. In any event, the same information could have adequately been presented in a 12-page report instead of a 36-page report. Two-thirds of this paper is sheer waste; 24 pages in every report. The cost of the booklet is \$1.39 each, for this little report.

Perhaps you may say that as this report would be of interest to very few people only a couple of hundred copies have probably been printed. Therefore, why do I make a fuss about it? If you say this, that only a couple of hundred people would bother to read the report, I hope you do not include the 117 members of this House. I doubt whether 25 people in the province have read this report from cover to cover, except perhaps the typesetters whose company is named in the report—

Mr. Pitman: A captive audience!

Mr. Burr:—the lithographers whose company is named in the report, the producers whose company is named in the report and the printer and publisher, who happens to be the Queen's Printer. The report was printed by order of the legislative assembly of Ontario, according to a note at the very end.

If I had any part as a member in ordering this report to be printed, I apologize now, Mr. Speaker. Do you know how many copies were printed? Over 5,000 copies—each one with an envelope. So we can count, I suppose, another \$300 for mailing because there was no envelope to the \$7,200 which the report cost the taxpayers of this province.

Over \$7,200 for this annual report but not \$75 a month for financially hard-pressed citizens who needed help to make a monthly visit on a errand of compassion. And a refusal of snow fences to a worthy organization even though there would be no cost whatsoever involved.

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the promise in the Throne Speech—"the ministry will listen closely to the problems of the people and will act swiftly to resolve them,"—are words thought up by some ivory tower speech writer, not by members of the so-called new ministry. I am quoting again: "Policies will seek to expand and nourish individual initiative." As the French might say, Mr. Speaker, it is to laugh.

Of course, perhaps this promise applies only to private land speculators and private highrise apartment builders, not to the ordinary citizens who have ordinary problems.

I must make some comment about the \$35 million Dow deception to place it on the record. This is probably the most blatant example of election-time gimmickry that we in this province have experienced in recent years. The lowest estimate for the time this suit would take in the courts is 1½ years. Other estimates go as high as 10 years.

The Trail smelter air pollution dispute, you may recall, lasted from 1928 to 1941—that was 13 or 14 years. What can we expect in this case?

Because the suit is based on charges such as "trespass on Crown property"—that apparently means the river bed—and "nuisance to the environment" there is high probability that Dow will be acquitted, especially as it will be a fairly simple matter for Dow to prove that scientific knowledge has given no reason for the company to suppose that it would cause any harm.

As this is apparently a test case other actions will be delayed until this one is settled. If this analysis is correct, Mr. Speaker, the suit is just a pre-election propaganda device to persuade the people of Ontario that the government is taking a tough line against polluters.

A simpler way of demonstrating this would have been to pass legislation making all polluters of the natural environment liable for damages. This would go a long way toward proving the government's good intentions.

I have had complaints from the auto plants both at Oakville and Windsor about in-plant pollution. One of the bad spots in the factories seems to be at the end of the line where car motors are started up and in the car conditioning area.

At Chrysler's in Windsor there are at least seven workers whom I could name, and many more of whom I have heard, who would tell you that they know that the fumes and the bad air were directly responsible for their afflictions. Some of them have had to retire early because of their miserable ill health. Let me identify these men and these afflictions: Mr. T. H.—throat operation, voice box lost; Mr. R. F.—voice box removed; Mr. W. T.—voice box removed; Mr. J. C.—throat operation, now deceased; Mr. T. M.—lung cancer, now deceased; Mr. G. H.—lung and throat cancer, now deceased.

There can be no doubt, even though there can be no proof, that in-plant pollution has shortened the lives and increased the pain of these workers.

The Department of Labour could play a leading role in reducing or eliminating in-plant pollution, and I commend this project to the new Minister of Labour (Mr. Carton). I am sure that this is a field from which he could derive great satisfaction by insisting that workers have a better working environment.

I should like to report briefly on the air pollution situation in Windsor generally. The members may be interested to know what progress has been made. The people who live around the Ford plant will give you quite an argument if you suggest that there has been any improvement. However, we are promised by the department considerable improvement later in the year. Windsor now has an API—air pollution index—which of course does not change the air pollution one particle. It simply gives a rough estimate of how relatively bad it is from one day to another.

The International Joint Commission's recent report showed that maximum fluoride air pollution in the Windsor area came to 2.9 parts per billion, which is higher than the maximum found by the United States National Air Sampling Network study in numerous American cities in 1967-1968. The maximum in this study was 2.5 per billion; so Windsor area is now worse than the American cities mentioned.

One part per billion, of course, Mr. Speaker, is the maximum permissible level in Ontario.

Windsor's API does not include any fluoride measurements as part of its index. We continue to remain in the dark in this matter, except once in every five years or so when the IJC makes a new report.

The API in Toronto has one advantage over the API in Windsor: If the index rises threateningly in Toronto, the minister can close down certain of the worst polluters. In Windsor, however, the minister's jurisdiction stops at the Detroit River. So far his persuasive powers have not convinced Wayne county officials or Michigan state officials to agree to a formula by which Michigan industries would be ordered, or even requested, to cut back or close down during periods of excessive pollution resulting from a combination of factors, including stagnant air.

Had such an agreement been achieved, a significant step forward would have been taken toward international co-operation dealing with pollution matters, and Windsor could have looked forward to a levelling off of the peaks even though the day-to-day pollution remains as serious as ever. Even this small gain has not yet been achieved. About the only progress that seems to have been made is in the reduction of the famous "pink cloud" from Zug Island. There are now times when there is hardly any remnant of this pink cloud to be seen, although I am assured that shortly after midnight is not one of those times.

That is not good enough, Mr. Speaker, for Windsor has the highest rate of lung cancer in the province, yet I am sure that many people still do not quite believe that air pollution really hurts anyone very much. Let me read from a letter written by a chest physician, Dr. S. L. Kolber, of Montreal. He writes:

How much more evidence will be required before the government sees fit to enact the legislation required for air pollution control?

As a chest physician, involved with the problem daily, I feel it my duty to point out that the causal association between air pollution and lung disease, particularly bronchitis and emphysema, is now generally accepted. In the past decade or so the mortality rate in these diseases has increased to the point that at the present time approximately 10 times as many people are afflicted by these diseases, compared to 15 years ago.

For those who are unaware, these illnesses are as devastating as heart disease since they are potentially lethal, and in many cases severely crippling, leading to premature retirement and a lifetime of frequent hospitalizations.

It is very disconcerting to see many healthy people in their twenties and thirties afflicted with prolonged or chronic chest diseases, especially this winter when the atmospheric sulphur dioxide concentration has been dangerously high. The only real cure for their symptoms is to abandon their urban environment.

This calls to mind a recent survey in Los Angeles which revealed that 10,000 persons had been advised by their physicians to leave that particular urban environment.

Dr. Kolber's letter continues: "But someone may say that this is just one doctor's opinion, not supported by evidence."

I wish to put on the record of this House the result of a controlled study by Dr. A. A. LaVerne, a psychiatrist at New York's famous Bellevue Hospital. In all probability he has done more work than anyone else in the field of what is called "pure air therapy."

Dr. LaVerne was not interested in going over ground already covered, linking air pollution with chronic diseases, namely, asthma, bronchitis, cancer, emphysema and heart disease. He was interested in the minor symptoms which most people tolerate without seeking medical help, such as burning of the eyes, difficulty in concentration, impaired judgement, insomnia, irritability, fatigue, lassitude, headaches, and many other symptoms.

Dr. LaVerne's groups consisted of 100 apparently normal citizens, none of whom was under any kind of medical care, none of whom considered himself sick. When interviewed, however, they described various symptoms mentioned above as well as many forms of urinary, bowel and stomach distress—sweating, perspiration, palpitation, tremors,

a continuous state of anxiety, as well as various sexual inadequacies.

Fifty subjects breathed, during their sleeping hours, ordinary New York City air which had been compressed into tanks, while the other 50 subjects breathed compressed pure air. This was a so-called blind test in which no subject knows to which group he belongs. Seventy-two per cent of those who inhaled pure air recorded various degrees of improvement in their symptoms. The improvements, or lack of them, were measured by investigators who did not know to which groups any of the subjects belonged, thus making it what is called a double blind study.

Among the 50 subjects who inhaled their normal diet of air—that is, ordinary polluted New York City air—there was no discernible improvement in their various symptoms. Remember, Mr. Speaker, this is a double blind test. Dr. LaVerne's work with pure air therapy leads him to stress two points:

1. Air pollution reduces efficiency in most areas of cerebral functions.

2. The healing process, both in physical and mental illnesses, is seriously impeded in the treatment of patients in a polluted-air environment.

Scientific journals have documented the connection between air pollution and the serious illnesses I have already mentioned, and even numerous deaths in air inversion episodes. Dr. LaVerne has now shown conclusively that air pollution either causes or, at least, prevents the healing of what are generally considered as minor ailments.

It is time that all governments, including Ontario's, took air pollution far more seriously than they are doing. It is time they took steps to speed up the installation of all air pollution control equipment.

As the deadline for the removal of phosphates from detergents approaches, there is a question still to be answered. In fact, it has scarcely been asked as yet. Namely, what chemicals are acceptable in soaps, detergents, floor cleaners, sink cleaners, and so forth? What cleansing chemicals can safely be disposed of in our rivers and lakes? If the answer is none, then we must back up one step and rephrase our question. What chemicals can be disposed of into our sewage systems and be safely removed at that point?

It seems to me that there are two answers to this problem. Independent scientists should make two lists of chemicals:

(a) Those that cannot be controlled and extracted by standard sewage systems and yet

cannot be permitted to pass on into our rivers and lakes and;

(b) Those that can either be controlled at treatment plants or can be permitted to pass on into our rivers and lakes.

This would enable the cleansing products industry to know from what list of chemicals or other materials their soaps, detergents and other cleansers could be manufactured. This should simplify many decisions.

For example, if table salt in large quantities were to be used as a basic component of large numbers of detergents, what would be the effect on the rivers and lakes? Certainly not a desirable one as a long-term procedure. Would removal at sewage plants be feasible? Probably not. They would probably be exorbitantly expensive. If so, table salt should not be used in this way.

Another example: If phosphates from detergents were easily removed at sewage plants, along with phosphates from industrial and human wastes, then this might enable the industry to continue using them without contributing to algal bloom and the deoxidation of the Great Lakes.

The principle to establish, I suggest, is to determine what is tolerable and controllable, then to establish rules in accordance with this knowledge.

The same principle should be applied to all areas of pollution. Now that we know that there are certain areas of the Great Lakes that have too much mercury, let us discourage immediately the continued use of mercury. Let us encourage the use of substitutes and, if necessary, encourage research to hasten the reduction of mercury to as close to zero as possible.

The same principle would apply to cadmium, now found to exist in disturbing amounts in the air and therefore in the rain and the snow and therefore in drinking water. Since the desirable level of cadmium is zero parts per billion, and since the permissible level is 10 parts per billion, when we find drinking water at or near Guelph containing 18 parts per billion, then it is high time to find out the source of the cadmium and reduce it immediately and eliminate it as soon as possible.

I may as well put on record, Mr. Speaker, a brief summary of what might be called "the trouble with cadmium." Cadmium is a toxic, heavy metal now widely used in the manufacture of batteries, paints, plastics and even in some pesticides. It is widely used in anti-corrosion electroplating and in the refining of zinc.

The Sunday Times of London, England, recently told the story of the Japanese girl who committed suicide in August, 1969, because, as she wrote in her diary: "The fear of cadmium contamination permeates my body. Pains gnaw at me. I feel I want to throw out my stomach and intestines. If ever I recover from this disease, I want to become a case worker."

Six fruitless hospital appointments had failed to diagnose her illness. Was she just another hypochondriac? Fortunately, her body was not cremated as is the usual custom, but an autopsy was held which revealed that her kidney contained 22,400 parts per million of cadmium. This is the severest case of metal poisoning known in all medical history.

Yet there were warnings. In the early 1950s, a Japanese doctor was concerned about the large number of patients complaining of agonizing pains. He decided that cadmium was the cause. Of 350 such patients that he treated, 119 died. When he complained to local mining companies, arguing that their industrial discharge had polluted local rice fields, he was accused of trying to cash in on bogus compensation claims.

This story, Mr. Speaker, is reminiscent of that of the Japanese doctor who fought for years to prove his patients were dying of mercury poisoning.

As the London Sunday Times story was reprinted in the Globe and Mail of February 8, 1971, I shall not go into further detail, except to read the final paragraph:

When Premier Sato was told about the case in Parliament last week he wept. Yet only last month, he confessed on television that while the powerful men of industry had so much influence on the government, it was difficult to see how effective legislation could be framed. And in December, in fact, the antipollution bill was emasculated through pressure from business leaders.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, big business in Japan is just as corrupt and greedy as it is anywhere else. Unfortunately, this is not the end of the cadmium story. It is probably just the beginning.

A few weeks ago, the Canada Centre for Inland Waters, while making surveys, discovered, although they were not looking for it, excessive amounts of cadmium in several areas in the Great Lakes region, especially in the vicinity of Guelph. Why were they not looking for cadmium? Have the various

branches of The Department of Energy and Resources Management yet started to look for cadmium?

The federal health authorities are now finding larger than expected amounts of cadmium in food all across Canada. Trail, BC, the home of the Cominco zinc refinery, has won the unwanted honour of having the highest cadmium contamination of food so far recorded in the federal survey. The people of Trail are already plagued with lead and fluoride pollution. Now they have cadmium pollution too.

The Food and Drug Directorate has also found canned and fresh water fish with substantially, perhaps hazardous, concentrations of cadmium.

As the months go by, we find more and more heavy metals polluting our air, our water and our food.

Again, I ask the minister, what is his department doing to bring about the reduction of cadmium, and for that matter, of mercury, in the industrial processes of this province? Is anyone trying to find substitutes? What pressure is the minister applying?

These are some of the questions, Mr. Speaker, I have been hoping in vain to ask the minister during question period. I ask them now.

I have considerable more, but in the interest of speeding the debate I shall resume my seat.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to take part once again in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, I consider myself highly honoured and privileged for being given this opportunity. At the outset I would be remiss if I did not extend my sincere congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, first on your appointment to the high office and on the fair manner in which you conduct the business of the House.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. B. Newman: Likewise, Mr. Speaker, my congratulations to go—yes, the member for Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter) personally, and to the member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Cass), whose shoes you so aptly fill, and to the member for Northumberland (Mr. Rowe). I likewise would like to extend congratulations to the Premier (Mr. Davis) on his

selection by delegates representing approximately 15 per cent of the population of Ontario to the premiership of the province. My congratulations also should go out to the newly appointed ministers and the ministers without portfolio.

Mr. Speaker, my comments this afternoon will be in a series of units, and the first deals with gasoline pricing and marketing. Approximately one year ago I brought to the attention of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) the differential in gasoline prices between the Toronto area and my home area, Windsor. And I noted at that time that the difference ranged anywhere from one cent to as much as eight cents a gallon. I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that I would have had a reply to my question of the minister at the time, but apparently nothing of any substance did happen. I hope that the present Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Wishart) will take note of the comments I have concerning gasoline pricing and marketing and look into the situation and do something about it.

On April 16, an editorial in the Windsor Star, was headlined "Gas Price Inequities." I will not read the whole editorial, but will read only portions of it. The last paragraph says:

The Ontario government has a responsibility to the citizens of this city to investigate the difference in the cost of gasoline across this province, just as it has a responsibility to investigate any inequities in the cost of other consumer goods across Ontario.

A few days after that Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jack Kent, a very capable newsmen of the Windsor Star who heads a column "Business Highlights," had the following comments. To those members who come from northern Ontario, I certainly would like them to pay attention to these because you can see the gross inequities that do exist in the whole gasoline pricing structure.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): That is for sure. We agree with the hon. member.

Mr. B. Newman: Jack Kent writes:

Last week on a visit to Detroit it was a simple matter of going to the first service station to fill up with 19.2 gallons of regular fuel—

that is Gulf gas—

—for \$4.97 or 25.9 cents a gallon.

Now I have seen gasoline advertised in stations in Detroit as low as 22.9 cents a gallon. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, gasoline down to 22.9 a gallon.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): They pay 43 cents a gallon themselves.

Mr. B. Newman: Granted this is an American gallon and as a result is smaller, but when you translate the 22.9 or 23 cents a gallon for gasoline into Canadian volume and Canadian prices you are buying gasoline for less than 30 cents a gallon.

An hon. member: How do those poor companies survive!

Mr. B. Newman: Now at that price Mr. Speaker, one would wonder where the gasoline would come from to be able to retail it at approximately 30 cents a gallon to a Canadian. But let me read you a little more of Mr. Kent's comments.

A comparative purchase of regular fuel in the city of Windsor (Shell) selling at the slightly reduced price of 52.9 cents a gallon costs \$8.46.

In other words in Detroit you paid \$4.97 for the same amount of gas that you got in Canada, in Windsor, for \$8.46.

There is even the factual story of a Windsor service station operator who fills his gas tank in Detroit whenever the opportunity arises. He cannot afford his own prices here.

An hon. member: Oh my!

Mr. B. Newman: Now I want the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs to listen to this. This paragraph will shock him.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Their gallons are smaller.

Mr. B. Newman: To continue:

There are also reliable reports that United States tank trucks fill at the Sarnia refineries and haul into Detroit.

Here we have Canadian gasoline, so it is said, being sold in Detroit for approximately half the price which it would be sold in our own Canada.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): That is what the bootleggers used to do during the temperance days.

Mr. B. Newman: And further:

Even with fuel oil some of American lakers go into Sarnia to obtain their oil

because the price is reportedly cheaper there than from the U.S. sources.

Now if that is right, Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong in the state of Ontario.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): There sure is.

Mr. Bukator: We knew that a long time ago, so surely the government did? That is not going to enlighten it now, it has known that for years.

Mr. B. Newman: However, Mr. Speaker, not only should the government investigate the difference in the cost of gasoline across this province, but it should also look into the whole picture of the marketing of gasoline and the relationship between oil companies and service station operators.

Both British Columbia and Alberta have undertaken such comprehensive studies. Alberta's 744-page report took four years. Why has not Ontario undertaken such comprehensive studies? Why not?

Mr. Bukator: They have run out of pigeon holes.

Mr. B. Newman: Senator Phillip Hart, senior senator from the state of Michigan, is now chairing an investigation into monopoly and antitrust practices in the United States oil industry. I can safely say that his findings will be similar to the presentations made to the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs' committee on franchising by Mr. Ken W. Langdon, who happens to be a former Windsorite and is now executive secretary of the Ontario Retail Gasoline and Automotive Service Association.

Senator Hart has been given 60 days within which he must submit his report. Now if they can do it within 60 days in the United States, surely, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister could have a committee look into the picture in the Province of Ontario and maybe even before the next election come down with an answer to the problem. Maybe then our consumers would be able to get gasoline at a reasonable price; a price which they are entitled to pay.

The Ontario Retail Gasoline and Automotive Service Association brief in no uncertain terms shows how the international oligopoly in the petroleum industry—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. B. Newman: That is right, oligopoly.

An hon. member: That is what I was wondering. I am glad we got that straight.

Mr. B. Newman: —has economic power far greater than that of the combined power of all 10 provincial governments in Canada. It shows the helplessness—yes, even hopelessness—of the service station operators in their dealings with the oil companies—their attempts to have oil companies follow the cigarette industry's ban on promotional gimmicks, games and giveaways.

These station operators need a bill of rights for themselves. They request a bill of rights for service station operators. It is one of their prime concerns and it is hoped that the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs will appoint a mediator to chair such negotiation meetings.

Of special interest to me, Mr. Speaker, is the brazen misleading approaches used by oil companies in their advertising for new station operators. For example, on May 1 and 2, 1970 the following Texaco ad appeared in the Windsor Star:

This Texaco service station could be the income opportunity you have been waiting for!

This Texaco station will offer an excellent opportunity for the man who wants to be in business for himself and make a good income. Prime location. Our research indicates strong profit potential. Only small investment required.

However, Mr. Speaker, a Windsor member of the retail gasoline dealers' association commented concerning the above. This is a Texaco station located at 278 Tecumseh Road East in Windsor on the northwest corner of Tecumseh and McDougall across from the Kennedy Collegiate Institute and the Chrysler truck plant. It now goes under the name of Collegiate Texaco.

This company advertisement in the Star says:

Our research indicates strong profit potential.

However, Mr. Speaker, here is the history of this location.

A man by the name of Denomme left the business in December, 1959. Wright leased it from December, 1959, to May, 1960, being in business for only five months. Indig followed Wright from May, 1960, to March, 1963, for 34 months of operation. Dingwall followed Indig from April, 1963, to March, 1965, for 23 months. Plumb, a very capable operator, took over from March, 1965, to April, 1965, maintaining the station only for one month. Now Grouleau had it from June, 1965, to April, 1970, being in business for 58 months and then going into bankruptcy.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the oil company should have disclosed complete and truthful information about the past and potential profit potential of this station to anyone interested. Such callous business tactics should not be tolerated by the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs who has a responsibility both to the buying public and to the lessee.

This is only a Windsor example. I imagine it could be duplicated in many other parts of the province. In Ontario, from 3,000 to 4,000, or 25 to 35 per cent of the service stations change hands each year. One of the province's largest industries, distributing one of the most basic products in the economy, suffers from an incredible mortality rate. Major brand name gasoline dealers or franchise dealers pay from two to nine cents a gallon more for the same gasoline as do unbranded and non-major gasoline operators.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, operating a business in which you are:

1. Not free to set your own hours.
2. Not free to buy the gasoline you choose.
3. Compelled to buy designated brands of miscellaneous items at prices that are not always competitive.
4. Not free to advertise your own name and compelled to advertise the oil company.
5. Compelled to pay for promotional advertising programmes and contests sponsored by the oil companies.
6. Compelled to accept lease and contract charges or abandon the business.

However, in the service station business there are two freedoms. There is (1) the freedom to do everything the oil company "suggests" and (2) the freedom to go broke.

The oil companies advocate freedom of enterprise for themselves but practise economic slavery for the operators.

So says the "Alberta Gasoline Marketing Report" on page 30.

The Toronto Daily Star on June 5, 1969, had an article dealing with this very same problem. The headline on the article read: "Are Gas Station Dealers Slaves of the Oil Companies?" Reading through the article, one cannot help but conclude that the headline was aptly placed and aptly reflective of the complete article.

The second article on that same page by Ron Lowman—both articles were by Ron Lowman, Star staff writer—has the headline: "You Can't Beat the Oil Company so the Dealer

Quit." It is concerning a gentleman by the name of Ernie Barnett who just could not make it as a gas station operator because of the tactics employed by the industry itself.

Is it not time, Mr. Minister, that Ontario got into an in-depth study of this problem, or accepts the findings of both British Columbia and Alberta and passes a bill of rights for service station operators and puts prohibitions and restrictions on oil companies, exactly as is proposed in the "Alberta Gasoline Marketing Report" on pages 38 and 39 and that Ontario enact a Franchise Fair Dealing Act, similar to that of Massachusetts?

The time is now. Let us protect the service station operators. Let us bring the price of gasoline down in line as to what it should be, not only in my area of the province but in all parts of the province and, especially, Mr. Speaker, in the northern part of Ontario, an area that has been too long penalized by such operations.

Mr. Bukator: Too bad the whole group is not here to listen to this good speech. All these prominent men ought to be here and listen to that.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I would like to at this time make a few comments concerning rent supplements. With the acute shortage of housing throughout the metropolitan areas of this province—yes, even in smaller municipalities—the plight of the person with a large family or the one on a limited income or on a fixed income, the plight of the underemployed, the plight of those in lower-paying jobs, the plight of the large number of unemployed—some receiving unemployment insurance benefits, others living off savings, if any, or borrowings from credit unions, finance companies, and so forth—and the plight of many, many senior citizens who were never able to purchase their own homes, concerning the cost for shelter, their plight is extremely serious.

Some are fortunate enough to get geared-to-income Ontario housing and as a result pay a reasonable rent, if in one of the above categories. However, most people are not that fortunate. Is it not about time the Ontario government has a new look at the least fortunate who desperately need housing that they can afford. It is said, and rightly so, that Canadians pay out in rent proportionately more of their consumer expenditures than do people in most countries in the world. Many—yes, far too many—especially senior citizens, pay more than 50 per cent of

their total income solely for housing. The minimum wage earner is another example, as is the under-employed or part-time worker. I could go on and on listing categories, Mr. Speaker, but that would not solve the problem. The real solution is the building of more and more housing, and now with unemployment being as critical as it is what better way could one help solve or minimize two problems at the same time: one that of unemployment; and two the need for housing.

Up until the time the need is met, a large segment of our society will be taken advantage of by some unscrupulous landlords by paying more than a fair share of their income for shelter.

Were there no shortage in housing, then one would never read, as I do now, from the May 2, 1970, issue of *The Windsor Star*. The headline is "A Welfare Mother Tells of Her Rat-Infested and Insect-Ridden Home."

I do not intend to read any more, Mr. Speaker, this is enough. It speaks for itself of the acute needs for decent housing at a decent rental. As I said earlier, those who are fortunate enough to get into geared-to-income housing are really getting subsidized rental accommodations. Those who are not able to get such housing are being financially penalized by being required to pay a disproportionate amount of their income for housing or, on the other hand, in many cases required to live in substandard accommodations or eat less.

Mr. Speaker, if one fortunate group can receive a rent subsidy or supplement, then why should not those not so fortunate be likewise assisted? The federal government provides some persons on old age security with a guaranteed income supplement. Why should not Ontario, through the Ontario Housing Corporation or The Department of Social and Family Services, or both, step into the breach and provide a rent supplement or a rent subsidy?

If the government of Ontario is a little hesitant to include all of the categories that I have mentioned, I suggest that they stage the programme by starting with senior citizens first. I suggest that the office of aging in The Department of Social and Family Services undertake to set up a bureau to deal with rent supplements. The names of those receiving old age assistance are now readily available to this branch.

I would suggest that along with the application form received by a person when he becomes entitled to his basic pension, the application for the supplement would go, in this province, a description of the rent supplement plan. It should be automatic that qualification for the supplement will enable the pensioner to receive the rent supplement.

He can then apply to The Department of Social and Family Services giving them the necessary statistics and, after one home visit, should receive the rent supplement himself. The supplement should cover the amount of rent per month in excess of 25 per cent of the total pension received. I hope that we can think about this question in a non-partisan manner because Ontario must take steps to remedy this problem immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, as I have now for some six years, bring to the attention of the House my comments concerning mobile or portable housing. I would have liked to have made quite extensive comments on housing but for the sake of time, I will curtail my comments and make mention once again about the slowness with which portable or mobile housing is being looked upon in this province as an assist in the housing crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I do not suggest that mobile housing is the only answer to our present housing crisis, but it sure can go a long way toward reducing the crisis. This method of housing would have many advantages;

1. It would enable small municipalities, especially in slow growth areas to attract and hold new industry.

2. It would enable municipalities to plan in a more leisurely and economic fashion, instead of being stampeded into housing developments.

3. It would assure housing to persons moving from one area to another.

4. It would be one way that a housing surplus could be provided a community, thus easing the disastrous rent spiral.

5. It would force owners of substandard housing to bring that housing up to an acceptable level.

6. It could be used as housing for farm labour.

7. When the housing crisis in any municipality was overcome, these mobile or portable units could be transported to another area.

8. When they have served their purpose or their master they could be sold as summer cottages.

There are many other advantages that could be mentioned in making a case for portable housing. Mr. Speaker, it is over six years now that this was first brought to the attention of this government, and it certainly is about time that some action was taken on this.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few comments at this time to the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko). Unfortunately, he is not in the House, but I know he is one who will read Hansard, and as a result notice the comments that have been made in the Legislature. And, as a result, act accordingly.

Mr. Georg G. Boukydis, president of the Ontario region of the Canadian Restaurant Association, wrote a very short letter to the Windsor Star, and here is the letter. It is headed "Just fine society":

Sir:

I was surprised to read in the Star that a hotel near Windsor was given only the minimum fine of \$5,000 for wickedly serving beer without the prescribed sandwich.

Legally the fine could have been as much as \$25,000.

Given the barbaric attitude of Ontario's Liquor Control Act toward punishments, it could have expected that the offender would be at the very least have been put in stocks in the public square, or maybe the rack would have been deemed more appropriate.

So much for Ontario's version of the just society.

These are comments by one individual concerning the Liquor Control Act. Here is another extremely interesting comment, dated March 12, 1971, "Laughable Paradox of Ontario's laws":

The fact that a Windsor area establishment received the minimum fine of \$5,000 for serving beer without a meal points to several things. The first is the antiquity of the thinking behind many of the laws in Ontario which deal with liquor and the manner in which it may be purchased, served or consumed.

The Ontario Provincial Police should not be faulted for bringing the charges against the offenders. The law is there for them to uphold. Obviously what is needed is a completely amended law.

Nor should the judge be criticized for the \$5,000 fine, he was merely acting within the confines of the particular piece of legislation and handed down the minimum

sentence. Strict application of the law rather than turning a blind eye toward chronic shortcomings due to changes in attitude and untimeliness is perhaps the surest way to get our well-paid legislators to update outmoded laws. Most certainly the average citizen will start to complain to his elected representatives if some of his laws, dated almost to antiquity, are brought to bear.

The minimum fine of \$5,000 for sale of a glass of beer without a meal also points to the inadequacies of some of the other laws controlling even more severe crimes against society. Take pollution for example. It is laughable that a wealthy corporation faces a fine of \$5,000 for the first offence when it pollutes its environment.

Think of the difference between the two. What a paradox! What a laughable paradox!

Surely on a scale of values, any polluter should be subject to a far larger fine than \$5,000 for failing to ensure no pollution occurs if someone is subject to a fine of \$5,000 for illegally serving a beer.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): One glass of beer?

Mr. B. Newman: Yes. You know this very well, Mr. Member for Victoria-Haliburton. He knows the injustices—

Mr. W. Hodgson: I am from York North.

Mr. B. Newman: I am sorry, York North. You know the injustices of—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member will address the Chair.

Mr. B. Newman: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, through you to the hon. member; he certainly does know the injustice in this circumstance.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): If he does not, he had better sharpen up.

Mr. B. Newman: He is on my side there.

Mr. Gaunt: All members up there need to be complete is Eagleson. That is a reactivated Chicago gang up there.

Mr. B. Newman: With pollution being such a major threat to the environment and population, what is needed is severe handling of offenders rather than the kid glove approach now taken through our laws. It is time our legislators do just that.

Not too long ago Chief Justice McRuer submitted his final report, the fifth report. On April 17 an editorial headed "Fast Action Needed on McRuer Report" makes the following comment:

Among these is Mr. McRuer's recommendation for a change in liquor laws and their administration and enforcement. The province's liquor legislation has been a previous target for McRuer criticism. Now the final report specifically recommends a relaxation of some of the arbitrary powers of the Liquor Licence Board as well as the removal of some present licensing functions of the Liquor Control Board.

Surely the answer is in a complete revision of the Act, Mr. Speaker? By the way, once again to the Provincial Secretary, I am just wondering when the report from his department concerning the study undertaken by his predecessor about keg beer is going to be released? If only from the aspect of the use of fewer bottles and cans, and the lessening of the bottle and can pollution problem, this government should consider the sale for home consumption of beer in kegs.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of unemployment is probably the most serious problem, next to one's personal health, that one is ever faced with in a whole lifetime. With new techniques, processes and so forth, the idea of providing everyone who wants it or needs it with gainful employment seems to be getting more difficult daily. With rationalizing in industry, with runaway plants, with plant closings, with curtailment of production necessitating layoffs, municipalities as well as labour find themselves in a most difficult position.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of unemployment is universal. Most industrial nations are now faced with it. It is easy to blame the hon. Mr. Trudeau, or likewise the hon. Premier of Ontario, but can you blame both of them for the US problems? Who do you blame for Britain's woes? An UP article headed, "British Unemployment Hikes" says:

Unemployment in Britain increased to 3.4 per cent in April with 814,189 listed without jobs, the highest figure in 31 years, the government said Monday in a monthly report. The Conservative Party government blamed the continuing rise in unemployment on inflationary policies of the previous Labour Party government.

So who do you blame?

Mr. Bukator: They are both wrong. They do not know what they are doing. They need a Liberal government.

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Cannot blame the Liberals over there.

Mr. Ferrier: There are not any Liberals; wise country!

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, blaming one does not solve the problem. It does not help those in their fifties who, as the Detroit Free Press headline the other day said, "Will Soon Form a New Aged Poor Class" because they may never be called back to work in some areas and in some types of industry. Blaming someone does not solve the difficulty of those injured on the job and able to undertake only light work, and let out of their employment with little hope of any recall. Blaming someone does not help those who were forced—or is that too strong a word?—to accept early retirement at a pension reduced to a point where they may be in great difficulty in making ends meet without some part-time help.

The severity of the problem requires a non-partisan all-out war or attack on the number one economic problem. I shall make a series of suggestions later in my comments as a partial and temporary answer to this social evil.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to show how concerned the people in my own area are in this respect. For example, a headline of April 21 of this year says, "Operations Moved, Cosmetic Firm to Pare Staff." Approximately 30 of the company's 50 employees are going to be laid off. A second headline says, "Contract Lost." The date is April 3, 1971, "Canada Bread will lay-off 27." Another headline dated April 3: "Indefinite term: Kelsey Hayes lays off 200."

These are only the layoffs that I mention, Mr. Speaker, but there are other aspects to the problem. There is the aspect of the proposed imposition of restrictive tariffs by U.S. Customs that can have an adverse effect on employees in the Dominion Forge plant in the city of Windsor. There is the effect of the imposition of duties that may have an adverse effect on Dominion Twist Drill Limited.

In a letter from Mr. A. R. Anderson, President, of February 23 he points out to me:

We are gradually being edged out of the market by imports brought in and resold

at a cost much less than we can manufacture, and these are being purchased by the large automotive manufacturers and chain stores; also by government departments.

Then there is the problem Fabricated Steel Products Windsor Limited are afraid of, which is—thermal moulded boat hulls are being imported on a reduced tariff so that the company itself cannot compete with the imported product.

Mr. Speaker, in my own community at the present there are 5,333 registered for employment, there are 5,307 receiving municipal social service assistance, but there are 15,928 receiving unemployment insurance. I would assume—and I hope—that many of these receiving unemployment insurance are not permanently laid off; that they will have the opportunity to return to their jobs.

In an attempt to focus attention on the seriousness of the unemployment problem, the Essex and Kent Building and Construction Trades Council and the Windsor and District Labour Council called a mass meeting for April 4, 1971, for the purpose of organizing jobless men and women in the community so that they may act and speak collectively on their own behalf.

The meeting was held on Sunday, April 4, 1971, and it was chaired by Vic White, chairman of the full employment committee of the Windsor and District Labour Council. Present at the meeting were Mr. Harris of local 200, Mr. St. Pierre of local 195, Mr. Brooks of local 444, Mr. Frank Hutnik of, I think it is local 494, the Carpenters' Union.

The group met and had submitted to them a series of 12 recommendations. They discussed the recommendations and approved all of them. I will not read the recommendations at this time, Mr. Speaker, but I will read the result of the meeting. The meeting selected and formed a committee to do the following:

First: So that they may have an effective voice to all levels of government.

Second: To open up employment opportunities.

Third: To assist in solving the problems of the unemployed person by directing their personal problems to the pertinent authority and to see to it that they have equitable consideration.

Fourth: To be as free as possible from any political ties.

Notice that fourth aim of theirs, to cut themselves off from any political ties—a very noteworthy gesture on the part of the unemployed.

The Greater Windsor Foundation is a non-profit organization devoted to making Windsor a better community in which to work, to play and to shop. Under the leadership of a most able president, Al Baker, this foundation was asked by city council to sponsor a meeting to look into (a) the worsening of conditions in the local area, (b) the stimulation of the local economy and employment and (c) the reduction of the welfare situation.

In addition, they had three points to consider. First, the reasons for the slowdown in the construction industry and what measures could be taken to improve the situation. Second, the effect of the auto integration on employment and merits of supporting a broadening in the auto integration for advocating the extension of integration to other industrial areas, and third, the stagnation of new industrial development in Windsor and what steps, if any, might be taken.

The meeting itself was chaired by George Burt, who is a well-known labour leader in Canada. The meeting, held on April 15 in council chambers, had invited to it people from all walks of life, from both union and management, as well as the three levels of political endeavour.

During the meeting, some substantial and noteworthy comments were made. For example, Frank Hutnik, financial secretary of Local 494 of the carpenters' union, made this suggestion: that with the help of senior governments, the city undertake the development of the Ojibway area into a free port. The development of a Windsor free port would not only provide a considerable amount of jobs in the construction of the physical facility but would establish year-round employment in the operation of the port.

Dr. R. C. Quittenton, who is president of St. Clair College and an outstanding citizen in the community—very outspoken concerning the needs of the community—said that ways should be found to harness welfare recipients and the unemployed, to a massive cleanup campaign.

On the management side, John McGivney, representing Chrysler Canada and representing the company's president, Ron Todgham, and Robert J. Daragon, representing Ford of Canada, said that their companies had laid off employees in the past few months because of market conditions but now that the markets were picking up, they anticipated full employment for some time to come.

Mr. Daragon said Ford hired about 2,000 workers in the last year and that more than 200 were employed in the summer as re-

placements, and I quote his comments: "If all goes well, we shall be needing more replacements this summer."

However, Mr. Steel, the city manager, termed the unemployment problem "monumental." He said neither federal nor provincial governments have provided any answers and the burden remains with the municipal government. The city manager said the city needs works of several million dollars, especially in the sewer programme, but he cannot introduce expenditures in his budget because of the burden they would cause on the taxpayers. He said any budget should be commensurate with the taxpayers' ability to pay.

The meeting concluded, Mr. Speaker, with the following headline which was aptly put: "Jobless Meet Fails to Find Solutions."

However, as a result of the meeting, the mayor was asked to create a mayor's committee on unemployment, and he did select 14 individuals who were to look into the problem and report.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few suggestions as to creating employment. I do so knowing that all of these do cost money and they are always limited by budget restrictions. For example, one of my suggestions is a seasonal works programme, similar to a winter works programme. A winter works programme has been suggested by the hon. member for Essex-Kent and endorsed by all members in this House. A seasonal works programme could be planned so that at any time unemployment reaches a critical stage it could be thrown in and fill the breach and provide needed employment.

A second suggestion, we could require citizens to sort their home wastes into bottles, separating them from cans, from paper and from waste. This would mean added costs to municipalities, and so some type of grant would have to be made to compensate for this added cost because the added cost would mean added manpower. However, with the collection of bottles, cans and papers individually, we could have all of these recycled, we would have an ecological assist and an elimination or partial answer to the problem of unemployment. This would also extend, in years, the needs of the sanitary landfill of the various communities.

A third suggestion is the problem of crime in the big cities. We see from our neighbours to the south how serious it is. Let us not have our citizens being afraid to walk our streets at night. Terry Wills, a Canadian writer in the legislative press gallery, who lived in

Washington, DC, can certainly tell you what it is like to be within sight of the White House and not be safe on the street. Let us make our cities safe 24 hours a day; to help to do this will require manpower, a special kind of manpower, more policing; in other words, more police officers.

To ask municipalities that are hard-pressed to provide the funds for more police is not realistic today, unless some of the municipalities' financial burdens are lessened substantially. Provincial grants would have to be made to increase protection to people—at least I think the government could implement a pilot project in this respect to see if more policing would make our streets safer.

A fourth suggestion: On May 8, 1964, a select committee of the Ontario Legislature was appointed, among other reasons to look into the employment opportunities of youth. As an example of increasing employment opportunities, the junior forest ranger facilities are only used during the months of July and August; I would suggest that they also be used in May and June and the month of September by university-attending students, and in the summer months by students who are being accommodated today. The facilities are there; there is no added expense at all. It simply involves putting the university students into the facilities and giving them some worthwhile training.

I would prefer more facilities for the junior forest ranger programme. I would like an expanded programme, but that would entail the developing of more facilities which would mean a greater financial involvement and I hesitate to do so because of that. However, we must always consider the physically handicapped youth. They should never be forgotten in any of our programmes, as they generally are last hired and first laid off. The facilities of the junior forest ranger programme could be used in off-seasons to prepare the physically handicapped to develop some type of skill that would enable them to have a fair share of our economic abundance.

On page 126 of the youth committee report, one of the recommendations is that a province-wide campsite be undertaken by The Department of Lands and Forests to provide camping facilities to non-profit youth agencies at a nominal fee. Camp grants for the assistance of non-profit youth agencies which are presently available are inadequate and should be adjusted to more accurately reflect present day costs.

Mr. Speaker, in my own community is a group of students who have written to the Premier and suggested that he give most serious and favourable consideration to this group of teenagers who now represent only three high schools—Assumption, St. Mary's and Forster—but soon will include all Windsor high schools in their project to try and alleviate poverty in the community. Robert Richards, president, and Francis Reeve, vice president of the group called STOP—Students To Oppose Poverty—has written asking the Premier for assistance.

I am not going to take the time of the House to read into the record their communication to the Premier. However, I would say that theirs is not a new project. For over a year and a half these teenage students have been working with underprivileged welfare children of Windsor.

STOP, Students To Oppose Poverty, would like to become more deeply involved. They plan on running a camp to which children from the disadvantaged would be brought, taught many skills, and have developed new attitudes toward society. They want to show that someone cares and is willing to help those who need help and guidance.

Mr. Speaker, it is now up to the Premier. I ask him, please, to consider this request from concerned students to aid the disadvantaged.

Another suggestion I could make concerning the alleviation of the problem of the unemployed is the need for an expanded housing programme. This has been mentioned by many other members in the House, and it covers the needs of all communities in Ontario, and I can say that the city of Windsor is no exception.

Unfortunately, housing at today's prices precludes many from not only ever achieving their dream of home ownership, but it even precludes the dreaming of home ownership. However, I would like to submit two suggestions to this government, not only to help the unemployment problem, but also to help people achieve the dream of home ownership.

For example, (a) I would suggest that the government undertake a home mortgage interest subsidy programme for those below a certain fixed income, this income to be derived after detailed study, but to be as low as possible. The HUD programme in the US, programme 235, as I mentioned in last year's debates on The Department of Trade and Development should be seriously considered.

A second suggestion on this line is the removal of the provincial sales tax on building materials, to show good faith and thereby encourage the federal government likewise to do the same.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): They are pretty hard to encourage.

Mr. B. Newman: Theirs is 11 per cent. The Ontario government's is five per cent. They have substantially more to lose than this government.

This government should show its good faith. Remove the sales tax on building material. Even remove it on condition that the federal government removes it then, to make it fair. I would suggest that this tax subsidy—that is the removal of the sales tax—be deducted from the selling price of the home.

Now even the group in Windsor that organized themselves—the unemployed—made the suggestion of the removal of the 11 per cent sales tax. Most of their recommendations actually dealt with the federal level. However, in spite of that, they are substantial and noteworthy.

For example, that same group recommended that federal and provincial governments finance the development and installation of all utilities—meaning services—toward the development of serviced lots for home building. They likewise suggested that the governments be petitioned to clean up the slum areas and waterfronts.

Mr. Speaker, I could suggest that, naturally, all of these suggestions will require the expenditures of maybe a substantial amount of funds. As a result, I do not say that the government should come along and implement them, but should look into the potential as far as employment is concerned in the adopting of some of these suggestions.

One is that the province pay a tax on all of its properties. In this way, if they paid full municipal taxes then municipalities themselves, getting these funds from the province, could undertake some of the worthwhile projects that I had mentioned previously, or maybe other projects so that they, themselves, could provide substantial assists to alleviate unemployment.

Another suggestion is the financial assistance toward the cost of construction in operating municipal sewage control projects. The IJC made a recommendation that unless we seriously go into control and abatement our Great Lakes will become dead in the not too

distant future. If the government can see the light of day, there is another way in which substantial employment could be created.

"The doctors in the community, seeing the need for chronic care facilities, made mention in a letter to me that I transmitted to the Minister of Health that because of the lack of chronic care facilities, many acute care beds in our hospitals are being occupied when they normally would not be occupied, were we to have nursing home facilities. The doctors estimate that anywhere from five to 15 per cent of our hospital beds now are being occupied by patients requiring chronic care, when they could be placed in by far cheaper facilities.

Mr. Speaker, another way that this province could assist in creating employment is if they took to heart the recommendations of the Automotive Parts Manufacturers Association, in which they make mention—and their proposals are few but extremely noteworthy—one of their proposals is the reduction of corporation taxes on a formula basis in proportion to the company's participation in export markets.

A second is to provide low-cost financing for automotive parts manufacturers needing expansion and renovation capital, or working capital, or for anti-pollution equipment.

The third is an extremely noteworthy one, one that had been taken care of by the federal government but was quickly picked up by this government. That is the elimination of the retail sales tax on machinery and equipment used in production, either directly or indirectly. Were this government to consider seriously the presentation of the Automotive Parts Manufacturers Association, I think substantial employment could be created.

There is another problem, Mr. Speaker, and that deals with both levels of government, the federal and the provincial, concerning students wishing to upgrade their skills. In the first instance, they go into an upgrading course which generally requires 64 weeks of attendance. In other words, 16 weeks for each year—requiring 16 weeks for grade 9, 16 weeks for grade 10, 16 weeks for grade 11 and 16 weeks for grade 12.

However, the agreement with the federal authorities is such that the federal authorities will only purchase from the Province of Ontario, 52 weeks of upgrading programming. The student who has never had grade 9 is able to get 52 weeks of upgrading so he gets up to as far as grade 11, has four weeks of grade 12 and is cut off. He can no longer get

financial assistance. The government says at that stage, "You are no longer required in this programme. We cannot help you complete the programme."

Were the provincial and federal governments to put their heads together and solve this problem, we would find that many of the students who are now in the upgrading programmes would be able to complete their four years of high school and then go into a skill-training programme. They are not allowed to go into a skill-training programme without a grade 12 education. They cannot get a grade 12 education, because the programme as set up now only allows them to get four weeks of grade 12. As a result, not being able to develop a skill they find themselves thrust into the ranks of the unemployed.

The skill-training programme can last up to one year. However, normally, it takes about 40 weeks. My suggestion is that the provincial and federal governments get together and combine the skill-training and upgrading programme, so that the student can have the full 104 weeks of training—60 in the upgrading, and 44 in the skill-training.

Mr. Speaker, on a very parochial basis I can make mention of a series of other ways of relieving the unemployment picture. For example, on Lake St. Clair the province has purchased a park, but the park remains just parkland. Surely we could employ people to develop that land now so that for the summer time it could be put to use.

There is Peach Island in the Detroit River. I would suggest to the government that it consider a purchase, or a lease purchase, of the property so that the unemployed could be used at this stage in enlarging or developing the programme, or, at least, so that it could be held for future development.

I could suggest the development of a seignery or a Jesuit village, as I have proposed years ago, in the French section, or the early French settlement section, in the Essex county area. I would like to suggest that holiday provincial parks be used as a junior forest ranger on-the-job training area. We cannot accommodate all students who would like to take the junior forest ranger programme, but we do have provincial parks that could have an on-the-job training programme where the student would live at home and simply report daily to the park for various types of junior forest ranger programmes, and in this way enable himself to develop a skill and also earn a few dollars.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): There is SWEEP.

Mr. B. Newman: I do not see any of that SWEEP in the Essex county area.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Oh, it will come!

Mr. B. Newman: If it will come into the Essex county area, I think it is good and I will commend the minister for it.

I would even suggest to the Premier, now that he is here, that he extend the junior forest ranger programme right into the cities and have junior forest rangers associated with the parks department, so that these youngsters could, under the guidance and direction of some parks personnel, do almost exactly the same thing that they are doing up in the northern regions of the province.

The government could accommodate the youngsters and develop a lot of new skills and thereby develop attitudes in these youngsters—the types of attitudes that we want them to have. We do not want them to be bitter at all. They are stating that government is not able to come along and provide the opportunities for jobs.

I could also mention to the government that the tourist reception centre now on Huron line is closed. For heaven's sake, why do we not open it and employ some of our university students, if not on a full-time basis at least have it open on a weekend basis in the off season? Let us employ half a dozen young university ladies taking care of the tourist reception centre and providing information to the many people who pass through our area on their way to other reaches inside the province.

The building cost approximately \$100,000 to build and it is only staying there. All during the winter months and weekends we have tourists coming in, wanting to go to various ski areas in the province and having no place—once they get off the bridge—to find where they could actually go and be accommodated. Back in 1959 the government fought a campaign on building a provincial public building. Now is the time, when there is a surplus of labour, to consider the centralization of all of the offices in the Windsor area by constructing that building and providing needed employment.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on, but I would like to conclude my remarks by bringing to the attention of the government something that to me is probably a more serious way of looking at unemployment. Now that we are confronted with large numbers of un-

employed, is it not about time that we took a second look at our export-import picture? We should now be looking into the matter of labour content or man-hours principle. If we are going to make it fair to all concerned, should we not be looking beyond the idea of wage parity and think now of labour content parity?

If we are to develop our Canadian economy and provide employment for our ever increasing population we must go beyond the dollar value of our exports and imports. We will never be able to provide increased employment opportunities if we export products that require little labour application while we import high labour content products.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain there must be a greater concern shown to the export-import job opportunities, rather than seeing our balance of trade being solely expressed in dollars and cents. Our balance of trade statistics should also reflect and include our job opportunity position. Since we have the natural resources that are needed by many nations in this world, and since the world's greatest gobble of natural resources is our best customer—that is, the United States—should we not include in our negotiations both the dollar value of the goods we export to them and the labour content required to produce these exports, and permit an import from them of equivalent dollar value and equivalent labour content? Our economists can arrive at some formula that would be fair to all parties involved in this quest for world trade.

Mr. Speaker, I more than likely have spoken a little too long. I could extend my comments in many other fields, but as the estimates of the various departments come down in this House, I will, at that time, make further comments.

I would like to close, **Mr. Speaker**, by bringing to the attention of the House just this one little item. Here we have a nylon washer that could be stamped out by the millions. A nylon washer, very, very simple—yet it cost 55 cents. Surely somebody is being really taken here on an article like that? Thank you very much.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): What is that again?

Mr. B. Newman: A nylon washer—55 cents.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Would the member send that across to me for a minute?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to get into the main import of my address because of the lateness of the time. If you wish me to—

Mr. Speaker: I was just wondering, because Mr. Speaker's list indicates that the member for Kent (Mr. Spence) was the next speaker on the list. I was just discussing it with him, but he agrees to have the hon. member for Thunder Bay carry on.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): The member is only going to speak six minutes.

Mr. Stokes: First I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, and your deputies for the worthwhile contribution you both have made to the proceedings in the House, and hope that you will continue to perform that function as you have in the past.

I did want to make a few brief comments, Mr. Speaker, on the Speech from the Throne as it affects northern Ontario. I am happy to see the Premier (Mr. Davis) in his seat because, not being a very frequent visitor to the part of the province that I happen to represent, I am sure that some of my comments will be of interest to him. I hope that he will take them into consideration when he is formulating future plans for his government for whatever length of time is available to him.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! If the hon. Prime Minister or any minister wishes to engage in the debate he will at least please be in his own seat.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The Premier must consider himself told off.

Mr. Stokes: The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, was a 16-page document outlining the programme in response to the requirements of life in Ontario during the 1970s. It is stated that the ministry will listen closely to the problems of the people and will act swiftly to resolve them.

What evidence was there, Mr. Speaker, that this government understood the needs and the aspirations of the north? Two paragraphs were devoted to the need for action in this 16-page document. One was:

Existing regulations and standards of the Northern Ontario Development Corporation are being revised so that the assistance will be more readily available to small Canadian-owned businesses and to certain

segments of our service industry. A programme of immediate assistance has been launched to improve or re-locate tourist establishments.

Number two:

A new Department of Transportation and Communication will be created to take on the former responsibilities of The Department of Highways and Transport. An immediate function of the new department will be to undertake a review of the cost of transportation of goods in and out of northern Ontario.

What will these announcements mean to the communities which go to make up the northern portion of our province? Is the study which was commissioned by The Department of Treasury and Economics and announced at Lakehead University last October 13, to be shelved? This study was conducted by Mr. Wilbur Smith and is already in the hands of the government. But the government insists on having another study to study the study.

Design for Development for northwestern Ontario, Mr. Speaker, reflected the aims and aspirations of our people because it was formulated in consort with them and, in particular, with the capable assistance of the Northwestern Ontario Development Council. The reaction to phase 2 was positive and constructive and presented an excellent plan for immediate action on the part of the provincial government. It was not even mentioned in the Throne Speech.

I find this very disturbing, Mr. Speaker, when one considers that, of the 10 economic regions, across the province, only two have progressed to the phase 2 stage. One is the Toronto-centred region and the other is our own in northwestern Ontario. Yet, there was no mention in the Throne Speech.

I believe it is fair to say that our Northwestern Ontario Development Council and northwestern Ontario joint chambers of commerce have worked arduously and in a very responsible and positive way to focus attention on the needs of our citizens in northern Ontario. I personally have taken advantage of every opportunity to define the problems and to offer concrete and constructive proposals for government consideration and action.

Where have we failed? I do not think we have been negative in our approach. No one realizes better than we ourselves the huge treasure of natural and human resources that we possess in northwestern Ontario. No one has worked more diligently to extol the advantages and virtues of life in the north. Granted there is a dire need for expanded health services and facilities to many isolated communities. Granted there is a need for better educational opportunity for our youth,

but surely all of these things are possible, if the orderly development of our natural resources is managed in a fashion and in a way that will bring maximum return and benefit to our people in the north.

As has been pointed out to you on previous occasions, six out of every 10 jobs in the forest industries are located in southern Ontario. This was made evident by the Hedlin-Menzies report commissioned by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle). Four out of every 10 jobs are located in the north where the greatest percentage of our forest resources are found. If these figures were simply reversed, it would mean an additional 50,000 job opportunities in northern Ontario.

If processing of our mineral wealth were to take place in northern Ontario this too would provide many thousands of jobs in this area.

A report released just a few days ago by The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs—I am sorry the minister is not in the House now—revealed that the total value of mineral production in Ontario for 1970 was \$1.6 billion.

It is ironical, Mr. Speaker, that the communities in northern Ontario which are facing the greatest difficulty are those which owe their existence to the mining industry.

I have often heard it said that the problems facing northern communities are insurmountable and that we should let them die. I am not prepared to accept that point of view.

There is not an area on the face of this earth that has been so richly endowed with such wealth and such potential. I am not aware of any other place which offers clean air and water in such abundance. I am not

aware of any other area which offers such a variety of interests and attractions to the ever-increasing number of tourists seeking respite from the asphalt jungle.

So I say to those who have resigned themselves to the "conventional wisdom" that we will always be a have-not part of the province and a have-not part of this country: "Move over and make way for those of us who wish to be rid of the tab 'hewers of wood and drawers of water.'"

We have the potential to fashion a life style which will be the envy of all, and I am sure that we are dedicated to the task of providing a living condition which will ensure all our people equal opportunity and freedom from want.

However, it is not sufficient simply to lament or criticize. This will accomplish nothing. We must be constructive, we must be positive and, above all we must be unified in our efforts. It is not simply a matter of groups of people coming together to share each others' problems. It is much more than that.

It is not enough to study and restudy, to survey and resurvey the problems of the north. We must commit ourselves to the task of establishing our own priorities, formulating a plan of action, and move forward together with the resolve to fashion a way of life that our children and their children will thank us for.

Mr. Stokes moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Introducing members of United Kingdom young farmers' clubs, Mr. Stewart	723
News stories re system of issuing licence plates, statement by Mr. Davis	723
Appointment of Dr. J. M. Gillies as chairman of Ontario Economic Council, statement by Mr. Davis	724
Safety study re use of studded tires in winter driving, statement by Mr. MacNaughton ...	725
Government policy on motor vehicle purchases, statement by Mr. Auld	726
Three million dollar patronage re dispensing of licence plates, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Singer, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Bukator	727
Retaliatory legislation by Quebec in answer to Bill 10, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Singer	730
Reclaiming mercury from lake bottoms and river beds, question to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Singer ..	731
Action re observance of Sunday laws, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Singer	731
Studded tires on cars entering Ontario from Manitoba, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Pitman, Mr. B. Newman	731
Agencies dispensing automobile licence plates, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Shulman	732
Employment applicants for Liquor Control Board stores, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Pitman	733
Conference on Americanization, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. R. M. Johnson	734
Labour dispute between Niagara board of education and supporting staff, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Pitman	734
Loan by federal government to stimulate work projects, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Yakabuski	734
Possible loans to medical students, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Sargent	735
ODC loans to commercial fishermen, questions to Mr. Crossman, Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. Stokes	735
Tabling of death certificates relating to Indians, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Martel	736
Protection measures from landfill in Toronto waterfront area, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Bukator, Mr. Sargent	736
Application from Lakehead University to extend forestry course, question to Mr. White, Mr. Stokes	737
University research financed by Pentagon, question to Mr. White, Mr. Lewis	737
Presenting report, companies branch, Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, Mr. Wishart	738

Presenting annual reports from Department of Lands and Forests and various boards, Mr. Yaremko	738
Presenting report, standing private bills committee, Mr. R. G. Hodgson	738
Tabling orders-in-council exempting inquiry provisions from being applied in certain expropriations, Mr. A. F. Lawrence	738
Presenting report, Fire Marshal, Mr. A. F. Lawrence	738
Control of credit reporting agencies, collection of credit information and credit reporting, bill to provide for, Mr. Wishart, first reading	739
Department of Highways and Department of Transport, bill to amalgamate, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading	739
Mining Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bernier, first reading	740
Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. Ruston, Mr. McNeil, Mr. Burr, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Stokes	740
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Stokes, agreed to	768
Recess, 6 o'clock	768



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, April 22, 1971
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 1971

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps before the hon. member for Thunder Bay resumes his speech, he might permit me a moment to announce that we have a group of 40 people in Mr. Speaker's gallery who are the Business and Professional Women's Club from Hamilton.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (Concluded)

Mr. J. E. Stokes: (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I saw the group to which you referred in the company of the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mrs. Pritchard). I am sure she would like me to remind the House that they are friends of hers and we all welcome them to the gallery.

I think that it is also appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that I should be speaking on behalf of perhaps the newest and the least developed portion of Ontario—I speak especially of the northern part of Ontario, and in particular northwestern Ontario—at a time when we have a lot of young people representing the Boy Scouts of Canada in both galleries. I think it is appropriate that they should be here when someone in the Legislature is speaking of the great potential that we have in both human and material resources in this province yet undeveloped, and just crying out for the kind of governmental action that will bring people from that area into the mainstream of economic, social and cultural life of this province.

Just before the break, Mr. Speaker, I was speaking about this potential and about the Design for Development: Northwestern Ontario Region, Phase 2 and how hard and how dedicatedly the people of northern Ontario worked in making the government and The Department of Treasury and Economics aware of the potential and what their aspirations were and what solutions we felt were available to this government in order to achieve and accomplish those ends.

I would like to refer briefly, Mr. Speaker, to a critique of the Design for Development: Northwestern Ontario Region, Phase 2 by the Thunder Bay Chamber of Commerce. All through this critique, it highlights the need

for attention to the exorbitant costs of transporting goods in and out of northwestern Ontario.

We have a wonderful plan in the Design for Development, but I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that none of the aspirations and goals are going to be realized until both the provincial and the federal governments come up with a comprehensive and a realistic freight rate structure and transportation system that will allow us, and particularly the people of northern Ontario, to develop that tremendous human and material potential that we have waiting for us and bestowed upon us by such a—

An hon. member: Tories will not do it.

Mr. Stokes: —benevolent providence.

It is very important that this government realize that nothing will happen in that part of the province unless governments take the kind of action that is necessary to do away with the many things, such as the high cost of transportation, which mitigate against the kind of development that is so badly needed.

I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, when one considers that all of the entrepreneurs up there have been faced with as much as a 50 per cent increase in freight rates over the past four years. Governments from time immemorial have been telling us that because of our geographic location and our great distance from markets, it is almost impossible for us to enjoy the same standard of living, the same level of income and the same equality of opportunity enjoyed by people in other areas of the province and the country. We from northern Ontario do not buy this.

As I said earlier, northern Ontario is the repository for some of the greatest mineral and forest wealth anywhere on the face of the earth. And yet, when one considers the plight of many communities that are slowly dying for want of a viable economic base, for want of the kind of development of secondary industry that is so necessary to bring that area of the province into the economic mainstream, it is not going to happen by accident. It is going to happen when this government, or some other government, dedicates itself to the task of using all

the technical expertise that we have available today and using what financial resources we have to develop that huge storehouse of resources for the benefit of the people who live there.

That area of the province contributes well in excess of \$2 billion of new wealth annually. Unfortunately, very little of it remains there for the development of secondary industry for the providing of services of people who live in that area. And this government has done very little to accomplish that, certainly since I have been around in the political scene in the Province of Ontario.

There is so much to be done, Mr. Speaker, by way of organizing our affairs for the orderly exploitation of the resources by the complete rethinking of our forest management policies, our forest harvesting policies and our re-allocation of timber licences, where we have about 13 land barons who have effective control of all the timber resources that we have in this province; when we have small entrepreneurs who are just crying for sufficient resources of raw wood fibre in order to provide employment and some economic viability to communities that are slowly dying unless this government takes action.

I see the Minister of Education is in the House tonight, and I would like to draw his attention to the guidelines that his predecessor (Mr. Davis) invoked on school boards across the province. They may be legitimate guidelines in certain areas of the province; they may be legitimate in southern Ontario and in eastern Ontario. But I would like to suggest to the present Minister of Education that these guidelines are completely unrealistic in northern Ontario. If he thinks that the students—the children, the adults of tomorrow—from northwestern Ontario are going to enjoy equality of educational opportunity under those guidelines, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he is deluding himself.

Hon. R. S. Welsh (Minister of Education): Those ceilings are weighted.

Mr. Stokes: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Welsh: Those ceilings are weighted.

Mr. Stokes: The minister would have a very difficult time convincing the people of northwestern Ontario that that is the case—

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): One-tenth of a point.

Mr. Stokes: When the minister makes a statement like that—

Hon. Mr. Welch: They are treated differently from the south.

Mr. Stokes: Yes, worse.

Hon. Mr. Welch: No!

Mr. Stokes: Is the minister aware, Mr. Speaker, that it costs 15 to 20 per cent more to acquire the services of a teacher in northwestern Ontario than it does in any other place in the province? Is the minister aware that the capital cost of building school and educational facilities is about 20 to 30 per cent more than it is in any other place in the province?

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): He is aware of it but does not care.

Mr. Stokes: Is the minister aware, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: Is the minister aware, Mr. Speaker, that we are taking children 120 miles a day by bus, round trip, to composite high schools in northwestern Ontario?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Is the minister aware that the high school teachers are not fully qualified?

Mr. Stokes: Is the minister aware, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of building schools runs anywhere from \$7 to \$8 per square foot more in northern Ontario than it does in southern Ontario?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: I am telling the minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, that the teachers, the students and the trustees of the district school boards in northwestern Ontario tell me that the minister's guidelines are completely unrealistic. If he wants to provide quality of educational opportunity everywhere in this province, regardless of where people live, he had better take another and more realistic look at his guidelines.

Mr. Martel: He had better train the teachers equally too.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The hon. members do not understand the guidelines as they apply to northern Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: The minister wants to suggest that to the trustees and those who sit on the board and to the high-priced help that we had—directors of education right down to administrators, principals, vice-principals and

the teachers themselves. He should ask them how realistic the present guidelines are.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The member can just find out what they are.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, because of the exigencies—

Mr. Martel: Does the minister know what they are?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Sure.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, because of the exigencies of time, I am not going to dwell too long on any one of these particular topics, but I do want to mention—

Hon. Mr. Welch: Ask the member for Peterborough.

Mr. Stokes: But I do want to mention, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission has operated for—I do not know how many tens of years in this province. I see the vice-chairman just coming in to his seat now. Maybe he can enlighten me. But never in that time has northwestern Ontario ever had representation on that commission.

The Prime Minister made an announcement of a task force that has been set up to study all of the ramifications pertaining to the operation of Ontario Hydro. There again, nobody from northwestern Ontario was appointed to serve on that board.

The people of northwestern Ontario, Mr. Speaker, are getting just a little bit fed up with being ignored when any of these surveys are going on. When any of this consultation is going on it is in many cases without the knowledge of and without any consultation with our people.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are getting a little bit fed up. We demand equal time and we demand that we be recognized and that we be represented on these various boards.

An hon. member: You are getting more than your fair share now.

Mr. Stokes: I think that I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, with the complete support of 90 per cent of the people who live in northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Pitman: That is the point.

Mr. Martel: Studded tires, for example.

Mr. Stokes: Just this afternoon I had hoped that I would get an opportunity to get up and ask the new Minister of Highways and

Transport (Mr. MacNaughton) what he was doing about the representations made by one of his colleagues, the newly appointed Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier). I know that he got about four columns in a recent edition of the Toronto Globe and Mail for—

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): The hon. member will not get a thing.

Mr. Stokes: No, I probably will not. But if it will get any action, I do not mind spending a few moments talking about it.

Mr. Martel: What is the Minister of Mines going to do?

Mr. Stokes: But I think that 400,000 people in northern Ontario know the value of studded tires in this province—

Mr. Martel: Did the minister read the papers?

Mr. Stokes: Indeed, the new Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs knows it. For his own reasons he cannot get up in this House and say so, but I know that he feels just as strongly as I do. And I know that if he had a little bit more courage, he would stand up and echo the sentiments of the people—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Stokes: —he represents in Kenora riding and speak on behalf of retaining studded tires in northern Ontario where they are so badly needed.

An hon. member: Break now; come on.

Mr. Martel: Sit in the back row and—

Mr. Stokes: I will even give him time if he will take advantage of it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Stokes: One other thing that I would like to mention is the farm tax reduction programme that was instituted jointly by the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) and the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart). It is an excellent programme, Mr. Speaker, and I have advised every one of my constituents who are taxed under the farm assessment programme to take advantage of it, to cash it and to use it as they see fit. But it is very ironical—it has come to my mind and to my attention in the last couple of days that Domtar—

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William): Are they farmers?

Mr. Stokes: No, I would not think so.

An hon. member: They might have some horses.

Mr. Stokes: Domtar actually received a cheque on behalf of the farm tax reduction programme.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Don't tell me.

Mr. Stokes: They actually received a cheque.

Mr. Gaunt: What abuse!

Mr. Stokes: I know of one mining company, Mr. Speaker, that got an \$800 cheque because the patented land that they hold tenure to is assessed as farm land.

So it helps some people but it helps an awful lot of people it was not designed to help at all.

Hon. Mr. Welch: It helps the farmers, the member knows that.

Mr. Stokes: All I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that when these programmes are thrown out by the province I think that they should be operated so they help the people they were meant to help—

Hon. Mr. Welch: It helps people who wanted it.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): That is who it helps.

Mr. Stokes: —not a lot of people who are just cashing in on expediency.

Mr. Speaker, I had made a commitment that I would not speak any more than 15 or 20 minutes and I am going to try to adhere to it.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I am for that.

Mr. Stokes: But I am going to suggest, through you Mr. Speaker, to this government that if they want to retain the little bit of support that they have in northern Ontario in the next election, they had better listen very carefully to any spokesman from northwestern and northeastern Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The man from Fort William.

Mr. Stokes: —because there is a move and a wave of disenchantment in northwestern and northeastern Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Look what happened in Fort William.

Mr. Stokes: —the likes of which this province has never seen.

Mr. Martel: Call the election.

Mr. Stokes: I am going to suggest to the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) that because of the negligence of his department and the policies enunciated by his department, we could have another member representing the New Democratic Party in Ontario in Cochrane North next time. The minister may have a little lead time, but not very much.

Mr. Jessiman: They had one; how about Ted Freeman.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: I can spend a considerable amount of time here speaking in more detail about the timber management policies of the department under this minister—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The member is always negative. Let us be positive.

Mr. Stokes: I am not going to do it. I am giving the minister time to put his house in order.

Mr. Jessiman: Ted Freeman had lots of time.

Mr. Stokes: If I have to, Mr. Speaker, I will publicize just what is actually going on within that department to the detriment of development in northwestern Ontario.

I suggest to this House, through you, Mr. Speaker, that we have the greatest—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: He tries for the best of both worlds.

Mr. Stokes: —storehouse of human and material resources any place on the face of the earth. We have the people, we have the expertise, we have the will to get on with it—all we need is assistance by way of realistic, meaningful government programmes to give us the necessary impetus to get this thing going. I know that we have the resources to do it, the people in the north have the will to do it—if you do not believe me, ask the chamber of commerce, ask the Northwestern Ontario Development Council, ask any of those people—

Mr. Jessiman: Ask Ted Freeman.

Mr. Stokes:—including the hon. member for Fort William.

Mr. Jessiman: Who replaced the NDP member?

Mr. Stokes: He is being a little bit hypocritical right now, Mr. Speaker, because when we talk about these things, about the needs and aspirations of northwestern Ontario, he agrees with me right down the line. But he lacks the intestinal fortitude to get up here where it really counts and say so.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Watch your blood pressure.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: I think, Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes allotted to me—

Mr. Pitman: You will not get him excited again, will you?

Mr. Stokes:—I have time to pinpoint the feelings of people in the area of the province that I represent. If this government thinks it deserves the support of the people in the next election it better start listening to people like the chamber of commerce, people like the Northwestern Ontario Development Council and people like myself, who speak on behalf of all the people in northwestern Ontario. If you look after human needs and human wants you will make that part of the province a better place to live. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): In rising to take part in this Throne debate, I wish to extend congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on your kindness shown to me during your term of office, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, I wish you well.

I would like to extend—though he is not in his seat—congratulations to the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) on being elected Prime Minister of this province, a position that very few men ever held. I know his task is no easy one. I know he will be called on to make many very important decisions, and I wish him well.

An hon. member: Not too well, but well enough.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex Kent): Even though we will short-term him.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Let him make his own speech.

Mr. Spence: I wish to congratulate the hon. members who have been named to the cabinet since the last session. There have been seven. I know it is an honour to them; it is an honour to the ridings that they represent; and I wish them well. Also, to the other cabinet ministers who have been changed from portfolio to portfolio, I wish them well.

Mr. Speaker, I have said all the nice things. So now I will have to say something of a warning to them—

An hon. member: Not necessarily.

Mr. Spence:—because I will have to tell them that their term of office is going to be very short.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the government some of the things that concern and bewilder many citizens of the Province of Ontario. The people cannot understand why this government—which is one of the biggest institutions in this province—collects money from the taxpayers and turns round and rebates it back to the municipalities and to the individuals. What could be more inefficient and costly than this way of doing things?

Surely a government which has been in power for 26 or 27 years should have learned by now to handle things better than this? Why, if a housewife handled her money in this way, Mr. Speaker, even the most long-suffering husband would show her the door—and maybe that is what the long-suffering taxpayers will do at the next election.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Hear, hear. The poor husband and the poor taxpayer.

Mr. Spence: The farmers, in particular, feel that they are getting a very raw deal, and the public sees that when the money rolls into the Ontario Treasury it is spent, not always on essentials but on frills. I am not against sensible expenditures on education, Mr. Speaker; I want the best possible education for every boy and girl of this province. We all realize that a sound education system is a good investment for everyone. But, Mr. Speaker, people wonder when they have to scrimp and save to furnish expensive palaces that have nothing to do with the actual business of teaching and learning.

The government no longer asks, "What do we need?" Now it says, "This year we will take 30 per cent, or whatever, of the gross provincial product, one way or another, and

when we see what this percentage brings in, then we will decide how to spend it." That is the way it is done today, Mr. Speaker.

My constituents have had just about enough of the present Ontario government's policy. I know that even many government back-benchers feel as I do, and they would speak out in a similar fashion if they dared. But they have to obey the whip, and so they stay silent.

It seems the civil service has got itself a good thing, with all these fragmented repayments on the go. Mr. Speaker, they will be the last ones to rock the boat. Unfortunately, too, some municipalities are now taking the easy way out and are starting to accept the idea of the basic shelter exemption as a fact of Ontario life. After all, this was intended to be only a temporary measure. The municipalities have become less vigilant in their initial demands than they otherwise might be. They know that if they set too high a mill rate, Queen's Park will come back with a bigger cheque. This does not make for good local government practices.

There are farmers in my area getting three or four different small cheques, but they are not fooled. They know that they were overtaxed in the first place. The old people are not fooled either. They were not born yesterday, in more senses than one.

When I go to my riding on the weekend, people say to me: "Well, John, what are they doing about high taxes?" Then I have to tell them that when we want to do something positive about costs, as in the human resources committee or the public accounts committee, we cannot even get to first base. Mr. Speaker, this government does not really want to get down to matters seriously, but only wants to do a little window dressing in preparation for the coming election.

How else can anyone explain the Premier's refusal to engage research staff for the service of the human resources committee—people quite independent of those who stand ready to defend their actions and their jobs—so that the committee can really look at the functions of education in relation to costs, and decide what is worthwhile and should be continued, and what is wasteful and should be scrapped?

Mr. Speaker, people all across the province can see for themselves that the Premier and his government are not really sincere in their promises to look into the great duplication and waste in our education system, and really have no honest intention of ensuring the taxpayer will get full value for his education tax

dollar. Because of the government majority on the committee, the courage of one Conservative ready to speak his mind will have no effect. We must admire the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith). What he did on Tuesday afternoon was to put himself in a position where he could sleep nights with an easy conscience.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is more than the Liberals can do.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): They have an easy conscience but they are not going to sleep.

Mr. Gaunt: Uneasy lies the head—

Mr. Spence: I admire him for standing up for his convictions, but I have no doubt that he will pay the price in his position within the Conservative caucus. I hope he did not have any high hopes of becoming a cabinet minister in the near future.

Mr. Ruston: We will make him a Minister without Portfolio.

Mr. Spence: I wish to congratulate him on seeing where the real values in this life are. Maybe he should not give up all hope of becoming a cabinet minister at that, because the Liberal Party of Ontario welcomes men with courage and integrity. As we shall be forming the next government, he should not give up the idea altogether. That is right; that is the kind of man we need.

In spite of all the setbacks caused by the negative attitude of the Premier, I know that my colleagues in the opposition will pursue the question of education costs in relation to benefits with all their might. They know their goals, and they have my backing all the way in their efforts to make the human resources committee an effective committee.

At the same time, I know the opposition members on the public accounts committee will get down to the real question of how last year's money was spent in relation to what the taxpayers got for it.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The member means "wasted".

Mr. Spence: They do not want to conduct a witch-hunt, like the late Senator McCarthy in the United States, but Ontario's McCarthy obviously leans in the other direction. How can he investigate his own department? How can he sit across the table from the people he has been working with for the past several years and be objective in studying what they have done and what they are doing?

Hon. R. S. Welch (Minister of Education): He is just going to be the executive officer.

Mr. Spence: Is that right? We have to do something a little better than that.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing against Dr. McCarthy whatsoever, but I would say he is the wrong man for the job. He is too close to this whole question. What is needed is an inquiry under the direction of elected representatives from every party in this House. Such an all-party committee needs an adequate research staff to carry out the detailed research and give advice when it is necessary.

The government must demonstrate beyond a shadow of a doubt that it is sincere in the matter of selectively reducing education costs. It must reappportion the base of education taxes so that the property owner is relieved of this unfair burden. Then, maybe, we shall feel that this government is getting somewhere. If these things are not done, the government will never satisfy the people across the Province of Ontario that it is honestly trying to eliminate duplication and waste from our education system.

Reassessment is another disaster, Mr. Speaker. Some parts of Ontario are now reassessed at market value; others are not.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): It is one disaster after another.

Mr. Spence: I must say, Mr. Speaker, the mistakes that have been made in some of the assessment offices across this province concern me greatly. Every man is subject to making mistakes, but in the township in which I live, 15 farmers have not received their \$25 tax rebate cheque as yet. One of the reasons is that the assessor who assessed those 15 farms assessed them as residential property. I wonder what is wrong with that assessor, Mr. Speaker, when one of the properties has 400 acres, has farm equipment and livestock, and yet is classed as a residential property. Another farm has 250 acres and is equipped with machinery and livestock, and another of 100 acres is classed as residential property.

We have contacted the assessment office and asked if anything could be done to change this back to farm property so that these people could get their \$25 tax rebate cheques. It has been impossible so I have come to Toronto and called up The Department of Municipal Affairs. I am not critical of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) because he has held that office just a very short time, but I must say that one of

the officials told me that they could do nothing. There had to be an order-in-council passed. I must say that all the red tape here in order to correct a mistake is unbelievable to the average individual. If the man on the back concession of our county had a problem to solve and he did not have somebody to go to or was not familiar with Parliament, he would never get these things straightened out.

I do hope that this Prime Minister and this new cabinet will cut the red tape so that the average individual can understand how to correct a problem or how to improve conditions. I hope that is done because the red tape is getting so thick it is beyond the little man to do anything.

I must say to my colleague from Perth (Mr. Edighoffer), who said in the House a few days ago that the new assessment is completed in the riding of Perth and that this assessment is going to be kept secretly on file until after the next election, that it is unbelievable to hear statements like that here in the House—that they will not break out the new assessments until after a provincial election is called.

The government intends to hold a carrot in front of the electors of this province to coax them to vote for them and, then, after the election bring out this new assessment, which will be stunning and which will frighten the taxpayers of this province.

An hon. member: That is what you call a loaded carrot.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to escalate the war between Ontario and Quebec over the interprovincial trade in farm products, but I would not be fair to my constituents if I did not observe that the people in my area—for example, some egg producers, vegetable producers, cattle producers, hog producers—view these barriers with alarm. Any action to restrict trade between the provinces, Mr. Speaker, concerns many of us. They know they will be the losers in the long run and perhaps even in the short run. The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) has been listening to a lobby of big producers who misguided him.

I must say Gordon Hill of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture should have taken a poll before embarking on an endorsement of restrictive policy between the provinces. They would have discovered that far from having 100 per cent support their membership would have been split 50-50. Those who

can see a little further are opposed to restrictive legislation. Some of them are going to go to law about it while others will show their sentiments by voting against the government which brought this law into being.

Let us hope that there will be no retaliation from Quebec, because our agriculture industry—

Mr. Sargent: The government is tearing down Confederation.

Mr. Spence: —is already facing very great difficulties and problems at the present time.

It seems that we have the fastest regulator in the west at the corner of Bay and Bloor. Regulations for the broilers were in the Toronto Daily Star on Monday afternoon and in fact the Star had the text over the weekend.

So you see, this government can move fast when it wants to. The pity is that we move in the wrong direction and it will have to be undone, if not by the Supreme Court of Canada, then by way of repeal when we form the government. Liberals believe in free trade across the provinces. It is just as simple as that.

What a situation we have now. The income of many of my constituents is liable to be cut as the market for their produce is cut off as a retaliatory measure. Meanwhile their taxes will continue to go up in all proportion as re-assessment proceeds. Their hard-earned money is to be used to pay education costs which the elected representatives of the people are not permitted to examine in any constructive or objective way.

Finally, with their incomes reduced and their taxes increased they will be given rebate cheques and the government will expect them to applaud.

At the same time, over here in the gleaming new office buildings at Queen's Park—

Mr. Sargent: Better than the Taj Mahal.

Mr. Spence: —floor after floor of expensive offices will be filled with civil servants employed to send out these cheques.

Mr. Sargent: I just picked it up at my office last night.

Mr. Spence: In fact, more people will be working at sending the taxpayers' money back to them than are needed by the provincial government to collect the money in the first place, because some of the taxes are collected by the federal government and some by the municipalities. The money goes round

and round, and sometimes some of us do not know where it goes.

If the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) had become Premier of this province all this would have been different. He told us himself that: "No one department should receive 41 per cent of the budget." He also said—

Mr. W. G. Pitman: There is an idea.

Mr. Spence: —"Winning is just the beginning," and to turn this around, "Losing is just the end," the end of our hopes that this government will relate education costs to functions and to the earning power of the people of Ontario.

The only hope, Mr. Speaker, is the old saying: "A new broom sweeps clean," and we in this party are just the people to do the sweeping.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, that comes as a surprise. We usually have one or two of the opposition speak before we call on two of one party.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): No interest shown.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): Two for one.

Mr. Bukator: One thing about it, I am always prepared. My speeches in this House are not hard to make, because I have been here a long time.

I prepared an exceptionally good speech for this evening and then I left it at home when I came in from the Falls. This morning when I left home I forgot to pick it up and bring it with me, so you will have to contend with me this evening by way of—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Off the cuff.

Mr. Bukator: —speaking to you about the things that I believe are right and wrong with this government.

First of all, I would like to say how pleased I am to see these young page girls that we have with us during this session. They have done an excellent job for us and I want to say to whoever is responsible for having them here, I am very pleased with them. They are doing a good job and I hope the education that they get here with the members will help them in the paths of life. And by the time

they are 21 years of age, I know how they are going to vote. They are intelligent young people, and that way we know we will have them in our party.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bukator: I say nothing for the boys because they have always served us well and it is nice to see them doing such a fine job for us. We do appreciate it.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): The girls are going to vote for us.

An hon. member: Two votes is all they are going to get.

Mr. Brown: You cannot blame them.

Mr. Bukator: I can say one thing for the member for, where is it—

Mr. Gilbertson: Algoma.

Mr. Bukator:—Algoma, he is a very optimistic gentleman, and that way you can stay in the game a little longer, at least until the coming election.

Mr. Speaker, many things have passed through my mind in the last few weeks. I look at the shuffle in the cabinet and I see the ministers who were not fortunate enough to become cabinet ministers getting to be Ministers without Portfolio.

Mr. Sargent: Even the back-benchers are cabinet ministers now.

Mr. Bukator: I think the government has made another mistake when it did not honour the only lady in the party with a high office.

An hon. member: That is right.

Mr. Bukator: This lady, in my opinion, has served her party well.

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear, Mrs. Pritchard.

Mr. Bukator: It may be that she supported the wrong one in the leadership convention. That does make a difference, you know.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): She picked the wrong horse there.

Mr. Bukator: Anyway, I want the member for Hamilton West (Mrs. Pritchard), to know that we, in our party, are with her. We respect her for the job she has done in this House for the period of time she has been here.

It seems that you start out complimenting people, and then you lower the boom. I was going to start at seat number one, the former

Prime Minister of the Province of Ontario, (Mr. Robarts), and I would like to make this distinction. I was told that the Prime Minister is the man who is the leader of the federal government and the Premiers are the leaders of the provinces. When Mr. Robarts was asked how he came by that title, he said that when he moved into the office of the Premier of this province, on the door it said "Prime Minister", so he accepted that. That is how he became the Prime Minister of the Province of Ontario. Somebody put the name on the door.

I would say, too, watching him all the years that he was here and Minister of Education before becoming Prime Minister, he served the province exceptionally well. I want that to go on the record. I have respect for this man for the time that he has served and the job that he has done for this province.

Mr. Sargent: Do not lay it on too much.

Mr. Bukator: I will tell you how brilliant and intelligent this man was: He knew that someone was going to lower the boom on him and he quit before he was fired. He said, "I am not going to be defeated. I am riding the crest of the wave." Nobody sits on a pedestal in politics. They were riding the crest of the wave; he knew it would crumble and the thing would fall and that he might drown with his party. So he moved out and he has now become one of the most prominent and capable politicians in the Province of Ontario. Who knows, he may even go to the federal House.

He was a great man. He has supported Confederation and worked hard to bring this party together, but is it not remarkable how quickly those people in the government now have torn the thing apart. With this farm bill alone, they have now balkanized, as my friend from Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) says, the Province of Ontario. We are going to have divisions of a type that this country has never seen before, because the people of Canada now cannot trade with each other without having to contend with each other's laws.

Mr. Sargent: Barriers all over—for every commodity.

Mr. Bukator: And so the people will have to make a choice in the very near future about the Premier (Mr. Davis) and his new government—and I am sorry that the new Premier is not here. I watched the convention with interest and how close he came to being beaten by an individual who had no right to win that leadership at all. He was a rebel, a maverick, in that party. They finally

made him Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) and then he contested. I watched with interest until all hours of the morning and noted how well he conducted himself with his pleasant smile, and I thought, "My goodness, I would have voted for him myself." He would have been another—who was the fellow who took over for us in 1934?

Mr. Gaunt: Mitch Hepburn.

Mr. Bukator: It struck me that he could have been another Mitch Hepburn. And that would have been good for the province, because it is about time some of the oldtimers with their old methods were put out of office. Not that we have anything against them individually, but the ideas they carry though in this modern day and age are not fitting to this particular way of life. They have come to the place in this game where they have forgotten that they are dealing with people, dealing in the 1970s rather than the 1930s and 1940s. There are some of them in this particular House right now who were elected back in 1943 and even before that. Their ideas have not changed a bit.

So this is what the people have to contend and wrestle with—consult their consciences, if you will, in the next provincial election and look over the possibility of whether they want to go to these radical socialists to the left. I am sorry that I only have three or four to deal with.

An hon. member: What a lot of nonsense.

Mr. Sargent: That is all they will have the next time too. They will be lucky if they get five next time.

Mr. Bukator: Can you imagine, with what few they have here in the House, there is only one millionaire in this crowd of five. He could conduct some of their affairs, I believe, because he knows something about free enterprise and yet he claims he is a socialist. I do not know how the man could become a millionarie in the free enterprise system and still believe in socialism. I cannot understand it.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It might interest the member to know that we are for free enterprise.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: But we do not believe in socialism for the rich!

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): This is the waffle, waffle talking.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Speaker, I wish they were all in their places this evening.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bukator: I wish they were all in this place this evening. I would like to give them a portfolio—make them the ministers of the different departments and put in their hands the industries, the resources of this country, and let them administer the affairs of this province and see what they would do to us. It would take another century to put the show back on the road again, as my colleague from Owen Sound says.

Can you imagine putting the wealth of this country into the hands of a gang of people who would run it in their own way—take it or leave it, the industry will stay here. The wages people will get will be a certain amount and all things will be done by this small handful of people who cannot run their own affairs properly.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): They would fire all the civil servants.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): He did not say that.

Mr. Bukator: Oh, yes, if the civil servants do not become socialists immediately they will all be fired.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What did these fellows say about patronage this afternoon?

Mr. Bukator: I will say something about that. I do not believe the people on the government side of the House are right. What business have they got feathering the nests of their political friends?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Terrible.

Mr. Bukator: Now getting down to the facts of the province—the ministers and the affairs of the province: the minister who interjected was the Minister of Prisons and Reforms at one time.

An hon. member: Correctional Services.

Mr. Bukator: That was after that. First it was Prisons and Reforms, then it was Correctional Institutions. He came into the county of Welland. They decided they would have a form of regional government before they had regional government and the county of Lincoln and the county of Welland would

have one beautiful big prison block where all the prisoners would be treated properly and this fine establishment would be built. I was invited to this lovely dinner—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member is thinking of the federal government. It puts up prisons; we put up correctional institutions.

Mr. Bukator: We decided in St. Catharines to get together and this minister came down with a pocketful of pens like the President of the United States. He signed a contract with those two counties that now the government would take over and would build a lovely new jail-house and a new county building of the type of which we would be pleased. So I applauded him, and everybody did. As a matter of fact, I thought I would get my picture in the paper with him but because I was from the opposition I had to stand on the side while the minister and the authorities shook hands. I said to myself, "This is fine; at least they gave me a lovely dinner." So, remembering this particular process within the last week I received a letter from this great hockey player, the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Apps), "We are coming to your part of the country in the next week and we would like you to be our guest because we are going to build a new court house for you." This is three years later—I wonder why this would happen at this time.

Mr. Sargent: We have not got any in Owen Sound. The former minister promised one in Owen Sound. They are still talking about it.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Speaker, I am going to interrupt while they are butting in—it would take me all night to say what I have to say. So, as I said, the Minister of Correctional Services, a fine gentleman, has invited me to a second—the first one, I guess, must have been the dress rehearsal.

An hon. member: He has a healthy appetite.

Mr. Bukator: Now we are going to get this new building, and I thought there must be an election coming up. However, I understand they are going to turn the sod and they almost have the plans complete. I hope this time this fellow is a little more broad-minded than the former minister and he might have me in that picture at least, so that if the building is ever built they will say they have the member of the opposition who assisted them. Because when I was on county council, back in 1949, 1950 or 1951, we were talking about the obsolete old jails in those two

counties, and they should have then been rebuilt. And we came down here to Rev. Foote, I believe it was, who was then the Minister of Reform Institutions—they are changing these titles so fast I cannot remember them all; it was the same job but with a different name.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Sounds like the NDP.

Mr. Bukator: It did not happen under the previous administration and maybe the new minister will provide this for us. And before it happens, in case it does, I say thanks to that fine gentleman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: One is ready to open in two weeks.

Mr. Bukator: Very good, but not the ones we were talking about for three or four years.

Mr. Sargent: How many did the former minister build?

Mr. Bukator: The vice-chairman of Hydro has just left and I want to talk to him about some of the problems that we have to wrestle with in the Province of Ontario in connection with Hydro—the Hydro employees, the pensioners of that particular institution who have worked here so long and so well for small amounts of money and have finally set aside a little money for pension. I understand, if I were to look into the records, that there are millions of dollars in the pension fund. I was hoping that the vice-chairman would be in his place tonight and I could persuade him to finally get on his feet and say—

Mr. Sargent: He is driving home in a big black Cadillac.

Mr. Bukator: There is always a black car sitting out in front of the building to take him there. I understand at the Royal York Hotel they have one at the front door and one at the side, because he has so many problems to contend with and wrestle with that he does not remember what door he goes out of and they do not want to miss him. They have a car waiting for him to bring him back to the Parliament buildings and at this time of night they will take him back down again. All I am asking him to do is forget about the cars; I think he is entitled to them. I think he is entitled to the extra money he is getting for being vice-chairman of Hydro.

Mr. Sargent: He is not.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): If there are any fewer members over there, there will not be enough jobs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: Would it not be nice if they would consider the pensioners and give them just a little bit more money to maintain themselves?

Mr. Stokes: Some of those water rentals?

Mr. Bukator: Water rentals are things that I could talk about for hours, but I feel as the speaker for the NDP did, that 20 minutes is not too long to touch all of the bases. I will leave that for another time. I will give you all the facts and figures on how we are being taken on the Niagara Peninsula, but not tonight.

Mr. Stokes: I have some idea myself.

Mr. Bukator: I would think that on the one item only, the Hydro should consider increasing the pensions of the men who served them so well for so many years. The money is there, the millions are in their funds and they ought to increase their pensions because in this day and age people are not better off on fixed incomes. People who are on pensions just cannot maintain themselves with the way prices of everything have gone up, especially the increased taxes for school purposes. School costs have increased so much in the last year or two, and over the last five or six years, and there is no let up. They have finally come to the point where they are going to restrict the spending of the school boards because they know they have gone too far beyond their budgets and they cannot continue to maintain themselves.

The school boards which we had in some areas of the county were good. Half of the counties had boards which represented both high schools and public schools and they served their people well. They were elected to those offices and they did an exceptionally good job.

However, the Minister of Education, the present Premier of the province, decided we would have county systems regardless whether we wanted them or not. They had representations before the committee asking, "Please, leave well enough alone. We are doing well, we are quite content with our boards."

The proof was there that they were doing a good job. But, no, the minister says, "We will try the county system." And the school

costs increased so badly that no one could maintain themselves, especially people on fixed incomes and pensions. This is another problem they have to wrestle with.

You know, if the NDP or the Liberals had been in power for any length of time doing some of these things that are wrong, you could blame us, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Spence: That is right.

Mr. Bukator: Who has been running the government's affairs for the last 28 years—

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Nobody.

Mr. Bukator: —but the Conservatives themselves? If there have been increases and if there have been faults—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): By the choice of the people.

Mr. Bukator: It is the people on the right hand of the Speaker who have forgotten the people they represent. They have become not individuals who serve the people or stewards for the people, but they have become somewhat of a prince or a king in a kingdom where they run the affairs of the province as though they were their own.

I come to the man who has caused more grief for the Province of Ontario than any individual I have met in this House since 1959. That is the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough).

He put it so badly in debt—

Mr. Sargent: A hell of a mess!

Mr. Bukator: —and he has taken regional government and imposed it in four or five areas. He said these things would work because he was told by his experts; and he would not interfere with the way the province's affairs were run in these regions, because once they were elected they could run the show.

I recall a meeting in St. Catharines with the judges and the magistrates and the Ontario Provincial Police and the local police. We talked about the police question for a long time. I said, Mr. Speaker, at that time to the former Attorney General (Mr. Wishart)—who is also not in his seat; you know I like talking to empty chairs because they do not talk back. You can say what you like and they do not come back at you and say: "You are wrong."

But the former Attorney General, for whom I have a lot of respect, was at that meeting that evening. I said, "Mr. Attorney General, tell us if you are going to give us regional type of

policing, if the townships and the villages and the towns and cities would have policing equal to what they have in the city, it will cost more money. The city of Niagara Falls would have to have another 18 policemen and five more cars."

I remember the former Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch)—as he is leaving the House—saying to me that it was utter nonsense on the radio; I did not know what I was talking about. The member for Niagara Falls did not. I said it will cost money, and the members know what it has cost in the last five years; just look back—

An hon member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bukator: —look back and see what the increases are. Then project the thinking; who knows, maybe the people of my village will pay another three, four, five mills on a \$5,000 assessment; it is only \$25 but I want it.

The Attorney General says we will not inform these men how they should run their affairs. They are intelligent people and they can run them; we are not projecting. It is a good thing he did not.

Last year the cost to that region, of what the Minister of Education, the hon. member for St. Catharines, said was the greatest thing that ever came out of Queen's Park and was going to be the finest thing that they ever had—the increase alone for tying the police systems together was an additional million. There were \$350,000 more to be picked up by the taxpayer. So the former Minister of Municipal Affairs came down there with a beautiful car and a lot of support. No doubt, the Minister of Education was there when he gave them \$350,000 last year to help with the police and said, "This is what is going to help you over the hill."

What happens this year? Who is going to pick up the tab for \$350,000? Because the costs are still there. So I say to the government—

Mr. Sargent: The taxpayers should sue them; that is what they should do.

Mr. Bukator: Finally, we watch this leadership convention and we see the former Minister of Municipal Affairs walk across the floor and say to the present Prime Minister, "I am for you; I am going to support you." The first thing we know he is sitting on the right-hand side or the left-hand side of the Premier and becomes the provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Worton: Misery loves misery.

Mr. Bukator: If he does not do any better with that job than he did with regional government, and if he does not do better with that job than he did with provincial assessment—I tell members that the people of his own riding—I happen to have, by accident, a clipping in my hand. It is strange how it got into my desk: Regionalism: Newkirk Roasts It; McKeough Backs It.

The Treasurer will back it until the next provincial election and then when the government goes to the hustings to talk to the people about its stewardship, it is going to be defeated. We see it all over the Province of Ontario.

I said to the former Premier of the province, "We do not have to beat you. The things that you do and the way that you handle the affairs of the people of the Province of Ontario are the things that you will be governed by. When the people see what you have done that is wrong, they are not going to vote for us because they like us; they are going to vote against you because they do not like what you do. That is the way you are going to be defeated in the next provincial election."

I only wish I had four or five more hours—

Mr. J. R. Simonett (Frontenac-Addington): That is a negative attitude.

Mr. Bukator: It is nice to hear from the member for Frontenac-Addington away back there. I have lost track of this former Minister of Energy and Resources Management who had no energy.

Mr. Sargent: He was Public Works.

Mr. Bukator: He now has no energy and resources.

Mr. Simonett: I have no resources; I have energy, yes.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Speaker, he has the northwest—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: From what I hear, his resources are not too bad either.

Mr. Bukator: I wish those people would quit butting in while I am talking.

Mr. Simonett: Surely the hon. member does not mean that.

Mr. Bukator: I have never known a nicer fellow. I hope that when the geese are running well next fall up in Moosonee that the member for Frontenac-Addington will arrange

for the Liberals to go up and get a shot at those because he now owns the Ontario Northland Railway, I believe—or he is second in command—so I hope he will arrange for a trip for us to get in a bit of Canada geese.

Mr. Stokes: Does the member want the use of the private car too?

Mr. Bukator: Would that not be nice?

An hon. member: Do they have one?

Another hon. member: That would be a dead end for the member for Frontenac-Addington.

Mr. Sargent: The "Simonett Special."

Mr. Bukator: I wanted to touch on so many things, but I was told that the government is trying to get through the debate this evening and would like us to cut it short so we can be on our way by four in the morning at least. I do not have too many ministers to pick on; there are not too many in the House to pick on.

I might say, while I look the crowd over, it is an exceptionally nice thing to see a man who sticks by his convictions. I remember one of the Conservative members who walked up and down the halls and many of his fellow members did not even speak to him because he took a stand on the health problem. A fine gentleman, the member for Quinte (Mr. Potter).

I watched the shuffle in the cabinet and what had taken place, and I said, "There is a gentleman who is entitled to the little bit of a break that he got." The member for Quinte is going to serve us well. Thank you very much.

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands came in, how nice it was to get that invitation from him to go and turn the sod of this jail that was supposed to have been opened three years ago by the then minister. I am looking forward to the turning of the sod in a very few days.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do not let him get into the picture.

Mr. Bukator: I wanted to get in the picture, but he cut me off.

Gentlemen, this is a serious business. I have made many friends since I came into the Legislature in 1959. I know that there is not a man in this House who does not want to do what is right by his position and the people he represents. I believe that if we were in that position that they are in, we would do it a little different.

Right or wrong, I think we have some plans we could put into effect that the people would appreciate, because I think we in the opposition, who deal at the grass roots and hear the problems of the voters—and I think they are listening to us; we have listened to them—the day may come that we will be sitting on that side of the House. And I hope then when we get to that position, we will not treat them any rougher than they have treated me for the last 12 years.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I thought this evening I would take a few minutes to review the state of the situation for emotionally disturbed children in the province since that was the major reason that turned me to politics and brought me to the Legislature some four years ago.

On April 1, 1971, The Department of Health put into effect The Children's Mental Health Centres Act, which provided regulations and licensed some 19 centres in the province. This Act covers 950 children who were previously covered either by the parents, by Children's Aid Societies or various other departments of government.

I would like to compliment the government on this Act. There was a time when many people thought the Act was designed primarily to drive the Browndale organization out of existence. As it turns out, I supported the Act from the very beginning. The province has needed such an Act.

The revisions and amendments that were made to the Act prior to its actual passing were all good. I think the Act stands as a monument to the province. I am very impressed with the children's division of The Department of Health that has been established and the manner in which they have gone about setting up the regulations and introducing the programme.

I do need to point out, however, that the Act, the regulations, the licensing that went on—good as they are—did not create any new beds for emotionally disturbed children. That does not in any way detract from what has been done. It simply points out the fact that after waiting some eight or 10 years for increased and improved services to emotionally disturbed children, we still have to wait some more. The Act simply licensed those services that were already providing for children.

There is an anticipation in the community and in the child-placing agencies for additional beds. There was the dream and the hope that the problem and the burden of emotionally disturbed children being carried by Children's Aid Societies and other welfare groups would be ended when the Act came into being. The fact of the matter is the problem has not been solved. As so often happens when we sit down and begin to do a serious job about one of our social problems, we discovered that we were only seeing the top of the iceberg and that the one good thing we did to tackle the problem impresses us with the fact that there is so much more yet to do; and so it is with The Children's Mental Health Centres Act.

First, it is not providing enough beds at the present time. For some \$14 million or \$14.5 million, 950 children are going to be served in the Province of Ontario. We have somewhere in the neighbourhood of 250,000 children who need to be served. One per cent of that 250,000 is seriously disturbed children who require intensive facilities. We are going to have to find more money. The Treasury Board is going to have to find a way to see the relevance and importance of services to these children.

I know it was a great struggle for them to come up with the \$14 million. The Act was supposed to come in last fall and it took until April 1 before it was finally brought into effect. But when we look at the priorities, when we look at the expenditures of government, surely we can find more than \$14.5 million to put into this important work?

One of the problems that comes as a result of beginning to tackle the problem of emotionally disturbed children—one of the byproducts of this new Act—is the fact that we begin to see some of the miscalculations, or some of the foolish moves, that were taken in the past. I will just take a moment to talk about the area where the largest number of unserved, emotionally disturbed children exists at the present time in the province.

In The Department of Reform Institutions—where some 20 to 50 per cent of the children are emotionally disturbed—somehow, either by policy or by ignorance, children were placed under the jurisdiction of that department when they should have been more appropriately placed either in welfare or health, or in my preference The Department of Education. The fact of the matter is the government is now doing a very thorough and proper job for emotionally disturbed children, but it is not reaching children who are

under The Department of Reform Institutions.

Either The Department of Health, children's division, should have jurisdiction over the emotionally disturbed children in that department, or that department should quickly move to collaborate with this new children's division to set up proper services within its jurisdiction. I think one of the reasons why the reform institutions were allowed to collect such a large number of disturbed children, was primarily because of some bad professional advice.

There was a thought that operant conditioning—a technique that has been discarded in many jurisdictions of the world but was introduced in Ontario at a time when it was being withdrawn in other centres—there was advice from people who practise operant conditioning that these children could be served in reform institutions even though they were seriously emotionally disturbed.

Operant conditioning is a method which was developed by the rat psychologist a number of years ago. Essentially it says you reward desirable and good behaviour and you punish bad behaviour. By itself it is not necessarily bad. Most parents and families use this method in their own, untechnical way in the raising of their children, and it does work.

Unfortunately, reduced to a method, applied to an institution, used by people who do not understand it and who do not have relationships with children, it can become a dangerous tool. As practised in reform institutions, it is a very seriously dangerous tool to be used on young children who have no choice of whether they have it applied to them or not.

In those parts of The Department of Health which practise operant conditioning in the mental hospitals for the adults—there are unfortunately some children still there—and in the Ontario schools for retarded children where it is still used, it is also a dangerous tool. The danger comes in that people do not understand the dynamics of how it works and why it works and what they have to put into it themselves. There is not proper supervision of it.

I would suggest to the ministers responsible that they immediately investigate the use of operant conditioning in their departments; not with an idea of necessarily stopping it, not with an idea of necessarily having heads roll, but with an idea of bringing a tool that might be useful into proper use. These people should not be meddling around with techniques they are incapable of handling.

The social agency in the province that carried the greatest burden for emotionally disturbed children prior to this Act was, of course, the Children's Aid Society. They struggled with it, they tried to get financing for it, they suffered the burdens of attack from budget departments of local municipalities, of the provincial government, The Department of Social and Family Services; and generally they were struggling in an uphill battle to find some way to provide resources for the children they were charged to be responsible for.

I would like to say, as I have said on other occasions when I talked of the Children's Aid Societies, that we in the Legislature must recognize that we ask the people in these agencies to carry on the parental conduct, supervision and guidance of children who are orphans or whose own natural parents cannot do it, on behalf of society, on our behalf. We give them that heavy burden of responsibility, and time and time again we fail to provide them with the means to carry it out in the manner that we would like to do if we were left in charge of that onerous responsibility.

Now the burden of disturbed children has been taken from them. The agencies, in a natural way, are feeling a little lost. They need to be understood; that something they struggled for and fought for has now been turned over to other people's responsibility.

They are now left, and they will soon discover, all of the other urgent problems that are just as grave as this problem of emotionally disturbed children, which still rests within their jurisdiction. But they are going to be faced once again with the same problem: They will not have the means or the funds or the wherewithal to provide for those children.

One such group of children, of course, is that older, adolescent child, the child who has gone through a treatment centre, the child who has gone through a foster home, the child who has lived in his own family but who now cannot hack the authority structure of that home or cannot function within the family unit, whatever it might be—a foster family, his own family, an adoption family, a group home—but is not yet ready to be independent in the community and needs some kind of support to bridge him over.

In previous times, and still now with extended families, such a son or daughter is sent to a relative, an uncle, a cousin, a friend and there, out of the immediate involvement with his own family and the authority struc-

tures of that family, he is able to buy the time that he needs to become independently functioning.

There is a large number of children who have moved out of the parental structures, who have no place to go and no one to defend them, because we have small, nuclear families. And so they are on the streets. They are without proper food, shelter or clothing, and Children's Aid Societies will be finding the necessity to protect such groups more and more. We do not have funds to supply the Children's Aid Societies.

The most significant area—and the area that has always been lacking in this area of work—has been the lack of funds for prevention, where they have an opportunity to hire the qualified staff and enough numbers to get out and work with families before the child is removed, keeping families together.

I do not want to take more time—we are trying to finish the debate this evening—but I do want to close on one other issue which I think is a very vital issue. It has involved me deeply; I have spent a lot of time and worry and problem with it; I have spent a lot of money on it. It is the zoning bylaw problem when it comes to placing people in the community.

We know now that we must not continue to build large-style institutions. We know now that the family model is a more appropriate way to take care of people, whether they happen to be delinquent children, mentally ill children, emotionally disturbed children, retarded children. Right now, for instance, we have just witnessed an exposé of the conditions that everybody knew existed in the Orillia school. We have known about them for a long time.

The pressure that is on The Department of Health now will tend to move the government, for political reasons, to update that archaic institution, and there is a danger that we will build more institutions when we should be moving away from institutions. It would be possible within less than one year to remove every child in the Orillia school into small, family-like units in the community, properly supervised, with adults around who can care for them. It is perfectly safe for the community to have those children because they will be supervised by people, not by bars and not by covered cribs.

This can be done—it can be done more cheaply than to build the institutions. It has more humanity to it, it has more relevance to it, and I would very much urge the government to look at that. But the problem remains that the local municipalities can exclude these

children from any area within their jurisdiction, and they have done that in the borough of Scarborough and in the borough of Etobicoke.

They have done this despite the fact that they know they are on very shaky ground legally. We have fought the issue in the courts to the Supreme Court, not because we like to violate zoning bylaws, not because we feel that somehow it is good to have a battle with municipalities—we do not and we never have—but because we believe that because a child had a mental illness, that because a child was without his own parents, did not mean that he should be restricted from living in any area that he might live in if he were living with his own family.

We thought it reduced us as a society to do this to children and we thought it important enough to spend money to try to get it decided in law.

I will tell members quite bluntly and quite flatly that the decision in the court is something that the law, the lawyers and the jurisdictional people in the province need to look at very carefully, because it was not a credible decision. It was a split decision. It was a decision that should be reviewed and reversed. It is not a sound legal decision that will stand the test of time.

I would suggest that there be provincial leadership to set a standard of what a municipality can do in setting restrictive zoning bylaws to prohibit children from living in certain areas of the community, particularly in those municipalities which do not have the good common sense to provide for their children, who come from homes in their own municipalities, to be treated in that municipality.

In Scarborough and Etobicoke the children who come to the Children's Aid Society, who come into the treatment centres from both areas have to be treated in communities outside of Scarborough and Etobicoke. I ask the government what kind of an attitude is that? What kind of gross, reduced political manoeuvring produces that?

It is a shame! It is a shame to the people who live in those areas. It is a shame to the politicians. It is about time they made a change.

We tried to elicit the co-operation of agencies a number of years ago to stand together and exercise some power against them. It was not possible to do that. Today the scene has changed. It is possible to exercise pressure on municipalities to change this kind of restrictive legislation. I would en-

courage the government to take the lead. I would encourage the government to pass regulations that would set limits on what a municipality should do with set guidelines.

I am going to close on that note. It has been a pleasure to work with both of the parties on both sides of the House. I hope that I have an opportunity to have contact with the members after the next election, as well as during this period of time.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, I have three things I would like to talk about, hopefully for no more than half an hour, and the order of the comments I would like to make follows directly on from the remarks of the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Brown).

I would like to say that his credibility on the issue he has just discussed is total, with my own findings. For the last few months I have been, if you like, studying the question of emotionally disturbed children, the question of mentally retarded children and the multi-handicapped children in our society and how our society treats them.

I would say that the research I have been doing in the last few weeks has given me a much greater awareness of the tremendous sense that the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine makes when he makes a speech on this subject.

I say, sir, that if he was a member of this party—I suppose even in a non-partisan sense—I think that if only he would believe more in the democratic system, the possibilities of the legislative parliamentary system, he would remain in this House to make a contribution in this area.

No one speaks for the children in our society. The children in our society do not vote. The mentally retarded or emotionally disturbed children do not have a vote. I think that we must have spokesmen for them.

I hesitate to begin what I hope will be a very fruitful contribution in these next couple of months on this subject in any general sense, but I would state that one article that struck me in particular, that I was reading just yesterday, makes this point. It is very simple and it is a point that the hon. member has just made.

The reason many young children and teenagers who are mentally retarded get pushed away into institutions away from their communities is not a medical reason. It is a sociological reason. It is the attitude of the

community that so often forces parents to put their children who are mentally retarded into institutions such as Orillia.

I would add that the article makes the point that many of the medical people involved in this area have become so specialized in the area of mental retardation that they want the children in institutions so they can study them. They have a vested interest in encouraging parents to send their children away from home care, from day care, into institutions.

As the hon. member has just made the point, in many communities the social prejudice against the children who have a problem in mental retardation and their families is such that the parents become isolated from their communities because of that fact—because their child is different and because they love that child they try to protect him by withdrawing into their own family unit.

Eventually the pressure becomes so great on the family that the only option remaining to a family, when the child reaches the age of 12 in particular, is to send that child away from home care—which is very low-cost in terms of tax-paying dollars—into the high-cost institutions such as Orillia.

Mr. Speaker, in a sense I am not ready to engage in that type of analysis at this time—perhaps two weeks from now in the budget debate I might get into that area. One thing that I would like to set straight now has to do with the question I asked the Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) concerning the use of the children in Orillia as guinea pigs in the testing of vaccines that were not allowed on the market by The Departments of Health, provincially and federally.

My question to the minister was a very simple one. I asked him whether, in fact, children at Orillia had been used as guinea pigs in the testing of vaccine and other drugs. He promised to come back and report to this House and answer that question. He took it as notice. He has not answered that question to this day.

I would like to put a couple of things on the record, Mr. Speaker, because I did have a number of very negative phone calls from people who said, "Your charge is totally irresponsible. It was shrill—what are you saying?"

I would like to put the following factual information on the record. I just hope the Minister of Health will answer the question in some detail because the question has to do with the attitudes of our society; with the medical profession's attitude toward mentally

retarded children in our society. I use this as a case example, if you like, of that attitude. I will try to keep my remarks brief and to the point on this issue before moving on to two other questions, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to state simply this: That at the meetings I have been at with parents of mentally retarded children who are living in the Orillia institution, the essential point that comes across is that once the child goes into Orillia they, the parents, have no rights to know what is happening to their children in that institution.

For example, a child in Orillia can be transferred out of Orillia into a nearby hospital, if you like, and the parents are not even notified. A child can even have an operation performed on him and the parents are not notified. A child can have what has been termed in Orillia, particularly in the tiny tots ward, severe chronic dysentery which has been running through that ward for the last two months, and the parents are not told.

Half the children, for example, Mr. Speaker, in the tiny tots wards have got gums that are bleeding, infected—there is lack of dental care. The children come home for Christmas. Their gums are bleeding. The parents have not been told.

What I am trying to say, sir, is that the fundamental problem is that the profession, the department in charge of Orillia, has a basic attitude that parents are no longer parents once they place their children in an institution like Orillia. The communication gap is total.

With the rubella test vaccine for german measles—this is a case example—and I put this in the record before—the parents received a form letter, sir, which simply said, Your child will be used to test this vaccine unless we hear from you stating to the contrary within 10 days. In other words the assumption was these children could be used. They were the discards of society, their value to society was nil and they could be used as guinea pigs. The thing that interests me, sir, is this: There was enough evidence to show that the rubella vaccine should not be used in children who are more disadvantaged or unfortunate than other people in our society.

The point is simply this: For example, a professor of paediatrics at Yale actually conducted a study of 15 army recruits all of whom had been vaccinated with the new rubella vaccine two months previously. Then she compared their susceptibility to rubella with a similar group with natural immunity. When german measles hit the two groups,

those who had been vaccinated had an 80 per cent re-infection rate, while those with the natural immunity had only a 3.4 per cent re-infection rate. This professor concluded that more research must be done.

That was knowledge available to The Department of Health of this government which approved the testing on these mentally retarded children in Orillia; they knew that the probability was that these children would have a higher re-infection rate because they had been used and tested in this way.

In the August, 1970, issue of Ladies' Home Journal, the following comment was made concerning this vaccine.

The vaccine against german measles, rubella, is made in several ways. Doctors have been reluctant to give women the first ones marketed because they are likely to cause arthritis-like pain and joint-stiffness in adults.

The newest vaccine, a particular strain, is much safer. But the government-approved labelling in the US says joint symptoms were reported as less common, generally milder and of shorter duration than with other rubella vaccines. But even with that newest-developed type of vaccine, there are known adverse effects on the persons vaccinated.

Now why were the parents so upset? They were upset for a number of reasons. They were not treated as parents; they were informed that they had 10 days to opt out—not that they had 10 days or a month to opt in. They were saying—they said this to me and I am sure they said it to other members in this House—"Why cannot our children have the same rights as other children in the school system?" If someone wants to fool around with a vaccine or a drug with ordinary children in the school system, they have to get the permission from parents to opt in, not to opt out. Why this discrimination against the child because he is mentally retarded and in an institution? They are concerned with that.

The thing that struck me most severely in this, sir, is that Richard Wilson, the Orillia hospital administrator, tried to justify the fact of using these children in Orillia as guinea pigs for this vaccine—and I quote from the *Globe and Mail* story of April 7, 1971—"because the condition of many of its patients arose because of the mothers contracting german measles during pregnancy."

That is totally misleading, that is inaccurate and it verges, I think, on a total falsehood, because the letter that was sent out to parents was a form letter. It went to parents

where the women had not had german measles. That to me almost destroys what verges on an untruth by the hospital administrator and discredits his story.

The second point is that the majority of the girls in Orillia will not be having children. I think this is a safe statement to make. So how can Richard Wilson, the hospital administrator, try to justify the use of these children for this vaccine by saying he wanted to see what the effect would be on them and presumably on their children? It is a totally irresponsible coverup, if you like, by Richard Wilson, the hospital administrator.

I would like to make the following conclusion to this, Mr. Speaker. It is simply this, that the Ontario Hospital committee of the Metropolitan Toronto Association for the Mentally Retarded made a recommendation to the then Minister of Health (Mr. Wells) and I quote directly:

The Ontario Hospitals committee of MTAMR would recommend that children in Ontario Hospitals should not be used in studies other than those that have a direct bearing on their particular affliction. It is to be made known that we are not against vaccines or clinical evaluations, but we are definitely against Ontario Hospital children being used for these clinical evaluations. We have done this study at the request of concerned parents and we ask that our report be forwarded to the hon. Thomas Wells, MPP, Minister of Health.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): Did the member not think that test had some bearing on the affliction of those children?

Mr. T. Reid: That is the point I am making—I am making two basic points, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The member does not understand much about rubella vaccine.

Mr. T. Reid: I understand the file I have in front of me and I understand the wishes of the parents, which apparently this government is too insensitive to understand.

If the government wants to test this vaccine, test it on people in our society who have much, not those who have the least.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Does the hon. member know it was tested that way?

Mr. T. Reid: Why did the minister use these children in Orillia as guinea pigs? Is he trying to tell me that the reason is that he is interested in testing out what would happen to their children because they have been vaccinated with this vaccine?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No.

Mr. T. Reid: The minister is not prepared to say that. He has just refuted the basic claim of Dr. Wilson in using those kids up there as guinea pigs.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The aim is to eradicate german measles properly.

Mr. T. Reid: And if a child is mentally retarded, the minister is prepared to use him as a guinea pig.

Hon. Mr. Wells: They were not guinea pigs.

Mr. T. Reid: What justification can the minister make for using those children as guinea pigs?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The member does not understand the whole programme. Does he know where the other tests were done?

Mr. T. Reid: I do not understand the whole programme?

I am concerned with mentally retarded children whose parents have been denied the right available to other people in our society to opt into a programme, instead of having to opt out within 10 days. There were parents who were away on vacation, who came back and had this letter in front of them, that their child was going to be used as a guinea pig unless they opted out. But 10 days had elapsed. I have a copy of that letter here sent to parents by T. M. McCleary, MD, director of the hospital unit. I find that a despicable practice.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The member does not understand what it is about. He just does not understand.

Mr. T. Reid: I do not understand? I understand the basic rights of people in our society, Mr. Speaker. I understand that in our society people are not used as guinea pigs unless their parents or they themselves say they shall be used as guinea pigs.

Hon. Mr. Wells: He just does not understand.

Mr. T. Reid: "I do not understand," he says. This government was prepared to say to the doctors of the medical profession in charge of this programme: "Go ahead. These mentally retarded children are the rejects of society. We do not want them in our community. We shove them away into these institutions. Go ahead, use them as guinea pigs. Give the parents 10 days to opt out. Do not ask the parents."

You know, Mr. Speaker—the final point—Dr. Wilson makes a claim here that the reason is that there is some relationship between the use of this vaccine and their mothers having german measles. You know, Mr. Speaker, the letter which he sent to parents was a form letter with the "Dear" and the "Mr. and Mrs." typed in, and probably it had a stencilled signature too. After all, there are over 1,500 children up there so it does not matter. Have a form letter. Send it out. Send it out to all the children. Just do not send it to the children whose mothers had german measles.

Now in here it does not state one reason why they want to use their children as guinea pigs. It does not give a reason in the letter. It simply says this vaccine has been developed to give protection against German measles.

Hon. Mr. Wells: There was no hazard in using the vaccine.

Mr. T. Reid: No hazards at all?

Mr. Speaker, a point of fact here. I quote from the hospital committee of the Metropolitan Association for Retarded Children. One parent had a seven-year-old child in Orillia whose record in Orillia says: "No injections, subject to convulsions." Do you know that that parent received this form letter from this Dr. McCleary, and that family was so upset it tried to phone the minister.

Many parents try to phone through to Orillia and they cannot get through. They said, "Do you not realize that you must not inject my child because, according to the medical record available up there it says that this child ought not to receive injections unless it is a matter of life and death for that child."

Hon. Mr. Wells: He would not have received it even if the letter was sent.

Mr. T. Reid: They did receive it. The minister's credibility is totally shot.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The member does not know anything about it.

Mr. T. Reid: I do not know anything about it? No, of course not. I do not know that children in our society have some basic rights.

Hon. Mr. Wells: All the member is looking for is headlines.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Scarborough East has the floor.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I conclude this section because I said I would take just a short time.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The greatest misrepresentations and ill-founded facts I have ever heard!

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, the correspondence I am quoting from is from the chairman of the Ontario Hospitals committee of the Metropolitan Toronto Association for Mentally Retarded Children.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am talking about the whole specious argument that the member is trying to bring out.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, this is just fine with me because this shows the type of philosophy after 28 years that this government has developed compared to the approach that we have. We happen to believe, Mr. Speaker, in this party, and I am sure the NDP probably have the same feeling—

Hon. Mr. Wells: I will stake my reputation against the member's with the Ontario Association for the Mentally Retarded.

Mr. T. Reid: The minister's reputation is shot. He is a fraud and he should get out of that government.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I will stake my reputation.

Mr. T. Reid: The minister's reputation is that of a staller in the medical profession. His voice is for the vested interests in this society.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The member should ask the Ontario association who they would rather face. I will stake my reputation against his on what I have done for them.

Mr. T. Reid: No, Mr. Speaker, my facts come from the parents. My facts come from the Metropolitan Toronto Association of Mentally Retarded Children.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Let the member ask the Ontario association who they would rather work with.

Mr. T. Reid: Do you know what our view is, Mr. Speaker? We would not have allowed and we will not allow, when we have the responsibility of government, mentally retarded children to be used as guinea pigs for the testing of vaccine or drugs—

Hon. Mr. Wells: The member is nothing but a cheap headline hunter.

Mr. T. Reid: —and it has nothing to do with their ailments. We would simply outlaw that. Do you know the other thing we would do, Mr. Speaker? We would pass a law in this society saying one thing very simply: that before children, particularly children under the age of 16, are to be treated with vaccine that is not approved on the market—

Hon. Mr. Wells: That vaccine was approved by Ottawa.

Mr. T. Reid: —that they and their parents must give explicit written permission before that happens—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. T. Reid: —not simply an opting-out process.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, can I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. T. Reid: No. Sit down and shut up.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That vaccine was approved and the member cannot deny that. Ottawa approved it for use.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member for Scarborough East—

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, the ignorance of that particular man over there is total. The letter that Dr. McCleary sent to the parents made it quite clear that this was an experiment, that this vaccine was not on the market.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It has to be approved for experiment. Ottawa will not allow it unless it is.

Mr. T. Reid: Well, has the minister not got the guts to stand up for the mentally retarded kids in our society? He should get out of politics.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The member is totally irresponsible—a cheap headline hunter. That is exactly what he is.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I shall be dealing with the absolute chaos that this minister, former minister, created in a number of areas later on, and I shall have—

Hon. Mr. Wells: It will get the member lots of votes in Scarborough East, I can tell him that.

Mr. T. Reid: —tape-recorded evidence if he wants to use it. Mr. Speaker, I believe that children in our society have basic rights. I believe that mentally retarded children have

more than basic rights, and I consider it immoral and improper for mentally retarded children who are locked into an institution to be used in such a fashion. I conclude my remarks on that issue with those comments.

Hon. Mr. Wells: You should be ashamed of yourself.

Mr. T. Reid: You should be ashamed that you ever allowed it. You should get out of politics.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Just wait until the minister answers the questions.

Mr. Speaker: You are not supposed to be talking across the floor. Will the minister please—

Mr. T. Reid: You know, I happen to agree with Richard Doyle about what he said about the minister.

Hon. Mr. Wells: You say you happen to agree with him?

Mr. T. Reid: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, that is a very interesting observation from you.

Mr. T. Reid: You are a regressive reactionary.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Thank you. At least I am not in favour of legalizing marijuana like you.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I am not in favour of mentally retarded children in the jurisdiction of that minister being used for the testing of vaccine without the consent of their parents or by themselves.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The member is in favour of legalizing marijuana. That is why I am a reactionary because I am not in favour.

Mr. T. Reid: Yes, and the minister would like to lock up all the 16- and 17-year-olds—

Mr. Speaker: Would the member for Scarborough East continue his—

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to another area. It has to do with The Consumer Credit Reporting Act—

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): How about pistols at dawn?

Mr. T. Reid: Pistols? I will take him on with a dagger.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): The minister did a nice job.

Mr. T. Reid: The second comment I would like to make, now that the Minister of Health cannot stomach facts has to do with The Consumer Credit Reporting Act introduced this afternoon.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I thought until this Act was introduced that we were heading into a spring election because the government had no legislative programme whatsoever.

Then this bill came in—it is a long bill; 17 pages—and a couple of other bills came in. I thought, well, the government is serious about having a legislative programme. Then I have changed my mind in the last couple of hours.

I have read this bill over and I find that basically it is a bill that is concerned more with the rights of credit reporting companies than with the rights of the persons whose privacy has been invaded by those credit reporting companies. There are two points in particular—two fundamental points in particular—and it is on the basis of these two points that I shall urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

The first thing is that bill does not say that a credit reporting company must inform the people on whom it has collected this information by invading their privacy with a statement that it has collected such information. In a bill that I have introduced in this House twice now—introduced in the 1968-1969 session, entitled An Act to Provide for Data Surveillance—I made it quite clear that it is on the private enterprise sector that the responsibility rests—

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. T. Reid: A point of order.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am very interested actually, Mr. Speaker, in what the hon. member is saying and I am certainly very interested in his comments on the bill that was introduced yesterday. I introduced it and I will be most interested to hear his comments on it and I trust I shall profit from those remarks.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): We are getting to the point of order? I trust we are getting to the point of order.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Certainly. If the member can just bear with me for a moment, he will get it. He will get it. But, Mr. Speaker, this is no part of the material in the Speech from the Throne. A debate on this bill should come on second reading and in committee.

Mr. T. Reid: I am not debating. I am telling the minister what is the matter with it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am most interested in hearing what the hon. member has to say about the bill but I think this is the wrong place. I would appeal, Mr. Speaker, not only to you but to the hon. member. In view of the fact that we are trying to conclude this debate, let me have the benefit of his remarks at the proper time and place. I am quite serious and I am anxious to hear him but not tonight on this subject. This is not part of the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, to get my remarks back in order, I would say that in the Speech from the Throne there are many references to the way in which this government would try to humanize government, would try to make society a bit better place for the individual to live in; that this government was very much concerned with the quality of life of the individual.

I would say, by way of brief examples, sir, that the attitudes reflected in the Speech from the Throne have not been proved to be shown in some of the actions of the government since. I simply say this that in a Liberal government, since we are concerned with the questions of the individual in our society—the right of the individual to be protected from invasion based on commercialization, invasion based on the profit motive—we behave that individual privacy comes before the right of companies to make a profit by invading a person's privacy.

In our government programme, we would for example, sir, do the following types of things: That when we identify firms such as credit reporting agencies, which are engaged in investigations of people's backgrounds, which are engaged in surveillance of people so that they can make money and profits, we would say that in that particular area such companies which are, if you like, almost blood-suckers on the privacy of individuals, such companies would have placed upon them the legal requirement that they must inform the individual on whom they have collected information that they have in fact done so and that they would provide, perhaps by a simple mechanical step or by pressing a button on a computer, capability to send a form postcard to all the people whose files have been stored in the brain of that computer, stating: "We have a file on you—we have collected information on you. It is available to you for your perusal at the following address."

We would say, sir, the individual in our society has the fundamental right to receive that type of information from people who have collected information on him for sale to make a profit. For example, in the bill introduced this afternoon by the former Attorney General—the present Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs—that bill is based not on the interests of the individual, but on the interests of the companies. Our philosophy would be the exact reverse.

I just add, sir, that the wording we would have in such a bill would be that "any person about whom information is stored or collected shall receive from the company not later than two months after his name is first programmed into the data bank or stored in a file, a printout or summary of the data contained therein which relates to him."

By way of conclusion, sir, the second major point in this regard we feel is that this bill introduced this afternoon is basically unenforceable. Credit companies are engaged in other forms of activity. They use the information collected by spying on people for employment purposes. They supply it to lawyers who are interested in cross-examining witnesses. They supply it to investigative agencies. This bill does not say that the companies must tell that individual on whom that report has been compiled that that report has been sold to-so-and-so for some purpose.

Our belief is that when information which is basically collected by invading the privacy of an individual is sold or bartered or traded in the fish market of the commercial world the person about whom information is being sold ought to know who the buyer is. We say that, again, it is the fundamental right of the individual in our society to have that knowledge.

I say, in terms of the Speech from the Throne, sir, that our attitude would be very much different.

Mr. Speaker, I have really only one more thing to say. It really is what I was going to start off by saying. I shall not make more than a few minutes.

I would like to reiterate, as I have done over the past two years, my belief in this place—my belief in the democratic parliamentary system as we know it in Canada and as we know it in this province. I say, sir, that I am terrified of the alternative methods of society acting collectively to determine how the individual is treated in that society.

What I am concerned with is the attitude of the governing party opposite toward the basic democratic processes of this place, and

particularly of the standing committees and the role of the back-bencher in the Conservative Party and the role of the opposition members.

I simply make two points, I suppose. I find, not only among the young people I talk to, but among many adults, voters in the riding of Scarborough East, that this place has become unbelievable to them. They do not believe that this place is serving the people of Ontario, that this place and the civil service are sensitive to the needs of the individual in our society, nor that this place is really interested in what happens to them and their children.

I would say, sir, that I, as a member of Parliament in the provincial Legislature, felt a particular sense of disquiet for the attitudes of this government as propounded by one of its spokesmen in the press and in his place today during the question period concerning the patronage system that is employed, particularly in the licensing agencies.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The member had better look back at the history of his own party.

Mr. T. Reid: I am in the Liberal Party to make it a better, cleaner and a more democratic party.

I would just like to dwell briefly, sir, on that question of patronage, which one member of this government referred to "as a way of life" that is proper in the democratic processes of government.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. Reid: I had some constituents from Scarborough East here this afternoon. No wonder they have less faith in the democratic political process of this province than they have ever had before, after listening to one particular minister of this government almost brag about the way the patronage system works in the area of licensing agencies.

You know Mr. Speaker, the definition of absolute corruption is that those who sponsor corrupt practices do not know they are being corrupt. I think that is about the most damaging statement that can be made about the government opposite.

I just state, sir, that the Oxford English dictionary defines the word "corrupt" in a number of ways. It says:

To turn from a sound into an unsound, impure condition, to make rotten, to infect, to debase, to defile, to make venal, to become putrid, to rot, to decay, to foster the perversion of integrity.

Sir, this government has governed too long; it does not know it is corrupt.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is the traditional thing for those who wind up the debate on the Speech from the Throne to speak briefly about those comments which have already been made during each speech and also to comment briefly on what we are about here as legislators.

So I congratulate those who have played a part in this debate. I think there have been some very useful, worthwhile contributions. I have not agreed with all that has been said on either side of this House.

One would have hoped there might have been more ministerial involvement. I live for the time when the Speech from the Throne becomes a dialogue between those who govern and those of us who are mere back-benchers in this place. That has not happened yet. I think perhaps the new Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) might very well—I wish he was here so I could suggest it to him—think over the proposition which has been presented by myself and others in this Legislature that we should have television cameras in this place all the time, constantly, prepared to pick up whatever is said, whatever is done in this chamber at all times.

The member for London North (Mr. Robarts), the previous Prime Minister of this province, did not feel that television cameras had any place here on a continuing basis. He saw them simply as something which should be here on state occasions, when the budget was being presented, and when the Speech from the Throne was read.

I think, too, this medium might very well provide a different message for the people of Ontario if they were here. I am not at all sure that we can change the rules and create a meaningful dialogue. I am sure that a medium, such as television, could force us into different ways of carrying on our business. The very effect of that presence—that continuing presence of the medium—would indeed force us to dialogue, to interchange, to pose idea against idea, instead of simply reading hot speeches to each other across the chamber. We might make it, indeed, a place where there is some change of view on both sides of Mr. Speaker's chair as the debate went on. Perhaps that is too great a hope.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): It might make it relevant.

Mr. Pitman: Yes indeed! I submit what the member for Sudbury has just said is perhaps the greatest fear I have of this place. I, too, share with the member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) a great faith, a long-held faith, perhaps as a result of a long study of the parliamentary conditions of this country. But I say to those who govern, that we can become irrelevant; that this place can become a facade; that we can be telling stories and spinning tales that no one is listening to; that we indeed can become so irrelevant that all the power and meaning and bite takes place somewhere else. So I simply say that this may be the easiest way too bring relevance into this chamber.

My congratulations must go, as is traditional—and I do not resist these traditions; perhaps these are the traditions which make our lives here, in this place, civilized as legislators—to those who have taken over the seats of power in this government; to the new ministers, particularly the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Apps) who is sitting in his place here tonight and to those ministers who have changed portfolios.

I think it might be said, Mr. Speaker, that we in the opposition have tried to be generous. We have not attracted with all the vigour which might have been expected. We wanted the ministers to find their way into their seats and find out who the deputy minister was and where their departmental offices were before we broached some of the subjects which no doubt they would have expected. We hope they will soon get to know some of the details. We hope they will not get buried in a trivia.

But they can be sure that over the next few weeks, as long as we are allowed to stay in this place, we shall try to discover whether their competence is sufficient to guide the destiny of this province.

There have been embarrassments. We have all been embarrassed by the lurching from crisis to crisis since we have arrived here. We all cringed and shuddered as the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman) explained the housing development which was going to provide so much employment. Then we cringed as he re-explained it. Then we shuddered as he explained it again. And every time he explained it there were fewer jobs, fewer houses, fewer opportunities, and less living accommodation, and the horror of the whole thing became

apparent that it was, indeed, a facade, that it had very little reality at all.

We indeed had great hopes and we still have some hope left—as the Minister of Highways and Transport (Mr. MacNaughton) said, “A little bit of hope”—that the new committee system would provide an opportunity for those of us who sit on the benches here to really know what is going on. It has not been in the best interests of this province that we have been prevented, log-jammed. We realize now that we may have been new wine in these committees, but it is going into very old bottles, Mr. Speaker. I suggest that those bottles are going to break apart unless there is some flexibility; unless there is some realization that the standing committee can be more than just a place where people go and carry on some irrelevant conversation with a few of the deputy ministers and officials of the various departments as they come before us.

We have been appointed, for example, in the human resources committee, to talk about the costs of education. I am sure that there are those to your right, Mr. Speaker, who joined with me yesterday as we saw the complete hopelessness of those of us here in this House. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, you yourself were in that meeting. You realized, surely, the hopelessness of the activity which went on for five solid hours yesterday in room 2, down here in the west end of this building!

Because we did not have the information, we could not take any kind of comparative approach or analysis as to what was going on; either at OISE or in any other part of the educational system. We could not really take a look at the statistics which were brought before us from the Ontario Secondary School Teacher's Federation and give any kind of feeling of expertise. We could not tell anybody to check on that fact on page 14, or find out whether that is a relevant programme for OISE on page 3 of the great pile of material which was placed on our desks as we sat before the chairman on that occasion.

And so we went through the motions. We asked questions. We flailed around in the dark. We watched as they gave us a song and dance routine which was really very—and I do not mean that in a deprecating fashion at all; I was impressed; one cannot help being impressed—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): They are past masters.

Mr. Pitman:—I suggest to the member for Sarnia that the educational system is filled with people who can tell us magnificent things about programmes, but never really tell us where it fits into the total picture of what we are doing with kids in the Province of Ontario. That surely is what it is all about.

What we want to be able to do is to take a look at one college of applied arts and technology and say why is it that it costs so much more to administer this college than that college? Why do you have to have three administrators for every person in the classroom at that college and two in this college over here? Why does it cost so much for a student, to teach him a certain course at that college and so much less at this college over here? Why are we teaching that course when the course is available over there in the high school or university?

Mr. Bullbrook: The member echoes many speeches I have made.

Mr. Pitman: Indeed, I think that these are echoes of speeches which I myself, have made, and I say this with no lack of recognition of what the member for Sarnia has brought to this House.

But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that what process we have gone through for the last three weeks has not given lustre to any new government. There have been no new waves; it has been entirely backwash. Unless we in this Legislature are given an opportunity to look honestly in the human resources committee at the cost of education, I can assure you the people of Ontario will not be served. I simply say that, and I hope that we will see a change of attitude. I intend to bring certain efforts to bear upon that committee and I hope they will be accepted.

We have had in this House an unemployment debate. In that unemployment debate I think it became very clear—it was unfortunately never concluded—that this government could do something about unemployment, and it could have done something about unemployment over the past number of months, both on the short term and in the long term, and it has sought to do very little.

One of the things I think is rather interesting, because it came out in that debate—and I want to say something about this, because the Speech from the Throne was filled with it—is this phrase, “the quality of life.” This is becoming one of those catch phrases which now covers up a great deal of very foggy thinking about what life is really all about.

But, nonetheless, one of the things which bothered me about a speech which was made by one of our friends over here on this side—about those who are on welfare not wanting to work—was that he said that we must not allow welfare payments to get so high that people would rather be on welfare than work. Heaven only knows, Mr. Speaker, there is no political party which has had more to say continuously about the minimum wage and the need to provide a decent wage for anyone who carries on work in the Province of Ontario.

But I want to say to those people in this Legislature or in this province who have made deprecating remarks about those who are on welfare, indicating that there were those who would rather be on welfare than work—this is not so. One of the programmes which this government brought forward very late—indeed, well after the time when it should have come—this programme for assisting municipalities to provide work in those municipalities, should have come last fall, not in March; and one wonders why it could not have been more long-term than to have it cut off on June 30.

Nonetheless, that very programme pointed up exactly what I believed about the people in this province: They do want to work. Because when that programme was brought into the various municipalities across this province, if that programme was announced, they found that there were hundreds of people who phoned and asked to work—they wanted to work; they were willing to do any kind of work rather than accept the dole which we in this province hand out to those who are on welfare or those who are on family benefits.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): How many do not want to work?

Mr. Pitman: The hon. member obviously does not believe what I have to say and really does believe that people do not want to work. I simply say to him—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What he is saying is that everyone who cannot find a job is a bum. That is what he said.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Evans: Because the NDP are the socialists.

Mr. Pitman: I want to say to the hon. member that there were no people phoning him and saying, “I do not want to work.”

Mr. Evans: There were lots of them.

Mr. Pitman: I suggest to the hon. member that if he really believes—this is what is wrong with this government; they have no faith in the people of Ontario. They believe that people would rather be bums than work. We on this side say that if we give people a chance to work, they will work and contribute and make this a better province. That is the difference.

Mr. Stokes: And that is the excuse that government uses to deal effectively with the problem.

Mr. Pitman: I want to say there were hundreds of people, and indeed when this government brought down the programme to provide young people with jobs, they found—and they will find—that there are hundreds and thousands of young people who want to work who cannot be given work by this government. When the appropriation is not large enough, the programmes are not ambitious enough, there simply is not enough imagination to provide these young people with activity during the coming summer. I think that is the point that has to be said and has to be made. In fact, one might well say what a pathetic effort on the part of this government to really face up to the problem of youth unemployment.

We know there are going to be hundreds of thousands of young people on the labour market every summer. I asked the former Prime Minister when there was going to be a long-term planned continuing programme to deal with unemployment of youth in this province. One would think that the whole matter of the release of hundreds of thousands of young people, who are going either into university or into colleges of applied arts and technology and who must find somehow support in order to carry on their education, was something unique that took place every June, or every April or May. Do you think that these young people had never appeared before?

I simply say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a continuing phenomena, if one wants to call it that. There is no reason why this government cannot cope with that kind of a situation and to send out, as happened just a few days ago, a young person to organize a SEED project in a community is unfortunate in terms of timing.

The SEED project—for those who may not be familiar with it—is a very, very complex, different kind of a project to provide learning experiences for young people. It began as a summer programme in Toronto—I think it is called the “shared experience”

programme. It involves a very complex relationship with a great many—

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): What is the abbreviation?

Mr. Pitman: Shared experiences—and something—D.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That is an acronym, not an abbreviation.

Mr. Pitman: I might say to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, I get so lost in all of these programmes that I am scarcely able to remember what they all mean.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Now he is contradicting himself.

Mr. Pitman: I can simply say this to him. This is a very complex programme because it demands a focusing and a dovetailing of activities going on in the private sector and the social services sector. It demands a great deal of co-operation from community resources, our existing educational institutions and so on.

Here, in the month of April, a young person who is actually part of the SEED project in Toronto—who is on part-time and still going to school—is setting about the task of setting up four of these operations throughout eastern Ontario. They are setting up twenty-four of them across Ontario.

As I say, I give full marks to the government to conceive that this was something that could indeed be spread across this province and be of value to the young people of this province. But one suggests, why is it that one has to do it in April?

Is it not something that should have been developed last September and October? Is this not something that could have been developed with the co-operation of young people?

What will happen with many of these projects, and perhaps with the minister's favourite one—the SWEEP project, which he is so proud of—is that young people are going to be dragged into this too late. They are going to be brought into the programme, and they will not be given a very effective way of carrying out their activities. It will be disorganized. There will be people around the community who will say, “These young people do not want to work. They do not want to play any real part.” And simply because they were not given an opportunity to be a part of the initial planning and development of the entire project.

Here is something again which I think characterizes this government. They have no faith in people. They have no faith in young people. They will not give young people the opportunity to participate at the planning level—at the level where these young people can, indeed, involve themselves in the long-term objectives of our society. I simply say that that is, I think, one of the unfortunate aspects of all the programmes that have been brought before us since the beginning of this session.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk a little bit about the whole question of regional development. This, of course, is one of the gaps in the Speech from the Throne—not an unexpected gap. We in this party have watched with mounting horror the tortured, convoluted efforts of this government to cope with the planned development of this province. We have tried to be patient, we know how ill planning sits with this government. How tasteless it must be in the mouth, after so many years of suggesting that planning was not really a necessary function and role of government to find that one really has to plan in a modern technological society.

We have tried to be patient and to understand and we watched as the government set up its Design for Development. We listened as the Prime Minister told us the magnificent plans for the years to come. We wondered about the 10 economic regions and their viability. We questioned development councils, we recognized immediately that they were inadequately representative, we were unable to see any effective relationship with the existing municipalities and the existing municipal structure.

We recognized the complete alienation of these economic development plans and the process of regional government which was going on at the same time. We watched in wonderment as we saw the gaps that lay between The Department of Municipal Affairs, where regional government apparently was being processed, and the department of the Treasurer after The Department of Economics and Development gave up the ghost, so to speak, in the area of economic development.

We looked in disbelief as the Minister of Trade and Development began floating his EIO loans all over the province, spreading economic development like peanut butter across about 75 per cent of the land surface of the province.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): It was disaster.

Mr. Pitman: And we laughed as the government tried to explain all the charts and the arrows and the boxes. Indeed, one cannot but help remember that wonderful evening we had here one night, Mr. Speaker, as the provincial Treasurer at that time stood in his place and tried to explain what was really going on and what box we were in now as compared to where we were supposed to be going. Of course, in great large letters at the end was the term "goals." It had to be recognized, that to believe that you could move toward goals rather than to try and build on the goals, was a process that would end in complete disaster.

Well, the disaster has come upon us and it has come upon us with a vengeance. Now we have lost patience, Mr. Speaker, we have lost patience.

The Toronto-centred region plan was the last straw. The mountain laboured and brought forth not a mouse but a monster. A few pages of misconceived, wrong-headed nonsense. This broke all the bounds of credulity.

Mr. Sopha: Oh no, the northeastern plan is worse.

Mr. Pitman: We already heard about the northeastern plan, and I would hope that the member for Sudbury might tell us a bit more. I am sorry the member for Sudbury was not here when the leader of this party spoke about the northeastern plan. He brought—

Mr. Sopha: What does the member mean?

Mr. Pitman: —gales of laughter and tears to the eyes of those who sat and listened.

Mr. Sopha: What does the member mean, I was not here?

Mr. Pitman: Perhaps he was, I am very sorry, I did not realize the member was here.

Mr. Nixon: He is very rarely absent.

Mr. Sopha: A member can only be absent with the permission of the House.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, when the history of the next Prime Minister comes out, I think they will look back on his days in the opposition and they will say when he was discussing the Toronto-centred region and the northeastern region plans that was his finest hour.

I do not want to repeat what my leader has already said about the American obsession in this plan, this tying of Ontario into the horrors of the northeastern United States. One watches one's television set each night to see the quality of life which is expressed from across the border and one realizes that that is what this government intends to tie us into.

Mr. Haggerty: The member does not want that?

Mr. Pitman: One recognizes what distortions have been made to the north. Surely, I do not need to say anything more to what the member for Thunder Bay has already stated here tonight. One recognizes the wreckage of all the other plans which have gone on; the wreckage of the Lake Ontario Regional Development Council; of the Central Ontario Regional Development Council. The minister during the last debate on this plan said he was going to tell us how these would all tie in. If he can do that tonight, Mr. Speaker, I will believe that he can fit any square peg into a round hole.

I want to say that this policy which this government has followed—essentially using a good part of the Province of Ontario simply as a solution for the problems of Metro Toronto—is not one with which I can agree nor with which my party can agree.

The government of Ontario is elected by all the people of Ontario. They have a right to expect an overall sketched-in provincial plan which local people are then able to deal with, are able to place into context with, their plans, in which they are able to see some direction. That surely is what this government expects of any municipality which brings an official plan before it. And yet this is the very rule which this government has refused to follow itself.

Because there is no provincial plan, because there is no land-use plan—that is why your whole regional development lay in a shambles. That is why regional development has been noticeably absent from any comment in the Speech from the Throne.

I suggested, Mr. Speaker, that it does not fit into other development plans. For example, the blueprint for progress of the Lake Ontario Regional Development Council recommends giving greater emphasis to assisting the expansion of existing industries and “the possible use of transportation subsidies as a stimulant to industrial growth” and “the policies to be adopted in the manufacturing industry should be encouraged to

locate in those parts of the region which have reasonable industrial growth prospects.” Obviously Peterborough and other sectors would normally be a growth centre in that region and yet that is something which the regional plan has simply ignored.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Naturally.

Mr. Pitman: Naturally, I say to the minister; naturally, indeed. Yet the Toronto-centred region plan designates this whole area as recreational and suggests moderate growth can be expected. Well, in the context of this concept and the obvious plans of the department, as well as the experience of the Ontario government policies of non-designation for EIO loans in the past few years, it is little wonder that the people of that area regard their future as one of moderate goals being interpreted as synonymous with stagnation.

I think it is important to take a look at what this report says about recreation. Here is another blind spot in this government. Because of its hangup over recreation it never has been able to really grasp what is meant by a leisure-oriented society. It has never been able to grasp leisure in terms of the last quarter of the 20th century.

This is why, for example, so many of the embarrassments of this government revolve around the use of Algonquin Park, around the ravaging of Quetico Park and, of course, around the monstrosity of allowing the Niagara Escarpment to escape into private hands and then having to buy it back for several times what it originally would have cost it if the Gertler report had been accepted by this government.

It is the complete inability of this government to conceive of what recreation is really all about.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The hon. member has a bigger land inventory than any district in this province.

Mr. Pitman: The minister's comment shows us exactly what I wanted to say about the whole area of recreation.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: One hundred thousand acres right there.

Mr. Pitman: We are moving toward a leisure society and the need for land designated specifically and unalterably for recreation must be identified and protected. However, the recreation needs of our society will become increasingly more sophisticated and

will range from parkland within the urban complex, much of it highly specialized for recreation use such as tennis courts and skating rinks, to the wilderness areas of Quetico Park.

There appears to be no appreciation—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: There seems to be no appreciation of the spectrum—

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William): A member of the Quetico committee is right there beside the hon. member.

Mr. Pitman: I must remind the member for Fort William that I do not think Quetico Park is in the Toronto-centred region. I think that really has escaped the horror of that particular plan. There appears to be no appreciation of the spectrum of recreation needs and thus, obviously, the lands that will be needed as a result.

Instead, the entire zone, with hundreds of square miles, is set aside as recreational. Now, much of it is already agricultural, of course. Some of it is already being used as an industrial growth centre. Many areas, of course, have towns and villages.

One of the interesting things, for example, if I might just react to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The hon. member will not get out of Peterborough on the weekends.

Mr. Pitman: —the point that I think is so obvious is that so few of the parks which are under Lands and Forests are very close to the large centres of population. Here you have the whole Toronto-centred region area and—how many?—three parks are within a short distance of our largest area of population.

Mr. Stokes: That is out of 108 in the province.

Mr. Pitman: That is a perfect example of the simplistic, the totally inadequate approach to recreation which this government follows. Now the minister, I suppose, believes that by having Polar Bear Park—

Mr. Nixon: Most of the parks are for polar bears.

Mr. Pitman: —and having designated it, it is going to be a great resource in terms of the people who are going to be concentrating in the Toronto-centred region.

Mr. Nixon: Tundra. Permafrost!

An hon. member: White whales and polar bears.

Mr. Pitman: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that points out the very thing I have been trying to say.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: If the hon. member wants a wilderness, we will give him a wilderness.

Mr. Pitman: I suggest to you, sir, there has to be a gathering of land and lakefront, both close to Metro Toronto and farther distant, of different-size lots and for varied purposes. A transportation policy must be adjusted to serve this need. In addition, the information being gathered by the Canada land inventory should be examined before such a recreation policy is determined. Now, in the sketchy concepts of the Toronto-centred region, we are led to believe that this great area of land is going to be recreational. I suggest to you, sir, that it is incomprehensible; it is irrational and it is pointless.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Give us some solutions. Tell the government what your plan is.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I am going to try to keep within my limit tonight. I am going to resist the approaches of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. I would be very glad to consult with him on any occasion, at any time, to provide solutions to his problems.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: On any occasion.

Mr. Pitman: Now, may I say—

An hon. member: He is trying to provoke the member to reveal the NDP plans.

Mr. Pitman: May I go on to a second matter which involves this very plan. That is the worship of growth.

Mr. Speaker: For the information of the hon. member for Peterborough, and the hon. members of the House, standing order 3 calls for adjournment at the hour of 10:30 p.m. Perhaps I might inquire of the hon. House leader if it is his intention to introduce a motion to sit beyond the adjournment hour?

Mr. Nixon: The House cannot quit now. The Premier just came in.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I move the House continue to sit beyond the hour of 10:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: I think in order to do this properly, sir, we should have a motion to adjourn the debate and then we will introduce the other motion.

Mr. Sopha: Just a bunch of lawyers.

Mr. Pitman moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Now, perhaps we could have the other motion.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the House continue to sit beyond the hour of 10:30 p.m. for continuation of business.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): It is probably a mistake.

Mr. Speaker: Now, perhaps, we could have the proper order of business called.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough may now resume his speech.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Is the hockey game over?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Was there a game tonight? I did not know. I have been busy listening to the member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Oh, I cannot believe that. Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on to a second assumption on which this full regional plan is based and which I think has very little relevance.

First, there is a worship of growth, a mindless worship of growth in this document. The conventional wisdom is expressed better in this document than anyone can find in any comparable one that the government has brought out in the recent past. There seems to be little recognition of the fact that some very real and disconcerting information about our ecology is changing our attitude toward growth as a necessary element for the health of our economy and society. It is an assump-

tion of population and industrial growth and its concentration in the region. There seems to be an acceptance of the inevitability of rapid growth, which is most unsatisfactory in a plan which sets its sights on the year 2000.

During the first half of this century as Canadians, as Ontarians, we have depended upon growth in our population and our industry as a basis of prosperity and a rising standard of living. So in reference to all the scare literature, or quotations from sources which predicted destruction of our planet, one cannot help but realize that the most traditional and conservative scientists are deeply concerned and disturbed over the assault upon our ecology which emanates from our growth mania—population growth, industrial growth, consumption growth, waste product growth, pollution growth. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is exactly what has happened in this particular document.

One would have expected that the term "moderate growth" would have been a more appropriate term to be applied to the Toronto-centred region itself. One would have hoped that the growth syndrome would not be so ingrained in this government that they would be putting upon the Province of Ontario a programme for the year 2000 which has essentially the term "growth" as its slogan. One would have expected alternatives for some control led growth society, some kind of balanced society. Steady state society is the one which has been put forward, rather than a cancer-like growth of population in the Toronto-centred region. Surely it is more logical to propose modern growth centres across the province, particularly in northern Ontario. Is it not illogical, Mr. Speaker, to concede that zone 1 of the Toronto-centred region plan, which now has less than 40 per cent of the population, should have in the year 2000 some 45 per cent of the population. Surely dispersal of population in this society, for psychological reasons as well as ecological considerations, would seem to be necessary but I am afraid that concept is completely lost in the concept which governed the Toronto-centred region plan.

One would have thought it would have made a commitment to a lower population figure perhaps on an accompanying policy with The Departments of Health, Education and Social and Family Services, which might encourage population control rather than encourage population growth.

Of course, the third assumption is that a city is just a collection of people. I am not

going to spend much time on this—I question very much bringing 5.7 million people into zone 1; I question very much depreciating the life of communities outside the Toronto-centred region.

There is much more to a city than simply a collection of people in a certain area of land. There is a history and tradition. There are some parts of Ontario which are, which could be considered, simply places where people sleep so they can work in some other part of Ontario. That is not true about parts of northern Ontario. They do not want to see their sons and daughters leave; they do not want to see their able people drawn and sucked into the vortex of this monster which the government calls the Toronto-centred region.

I suggest that this government should withdraw the Toronto-centred region plan, should rethink all the assumptions upon which that Toronto-centred region plan has been based. They are out of date, they are totally out of context with all the thinking which is going on among urbanologists around the world. Sociologists everywhere are warning society not to allow those counter bases to develop, not to allow the kind of linearity which has been suggested in this concept as continuing.

Finally, of course, one could also comment on the simplest concept of pollution control. One would think that all one has to do with waste product is dump it into a lake. The idea of 5.7 million people being placed along the shore of Lake Ontario because it is the easiest place to dump waste, would be surely one of the most irrational propositions that has been placed before the people of Ontario. That is, presumably the reason why linearity is to be followed, spreading industry along the shore of Lake Ontario all the way to Port Hope and all the way down to Port Colborne—so they can cheaply dump products into Lake Ontario, making it surely what this government has allowed Lake Erie to become.

I reject that proposition. Surely what we should be doing now is making sure that every effluent of every waste disposal system is acceptable in the waters of any lake or river in the Province of Ontario. And I suggest for that reason the whole concept or linearity has very little logic, once one accepts that proposition.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude merely by saying that I reject the values which have been placed before the people of Ontario in the

Toronto-centred region plan. I will not repeat what my leader has already said about that plan. I simply state that this government, which talks about the quality of life, has failed totally to involve that concept in what seems to be now the provincial plan, that is, the Toronto-centred region plan. It is an adaptation to a mindless, conventional wisdom about growth, production, consumption and waste and pollution which I find totally unacceptable.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): What would the member have done?

Mr. Pitman: We demand that there should be provincial planning.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): They have not looked at the plan.

Mr. Pitman: I must say, Mr. Speaker, that we have the plan; there is very little of a plan to look at. I might say to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, there is very little of the plan that one can look at. There is only 20-odd pages. In fact, if any town planner brought that plan into—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Where does the population come from?

An hon. member: Where is the green belt?

Mr. Pitman:—The Department of Municipal Affairs, he would be thrown out on to Bay Street.

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. Pitman: Yet this government brings that kind of plan for people to try to cope with. Nearly all the town planners, nearly all the experts in planning—

Mr. W. Hodgson: Let the hon. member tell us what he would have done.

Mr. Pitman:—have been totally overwhelmed by the stupidities and the inadequacies of that plan. They cannot react to it in any effective way. I asked the previous Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton)—

Mr. Martel: That is right.

Mr. Pitman:—if he would let us see all the other submissions that were being presented in regard to this plan and we still have not got them. We have not been allowed to see those. But I would say to the minister that until we get the next stage, he is quite right.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The plan has the effect of controlling growth.

Mr. Pitman: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that one thing that the minister simply cannot say is that it is controlling growth. There is not a single indication in that plan of how the government is going to control growth—how it is to get industries to regroup from one place to another.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Where are the green belts?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member just wants this to go to Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: No, I do not. No, I can assure the Prime Minister I have no interest in that aspect. Tonight, I am speaking for the people of Ontario, not for the people of eastern Ontario, nor any other part.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I am not a bit bashful about asking for something for the people in the north.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Nor should the hon. member be.

Mr. Pitman: I can assure the Prime Minister that he cannot find in that plan any way by which he can determine where industries are going to go. It is not in the plan. Perhaps the minister has seen the next stages, but we have not seen them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Have a little faith.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Pitman: The final comment which the Prime Minister throws across the aisle is, "have a little faith." After four years in this chamber, Mr. Speaker, that is one thing I am left very little of in terms of the plans and the prospects that this government has placed before us.

May I go on?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member is still without faith after four years!

Mr. W. Hodgson: Let us get to the next one. The hon. member has not made any points on that one.

Mr. Martel: Where did they get him from?

Mr. Pitman: We have suggested a provincial plan, with the land-use plans—my goodness, Mr. Speaker, we are getting to them tonight. They are really getting very restive over there.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I wonder where they were before they came in. They have been quite active.

Mr. Pitman: We have also suggested that we must tie in any future development of—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Did the hon. member look in the dictionary and find out what the word "corrupt" meant?

Mr. Pitman:—regional government with regional planning and regional development, and we have suggested on this side that there should be no further regional development until there is tax reform.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Pitman: We are not going to allow any other part of this province to enter the morass which has resulted in Niagara, Carleton and the areas where regional government has been brought in without the proper financial resources.

Mr. Stokes: Without an adequate financial base!

Mr. Pitman: One can certainly say, when the hon. minister talks about faith—

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Remember what David Lewis said last night.

Mr. Pitman: I must say, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending a meeting in which there were officials from the board of education speaking to all the local town councillors from all the townships and villages in the area and one of the most interesting explanations, which I found rather amusing, was how the new assessment works in this area.

They were showing that the board of education in the city received, not one set of assessment figures, not two sets of assessment figures, not three sets of assessment figures, but four sets of assessment figures. One set was from The Department of Municipal Affairs, one set from The Department of Education, one set from the local township and another set from the regional assessment office, and they were all different.

And the board of education—

Mr. Stokes: And the Premier asked the member to have faith.

Mr. Pitman:—does not know on what set of assessment figures they are supposed to base their grant projections.

That is the kind of confusion which this government has placed upon the people who are trying to carry out their responsibilities in their area of activity in the province of Ontario.

Thirdly, I would suggest that there be a task force outside of this government to examine what has happened already in the regions where regional government has been brought in.

We have heard a great deal from the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Bukator) and it is pretty horrifying. We want to see what mistakes have already been made by this government when it brings in regional government without the proper opportunity for the people in the area to have some input into what kind of regional government they are going to have. We want to see exactly what has been going on before there is any further development in this direction.

Mr. Martel: The Prime Minister does not think so. He is very uncomfortable with what is going on.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Who is uncomfortable? I have not been more comfortable in years.

Mr. Pitman: I might say to the amiable Prime Minister, we want to see immediate assistance to the existing municipalities. This government has no right to leave the municipalities of Ontario in a state of suspended limbo, waiting to find out what they are going to do, whether there is going to be regional government or whether there is not going to be regional government. They are unable to really plan their development, are not given the grants to plan their development, are not given an opportunity to provide better services, and are not given support to provide intertownship and county-based services for the people of that area.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): The hon. member does not even know what he is talking about.

Mr. Martel: Where did that come from? Send him back to watch the rest of the hockey game. They are playing overtime.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Pitman: I only wish the hockey game had lasted longer, with longer overtime so that the hon. member could have amused himself in some other way.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: The member for Peterborough does not know what he is talking

about when he talks about regional government.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Nixon: We have not heard the member speak.

Mr. Martel: Let him give us his maiden speech.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I will take any one of them on about regional government.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Pitman: There is some mystique, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Nixon: He had better do it in a hurry, because he will not be here long.

Mr. Pitman: There is some mystique in this chamber, Mr. Speaker, that noise in the back row somehow gets the member to the front row. I wish that perhaps the Prime Minister might suggest to his members in the back row that this really is not the most effective way to get there.

Mr. Nixon: Vote against the government if the member wishes to get a promotion.

Mr. Stokes: I think the minister should give that cat more rope.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Pitman: We have heard a great deal from this government about planning and preserving our environment. I would like to read just a few comments from the previous Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) in regard to this matter and then talk a little bit about how it is working out day by day in at least certain parts of Ontario.

He said—and this is at the provincial-municipal conference, that love feast that took place about a year ago at the Ontario Science Centre: I finally discovered then what the Science Centre was all about. There was a time when I thought it had something to do with science, and I could not understand why I had to walk through so many palatial halls and go down a great big escalator to find any of the science.

Now I have discovered, of course, that it has mainly to do with the science of public relations, and this is mainly used to bring people together to give it to them and, believe me, the municipal officials got it about a year ago.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): No, no, no.

Mr. Pitman: No strategy or continuing strategy—they were told they were partners and what wonderful people they were and how they were going to get involved from then on in any continuing discussion on municipal-provincial affairs. Well there has not been one word since—not a single document since—and it has also disappeared in limbo.

Mr. Sopha: The member has not got it right. It is where we are going to put those relics.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, let me quote the Prime Minister:

During the next decade we shall place less reliance on economic growth for its own sake and more on the fulfilment of values of society. If we are going to control our destiny, we must be prepared to make certain commitments and accept that there must be personal sacrifice for the benefit of society at large.

Governments may have to forbid certain types of development to prevent pollution, the destruction of the natural beauties of the countryside or the loss of unique landmarks. Industries may not be allowed to establish in the locations of their choice. Housing developments may be prohibited in certain areas.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): That sounds like a good speech. I must have made it.

Mr. Pitman: For years, Mr. Speaker, I have appealed to this government to put subdivision control on southern Ontario. Only when there was a desecration of a good part of southern Ontario by Whiterock Estates and various other groups did the minister finally act to frustrate that kind of development and to stop the desecration. But it showed how easily townships could be put upon by interests which were as large and as effectively financed as these operations are.

I want to suggest that something even worse has taken place in this province. I do this with some hesitation because I do have some concern over what takes place in the lands about this province. My children and our children have to grow up in this province, but I do this tonight because the matter has already been brought to the Legislature floor by the member for Victoria-Haliburton, and I do not think anything more can be said which can provide any further initiative and opportunity for those who are carrying out a

massive desecration of the Province of Ontario.

As members have already heard from that member, there was a case in a Peterborough court on February 12 which recognized that section 26 of The Planning Act had a very large loophole; in fact, you could drive a truck through it. It discovered that it was quite legal for solicitors to register entire holdings of a landowner by conveying parcels of land by a single deed—a single deed, a single cheque, one person acting as an agent for several others. The land could be conveyed from one person to another.

What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? That means a great deal. That means the entire process of forcing developers to submit a plan of subdivision to The Department of Municipal Affairs, or even a local planning body, is totally avoided. No consent is necessary; these transfers can take place in any part of Ontario.

On March 8, the Minister of Municipal Affairs was told of that particular action which has taken place and what it meant in terms of The Planning Act in this province. On March 17, I received a copy of that letter and I sent a letter to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) expressing the hope that he had read that letter and realized what its implications were.

On the first week of the session I went to the Minister of Municipal Affairs privately and I asked him to bring legislation into this House which would allow that loophole to be plugged, because unless it is plugged there will be thousands of lots which will be severed in this province against the interests of planning and development, and pollution control and against the interests of township financing, and what have you.

Within a month, there have been 12,000 lots created in the Province of Ontario, in Victoria county, Peterborough county, Renfrew county and Sudbury. I say to the Minister, who is not here and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that plans of subdivisions which were turned down by the community planning branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs have now turned up and are now registered as land fit to be built on in the Province of Ontario. In the Lindsay registry office alone there have been 800 lots that are now registered; in Ops township, Somerville township, Fenelon township—cottage country, Mr. Speaker, where lakes and rivers abound, where the people of Ontario will look for their recreation needs in the future.

There are instances where plans of subdivisions were turned down. I ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs or any representative, to look at lots 5 and 6, concession 10, township of Somerville, in the name of Mr. Riel—34 lots which were turned down as inappropriate for development but which the community planning branch of this government is now registering for building in the Province of Ontario.

Lot 18, concession 10, registered by Mr. R. G. Wood, in Somerville township, 11 lots and 33 lots, have both been turned down by the community planning branch. In fact, this is a dandy. These lots are virtually on mud dredged out of a lake. They are about one foot above the lake. The community planning branch does not even know—now the minister can smile about this, but I can assure him that there are township officials across Ontario who are crying because they do not know what to do.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are not smiling about it. I was smiling about Fort Lauderdale.

Mr. Pitman: Fort Lauderdale is not rural Ontario, I can assure the Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know. But I was not smiling about Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: He would know more about that than the member or I.

Mr. Pitman: For a government which talks about conservation and protecting water resources, which talks about appropriate opportunities for proper land development, this is a desecration of the Province of Ontario. There are lawyers staying up all night preparing the deeds to be registered on land which has been turned down by the community planning branch—as I say, 12,000 lots across this province. I mentioned just one or two.

I can say this: When is the minister going to do something about it? I have appealed to him again and again. I bring it forth publicly, only because it has already been brought to this forum by the member for Victoria-Haliburton, and I have waited patiently for something to happen. I am going to make a charge. It is very rarely I make a charge in this Legislature. I am going to make a charge that this government is purposely delaying action until some of its friends, who have been embarrassed considerably by the efforts to control land in this province, can get the land severances they want. I think—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I hope the member can prove that. I hope he can prove that.

Mr. Nixon: Or what? Cut his head off?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No.

Mr. Nixon: What is the Premier going to do? He cannot read him out of the party.

Mr. Pitman: Can the Prime Minister tell me why it has taken two months to bring any kind of legislation into this House, when the minister has known about it, when this decision came to him on February 12? Is there any reason why it should have happened? Is it not the Conservative members who are having the most embarrassment over this problem? Was that not one of the things which he has indeed talked about many times as he went about rural Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, as a matter of fact.

Mr. Pitman: Well I am very surprised. I am very, very surprised, I think—

Mr. Martel: What are they doing about it?

Mr. Pitman: I ask this government to get that legislation in here as quickly as possible. They will receive the utmost co-operation on this side to get it through. But I am disappointed, I am shocked, at what has happened in terms of subdivision control in the province of Ontario as a result of the delays of this government and the pressures that have been put upon this government.

Mr. Martel: Where has the Premier's smile gone? Watch that composure.

Mr. Pitman: I want to talk a little bit more about one or two other subjects. One is the Ontario Development Council. This monster which has given away \$26 million to put a pay cheque on Main Street, as the member for Don Mills used to tell us; what a leading government economist has publicly called "a can of worms." I ask this government in this area, how do you answer the Canadian taxpayers when they will charge at the next election that their tax money has been used to Americanize the Canadian economy? How is the Ontario taxpayer going to react when he discovers he cannot even find out those companies which has not carried out their responsibilities?

I suggest that there is some difference between a private company which receives private financing and a private company which receives public financing. There is a public

responsibility and that responsibility has not been carried out. If I might be allowed as one of the amateurs who do not know what is going on in the outside world, as referred to by Mr. Etchen, I suggest that the real world is that Ontario is being sold out. In fact, I might even quote one of the friends of the government, one of the best friends of the government, Mr. Eddie Goodman. It is a fine quote—

Mr. Sopha: Fine fellow!

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Goodman said:

In the past decade the outflow to the United States in dividends, royalties, licence fees and other funds has far exceeded the amount of new U.S. investment in Canada. The outflow in a decade was more than \$2.6 billion. The people like Trade and Commerce Minister Jean Luc Pepin and Stanley Randall who say foreign investment is the lifeblood of Canada are living in the 18th century. They must believe in blood-letting and it is our blood flowing south of the border that they are talking about.

Yes Mr. Speaker, indeed it is our blood. And in the decade from 1960 to 1970 new American investment of \$5,497,000,000; dividends repatriated at interest of \$6 billion; royalties and fees repatriated of \$1,770,000,000—and what do we end up with? In 1960 to 1970—and these are American figures—minus \$2,625,000,000.

In 1963, U.S. funds—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: I am sure the Prime Minister will have an opportunity later to correct my observations. Maybe Mr. Goodman is crazy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

The hon. member for Peterborough has the floor unless there is a point of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: In 1963, U.S. funds as a percentage of total United States investment were 10 per cent. In 1964 it was 7.6 per cent. In 1965 it was 20.8 per cent.

Mr. Sopha: What is that? The NDP vote?

Mr. Pitman: In 1967, 9.6 per cent; in 1968, 4.9 per cent. That is what the real U.S. investment is in the economy of Canada, and in Ontario. I wonder if this government really

would like us to be like Latin America where from 1960 to 1970, United States corporations invested \$2,640,000,000 and took out \$10,194,000,000. Does this government not realize that this is a world-wide problem, that throughout the entire world the American multi-million-dollar corporations are raising 80 per cent of their capital locally? And what does it mean for us?

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): The member's leader said 94 per cent.

Mr. Pitman: I am talking about the world. I think the member will find that he was talking about Canada.

Mr. Randall: That is why they call the member an academic weirdo.

Mr. Pitman: I try to use different figures than my leader does. It gives a little variety to the discussion.

We are losing jobs. Foreign firms are concentrating on natural resources which have small labour content. They export to the United States where the jobs really are in terms of employment. Foreign firms are doing their research and development in the United States. What does this mean for the PhDs who are trained and educated here in Ontario?

Mr. Randall: Has the member been out to Sheridan Park lately?

Mr. Pitman: We inherited a huge balance-of-payments problem. And, of course, our interests are always second. If we are closing a plant it will be a Canadian plant. I shudder to think, Mr. Speaker, what is going to happen if that horrible war in Vietnam ever gets over, if the Americans stop shooting Vietnamese and stop shooting each other. If that ever stops, heaven help us, because if a recession hits the United States, it will be Canadian plants that will be closing. It will be Canadian workers who are on the streets.

Mr. Randall: What if Communists stop shooting Americans?

Mr. Pitman: I am sure that the former Minister of Trade and Development may have an answer, but I am not sure it will be the one that the people of Ontario will want to hear.

Mr. Randall: I have all the answers, believe me.

Mr. Pitman: Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a little about the whole question of education costs. Not just education costs because, as I said before and I will again, we have no right to talk about education costs until we talk about a programme.

We have tried in this House again and again and again to find out what the goals of the education system were; how they were related to the society in which we live; how we can evaluate the programmes which are being carried on in the schools; and how there can be some accountability in what is going on. I simply want to say that now we have reached the crunch. I want to say there is something more to this crunch than simply figures. I am not going to go over all that has been said about education costs, both by my leader and by other hon. members who have spoken. I want to say that the thing which bothers me most about what is going on in education in Ontario is the morale, the lack of morale, the undermining of morale which has gone on in all the institutions involved with education in Ontario.

That is very serious—I am sure the Prime Minister realizes that and, I am sure, so does anyone else who is involved with education in any kind of function where really performance is tied very much to motivation, rather than to income. You will realize to what extent morale decides the success or failure of a school or a college or a university—the morale of the faculty; the morale of the students.

One looks across the province and sees the erosion in morale which has gone on in this province. Look at the colleges of applied arts and technology. They have been in a state of upheaval ever since last fall.

This government brought in a Bill 217—we do not know if it will be introduced again, we cannot find out.

I asked the Minister of Education when it was first introduced. He said he had no way of telling if it covered the faculties of the colleges of applied arts and technology. The Treasurer certainly said it did cover them, indeed it did. Yet here is a piece of legislation which is so out of context with every tradition of academic freedom that we have in this province, every tradition we have of freedom of inquiry, it just boggles the imagination how this bill could have been introduced. How could it have sat on the order paper, you might say, as the cause of continuous debate throughout the colleges for the last six months?

Look at what it said and I relate this to the comments which the Speech from the Throne had about the quality of life—creating a society in which men and women can act as human beings.

Compulsory arbitration—no free collective bargaining for people who work in colleges of applied arts and technology. Two members appointed by the government, one appointed by the teachers—not even demanding unanimous decision in that circumstance.

Secondly, a whole list of areas which are non-negotiable at a time in our society when not only teachers but people who are working in industry want more and more opportunity to make decisions about their place of work and the kind of work they are doing and their relationship to others who are working in the same place, a shared decision-making which provides some kind of reality to what they are doing. At this time, a bill is brought in for these college faculties which cuts them off from that opportunity.

Third, penalties on the employees of \$500 to \$1000 if they withdraw services. A tribunal which can enter the employee's place of work, Mr. Speaker, of a professional person who is reading and marking and studying, and carrying on his activities in his own home. This is the kind of piece of legislation which is irrationally brought into this Legislature.

Well as I say, the undermining of morale has been absolutely horrendous across the province. Look at the secondary schools. The secondary school teachers are talking about a strike. We have indicated on this side that we would not wish them to go out on strike. They have every opportunity of using the ballot box some time this year to make their decisions known about how they feel about The Department of Education and what it has done. They are certainly concerned that some quality is disappearing. They certainly are afraid that the vulnerable people—those who are emotionally disturbed, students who need more help—are going to be hit by these cuts. They have had no real part in determining priorities, either as teachers or as trustees.

One cannot help wondering why it was not, when the Minister of Education of that day and the Treasurer of that day called all the board chairmen and all the administrators down to the Royal York, told them what the name of the game was and then let them go back home without ever giving any kind of a strategy for showing them how to cope with the next number of months.

Why is it there cannot be a continuing opportunity for dialogue not just between the trustees and the top administrators but between the teachers and other people in this province? Why can we not open up this whole business and let more people know what directions we are going in? We would establish some long-term goals. As the OSSTF put it recently, we might even be able to co-operate and define those goals and reach those goals.

But no, we do not get that kind of impetus from this government. Once again, it is a failure of faith in people and the fact that people do want to contribute, they do want to take part, in what is going on in this province. I simply say that the time has come, that morale will continue to go down unless there is some kind of a partnership concept.

One can talk about the teachers' colleges and the young people who are in those teachers' colleges now. Forty per cent of Althouse graduates cannot find a job and hundreds in other teachers' colleges as well. Now it is very easy for the deputy minister to say there is not going to be any shortage of jobs, but there certainly was last year. There were 700 or so.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, but the member should make a distinction between Althouse which is for secondary school teachers.

Mr. Pitman: All right, if the minister wants distinctions.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Tell the House the hiring season is not over.

Mr. Nixon: It could go down to 35 per cent; that is about it.

Mr. Pitman: I am quite willing, Mr. Speaker. I hope the Prime Minister may be driven to tell us what will be the final percentage, but I think he should also mention that the Althouse teachers are teachers who have finished their university degrees. They are not people who are going to be sort of recycled into the university system. They are not people who are going to be able to step into another form of educational opportunity. That is the end of the road for them in their teacher education, unlike the teachers' colleges where there may be that opportunity, and yet we cannot even find out the numbers here.

The minister criticized me for not being more exact, but we have asked the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) and he cannot tell us how many teachers there are likely to be.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He cannot tell the member?

Mr. Pitman: So I suggest to the Minister of Education that surely there are some things in this world which are known and have been known. I must say that it has not been helpful either for the Minister of Education to stand up and say there are too many lawyers, there are too many engineers—

Mr. Nixon: Ten million dollars in educational research and no predictions of this.

Mr. Pitman: That is the private sector, and for the Minister of University Affairs (Mr. White) to say it is because of unemployment and inflation is even more disconcerting in terms of the facts.

The fact is that we know how many children are being born. There is not an immense immigration or emigration going in and out of Ontario. We have a general idea of how many teachers are likely to leave the profession—we have an actuarial figure anyway of the number of teachers who are likely to be retiring. In other words, it seems to me—

An hon. member: The teachers are leaving too.

Mr. Pitman: —that the one thing that we can decide, at least to some extent—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member for Peterborough worried?

Mr. Pitman: —is the general need in terms of classrooms and as part of the input to programmes which are being developed.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Pitman: Surely we have some way of being able to tell with greater accuracy. Indeed, I can remember sitting in the supply committee of this House two years ago and saying to the Minister of Education that he was oversupplying, he was over-enrolling his teacher's colleges; that we were indeed going to have exactly the kind of problem that we have now.

Mr. Nixon: OISE forgot to even look at that. The minister did not ask them to.

Mr. Pitman: I was going to provide what I thought were some helpful constructive comments on areas which The Department of Education has not even looked at, which might very well be cost-cutting.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Samia): Tell us. Give us some ideas—seriously.

Mr. Pitman: I think there are a number of ways that we can cut costs. We could do it this way, by hacking and simply hoping that people do not get hurt, that there are not programmes that are going to be wrecked and destroyed. Or worse than that, that experimental programmes which could have helped young people are never going to be initiated because of these cuts. We can do it that way. We can up the teacher-pupil ratio; that is one way, but with a result there of terrible spin-offs. But I suggest that there are other things that have not been looked at which should have been looked at, as we move toward this period of some crunch in the area of costs.

First, the use of community resources. We never really tried to find out what the community could do in the area of education. We have equated education with schooling, and that which goes on in schools apparently has status and relevance. We have not realized what can be done in the community and what could be transferred. You cannot, as long as you are hung up on carrying out all your activities in school and institutional settings. I do not think that real cuts are possible. We have never really developed the concept of the para-professional; at least it is very embryonic. We have not really looked to see what could be done with people who want to participate, volunteers who are just starting.

In fact, in the Minister of Education's own riding a very significant piece of research is being done by OISE in that particular region, which will give, I hope, some very important and worthwhile developments in the future.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Minister of Education): It is a very progressive community.

Mr. Pitman: Thirdly, I think there are ways of taking a look at the curriculum. I suggest to the minister there is much curriculum which could very well be phased out. I think that more specifically job training in some of the CAATs might very well be done somewhere else.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say any more on this. I would like to, but I am afraid my time is gone. I want to ask this House to look at this resolution very carefully in conclusion. What we put forward here are a number of additions to the resolutions put by the Liberal Party. I want you to see these resolutions not just in terms of an additional series of activities—they are far more than that; what they represent is a change in thinking. I hope that a member of

the minister's department has passed on to him a book which we have been sharing over the last number of weeks. It is called "The Greening of America," by a man called Reich. He talks about consciousness—

Mr. Sopha: That is not a very good book.

Mr. Pitman: I think the minister might very well understand what is meant by trying to improve this consciousness—

Mr. Sopha: It is a bourgeois book.

Mr. Pitman: I think it would help him to perhaps understand what these are really all about. Because it does represent, I think, a faith in human beings, a faith in the desire of human beings to participate in government; a faith of people in their local communities to direct their lives. I think that is the real meaning of what quality of life is all about. It is more than just meaning that people are going to be able to breathe the air, to swim in the water and not to be buried in their garbage. It means far more than that.

It means that they are just going to be given opportunities to get some form of income maintenance if they lose their jobs. It means that we want to produce in Ontario the kind of life which means that people will participate—both in work and in leisure; they will participate, as well, as citizens in a government. That is what this government has denied the people of Ontario in the last number of years.

So we put forward this resolution. First, to give some views to the existing government, but to give some idea to the people of Ontario of what the next government of this province will really be like.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to outline in general terms the policy of this government as it relates to the scale of benefits payable by the province's health service insurance plan during the period May 1, 1971, to April 30, 1973.

In addition, I will detail certain steps which the government intends to take toward improving the general operation and administration of the plan.

To begin with, may I briefly set out what seemed to me to be the two basically different approaches open to the government and to this Legislature insofar as the relationship between the government—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Where did he come from? This should be a statement.

An hon. member: Ottawa.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence:—and the medical profession is concerned.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): This is a ministerial statement.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The first approach is by analogy—

Mr. Nixon: I thought this was going to be a shattering attack on the opposition.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence:—and by use of such words as negotiation, agreement, arbitration, using them to characterize, as it were, the Ontario Medical Association as the bargaining agent of the profession, and the government in the plan, as management.

This approach has several flaws—one being that it is not supported by legislation; another being that it accepts the adversary system and the sanctions of that system as being appropriate. It focuses almost total attention on the OMA schedule of fees.

The second approach is to look directly to the government and its responsibility, firstly, to operate the insurance plan, and secondly, to establish a scale of benefits payable under the plan. It accepts the fact that the OMA schedule of fees and the OHSIP scale of benefits are different things and indeed could be very dissimilar in both nature and quantum.

The second approach recognizes, however, that the closer the two are to being identical, the better both the public and the profession will be served. It requires the OMA to be responsible and to be responsive insofar as public policy is concerned, and that the government similarly be responsible and responsive insofar as the practice of medicine is concerned.

The 1971-1973 Ontario Medical Association fee schedule reflects the substantial policy input of my predecessor and those officials of this department who were involved for a long period of time in comprehensive discussions with the OMA during the schedule's development. The new schedule includes an overall increase in total fees of 4.5 per cent, effective during the two-year period 1971-1973. It includes increased emphasis, supportive of general and family practice, and a de-emphasis of a number of specialists' services.

In the opinion of this government, Mr. Speaker, it is constructive and fair. Furthermore, the internal arrangement of the fee structure itself has undergone substantial modification, making it more satisfactory as a vehicle for insurance payments. For these reasons, the OHSIP scale of benefits for the period May 1, 1971, to April 30, 1973, will be the OMA schedule of fees less 10 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to address myself briefly to certain new policies which I feel will result in significant improvements in the operation of our health services insurance plan.

Mr. Nixon: That is not much of a breakthrough.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: At the present time some physicians are billing the plan directly for services rendered on behalf of some of their patients. Some are billing others of their patients directly and in yet other cases both the patient and the plan may be billed. This variety of methods of billing is confusing to the public and results in misunderstandings, complaints and administrative costs. In order to correct this situation, we have decided to require that each individual physician choose, with regard to his total practice, between billing all of his patients directly or billing the plan on behalf of all of his patients.

The new system will operate in the following way:

Within a given period of time a physician should decide upon his billing method by either billing the plan or by billing the patient, but not both.

Arrangements will be made to accommodate circumstances where a physician provides services to, let us say, a university clinic and the balance of his practice is a private arrangement.

If an exception is warranted, the physician would elect a method of billing on a practice basis for each of the two components.

Where the physician bills the plan he thereby agrees to send all of his accounts to the plan and to accept plan payments, namely, 90 per cent of the OMA fee schedule as payment in full.

Where the physician bills his patient or patients directly, no payment or payments accrue to the physician from the plan. The amount of the physician's bill and arrangements for its payment are in such case left to the physician and his patient to determine, and the only involvement of the plan consists

in its payment as insurer to the patient as beneficiary, namely, 90 per cent of the OMA fee schedule.

To avoid misunderstandings, the physician who practices on the bill-patient basis has elected to deal directly with his patient as far as his bill and arrangements for payment are concerned. He will be required to notify his patient in writing when he proposes to charge amounts in excess of the scale of benefits. This notification should be made prior to rendering the service unless the particular situation makes this impractical.

Mr. Speaker, the plan and its computers are developing a capacity to provide complete and accurate profiles of the patterns of practice of physicians and of utilization by patients. This will give the plan the ability to improve to an extraordinary degree the detection of irregular, peculiar and unreasonable or fraudulent conduct by patients or doctors who may misuse or abuse the province's health services insurance system.

Our developing capacity to determine misuse and abuse of our plan, itself increases the responsibility of the plan administration, of the Ontario Medical Association, and of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, to act. All three organizations are at present involved in the attack on misuse and abuse. However, we intend now to call for even greater assistance from the OMA in programming our computers and in analyzing the statistical data from which the physician and patient profiles are themselves generated. And we intend to invest both the plan and the college with broad investigatory powers and sanctions in our attack on improper medical and/or financial practices.

I am convinced that the major changes which I have outlined will bring about a better administrative arrangement for OHSIP. They will erase some of the major problems as far as the public is concerned. In my opinion, this deals fairly with the profession and at the same time isolates those individuals who are abusing the plan.

A close co-operative arrangement between the providers of service, government and the public is essential to a successful programme. I am encouraged, Mr. Speaker, by the response which I have received in the few weeks that I have been in this office.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, when I hear the Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) announce the policy which

the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) and some of my colleagues have promoted with vigour over many years, it is depressing. It depresses me to realize—

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of University Affairs): Why? The member did not even understand it tonight.

Mr. Sopha: It depresses me to realize that in tomorrow's press it will be portrayed as if the Minister of Health has just rediscovered America.

If you cast your eye at the clock, Mr. Speaker, and look at the vacancy of benches over there, perhaps you will not think it indiscreet of me, nor an exaggeration to suggest to you that we have a prospect of arriving at the vote at just about the time the Black Knight closes, so the whip over there will not have to telephone the head waiter.

I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that your senior would be in the chair because I have some nice things to say about him—for a change. I was going to say to him that he has been much too quiet this year, and I fear that equanimity and equability are creeping up on him with age. For myself, if I had been him, I would have thrown the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) out the other day, but, of course, I am very partisan on that.

But I especially did want to commend him on the coeducational feature of the pages with the arrival of the page-girls. That is a major advance. And when, as last night, I viewed that taffy-pull in Ottawa going on and I saw the struggles of the females to try to get recognition on the governing council, then it is appropriate to point out that the Speaker is far more progressive than they are.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): One cannot mix with those socialists.

Mr. Sopha: I will return to them.

For example, I am glad to hear from my friend, the member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman). I could not understand today how it is that it is he, in the absence of the member for Riverdale (Mr. J. Renwick), and the leader of the NDP (Mr. Lewis), who asks the first question. Because that party being based on family units as it is, I would have thought when the member for Riverdale is away, the member for Scarborough Centre (Mrs. M. Renwick) would have the next priority. As far as family goes, that party is closer knit than the Cosa Nostra.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): I do not have a single relative in the party.

Mr. Sopha: The member will never go anywhere in that party.

But before I go on, and in the light of what I shall say later, I want to give myself the pleasure of saying to the new Premier (Mr. Davis) of the province—we are not allowed to say “Prime Minister” over here; the Leader of the Opposition washes our mouth out with soap—

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): With soft soap!

Mr. Sopha: —I wanted to take this first opportunity of congratulating him on his accession to the office of the first citizen of the province, and it is with a special delight that I do so when I remember that many years ago—where have they all gone? Where have those years gone, Mr. Speaker?—we were alumni at University College and were members of the student government at the same time and we were called to the bar of the province in the same year. So I can, in a very keen and enthusiastic way, share vicariously in the progress he has made. He has amounted to something.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He is not a bencher.

Mr. Sopha: No, he is not.

Mr. Nixon: Well, there now!

Mr. Sopha: He does not have that, but he and I here, notwithstanding that august body, we play in a tougher league here than there; they will be no difficulty to handle with the practice I get here.

I just want to acknowledge to him the terrible responsibilities he has taken on and amid the good fellowship of politics to wish him all the best in future years.

Mr. Speaker, it was on the Thursday night that CKSO at Sudbury said that they got 1,000 calls complaining that the Tory convention had replaced Red Skelton. That is what they said. On the Friday night they got 200 calls which said that Eagleson was better, though I must say that Eagleson gave me terrible moments of anguish.

I want to hastily pass over the presentation to the former Premier (Mr. Robarts). I suffered a torture of soul when I watched that. Do you remember when he handed him the plaque and he said it cost 39 cents. It said: “Happy sailing, good wishes, R. Alan

Eagleson, president.” The only thing it lacked was the autograph of Bobby Orr.

I could see that the Premier suffered great torment, but ultimately Eagleson saved the day. He saved the day from an otherwise droll affair. When I saw that he and not Eddie Goodman was to be the chairman of the proceedings I whispered a sigh of relief realizing that our chances would go up apace.

We are one of those among the captive audience from Sudbury. We have always had only one station—just one—the CBC, so we are very sophisticated television critics. When you have a steady diet you know what is bad.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): And there is plenty of it on there.

Mr. Sopha: And the CBC coverage was abysmally bad. I say that seriously.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Donald MacDonald was the only real contribution.

Mr. Sopha: But you have to recognize the CBC for what it is. It is a theistic hierarchy. It is steeped in theism. When you arrive at the top of the heap, the pinnacle of achievement in the CBC, no power on earth can remove you from those dizzy heights.

And one of the things in Canada, let me say in passing, that in respect to television we suffer from, is a dearth of intelligent criticism of the medium. Unfortunately, with the passing of Nathan Cohen there really is not a pithy, genuine and intellectual criticism of the way that medium operates.

The member for Scarborough West mentioned Eagleson’s observation on the length of Mrs. Davis’s skirts. I heard that. He did make an observation. I forget whether he said Mrs. Davis should wear longer skirts or shorter skirts, and it does not matter really. But that allusion is nothing compared with the vulgarity of the press and television in jamming microphones in front of the ladies, the wives of the leadership candidates.

I suffered a moment of the deepest sympathy for that nice Mrs. Al Lawrence when the cretin poked a mike in front of her face and said, “And now, Mrs. Lawrence, how do you feel now that your husband has been defeated?” How did he expect her to feel? She felt terrible. The noble lady—nice looking. I have never seen her in person. She must have felt terrible because, as Al Lawrence said, she worked his way through law school. So did mine, incidentally, work my way through, bless her.

But in all the tasteless, pedestrian, commonplace, hackneyed rhetoric of speakers and commentators—which I will deal with in a moment—there were moments of exultation.

Mr. Stokes: Donald MacDonald then!

Mr. Nixon: The hon. member should have kept him as leader.

Mr. Sopha: At 1 o'clock in the morning my wife and I were watching the final vote and I was on my feet when the CBC characteristically reported inaccurately that they had Al Lawrence ahead—do you remember?—and I was on my feet saying, "Go get 'em, Al!" I said, "Phyllis, the heads will roll if he is elected"—and roll they did. Some are almost out of sight. Somebody wake up the member for Ottawa South (Mr. Haskett) down there; tell him I am talking about him.

Oh, the attrition was very great. What about the member for Lanark (Mr. Gomme). And the member for Don Mills (Mr. Randall)—he leads the pack. But I want to compare that to another.

The member for York South was a commentator and, as I will point out later, I asked the CBC how come he was a commentator. They said, "Well, he went through this process, he was a leader." Well, he is among the fallen. The member for York South tonight is running for the presidency of the NDP; maybe he is making a comeback. How do we know? He should sit in the second row where the member for Scarborough West used to. I told the member for York South he needed rear-view mirrors to watch him.

The member for Don Mills is the next doorman at the Constellation Hotel. Supposing we take a straw vote to determine which position is more important—president of the NDP or a connection with the Constellation Hotel? I vote for the member for Don Mills.

To get back to the CBC—it really deserves a word, Bill Casey, we have seen him from time to time up here, is sort of a backwoods Chet Huntley, the affected droll, giving only the slightest hint of his boredom with mere politicians. At times I thought he was going to fall asleep. Maybe his mind was numbed by the paralyzing effect of the rhetoric he was hearing. The apple-cheeked youngster from the University of Waterloo—they said he was the head of the department of political economy—I do not have his name. I suspect he was not old enough to vote. Frank McGee—a Davis man—everything Frank McGee said was directed to promoting the Prime

Minister. I wondered how it was that the Attorney General, or the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) did not have somebody up in the booth. Well, Frank McGee is a relic of an age that has gone.

Mr. Nixon: That is what organization is!

Mr. Sopha: He does not fit the description of a successful politician.

Mr. Nixon: They did not have time.

Mr. Sopha: Do you know what a successful politician is? There is only one definition. He is the one who gets elected. None other ever fits. Then there was the man, as I adverted, the man who has become a fixture at these leadership conventions—old Donald A. himself. There he sat with the pacifier. And every time he took the pipe out he gave the impression he was saying something profound.

Mr. Pitman: And he always was.

Mr. Sopha: Giving up weighty encomiums on the political process for the lay public. The inside dope from an inside dope.

One word he used and he kept using it over and over again; and so it would not spoil the savour of the word I have not looked it up. I do not know what it means; I am not going to.

Mr. Stokes: It was "computation," was it not?

Mr. Sopha: It was the word "extrapolate."

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): It was a word left over from you.

Mr. Sopha: No, I have never used it. I do not know quite what it means. It has something to do with the projection of numbers. He used it in connection with the first, second and third vote, but he was extrapolating all over the place. And they tell me one middle-aged spinster called up and said, "He has got to stop it."

The relieving feature in the whole piece was when Frank McGee's father-in-law came in—that grand old man of Canadian writers, Gratton O'Leary. They had him in for a few minutes and he made some very acute observations. When he got tired of the company and Frank had disappeared from beyond the range of the lens, Gratton O'Leary said, "What have you got over there, Frank? Some scotch?" He needed it. But the presence of the member for York South raised a question that bothered me. I called the CBC; I spoke

to Knowlton Nash himself. I said, "You have to be consistent. If you have the member for York South on at somebody else's convention, how is it last night on the TV of the NDP convention there is no Liberal or Conservative politician?"

Mr. Pitman: They had Dalton Camp on.

Mr. Sopha: I mean a viable politician. I pointed out that these are the Pharisees. Give the member for York South the opportunity with a pipe and he will come through every time—"Thank God we are not as other men"—as we have heard it over the years.

Tonight, of course, they are meeting in Ottawa. But I just want to make a passing reference. The Lewis dynasty is on the way—they tell me that David Lewis will win it on the first ballot; the member for Scarborough West is down there managing the campaign. And it seems that if there is a vacant office in politics at all, there is a Lewis running—there are any number of them. I think we should find out about the Pope's health.

Mr. M. B. Dymond (Ontario): Tell them about the pill!

Mr. Sopha: Then there was the high comedy of my old pal, Norman DePoe. They should have had Norman up in the booth at the Tory convention, if they could have got him in shape. He was interviewing that fellow from Philadelphia who owned the voting machine. Did you see that? He was interviewing him and Norman, like a good professional television interviewer, said to him, "What went wrong?" You know how the count went wrong; more of them voted than were registered. One of my children said, "Dad, you cannot trust the Tories." He said to the fellow, "What went wrong?" That ought to have brought a responsive answer.

The fellow from Philadelphia started talking about, "When I left the Royal York Hotel, I was going down in the elevator and I met this boy, and he looked up at me and he said, 'You are a crook.'" Norman, at this point, I thought, was going to throw up. He said, "I just asked you what went wrong! Just tell me what went wrong."

They should have had Eagleson in that spot. They should have had Eagleson interviewing Windy O'Neill. But I must not say too much about that because the matter is sub judice—I understand there is a little action going on in the courts, brought by Windy, and that if he is successful the Treasurer's inheritance is going to be diminished. I understand the man is well fixed.

That is enough. That is the impact it had upon me. The Premier was not here when the former Minister of Municipal Affairs was so indiscreet as to say that he is going to stay in office for nine years. He said, "The Prime Minister told me privately." He got a shocked look from the Minister of Trade and Development and he said "It was not in cabinet that he told me that he is going to stick around for nine years." Let me tell you right now, that looking at the total context I am now going to start his political funeral eulogy.

The Premier won, it was by a scant 44 votes. That is the magic number. Where is the measure of the contrast? As I see it, the difference between the Premier and the Attorney General is best summed up in caution against rashness. Here is one quotation:

The need for change was the message in the resignation of John Robarts at a time when he was strongest, said Mr. Lawrence. The government has to project a new image, a new thrust, new faces. He called himself the man who had been sitting as a back-bencher for 12 years and has seen things fall apart. We have to decentralize government. We cannot have civil servants and bureaucrats telling the people what is good for them from some remote place in Toronto.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Who said that?

Mr. Sopha: That is the new image. That is the Attorney General. Then at a later time he had this to say, "Lawrence said he would cut the number of ministers from the present 22 and form an inner executive committee." I look at the Leader of the Opposition and say—

Mr. Nixon: Great idea.

Mr. Sopha: —where have we heard that one before? An inner executive committee with less administrative responsibility.

An hon. member: All the way to the South Pole!

Mr. Sopha: I will start that again.

Lawrence said he would cut the number of ministers from the present 22 and form an inner executive committee of ministers with less administrative responsibility and more time to think.

Mr. Singer: That is good.

Mr. Sopha: One must pause there and say, "Well that is a new idea," and invite that.

Mr. Singer: Certainly, that does not include the Treasurer.

Mr. Sopha: And I continue the quotation:

More time to take a comprehensive view. Although he disagreed with Welch on the need for an early election, he indicated he felt the Robarts government had lost touch with the public. "The big thing I am trying to get across is that we must change," Lawrence said.

Mr. Nixon: A nice phrase!

Mr. Sopha:

"I know it is not going down well with some delegates, but if we bury our heads in the sand, we will be turfed out. Right?"

Now that is what what the leadership race was all about. And it serves a useful purpose to use it as a focus in order to lay before the House the sum of the attributes of what it is that ails Ontario. So what did the Premier say? What did the winner say? Here is one that is typical. Speaking at North Bay he said:

"We have contributed a great deal to the people in this province," Bill Davis told his audience. "We have made the odd mistake, but that is only natural. Now we are not looking back but ahead without any apologies for what we have done."

Mr. Nixon: As the Hon. Minister of Highways and Transport (Mr. MacNaughton) would say, it is part of our way of life.

Mr. Sopha: Part of our way of life!

Mr. Singer: Patronage remains a major mistake?

Mr. Sopha: I will return to the 44, but the others, the also-rans, deserve a passing reference. I start with the boy orator grown up, the man who probably made the best speech on the Thursday night. You will recognize him. He was the one who spoke early in the evening. In a paraphrase he said something like this:

If you do not believe in the good society, if you are not willing to take on exciting tasks, if you do not accommodate your thinking to change, then do not vote for me.

And they did not. But he deserves a measure of tribute. Along the campaign trail he had this to say—and it points to his difficulties. Listen to it:

"I have always believed that no society can consider itself truly progressive if all people within that society do not share in the benefits of the total society," Mr. Welch said last week, in explaining his selection.

Several convention delegates seized on the statement during Mr. Welch's whirlwind tour ridings Saturday, in search of leadership votes. "This sounds like more of the have's giving to the have-nots again," complained one delegate during a meet-the-candidate gathering in Etobicoke. "No more giveaways, the sleighride is over," declared another delegate. "We have to tell people on welfare to go out and work if they want something." A woman delegate pointing to the increasing number of people receiving unemployment insurance benefits said, "There are jobs available for the unemployed as domestic servants, for example, but people just won't take a job that is beneath their former level."

Well, those are symptomatic of the pathology that ails that party, I protest to you. People who think in that way that woman thought about the giveaways formed the number of that 44 votes. They barely managed to eke out a victory over the man who promised change.

Bert Lawrence—Don O'Hearn called him a new Adlai Stevenson—

Mr. Singer: He is not here either.

Mr. Sopha: I hope he did not buy 150 copies of that column because he should be aware Adlai Stevenson said "Flattery is all right as long as you don't inhale." Bert Lawrence talked about the quality of life as deserving a higher priority than an increase in the GNP. He said this:

We are moving from the quantitative era of government when we thought in terms of how many miles of road, how many hospitals, how many schools, how many this, how many that, into the qualitative era.

What Lawrence was saying was that the emphasis in society must now shift to a better life for everyone. But quality—how many people would this get through to, ponders the editorial writer.

He used devastating frankness about a cabinet colleague—another report, the Globe and Mail:

Lawrence, Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, said that one of the first orders of business if he became party leader will be to review what he called "the buck is a buck" approach of Stanley Randall, Minister of Trade and Development.

Well, poor old Stanley, he got reviewed.

Here is another of Bert Lawrence's gems, another place in time. He suggested the deputy ministers should also be shifted regularly to ensure freshness of approach to problems. Do you see what I am trying to point out to you, Mr. Speaker? What I am trying to point out to you is that in that leadership race they detected the illness that afflicts that party after 28 years in office.

As the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) said in North Bay last night to a magnificent gathering, there is not another democratic government in the western world that cannot shift the blame to any other party for the ills that afflict the province.

Mr. Singer: It was well said then; well said now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Then we can take the credit for the wonderful province we have.

Mr. Sopha: And then, last but not least, there was the Duke of Kent himself. The brave old Duke of Kent, he had 10,000 men, he marched them up a very big hill and he marched them down again, and when they were up, they were up, up, up, and when they were down, they were down, down, down, and when they were only half way up, they were neither up nor down.

But he was not down for long, Senator Dave knew the way. He knew the way and Darcy followed in his wake. Ah, my heart cried when I saw him go. The press accounts had it, of course, that the deal was made the night before. I never saw this account denied. The Toronto Daily Star, February 13:

The McKeough dramatic and apparently spontaneous show of allegiance to Davis was in fact the climax of an anti-Lawrence alliance plotted two weeks ago by Davis and McKeough and cemented on the ballot before McKeough was eliminated. Provincial Treasurer Charles MacNaughton, Davis' chief strategist, said that when it was all over: "This was the prior commitment that we had, it worked very well."

Mr. Nixon: You can count on him to say something good, as usual.

Mr. Sopha: If that is so, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, because you will appreciate it, the now Treasurer was not completely honest with the TV cameramen when he said at the end of the second ballot that he had not made up his mind. That is what he said. He looked me right in the eye through the television screen when he said it. And I say again—I alluded to it before—if that's so, then "O false Sextus, that wrought the deed of shame!" is very well said.

Mr. Nixon: I see now the Attorney General is here, so you had better repeat some of this for his benefit.

Mr. Sopha: A delightful story is told by an eyewitness, an eavesdropper who overheard the conversation between the two Rasputins, Ernie Jackson and Eddie Goodman. They were standing looking up at the board where they posted the results and it seems that at the end of the third vote, when the numbers were put up, Lawrence had picked 108 and Davis had only picked up 74. Eddie said to Ernie, "Ernie, that"—you know, the offspring of a canine; you know what I mean—"has got us beat." And Ernie said, "Damn it, Eddie. You think I can't read a blackboard?"

Well, Lawrence picked up the 162 of McKeough's 346 and Davis only picked up 140. So McKeough's hold was tenuous. The funny one, of course, was the member for Ontario South (Mr. W. Newman). He had supported him all along the way; he could not stomach that and he rushed over to Al Lawrence's camp. He was the only one, the one of the noble four that I will define in a minute.

Mr. Nixon: He is the one who is still sitting up in the back row.

Mr. Singer: He will remain there forever.

Mr. Sopha: So I turned to the magic—44, by my count, supported Davis. Some of them were latecomers. John White—it took him two months to discern that Davis had better qualities. What a vote of loyalty—to find out that Davis was better than brand X—44 of them all, who do they speak for?

Four supported Lawrence—one in doubt; the chairman of the ONR. He is in doubt. The member for Parry Sound (Mr. A. Johnston)—as recently as this afternoon they did not know who he supported. He kept telling them he was on Al Lawrence's team: "He is my boss. He is in charge of the ONR." Wells, Hodgson, Reilly and Newman.

Mr. Singer: Yes, they would not even allow him to speak in the Throne debate.

Mr. Sopha: I admire them. They stood alone. The words of King Henry V are appropriate:

If we are marked to die, we are enow
To do our country loss; and if to live,
The fewer men, the greater share of honour.

They are especially appropriate—I have not got the clipping, but none will deny that he said it—especially appropriate in the light of the later remarkable interview with the Minister of Justice, in which he said he felt like leaving but one thing that would keep him would be to protect those four. Not a startling proposition: He would stay to protect them. Who is he protecting them from?

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): He shakes his head. He is misquoted.

Mr. Sopha: If they need any protecting, is it any wonder that Leonard Reilly is the leader in prayer?

Mr. Singer: And the member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. R. G. Hodgson) cannot get to speak in the Throne debate.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, Well, there you have it. Then it all came down to Alan Eagleson's encomiums about the Premier's dress. That guy—I do not know. Is there any prospect of you getting rid of him? Are you having a meeting of the party?

Mr. Nixon: I think so.

Mr. Sopha: I hope you do not. He ought to be good for 20 seats if he keeps on—for us.

After the convention, it seems he can never resist the press. If they ask him a question, he has to answer.

Mr. Davis has recently lost 15 pounds and Mr. Eagleson wants him to lose 10 more. It makes him look less tired and psychologically it is better for him. He has also been urging the Premier to pay more attention to his dress. The loose-fitting suits he wore as Education Minister have been replaced by pinstripe suits with creases in the pants, no cuffs sometimes and the occasional wide tie.

Well, maybe until he got the raise in the Premier's office he could not afford to.

Will somebody inform Eagleson that since this House resumed he comes in here with such sartorial splendour that doubtless Thomas Carlyle smiles in his heavenly abode. Those wide-lapel suits like he has on tonight—

Mr. Nixon: Belt in the back.

Mr. Sopha: Those \$15 neckties. John Bulloch is about to declare an extra dividend. I am going to pass over this portion, but if it was not the 44 over there, then perhaps it was the 52 so-called delegates at large. There was no doubt who was their choice. Listen to the names of some of them: John David Eaton—

Mr. Nixon: He is a good one.

Mr. Sopha: John Bassett.

Mr. Nixon: Another one.

Mr. Singer: Fine fellow.

Mr. Sopha: Ernie Jackson.

Mr. Singer: Great guy.

Mr. Sopha: Paul McNamara. Who elected them? In the Liberal Party—perhaps you will not consider it exultation to inform the House—we have no such animal as delegates at large. That is not the way we do it. We must have the mandate of the people.

Mr. J. R. Simonett (Frontenac-Addington): What about Weinstein?

Mr. Sopha: Well, as I watched, it had its more serious sides, and now I turn to one, Mr. Speaker. As I watched the charade unfold across the province, I had a persistent question in mind as to how it was being paid for. I have long been a supporter of some restraints on the excesses of spending for the goal of the office of leader of a political party.

Moss Munro of the Globe and Mail apparently is gifted with some insights, and his observations are very disturbing. Let us read some of them in to the record—I never saw these denied.

The Globe and Mail of Saturday, February 20. Will you hearken, Mr. Speaker, to what it says?

Altogether it can be said that the leadership race was a \$1-million campaign, undoubtedly the most expensive in Ontario political history. My estimate of cash expenditures made by five cabinet ministers in their campaign for the leadership is based on discussions with campaign aides as well as observations of the campaign. The amount of money spent seems to correspond remarkably closely with the order in which the candidates finished.

The winner, Education Minister William Davis, probably spent between \$150,000 and \$175,000.

Mr. Singer: That is an awful lot of money.

Mr. Sopha: To continue:

The runner up, Mines Minister Lawrence, was in the same cash bracket. Municipal Affairs Minister McKeough spent more than \$100,000. Provincial Secretary Welch spent about \$85,000, and Financial and Commercial Affairs Minister Bert Lawrence was the poor man of the campaign with a cash budget of about \$60,000.

Later on:

The motives behind all this largesse ranged from the altruistic to the venal. At one extreme are the contributors who want to help out a candidate even if he has little chance of winning. Somewhere in the middle are those who feel their contributions will guarantee access to the new Premier. Others seek the new Premier's favouritism. Still other contributors are quite frankly out to get the government contracts.

It goes on.

Mr. Yakabuski: Oh, no!

Mr. Singer: Perish the thought. It is just part of the way of life. That is what the Minister of Highways and Transport (Mr. MacNaughton) says.

Hon. Mr. Snow: It is provincial, not general.

Mr. Sopha: The large volume of contributions to the leadership campaign, and the questions those contributions raised, suggest a need for certain reforms. At some point there will have to be a limit on the amount of money that can be spent and, much more difficult to legislate, there will have to be laws forcing politicians to disclose the source of their funding.

Unless these reforms come about, there is going to be increasing suspicion and cynicism, sometimes justified, sometimes unjustified, about the nature of politics in this province. Later on, "James Lovick Limited did the advertising work for Mr. Davis." When and if this firm gets a large investment contract, will it be on the basis of its position as a large, established and reputable agency? Will the sceptics wonder aloud whether it had something to do with favours rendered?

Mr. Nixon: This party will wonder.

Mr. Sopha: "Mr. Davis' campaign, along with most of the others,"—will my friend from Downsview listen to this one?—"received sizable contributions from large real estate developers."

Mr. Singer: Oh, very interesting!

Mr. Sopha: "Again, this could raise suspicions, doubtlessly unjustified, that these developers will receive a special hearing when the new cabinet needs to decide on how rigidly to enforce the Toronto-centred region plan."

Mr. Singer: Yup! That is going to be very fascinating! If we ever get a decision.

Mr. Sopha: This plan, as it stands, would bar proposals—

Mr. Singer: What proposal? The Spadina Road extension?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member should not be critical until it happens.

Mr. Sopha: All right. That is the way Mr. Munro put it. I put it in this light.

Mr. Singer: What is the Premier going to do for Rohmer? Is he going to give him back his city?

An hon. member: Rohmer? Who is he?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): From the lips of a "Grit," it is too much.

Mr. Sopha: If there was nothing improper, or to use Mr. Munro's words "venal" in the million-dollar campaign, Mr. Speaker, if there was nothing—

Mr. Yakabuski: —nothing between you and the member for Sarnia.

Mr. Sopha: —none of that quality to it, then it is quite appropriate so say to the Premier: Table the list of contributors in this House. Disclose their identities and the amount of money they gave. The same applies to the lesser lights, those who were unsuccessful. I think in the light of that column by Ross Munro—

An hon. member: Speak up, speak up.

Mr. Sopha: —that he can do nothing less than that.

An hon. member: In a couple of weeks I will tell you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: A while ago, the member for Peterborough was asking for a dialogue in the House. I guess it has started.

An hon. member: Where does the member think we are now?

Mr. Pitman: Dialogues all evening.

Mr. Sopha: All right. I think that is a fair challenge to put to him because, as one member of the House who has never been involved in that context, I want to say that it is a matter of conscience to a great many people in this province that is very disturbing—that that kind of money is spent—

Mr. Pitman: Certainly.

Mr. Sopha: —on seeking the plum of the leadership of the party and especially when with it goes the highest office that can be bestowed upon a politician in this province. That office ought not to have attached to it any suggestion of wrong-doing whatsoever. Let him table it in the House. When he rises to speak tonight, let him tell us where the \$175,000 came from.

Mr. Simonett: He will.

Mr. Yakabuski: The member must stay for that, too.

Mr. Simonett: The member for Sudbury had better not run away.

Mr. Yakabuski: Before the cock crows thrice.

Mr. Pitman: The member for Renfrew South should take it easy. Just slow down.

Mr. Sopha: I want to turn—Mr. Speaker, will you tell the members I am going to leave them alone for a moment?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

An hon. member: The back-benchers are very happy with the member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: I want to turn, if the members will be a bit silent, to the modern revisionists. It is appropriate. There is an appropriate term for them, when one looks at what is going on at Ottawa—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sopha: —and the demolition of the Waffle group. These are the modern revisionists.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member for Sudbury is on much sounder ground.

Mr. Pitman: Oh! He was much better a few minutes ago.

Mr. Sopha: Tommy Douglas summed it up—

Mr. Pitman: The Treasurer was not here!

Mr. Sopha: —yesterday. You do not know how helpful this assistance is. Tommy Douglas summed it up when he said—get the beauty of this—I heard it myself on the radio, “We are no philosophical society involved in esoteric theories.” That is exactly what is wrong with them. That is how far they have come from the Regina manifesto. He said “esoteric.” I thought at first that he had said “erotic,” because there was a story told by Bruce Rogers—

Mr. Stokes: The member for Sudbury never did hear very well.

Mr. Pitman: If the member would stop talking long enough he might hear.

Mr. Sopha: —yesterday at the convention. Apparently they make a big thing out of economy. Now can the members imagine the contrast, a million-dollar campaign—

Mr. Pitman: What a contrast to this party's campaign.

Mr. Sopha: —the tremendous buffet they say that the Treasurer put on. You know, you wonder what the poor people are doing. I do.

Mr. Pitman: They pay more for balloons than we do for our whole convention.

Mr. Sopha: The opulence of that party—

An hon. member: Balloons and baloney.

Mr. Sopha: Compared with that one where they have an economy measure whereby they sell box lunches—

Mr. Pitman: Right.

Mr. Sopha: —at the convention. Nothing wrong with that. But yesterday somebody put in each one of the box lunches, a card—

Mr. Pitman: A Liberal, I will bet.

Mr. Sopha: —advertising a show down the street featuring topless beauties.

An hon. member: Free enterprise.

Mr. Sopha: Apparently, what had happened was—

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Share and share alike. Share the wealth.

Mr. Sopha: I say to my friend from Windsor-Walkerville that some of those hot-shot union people from Windsor had come in and they had organized the topless girls. It certainly is comforting to note, as we would not believe, that they might engage in some diversion. You know, to hear them tell about it, they never would. It is comforting to note that they have feet of clay like the rest of us.

Mr. Yakabuski: They were union girls.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): That is the basis of a socialist foundation.

Mr. Sopha: But it is sad to see, Mr. Speaker, the obliteration of conscience in that party. The death of us all. The lust for power is everything. Schreyer turned his back on socialism. The Laxer people, as far as I am concerned—

Mr. Pitman: Come on now.

Mr. Sopha: The Laxer people are the only ones that make any sense. Some of their ideas are very attractive. They are almost beyond dispute. As Laxer pointed out on television last night about Quebec—

An hon. member: And tonight!

Mr. Sopha:—he said we have to sit down with Quebec from square one and chart the future relationship. He said it is quite wrong to say that, put *in extremis* of Quebec threatening to separate, we will not use force. He said that is a very negative approach.

Now I am one with him on that—that accords with my thinking—

Mr. Pitman: What did Mr. Trudeau say?

Mr. Sopha:—it finds a sympathetic response with me.

Mr. Pitman: What about Pierre?

Mr. Sopha: Because I am one who is conscious that in English Canada there is a significant strain of belief that any oppression toward Quebec is all right.

If unemployment in Ontario was 11 per cent or 12 per cent, as it is in Quebec, the *Globe and Mail*, the *Toronto Daily Star* and the *Toronto Telegram* would be yelling bloody murder. And the Ontario members of the House of Commons—you would think that Armageddon had arrived!

But in Quebec, you see, that is all right. I am one of those who believe that you must look at the root causes of violence in Quebec.

Mr. Pitman: I wish the member had been around last fall.

Mr. Stokes: What about Trudeau and Marchand then?

Mr. Sopha: Do members remember the debate in the House of Commons on the special grant? I had the advantage of meeting those senators and members of the House of Commons who made up the constitutional committee, that travelling show under Mark MacGuigan—

Mr. Singer: David Walker too?

An hon. member: No. He is on the political—

Mr. Sopha: This is serious business. I had the advantage of meeting them and telling them my feelings about that debate in the House of Commons which involved a special grant to French-Canadian students to provide them with summer employment. Do members recall that one? When the opposition felt they had ferreted out what was a secret—I think it was something like \$2 million—they jumped on the government about favouring Quebec. It is part of the syndrome in this country that is popular with some people, the game of “hate Quebec.” You are not with it if you do not say something scurrilous about Quebec. In this city—

Mr. Singer: The Minister of Agriculture and Food says he needs an interpreter four times a day.

Mr. Sopha: In this city almost every day—

Mr. Singer: He does it four times every day, and listen to him.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: In this city almost every day CFRB carries on a veritable war against Quebec; almost every day. I heard them this morning about the resolution concerning the monarchy that they said originated in Quebec. Well on this matter the NDP, as on several others—it is becoming apparent that this convention is rife with hypocrisy—

Mr. Stokes: That is nonsense!

Mr. Pitman: We have stated unequivocally that we are prepared to allow them their own self-determination.

Mr. Sopha: Hypocrisy in their attitude toward women and women's rights.

Mr. Pitman: No other party has stated this.

Mr. Sopha: I alluded to the struggle that went on yesterday by the women to get a certain number of seats in the governing council. Let me tell you that they had a convention at Kingston about a year ago—some will recall that—and the wife of James Laxer, the lady with the lovely name, she goes by her single name, raised the question of women's rights to be represented on the council and they did not elect one, not one.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: And the hypocrisy of their attitude toward foreign investment Laxer and his people said yesterday they were beaten down in a resolution that would empower the government to initiate inquiries into the financial affairs of industry that threatened to lay off people and close down for economic reasons. They were beaten down. Is that not what the member for Riverdale was saying here? Is that not the very thing he was saying? Is that not what he wanted with Dunlop Tire? You see the lust for power.

The leader of the NDP in Ontario, the member for Scarborough West is attempting to become respectable. Put aside the radicalism, put aside the idealism, put aside the philosophy; power is everything!

They have become a bourgeois party and the Maoists that split that party right down the middle between those with conscience and those who want power are eventually going to liquidate them. They will be politically liquidated. Is it any wonder they never got any more than 17 per cent of the vote?

Mr. Pitman: Absolute nonsense!

Mr. Sopha: I say to my friend from Peterborough, the people of Ontario are smarter than he thinks. They will not turn to his party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Fine, fine!

I said at the beginning—and I make no apologies—that to look at these conventions gives an insight into the political climate and the political texture of the province today and what the issues are about in this province.

I have a couple of other items that I want to just rush through in passing. Concerning this committee on productivity, I want to register a dissenting voice; I want to put Sopha down at the end of the bench. If everybody else in the House approves of that committee, then I want to be the lone dissenter.

The name of it repels me—committee on productivity of government. Government is not a business according to my political philosophy. It does not have to be run like a business. Government deals with human beings, with human problems. It makes responses that are not businesslike. That is the ethos of government.

And I am not at all impressed, along with my dissent, with the *dramatis personae* that make up that committee. Deputy Minister of Lands and Forests G. H. U. Bayly—well let me confess that, having been around here for 12 years you develop certain interests and certain pastimes to while away the hours and the moments of rumination and reflection, I just say in passing that for a long time now I have been watching the progress of Bayly. He is a man or the move, very much on the move.

The Deputy Minister of Justice, the Deputy Treasurer, the secretary to the cabinet. One questions: These people, fraught with human qualities and human strivings and human ambitions like the rest of us, do these people, one wonders aloud, in making their report, perhaps carve a niche? Do they carve out, do they set the context of the place where they hope to fit?

I have no responsibility to speak for the Leader of the Opposition, but I want to say this, having thought upon it—I want to be very careful that my words are not understood—I do not want the Globe and Mail portraying something tomorrow that is not accurate—I want to say that I am a firm believer, buttressed as I am by the Minister of Justice—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Misunderstood!

Mr. Sopha: I do not want to be misunderstood—but I am of the firm belief that when there is a change of ministry—as we hope and expect there will be a change of ministry when the man from Brant is called by the Lieutenant Governor—I believe that deputy ministers' resignations should be on the table; and I confine that to deputy ministers.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We are going right back to Hepburn.

Mr. Sopha: Oh no, I knew the obtuse—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Talk about patronage. The member has the nerve to talk about patronage when he—

Mr. Nixon: Too bad the Treasurer did not win that top job, he would have been so good.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Will the Premier muzzle him?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will offer to restrain my colleagues if the member for Sudbury can restrain his.

Mr. Sopha: I will try.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Particularly the member for Downsview.

Mr. Sopha: Sometimes I think that to have full participation in a debate you need a baseball bat. I knew somebody as obtuse as the Treasurer would seize upon that one.

Mr. Stokes: The biggest heckler is the member for Downsview.

Mr. Sopha: I am not saying anybody else other than deputy ministers because I base that on this assertion: Deputy ministers are the focal point of policy-making power in the department. In very large measure, as the Attorney General said, they make the policy. Many a minister we can see after a dozen years—and who would know that more than John Robarts—does very—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (London North): The member for London North.

Mr. Sopha: I did not want to provoke him, but who would know better than he that ministers vary in quality. Some would be involved in the policy making process; others would not. I have seen them over there that if you asked them a question like the time of day they would not tell you until the deputy phoned the Dominion observatory. That is the type I mean.

I am saying that I would have it that deputy ministers, as the Minister of Health said, should be shifted around. In a change of ministry the resignations of deputy ministers should be on the line.

Now the other part of this committee on productivity—I am a dissenter—the director of Gulf Oil, the president and general manager of Lake Ontario Steel Company, the president of Noranda Mines, the president of

Oshawa Wholesale. Now some would think—and I cannot say it, I cannot lend them the dignity of assent—some would think that is a tremendous businesslike committee, to give government an *elan vital* of business. You know, to make it really efficient; the kind of rhetoric you would hear at a stockbrokers' convention, at a meeting of the executive of the chamber of commerce. But I certainly have my suspicions when government moves in that direction.

Well the Premier made a statement that I am not going to tarry with. I was glad—I was worried, you know; I was worried about Clare Westcott; he had formed part of that statement. When I got back I asked where old Clare was and somebody told me to my horror, that the Premier had left him up in Education. He was marooned up there. Somebody told me; he said: "Clare is going to stay up in Education and Bob Macaulay's brother is the big noise. He is the big noise."

Well, you can imagine my relief when I heard Wescott, the genius behind the scenes, had arrived. I do not know what to call him, but if he was a female, I would call him Madame de Pompadour.

He is the fellow who coined the phrase—he said, "My man up or out." He also said during the convention, "Davis has IOUs he does not even know about." Some of them were not paid.

Well, I turn now to a difficult, a very difficult aspect on which I searched my conscience and with which I had not hoped that I would have to deal; I regret very much that I must. I must so that I will have enough salve in my conscience to sleep tonight, and that is to refer to a speech made by my colleague from Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent). So the House will know what I am talking about, I will read the whole thing into the record to provide the context. This speech was delivered on April 19—Monday of this week. I was there and I heard it. The portion I want to read in, I will read right through until I finish:

Mr. Sargent: We have a story here in February 3 Hansard on the House of Commons debate. Hon. Mr. Sharp was asked a question. He states, Mr. Speaker, that they made a loan of \$207 million to India with a maturity of 50 years at an interest rate of zero per cent.

The shocking thing about it is that we have in this country—40 per cent of the money going into Ottawa comes from Ontario—we have eggheads down there who are running around the world and who never worked in business. They have always been parasites working for the government, never knowing how to run a business, never having had to meet a payroll and they have the right to go around the world, making loans like this, when we have three-quarters of a million people out of work.

And later, on page 586—I was reading from 585:

Mr. Pitman: Oh, for heaven's sake.

An hon. member: What does the member for Sudbury say to that one?

Mr. Sargent: I think it is high time we had this government of ours go down and lay the cards on the table and say: "We are not in favour of such foreign-aid giveaways. If they are reciprocal, if we are getting industry back, then there is merit in it but a lot of these deals are not reciprocal. They are long-term deals.

Mr. Pitman: Will the member for Sudbury get to his fellow member?

I want to tell you where I stand on that. I entirely dissociate myself from those remarks.

Those remarks about the aid to India, the loan to India, put in that frame of reference in which he put them are against all I want to do in public life. I am of the belief that we do not give enough.

Not only are we in danger of losing the goodwill of the marginal peoples of the world; but if the pragmatists want it that way, we are actually endangering our own continuity.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Quiet! The hon. member is making a great speech.

Mr. Sopha: I want Mr. Sharp to know that there is one Liberal down here—and I know the Leader of the Opposition and many of my colleagues are others—who believe that we do not give enough in foreign aid.

I want to put it in this context so that something good will come out of this. Every so often there is a new arrival in the press gallery. He is usually from the *Globe and Mail*, and he writes an article. After he is here for a couple of days he writes an article saying that we Liberals are not up to much.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: It is all right. That is all right. There is a free press, but to some of us it becomes tedious.

We have had many of our ideas accepted. We have very much formed a part of the government of this province. We have voted unanimously on many policies that have bettered the life of the people of Ontario. For myself, when I first raised the question that we should stop the alienation of Crown lands in this province seven years ago, I could not get a supporter over there. Now it is fashionable.

As Marx said, "There is nothing more powerful than an idea whose time has come." So it is, so it is.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Come again, I cannot hear!

Mr. Sopha: The fact is, against that context—please listen to what I say, I am soon going to end.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: The fact is that we have an excellent leader of our party.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Long may he stay there.

Mr. Sopha: He is a man, Mr. Speaker, of keen mind, of indefatigable energy. He suffers many heartbreaks about some of the things the rest of us do.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: The fact is that when the member for Grey-Bruce or anyone else makes a speech like that—

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Is there a doctor in the House?

Mr. Nixon: I will survive.

Mr. Sopha: When the member for Grey-Bruce makes a speech like that—

An hon. member: Gather round me!

Mr. Sopha: —it detracts from the respect that he ought to have, because it reflects directly upon him.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Throw him out of the caucus; throw him right out of the caucus!

Mr. Sopha: Our leader, sir, is a man of deep compassion and he is admirably suited—I say to you genuinely, sincerely and with every timbre of consciousness of the truth of it, in my words—that he is a man who is admirably suited to deal with the anxious problems that confront the people of Ontario.

Why do I use the words "anxious," "anxiety"—two particularly appropriate words to describe the psychic state of too many of our people in this province? What do I mean by "anxiety"? It is obvious enough. The growing addiction to drugs of every variety, oceans of alcohol, mountains of nicotine, millions of pills—down they go, drug after drug. An incapacity to control change or stabilize society drives more and more people—oh yes, the government does not know how serious it is. Let it be noted that some of them laughed.

An incapacity to control change or stabilize society drives more and more people into a febrile search for an identity and release through drugs.

What does the government do? Its response is the appointment of yet another committee.

What do I mean by "anxiety"? Not enough decent houses. What do we get? An announcement that yet another commercial complex will go up along Toronto's shore and the threat of the creation of a sprawling urban megalopolis which will stretch from Fort Erie to Oshawa to Barrie.

What do we get? Anxiety. We get the refusal of aid to the separate schools. Refusal of aid to the separate schools means to deny any possible efficacy to the religious dimension in the training of the young. It is an age when it is fashionable to decry the value of the religious experience. You are not with it if you do not.

Yet Sister Patricia McKinnon, the principal at Marymount in Sudbury, tells me that of the 600 girls in the school they have had no drugs among them. But they have them at Sudbury High, they have them at Lasalle, they have them at Nickel District Collegiate, they have them at Sheridan Technical School. They have them at the school where the little girl who came to our house to babysit told us, "The other day the son of a clergyman asked me if he could walk home with me and on the way he asked me if I wanted to go on an LSD trip." So the little girl said, "I said, 'Don't ever speak to me again.'"

Is there some value in the religious experience in the separate schools that deserves cultivation? Is that the question? Are we to be prisoners of the straitjacketed thinking that the Premier exhibited in Ottawa when he refused those students and gave them a bland and emphatic "no"—that straitjacketed thinking that he says is our policy over the decades.

Hon. Mr. Davis: How can the member be bland and emphatic at the same time?

Mr. Nixon: That remains to be seen.

Mr. Sopha: Amid all the yacking of the Treasurer, I say to him tonight with assurance, in speaking for all of us here, that our policy of aid to separate schools is morally right. It is morally right!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Our amendment for many other reasons deserves the support of the House.

I must, before I sit down, deal with the NDP amendment. There is one section in it that does not attract me very well, before I turn to another one. We are going to support this amendment, subject to the qualification that I am now going to make.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, cut it out so I can finish and give everybody a break.

Mr. McKeough: There is nobody there to support.

Mr. Pitman: We will have them here; do not worry.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is it; bring up the reserves.

Mr. Sopha: I say to the Premier, from now on the Treasurer does not get in after 10 o'clock without a saliva test.

They have it in number 10 of their amendment—I am not going to read the whole thing:

10. The failure of the government to spur, in particular the processing of northern raw materials and the development of secondary and tertiary industry in the north by refusing to:

(a) Establish a Crown corporation for mine exploration and development, and to force the pace of expansion through public enterprise and, if appropriate, engaging in joint ventures with private enterprises already active in the mining sector.

Listening to what David Lewis and the others are saying down at Ottawa, I thought they were against nationalization. Maybe this is a splinter group here. But that one does not particularly enthuse me, because I am of the belief that private enterprise does a much better job in the exploitation of the mining natural resources. I am able to dream up much more effective ways of getting the public share, the public piece, off the top of our natural resources, as I have said here many times.

Now they would have us, by supporting them, support number 11.

Mr. Stokes: Why do the member's conferees in Ottawa not do it, then? Stop being a hypocrite!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member is losing his own party. They are all leaving.

Mr. Singer: They will be back.

Mr. Sopha: I am just trying to finish; I have an obligation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Number 11 says:

The failure of the government to establish a universal public automobile insurance plan at a cost based on compensation regardless of fault.

There is no way that we will support that one; there is no way! Our vote in favour of the amendment is with clear qualification that this party as no part—

Mr. Pitman: The insurance industry got to the hon. member, eh?

An hon. member: A sad world.

Mr. Sopha: —that this party as no part of its policy advocates the nationalization of auto insurance.

I remember the time when I first came into the House—

Mr. Stokes: What about Saskatchewan?

Mr. Pitman: What about Saskatchewan? Premier Thatcher thinks it is a great idea.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: —when I first came here I was quite surprised when Leslie Frost—

An hon. member: I think it is a great idea.

Mr. Sopha: —Mr. Speaker, said at that time we had 36,000 civil servants; and now, today, 12 years later, we have over 60,000—

Mr. Nixon: Not counting Hydro!

Mr. Sopha: So this party in the nationalizing—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: —of auto insurance would want to add legions to those members. That we cannot support.

Mr. Stokes: The hon. member does not want to save 20 per cent in administration costs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: The other thing to be said about auto insurance—and I speak as a lawyer who has had a great deal to do in the settling of insurance claims—is I can say genuinely

that in recent years, in the last two or three years, the attitude of the insurance companies in adjudicating claims of persons injured on highways has been tremendously more flexible and progressive. There has been tremendous improvement—a greater willingness to settle, larger settlements, easier to deal. They have given up the traditional defences—

Mr. Stokes: And great for the lawyers.

Mr. Sopha: They have—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Hi, Judas!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: All right, on that basis—

Mr. Stokes: In case the member for Grey-Bruce does not know it, he has been completely repudiated.

Mr. Pitman: There is blood all over the floor under his chair.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: With a meat axe!

An hon. member: It was shameful!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member for Grey-Bruce was an embarrassment to his party. The member for Sudbury said so tonight.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, the trouble with that group over there is that they were never able to understand, either the dimensions or the pathology of change that has taken place in this province since the beginning of the Second World War to the present day.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Treasurer): He was not very kind to the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. G. Demers (Nickel Belt): He may join us but leave his policies behind.

Mr. Sopha: It is quite—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where would he rather be?

Mr. Sopha: —beyond the appreciation of the nature and dimensions of that age; it is quite beyond the capacities of the Wally Downers, the Norris Whitneys, the Erskine Johnstons. I no longer believe that there is much validity in the old adage spoken by Voltaire—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: When the member for Sudbury is as tried and true as those men, then he can laugh.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Where has the minister been for supper?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member for Parkdale has not had a smile on his face since he came into this House.

Mr. Trotter: I look at the minister. Why should I smile?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Trotter: The minister is a crazy guy. What is wrong with him? He is acting nuts.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: There will be those in Huron county who will say that the minister is out to lunch.

Mr. Yakabuski: The member should leave the chamber immediately.

Mr. Sopha: I no longer believe there is much validity in the old adage spoken by Voltaire: "Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose." There are profound new phenomena that man has not encountered in his previous history.

For one thing, change and innovation are now built into the culture with the news media. If you watch press and television closely—

Mr. Yakabuski: The member will be a long time.

Mr. Sopha: —you begin to understand that with them change is a vested interest.

Mr. Yakabuski: He destroyed the whole opposition a minute ago. It has all gone flat. He is through.

Mr. Sopha: Television has had a great deal to do with the weakening of the mores, which were suitable for and—

Mr. Yakabuski: It has gone flat. He is through.

Mr. Sopha: —binding together for a rural society. Rural Ontario has disappeared largely as the people have moved into the cities, and there has been a destruction of the old moral codes.

Mr. Yakabuski: He is destroying it. It does not mean anything any more. We were listening, but not any more.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: The people over there will go down to defeat, because they are a rural party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: They have not been able to assimilate to the changing pattern of life in the cities and the city people will destroy them.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: We are and always have been a party of change, not change for its own sake but change as a device—

Mr. Yakabuski: They are ashamed of him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He has been watching CBC too much.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The Leader of the Opposition had him write these speeches.

Mr. Sopha: —to better the lot of those we serve. That is the essence of the Liberal philosophy. That was said by a great Liberal statesman. In the light of the present disabilities that afflict the people of Ontario—

Mr. Yakabuski: The member is flat; he is through.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He is beginning to sound like the NDP.

Mr. Sopha: —I find the words of Laurier inviting when he said, "Evil are the men who see injustice and having the power to correct it, do nothing."

There is a great deal to be done in this province to root out injustice. Let us get on with the heroic task, but first let us have an election to determine who shall be the stewards of the people.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Give him hell.

Mr. Yakabuski: Keep it clean now. Do not be like the member for Sudbury.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the Throne debate, I do so with somewhat mixed emotions, and I do not want that to be misunderstood.

I have rarely seen an unhappier group than I have seen sitting across the House here on this occasion. I listened to the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), and I have to say this in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker. Parts of his speech tonight were the most delightful that I have listened to in this House.

I would only make this observation, Mr. Speaker—It is, to me, very typical of what the Liberals do not have to offer to the people of this province—the only thing the member for Sudbury could offer to the Legislature here tonight was one of the most significant pieces of entertainment related to the convention of our party. This was his total contribution to what he felt this province should be doing.

Although I will share this with him—these perhaps are not in the order that I planned—I agree with the observation that he made as it relates to the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent). To me it was a very significant revelation as to the thinking of some members of the Liberal Party, of the parochial attitude they take and their lack of regard and interest in those peoples beyond our own borders. To me, the member for Grey-Bruce, I think, deserved the kind of castigation he received from his colleague on the front bench in this Legislature here tonight.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Come down and look at the problems in my area.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I say that, Mr. Speaker, in a very kindly way, because perhaps there is yet time to learn. Perhaps he still has time to recognize that this country does have an obligation that extends beyond our own borders.

Mr. Speaker, I really recognize it as traditional, but I was inspired by the member for Sudbury on that one issue—the only one tonight—to offer my congratulations to you for the manner in which you have conducted the affairs of this House.

In reading back through Hansard over the past eight years since I have been a minister of the Crown, I discovered that I really have not participated in the Throne debate. This is, I think, the first time since I had the honour to move the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne some time in 1960. However, in checking through Hansard, I find the verbiage that I had contributed in my other capacity as Minister of Education was perhaps lengthy enough that they did not miss my contributions on the Throne debate itself.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to say this to the member for Sudbury. I appreciate the very kind observations he made to me as the leader of my party and as the Prime Minister of this province. I say to him and I say to his colleague, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon), and to the slightly decimated group from the socialists here tonight, that in spite of all the political differences that we may have in this House from time to time, and in spite of the byplay that is part of the democratic process and one that we all find stimulating, I can only say to the members of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, that I recognize the onerous responsibilities that are part of the Prime Minister's job in this province. I can say to them, in a very non-partisan fashion, that it is my intention to discharge these responsibilities in a way that will bring credit, not just to the government but to this Legislature and to the people of this province.

We have talked about the convention tonight, and I am not going to refer to it at great length. It has been brought back to me tonight on this occasion, as it was by the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Lewis), and by the member for Brant some few days ago. I remember the occasion very well—memories really that perhaps one looks back on with somewhat mixed feelings.

I can only say this to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to my colleagues and to the members of this Legislature—and this is partisan—that I was proud to have been associated with four other very excellent candidates, any one of whom, I would say this with respect, would make a very excellent leader for a party that might be situated opposite.

One of the very great and significant aspects of that convention, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that the Progressive Conservative Party in the Province of Ontario was able to find five men of capacity, and dedication of spirit, and enthusiasm, not only as it relates to the party, but this province. In a way that, I think, indicates very clearly the kind of success that this party will have whenever the Prime Minister determines that he will test the feelings of the electorate in this province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The Prime Minister is still prepared to let the people decide, is he? He is still prepared to let the people decide that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh I certainly am, and I am very confident of what their decision will be.

Mr. Nixon: Let us go and find out.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And I look across the House, Mr. Speaker, at my lonely friend from Peterborough (Mr. Pitman) and I think back not too many months to the time when he himself participated in a convention that to me was just so preset, so dictated by those who had this convention organized some many months in advance—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): That is utter nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that there was no question of its outcome. I speak for all my colleagues when we extend to him a very real measure of sympathy; because very frankly, Mr. Speaker, the member for Peterborough never had a chance.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Please do not waste your sympathy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He never had a chance. I only regret, Mr. Speaker, that the leader of the socialist group is not with us tonight—

Mr. Pitman: He is away on very important business.

Mr. Stokes: We do not need the Prime Minister's sympathy, we need action.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that he has found that family—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Shall we say his heart belongs to daddy? Shall we say that? His heart belongs to daddy!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I regret that the member for Scarborough West finds his family obligations more important than his obligations to the public of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Point of order. The member for Peterborough has the floor.

Mr. Pitman: On a point of order, I think it has been the practice in this House for this House to be recessed very often when the Liberal Party was holding a leadership convention and has not been in session when the Conservative Party was doing the same. I think that is the case.

I think that when the last Liberal leadership race took place—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Point of order? With respect, that is no point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: Point of information—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough was stating a point of order and it is quite proper that the Speaker should hear him out. It is not proper for any member of the House to state whether or not it is a point of order. That is for the Speaker to determine.

Mr. Nixon: It is a point of order, it refers to a custom of the House.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion it is not a point of order with respect to the regulations of this House. The hon. Prime Minister has the floor.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for anticipating your ruling. Where was I?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): The Prime Minister was being sorry for the member for Peterborough.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh yes, I was extending my concern to the worrier—the member for Peterborough.

But I am very serious about this, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Pitman: The Prime Minister was making some rather inappropriate remarks about where members of this party are.

Mr. Stokes: Unworthy of a Premier of this province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I am very serious about this, Mr. Speaker. I want the member—

Mr. Pitman: This is a national party.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right, but this is a province and he has a responsibility here in this House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: If there was a national convention of his party the Prime Minister would be there.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): That is why he was down at Mount Royal for half of one session, too.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! It would be most delightful if the members of the government would let their leader speak.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, please do not ever let me be cut off from the voluntary and very able assistance I get from my colleagues during these debates.

Mr. Stokes: And the Prime Minister is going to need it, believe me.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But Mr. Speaker, I want the record to show this, and I want the member for Peterborough to convey to his leader, that I do not want to hear in the future references made by him, as he did in this House the other day, as to the numbers of people sitting on this front bench to listen to the Leader of the Opposition, in this debate or other debates. I think the record should show that at this particular moment there are five members of the New Democratic Party participating in one of the very important debates of this Legislature.

An hon. member: Shame, shame!

Mr. Pitman: That was pretty cheap.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Pretty honest too. The member cannot duck it.

Mr. Pitman: That is a national convention and the issue of the relationship of Ontario and Quebec is very important. He has a very real responsibility, a very important responsibility to be there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, we organized the work of this House so we could have the vote on the Throne debate tonight to help accommodate the members of the New Democratic Party.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): That is right. Where are they? Yes. They can go to Ottawa tomorrow.

Mr. Pitman: This is a province which belongs to a nation and the issue of Ontario's relationship to the rest of this country is equally as important as what is going on here.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Oh get off it! Make the Legislature relevant. That is nonsense. They do not even show up.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I read very carefully what the leader of the New Democratic Party said in his opening of the Throne debate. His references to my colleagues and their attendance here related to their interest and must be replied to.

Mr. Pitman: If we were the government we would call this Legislature off so the Prime Minister could go to Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough does not have the floor and he will cease interrupting in a loud voice the speech of the Premier. Interruptions now and again are allowable but not continuously.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): The Prime Minister did not mention that the whole Liberal front bench is here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I was going to come to that.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: And they are a lot of help, too!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was going to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on having all of his colleagues on the front bench here to listen to my contribution tonight. I appreciate it.

Mr. Nixon: Where was the Premier earlier this evening when the representative of the NDP was winding up the debate?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I heard every word of it.

Mr. Nixon: He should have been in his place.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I heard every word of it. I can quote chapter and verse on his worries about the colleges of applied arts and technology, and their relevance in the educational system. Not only can I quote it, I have heard it a half a dozen times before.

Mr. Pitman: On a point of order, the Prime Minister was not in his place.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, quite right Mr. Speaker, but for the edification of the member for Peterborough I have very good communication. I listened to it; it is all there in my office.

Mr. Pitman: They can all listen to it somewhere else.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I heard it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Is that what the member for Scarborough West is doing, listening in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now Mr. Speaker, to try to move from the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: I doubt that we will hear anything new tonight from that side of the House either.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member for Thunder Bay would not recognize anything new if he heard it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, to deal very briefly with some of the important issues other than partisanship and conventions and leadership, because we could spend hours discussing these matters, and I have a whole file full of things that I wanted to say, through you, to the member for Downsview and others who made their contributions. The observations of the member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid), tonight, Mr. Speaker—I heard those as well—as they related to his description of this party, I do not think do him one bit of credit.

Mr. Nixon: He mentioned patronage, did he?

Hon. Mr. Davis: He even used the term corruption. What I find very intriguing—

Mr. T. Reid: I defined it quite specifically, too.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, he did indeed. I listened to his excerpts and his readings from the dictionary. He is very good at quoting academic references.

I find very intriguing the references made in the question period this afternoon to the revelations that we have had from Ottawa, from a certain candidate on that occasion; and very intriguing the observation from the member for Sudbury here tonight that if the Liberal Party were ever to assume office in the province, which it will not, not in the foreseeable future, that all the deputy ministers would be relieved of their responsibilities.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member a point of order or privilege?

Mr. Sopha: I did not say that. I only went so far as to say that with the change of ministry the resignations should be on the line. I did not say anything about relieving them of their responsibilities at all.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Same thing!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: What is the difference? It sounds like Mitch Hepburn.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I quite agree. The member for Sudbury said their resignations should all be available the moment the ministry changes. I accept this as a correction to what I said. I think the import and the intent were exactly the same.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) is not even a deputy minister.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do have to get through a very lengthy file of matters that I hope will be of some interest to all members of this House.

Some time later this morning I intend to leave this city to travel to Ottawa to have a meeting with the Prime Minister of Canada. On this occasion—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I understand he is there and I will be there as well.

Mr. Nixon: Now the Premier is sounding like the Globe and Mail. Is he going to give us a lecture on the Prime Minister of Canada not being in his place?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the government changes, the Globe and Mail is going to have to resign.

Mr. Pitman: The Premier is going to Ottawa? Everybody is in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well I thought I might see the member's leader there.

Mr. Pitman: He might do that; he might then convey his views in person.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Like the member for Sudbury, I have not been invited to participate in the convention as an observer or anything else.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of meeting the Prime Minister of Canada some weeks ago in the nation's capital. It was not a business session—a very pleasant occasion. Tomorrow, however, it is my intention to discuss with Mr. Trudeau—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Can the Premier tell me what one needs to catch him?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well I could really tell the member what happened, but I will not.

An hon. member: Come on, tell us.

Hon. Mr. Davis, I will say this, that I would refer to the CBC as did the member for Sudbury here tonight, although I was there at the convention and I understand rather personally some of the references that were made.

In my discussions with the Prime Minister tomorrow there are a number of matters that I wish to discuss with him. The meeting, of course, is confidential but I think it is time that the public understood my position as it relates to certain constitutional matters.

I shall make it very clear to Mr. Trudeau—and I want members of this House to be aware of the position as well—that this government is prepared to be constructive and co-operative in our relations with the federal government and we shall always temper our actions on behalf of the people of Ontario with that which will be in the best long-term interests of Canada.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Is this the Halifax speech again?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No.

Mr. Bullbrook: I wondered, because if this is the Halifax speech, I am going to leave.

Some hon. members: Goodbye!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Is that a threat?

Mr. Bullbrook: Do you promise the word "geese" is not in this speech?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I assure the hon. member for Sarnia "geese" is not in this speech. I would also make it very clear to him if he finds it necessary to leave, I shall not be offended—although I have to be very honest with the hon. member for Sarnia: There may be a reference to broilers, but not geese.

However, I want to make it exceedingly clear, Mr. Speaker, that our responsibilities in this House and my responsibility as Prime Minister is to look after the interests of the people of this province. Therefore this government is prepared at all times to speak out and act when we find that action by the federal government is damaging to the welfare of the people of our province.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): What does the hon. member for Sarnia say to that?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We will even get around to Dow if you give me time.

Mr. Speaker, the government of Ontario is opposed to, and prepared to fight against with every means at his command, the policy of the federal government to centralize and concentrate power in its own hands.

Mr. Bullbrook: This sounds like the governor of Mississippi.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh no, it is not.

Mr. Bullbrook: Is George Wallace over there anywhere?

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): If the member does not like it, leave!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: He is on the member's bench, right down there. The member for Sudbury pointed him out.

Mr. Bullbrook: Go back to sleep.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Put your shirt back in; it is bursting out!

An hon. member: Watch your temper.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this centralization—and I am speaking now as this relation to federal-provincial situations—defies the principles of Confederation and will make it very difficult for the government of Ontario to meet the responsibilities which are constitutionally ours. I wish to state categorically that the people of Ontario reject any policy whereby the federal government singles out Ontario for a reduced role in Confederation or in economic development of this jurisdiction.

Mr. W. Newman: How about that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, we are here to look after the interests of the province of Ontario. This has to be part of our responsibility; it has to be.

Mr. Pitman: Let us be more specific.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the federal policies to combat inflation have had a great impact on this jurisdiction and have driven the Ontario economy far below its potential and created our highest levels of unemployment in over a decade. Look at the figures; look at the comparison between the impact

in Ontario and our sister provinces in the past seven or eight months. I ask any hon. member opposite to dispute that fact.

The federal government, Mr. Speaker, has undertaken selective fiscal measures that have had once again a great impact on the Province of Ontario, such as the depreciation penalty on commercial buildings in Toronto and other key centres.

The so-called temporary surtaxes on personal and corporate incomes fall most heavily on Ontario, and rather than being taken off at the end of their term they have of course been extended. Surely—and I make this as a plea to the members of this House and to the federal jurisdiction—it must be obvious to the government of Canada that it is in the interest of Canadians in all parts of our country that Ontario retain a strong and vital economy. I will not refer to the goose that laid the golden egg, but some reference might be made to the broiler situation that exists in this jurisdiction.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Who wrote the Premier's speech? The hon. member for London North (Mr. Robarts)?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I must say that I had to temper my own remarks when I heard the hon. member for Scarborough East earlier this evening.

I want to talk for just a moment on a matter that relates to the constitutional conference in June.

Mr. Singer: What happened to the broilers?

Hon. Mr. Davis: What about broilers? Does the member want me to read the Federation of Agriculture's news release on the broilers or their editorial comment in the federation's bulletin?

Mr. Singer: Yes, talk about that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does he want to know what the agricultural community thinks of his party and the way it relates to their needs at the moment? It is all here.

Mr. Singer: Does the Premier want to know whether or not he seeks the opinion of the law officers of the Crown?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on a very important matter because I believe the hon. member for Sudbury at least is interested in the matter of constitutional

reform. Since the constitutional conference was established in 1968, the general subjects of fundamental rights, the judiciary, the institutions of federalism, regional disparities, mechanisms for intergovernmental relations and several items under the distribution of powers have all been examined and discussed.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Double-dealing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The areas of regional disparities and intergovernmental machinery have been of particular interest—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is well known.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —to the government of Ontario and reflect Ontario's major written contribution.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am disappointed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: While Ontario has participated actively in all phases of the review, these papers reflect Ontario's desire to effect immediate changes in the operation of the federal system by means of improvements in co-ordination and co-operation among governments and, when it proves necessary, to seek constitutional change.

At the constitutional conference of September, 1970, it was decided to undertake as a matter of high priority the patriation of The British North America Act and seek a formula to amend the constitution.

In February of this year much of the work of the last three years was brought together and tentative agreement was reached on a feasible approach to the question of patriation and an amending formula, fundamental political rights, official languages, regional disparities and so on.

The February consensus was drawn in general terms—and I emphasize this—and we have now entered into the complex and difficult process of considering what the details of these provisions might be and how they might be worked in draft constitutional provisions.

The federal Minister of Justice, the hon. John Turner, is visiting the provinces to clarify some of these details with the provincial governments in a series of bilateral meetings. He has already been here to visit this capital of Ontario and to discuss with me and my colleagues our views as they relate to a number of these matters.

We expect that he will be in touch with us again in the very near future, but at the same time we have proposed a multilateral

meeting of ministers to encourage the careful consideration of the issues which will be before the next meeting of the constitutional conference in Victoria, British Columbia, in June.

At the June meeting it is expected that the February consensus will be advanced by agreeing on the details of its general provisions. This is the hopeful anticipation.

However, I think it is important to emphasize, and important to appreciate, that the constitutional review has entered a very crucial phase. If it transpires—and here I may differ from some of my fellow Premiers or Prime Ministers across Canada—that should more time be needed to consider outstanding problems, then we should be prepared to take that time.

Since the people of Canada and their governments will have to live with these decisions, we must take great care to ensure that what we do now is technically correct and encompasses as wide a consensus as possible. Moreover, what is agreed in June will have to be widely debated, and I intend to provide this Legislature with the fullest opportunity to do so.

Mr. Speaker, just for about five minutes I want to deal with a matter that I hope is somewhat hypothetical. I hope it is somewhat hypothetical because it has caused me very real concern.

Earlier this week there were published reports—and I am the first to say that they may not be accurate—that the joint Senate-Commons committee on the constitution would recommend the abolition of the monarchy and the implementation of a presidential system in Canada.

Mr. Sopha: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bullbrook: It is beneath the Premier to give credence. It is beneath his position.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Hopefully I am not.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Get up and dissociate yourself.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for Sudbury says "Hear, hear!" I want to put on the record what I believe, because the member for Sudbury has expressed his point of view before. I have never done this before, Mr. Speaker. I want to express a personal point of view at this precise moment too. I share the opinion of the member for Sarnia who

does not believe what he has read in the paper; hopefully it is not accurate either.

Mr. Pitman: Why are we discussing it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I want to speak on it because it is very relevant to any federal-provincial discussions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Why does the member not go to Ottawa?

Mr. Pitman: I wish I was there.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): Is there any place he would rather be?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear—and I am speaking as an individual as well as the leader of this party and as Prime Minister of this province—that I am opposed to any suggestion that we move from the system that presently exists to a form of republican administration.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I make this abundantly clear.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, that is right. This is a personal point of view.

An hon. member: The government members applauded it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the member for Sudbury says he will be proved right. I sincerely hope he is wrong and I say that in a very personal way.

Mr. Sopha: It has inhibited our development.

Mr. Pitman: I think we have all gone mad.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Does a bencher have to take an oath of allegiance?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I now want to touch on matters of economics and unemployment which will perhaps have greater appeal to the member for Peterborough than matters of constitution and other situations.

Mr. Stokes: When is the Prime Minister going to say something about the north?

Mr. Pitman: Something that is accurate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not say they were accurate. I said if this were a possibility, I was opposed to it. The member for Sudbury has said he would support it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in London I think it is about 6—something. I do not think she is getting up yet, but I am sure she is not disturbed at all by what any of us say here tonight.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: How can the members opposite be a government when they are not even an opposition?

Mr. Sopha: Is there something wrong with the minister tonight?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I want to touch, in a general way Mr. Speaker, on the question of economics and unemployment. I shall do so briefly because of the other debate that will be going on, but several observations have been made recently by leaders in this country that I think must bear some comment.

I personally am aware of the enormous tragedy of family life being experienced by men and women throughout this province as a result of situations that exist at the federal level in this country today. I am not passing the buck. I will not accept that kind of criticism from anyone. More than that, I say to the members of this Legislature this government will do all that it can do, within the confines of its jurisdiction, to see that the people of this province have rewarding job opportunities.

I cannot accept, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of general philosophy that because of the social change and the technological change that has taken place in our society in the past 10 years, as stated by the Prime Minister of Canada, that this in itself means that a substantial number of people will be permanently unemployed. This, Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept as a matter of principle.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, we can be sufficiently creative to find job opportunities, even with the changes that have taken place and in a way that is relevant to the people of our community.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): The Prime Minister had better tell the people in his departments what he is doing about it. They do not know what he is doing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the people in the departments of this government do know what they are doing, which is not really a clear indication of the attitude and the philosophies adopted by the members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to touch just for a moment—in conclusion, because I really do not want to prolong this debate.

An hon. member: Carry on!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sort of enjoying it, I must confess. Maybe I will.

Mr. Ben: He is a good comedian. What we need is a Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for Humber, if he is talking about comedians, should have been here to listen to the member for Sudbury. Because we will never get—I say this most sincerely—a more delightful and humorous performance than was presented to the members of this House by the member for Sudbury tonight. I thought it was tremendous.

Mr. W. Newman: Let the record show that there are only three NDPs in this House.

Mr. Pitman: Why does the hon. member not dry up?

An hon. member: That is still three too many.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I want to touch upon matters of economic nationalism, because I know the member for Peterborough once again has a very real interest, as do his colleagues, in this particular issue.

I want to make it abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker, that this government is concerned about the ultimate control and future of the economic and social life of this province. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we have, as members of this House, a very real responsibility to the citizens of the Province of Ontario to find them job opportunities.

I listened to the leader of the party opposite the other day, Mr. Speaker. I have listened to pronouncements of members of that particular political group and I say to myself, I could go through them one by one and say to them, to the member for Oshawa (Mr. Pilkey) for example: "There is an industry prepared to locate in your riding. You need jobs. That industry happens to have some financing from outside the Province of Ontario or Canada." Is he going to say he does not want that industry to locate within his riding?

Do you know what the answer would be, Mr. Speaker? The member for Thunder Bay would not give me a proper answer; he would say: "Mr. Prime Minister, let us get that industry into my community."

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Sure he would. Certainly he would.

Mr. Stokes: When is the Prime Minister going to do it? I want to know when.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He does not care who owns it either, does he?

Mr. Stokes: I am not particularly interested as long as we get on with developing our area.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I should really leave this issue of economic nationalism right now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It has been settled? No, no, it has not been.

I say to the members of this House, Mr. Speaker, I share this concern and I think we can develop ways and means within the provincial jurisdiction.

We are limited. It is a matter of national significance whereby we can give greater encouragement to Canadian industry without becoming anti-American, anti-UK, anti this or anti anything else.

You know the great problem, Mr. Speaker, with the members opposite is they are negative. They have no confidence and no enthusiasm; they are sick. And the member for Peterborough is a worrier. But I do say this, Mr. Speaker, I think that more can be done to encourage—

An hon. member: He has a lot of worries.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He has a lot of worries; he has a lot to worry about.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The next election, for instance!

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I do say this, Mr. Speaker, let us recognize that our corporate citizens—and there are many good corporate citizens from outside our own borders—have made a very significant contribution to the development of Ontario and Canada. Let us not minimize it.

Mr. Sopha: Where did he go?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It has been helpful to Sudbury. But, Mr. Speaker, I think this can be and must be emphasized, that increasingly those companies who are doing business in Ontario and Canada must recognize that we need more research opportunities, more creative opportunities for the young people coming out of our universities and colleges. This is important; this is something which I think through attitudes of mind, or persuasion, we can bring about without relating or perhaps—

Mr. Ben: The Liberal government of Ontario will have it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say to the member for Humber, if he is really waiting for that event to take place, he had better not hold his breath, because he will not be around to see it happen.

I also want to make this observation, Mr. Speaker, that when we talk about economic nationalism, I want to make it abundantly clear that this government has demonstrated by its involvement with McClelland and Stewart that we regard the Canadian publishing industry and those matters relating to culture as being something different and separate and apart from some of the areas of economic investment that are necessary for this province and this country. We have an obligation to see that the educational system, the publishing industry and those matters that are culturally ours are preserved in a way that is unique for this jurisdiction. And this will be done.

Mr. Ben: This money will go down the drain.

Mr. T. Reid: Well do something effective!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, listen, I do not think the hon. member for Scarborough East should have too much to say on this particular point at this moment. I reviewed once again his latest publication—who published it?

Mr. T. Reid: Peter Martin Associates.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What did they teach the member in school?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, moving from economic investments, let us move very briefly to a matter I really thought I had left behind me some two months ago.

Mr. Stokes: Let us move a little north for a bit.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, we are always moving north.

Let us move very briefly to the matters that have been referred to by members opposite as they relate to the ceilings that have become part of the grant structure in this province. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Leader of the Opposition, I listened to the leader of the socialists, to the member for Peterborough, to the member for Scarborough East. I say to you very frankly, Mr. Speaker, I have very rarely heard more ill-prepared discussion in this House about the ceilings that have become part of the grant situation as related to the province of Ontario.

You see, Mr. Speaker, I know a little bit about this. For the members of this House and the members opposite to come in here and say that a meat axe approach has been used is just factually incorrect. The ceilings that exist for 1971 represent a six to nine per cent increase over the ceilings that were in existence in 1970, which figures were known to the members opposite a year ago. If we average it out, it means that there has been an enrichment on the per student amount of some seven per cent of the academic year in 1971.

If this is a meat axe approach, then I defy them to persuade me of it. It cannot be done. I would say it is great—

Mr. Nixon: Why is it that 40 per cent of the Althouse teachers cannot get jobs?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the issue is far more—

Mr. Ben: In other words, he is conning the public into thinking he imposed a ceiling when in fact he did not.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, for the edification of the member for Humber, the ceilings were there last year; the ceilings were there the year before. The ceilings are there this year with an increase of about seven per cent. Here we are trying to accommodate the thoughts expressed by the members opposite of autonomy, local decision-making and so on.

We have said to boards simply that over the next two years they will meet the ceilings that have been established. They will establish their priorities; they will get the fat out of the system if it exists. The intriguing part, Mr. Speaker, is that the majority of the school board jurisdictions in the Province of Ontario have been able to meet the ceilings without any drastic reduction in programmes. And the members know it.

We know there are certain situations of difficulty. We know there are problems in Carleton; we know there are some in a riding very close to the new Minister of Education, who will be one of the very great Ministers of Education in this province. I tell you now; he will.

Mr. Stokes: Is the Premier aware that the school boards in northern Ontario have had to cut out essential services to meet his guidelines?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I listened to the member—once again, I heard him through the communications media that exists. In case he did not know, there is already a weighting in the formula for northern Ontario as it relates to construction and operating grants. It is already there. I would say in this field, if in no other, this government has in the past number of years developed an approach where there is really quality of educational opportunity in northern Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: It is a different sort of approach.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I enjoy the enthusiastic requests by the Leader of the Opposition to the teaching profession in this province, not to strike: "You will take out your outrage in some other way."

Mr. Nixon: It was not a request. I said they would be irresponsible.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Quite right. And I listened to the leader of the socialist party saying "Do not strike, take out your outrage on the government in the ballot box."

Mr. Pitman: How come we are the socialist party now?

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are, they are.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: The Premier is a flatterer. They never say anything socialist.

Mr. Pitman: There is a difference in the Prime Minister's nomenclature.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is there really?

Mr. Speaker, I only say this to you the teaching profession in this province is not irresponsible, and it will not be conned by the kind of political observations that have been made in this House by the members opposite. It will not.

Mr. Stokes: The teachers and the trustees of northern Ontario will be happy to hear that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is a tough time, and I recognize that it is tough. The Minister of Education knows that it is tough, but at the same time this government has a responsibility to bring stability to educational spending. We are doing it in a way that is relevant and meaningful with full scope for local autonomy and local decision-making—

Mr. T. Reid: After eight years of mismanagement.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and the member for Scarborough East knows it very well. Mr. Speaker, when we talk—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I will not comment.

Mr. Singer: It bothers the Premier.

Mr. T. Reid: He could not act like a Prime Minister if he tried.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member for Scarborough East is a punk.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): He is a cheap little guttersnipe.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, unlike the members opposite, and like my predecessor, we do not have acting Prime Ministers; we have Prime Ministers who are active, this is a very real distinction.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, I have not got around to all this material yet; I could be here all night.

I would say to the member for Scarborough East, if there are any actors in this House they are the member for Downsview and the member for Scarborough West. I have never seen two such gentlemen who cast their eyes to the gallery more often than those two actors. I do not blame the member for Downsview. But—listen—when the member for Downsview speaks to me about attendance of my colleagues here, we had a very important debate on Bill 10 the other night, and I am told—

Mr. Singer: Yes, and I was at the hockey game with John Roberts.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —I am told the member's name was up in lights.

Mr. Singer: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: “Vernon Singer please report to the local Liberal office, we need you.”

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: There is no doubt about it, the Prime Minister is Ontario's Phyllis Diller.

Mr. Singer: Put your shirt back in, Darcyl

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it is also important because there has been a great deal of discussion in general terms about some of the very relevant statistics as they relate to educational investment. This government, Mr. Speaker, makes no apologies for the investment that it has made in education over the past number of years—

Mr. Ben: The government is never going to get any interest!

Mr. Nixon: Not much enthusiasm in the back row for that one.

Hon. Mr. Davis: On any comparative or competitive basis, Mr. Speaker, we have invested less per capita in this province than have competitive and neighbouring jurisdictions. Mr. Speaker, we invest less per capita than some of our sister provinces.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We spend less per student than the five neighbouring jurisdictions.

Mr. Ben: The Premier said invest less, not spend less. Maybe he should invest more and waste less.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Pardon?

Mr. Ben: The Premier said invest less, not spend less.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All right, we invest less than the neighbouring states which have been compared to our system.

Mr. Pitman: They have special problems.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Sure they have special problems. So do we.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We have very special problems, but on any comparative or any competitive basis the investment that has

been made can be compared very favourably with competitive jurisdictions anywhere on this continent, without any question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is now early in the morning—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have somewhere before me, I do not know where they are, those very relative amendments that were made to the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Pardon?

Mr. Breithaupt: Is the quartet going to sing?

Mr. Bullbrook: Does the quartet hum when the Premier sits down?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, there is one thing about us over here—we will sing together which is more than the opposition parties can do. You know something else, Mr. Speaker?

An hon. member: Did the Premier say they would sink together?

Interjections by hon. members.

J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Did they sing together?

Mr. T. Reid: Their singing is beautiful.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We will see, and what is more, Mr. Speaker, we will win together; which is more than they will do.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: And in darn good harmony, too.

Mr. Ben: Show me!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Somewhere in this very important pile of material I have those very "excellent" amendments that were made to the motion on the Throne Speech. Mr. Speaker, I will not single them all out, I will not review them—

Mr. Singer: That has been obvious for an hour.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The House leader has found them for me; thank you very much. I am particularly intrigued—I am not going to get into this debate tonight, but it just shows the House the very careful—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right—just the very well prepared and documented amendment that the Liberal Party has proposed. But, of course, here we come—"The failure of the government to come to grips with the grave problems of unemployment and inflation—"

Interjections by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be unkind. I really do not want to be unkind because I regard the Leader of the Opposition as a political friend. But I have to say to him and those who have participated with him in the debate on unemployment, I have never heard a weaker contribution than theirs in the debates of this House.

Mr. Nixon: Pass the buck!

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I will give the Leader of the Opposition some advice—

Mr. Nixon: Why is it that the Premier has not even taken part in it if he thought it was an emergency?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am going to wind it up as I am tonight. I will finish it.

An hon. member: He will not say anything on it again unless he is running a business, which he is liable to do.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will, and the members will hear me again and they might just as well get used to it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And then we go to—and I come down to a most interesting one, Mr. Speaker—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is No. 5, the failure of the government to extend financial aid to separate education. Mr. Speaker, it confounds me as to the intent and the purport of that particular amendment—

Mr. Nixon: The Premier does not know what it means?

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): We know what the member means.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, what I am concerned about is this. There was a policy paper presented by the educational expert in the Liberal Party, at their policy convention not too many weeks ago, that completely confounded me and confused me as it relates

to the Liberal position on education in this province.

Mr. Nixon: We have not changed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was concerned that this particular sub-amendment No. 5—

Mr. Singer: What is the Premier going to say on May 15 at his scheduled meeting?

Hon. Mr. Davis: With whom?

Mr. Singer: He knows.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Do I really?

Mr. Singer: Yes. When the Prime Minister talks to the audience, when he is going to make a great education announcement. What is he going to say? Let him look at his diary.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that for the first time this evening I find the member for Downsview has me without an answer. I do not pretend we will make any great pronouncement as it relates to education on May 15.

An hon. member: Where have you been?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have not the foggiest idea.

Mr. Nixon: Is he going to vote for the amendment or not?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: What does the member for Brant think?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as one goes through these amendments, and the amendments for the socialist party, one can only sum up the feelings that I and those associated with me have, that they represent a complete frustration, a completely negative and non-constructive approach to the problems that exist in our province today—and I do not minimize them. But I face the people of this province, I face the members of this Legislature—

Mr. Haggerty: The Premier does not have any answers.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —with a degree of optimism, because we must have this, a degree of confidence in our capacity to administer and discharge our responsibilities in the Province of Ontario. And I can only say to the members opposite, if you had any sense whatsoever, if you had any perception, if you had any capacity, you would reject categorically those amendments that you made and join with me and my colleagues in support of the original motion.

Mr. Stokes: We would be happy to do that if the Premier would show us the programme.

Mr. Nixon: The old Robarts speeches are with us again.

Mr. Sopha: Has the Premier got his speech writer—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the member for Downsview is quoting all the articles, all the material from the convention, all those remarks that have been made since. I must say this, I am the last one, Mr. Speaker, to in any way relate to polls, but I draw it particularly to the member for Downsview's attention, the Gallup poll in the Toronto Daily Star, Wednesday, April 14, 1971—

Mr. Sopha: What did he say in Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and modesty prevents me from relating the answers to the first question, but the second question: "Apart from your own political feelings, which provincial party do you think will win most votes in the next provincial election?" Liberals will win 22 per cent, Mr. Speaker, Conservatives 44 per cent—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Forty-four per cent. What does the member for Downsview say to that?

Mr. Nixon: Let the people decide.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do you want to give us that St. Andrew-St. Patrick poll again?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not rely on polls, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: Call an election then.

An hon. member: We are going to do better than that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not want to stop at 44. So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the members opposite to show their confidence in this administration as well and join us now in supporting the motion, which is of course significant in relating to the existing needs of the people of this province in a manner that this administration will handle in a meaningful way. I am sure the members opposite will be so persuaded.

Mr. Ben: Ho hum.

Mr. Stokes: The Attorney General is not very enthusiastic.

An hon. member: Divided we fall.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Too bad. Too bad.

Mr. Sopha: It must give the member for London North anguish to come to this:

Mr. Pitman: To come to this.

Mr. Speaker: Order—the Throne debate now being happily concluded, I shall call for the vote as follows:

Mr. Reilly moves, seconded by Mr. Henderson, that a humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To the Honourable W. Ross MacDonald PC, CD, QC, LLD, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario.

May it please Your Honour, we, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the legislative assembly of the Province of Ontario now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr. Nixon moves, seconded by Mr. Singer, that the following words be added to the motion:

This House regrets:

1. The failure of the government to come to grips with the grave problems of unemployment and inflation.

2. The failure of the government to propose and implement realistic measures of economy towards spiralling education costs, consistent with the high quality of education and training required by our young people to fit them to compete in the nuclear age.

3. The failure of the government to adopt the appropriate policies and to implement the necessary action to insure to those of our people engaged in agriculture a fair return for the contributions they make to the economy of Ontario.

Some hon. members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Speaker: I have not yet asked for a vote.

4. The failure of the government to provide adequate hospital, nursing home, and convalescent facilities to those of our people suffering from illness.

5. The failure of the government to extend financial aid to separate education through grades 11 to 13.

6. The failure of the government to provide leadership to those engaged in local government, to recognize the liabilities they face in dealing with the high cost of

administration and to inaugurate policies which would bring to reality a new partnership with the municipalities to replace the present autocratic approach and encourage local initiative and autonomy.

Failure of the government to move toward decentralization of government services, in order to bring those services into a closer contact with the people of Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: You will support that. You said so.

Mr. Speaker: To continue:

8. The failure of the government to adopt consistent and realistic policies to control pollution, arrest the deterioration of the environment, and to restore the benefits of clean air and pure water as the rightful heritage of the people of Ontario.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Did they not want to strike out the words "loyal subjects" too?

Mr. Speaker: Moved by Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Pitman, that the amendment to the motion for an address to the reply to the speech by the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor now before the House be amended by adding after the words, "the rightful heritage of the people of Ontario," the following words:

9. The failure of the government to reassert Ontario's control over its own economy by refusing to:

(a) Establish a revamped provincial development corporation actively to develop resources in secondary industry by planned channelling of a greater proportion of the capital available for investment in this province;

(b) Amend the corporation and security laws to provide for full disclosure of the operations of foreign-controlled subsidiaries;

(c) Establish a takeover review board which would examine proposals for takeovers by foreign interests and work out methods of retaining Canadian controls and protecting Canadian interests;

(d) Stop incentive grants to foreign-based corporations, giving them instead to Canadian enterprises in return for an equity of this, so that the people share in any profit.

10. The failure of the government to spur in particular the processing of northern raw materials and the development of secondary and tertiary industry in the north by refusing to:

(a) Establish a Crown corporation for mine exploration and development and to force the pace of expansion through public enterprise, and if appropriate, engaging in joint ventures with private enterprises already active in the mining sector.

(b) Establish a northern development fund purposely to direct an equitable amount of investment for the region.

11. The failure of the government to establish a universal public auto insurance plan at cost based on compensation regardless of fault.

12. The failure of the government to lower the eligible voting age to 18.

We will first vote on the amendment to the amendment, which was first moved by Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. member for Sudbury East is not going to Ottawa at all. He does not like any of the candidates.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The member is right.

Mr. Sopha: That member would not vote for anyone.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sopha: I am sorry, sir. Somebody was asking where you were tonight. I just replied.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member for Sudbury would give order, we will proceed with the vote.

The vote is on the amendment to the amendment which was moved by Mr. Lewis.

The amendment to the amendment by Mr. Lewis, having been put, was negatived on the following division:

AYES	NAYS
Ben	Allan
Braithwaite	Apps
Breithaupt	Bernier
Brown	Boyer
Bukator	Brunelle
Bullbrook	Carruthers
Burr	Connell
Deacon	Davis
De Monte	Demers
Farquhar	Downer
Gaunt	Dunlop
Good	Dymond
Haggerty	Evans
Martel	Gilbertson
Newman	Gomme
(Windsor-Walkerville)	Grossman

AYES	NAYS
Nixon	Haskett
Pitman	Henderson
Reid	Hodgson
(Scarborough East)	(Victoria-Haliburton)
Ruston	Hodgson
Sargent	(York North)
Singer	Jessiman
Smith	Johnston
(Nipissing)	(Parry Sound)
Sopha	Johnston
Spence	(Carleton)
Stokes	Kennedy
Trotter	Kerr
Worton—27	Lawrence
	(Carleton East)
	Lawrence
	(St. George)
	MacNaughton
	Meen
	Morrow
	McKeough
	McNeil
	Newman
	(Ontario South)
	Potter
	Price
	Pritchard
	Randall
	Reilly
	Reuter
	Robarts
	Root
	Rowe
	Simonett
	Smith
	(Simcoe East)
	Snow
	Stewart
	Welch
	Wells
	White
	Whitney
	Winkler
	Wishart
	Yakabuski
	Yaremko—54

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 27, the "nays" 54.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

I declare the amendment to the amendment lost. We now vote on the amendment moved by Mr. Nixon. Is it agreeable that the same vote be accepted?

Mr. Nixon: We will accept the same vote.

Mr. Speaker: The vote now will be on the main motion.

Mr. Sopha: Is this vote reversed?

Mr. Speaker: Same vote as recorded reversed.

Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost. I declare the motion carried.

RESOLVED:

that a humble address be presented to the Honourable W. Ross MacDonald, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

May it please Your Honour, we, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the legislative assembly of the Province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour hath addressed to us.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. It seems too bad too

me, and I ask you for your ruling on it tonight, that the press of this province has not covered this meeting tonight with so many people here on very important matters.

Mr. Speaker: I doubt very much if that is a matter which respects the privilege of the members of this assembly.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It will do for openers.

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves, seconded by Mr. Davis, that this House on Monday next will resolve itself into committee of supply.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 2.10 o'clock, a.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Conclusion of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Spence, Mr. Bukator, Mr. Brown, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Pitman, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Sopha, Mr. Davis	773
Motion that, on Monday next, the House resolve itself into committee of supply, Mr. McKeough, agreed to	845
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to	845



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, April 26, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

**THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971**

CONTENTS

**(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 26, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon, our guests in both galleries are students from Rockcliff Senior Public School in Toronto.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

PROVINCE'S POSITION ON PUBLIC ORDER ACT

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier. Can he tell the House whether the government either through the Minister of Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), or through the Premier's meetings with the Prime Minister of Canada, has a position on the continuation of The Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act? What is the position of the province in this matter?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the government does not have a position on The Public Order Act. It is being discussed. When the government makes some determination of this, I shall inform the members of the House.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Since the Act runs its course in the next two or three days, will the position of the province be made known for the guidance of the government of Canada and for the rest of us before that determination?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It will be made known.

HARBOUR CITY PROJECT

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question again of the Premier: Can he say whether or not his government has reassessed the position that the previous administration had taken in support of the so-called Harbour City project, the apartment project that was to be built with provincial assistance, in the harbour of Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the position of Harbour City is not so much being reassessed; my understanding is that there is to be some initiative by the city of Toronto. I read certain press reports that because of changes, the province was losing interest in Harbour City, and I would assure the hon. members of the House, this is not the case.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: There has been no change in the position of the government simply because we have a new Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman)?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): A supplementary: Is the province intending to exercise any initiative to push it along a little faster?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I sensed from what I read in one of the papers that perhaps the city was waiting for us to show some initiative. If my studies prove this is the case, the province will not be reluctant in so doing.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could the Prime Minister advise us whether he still goes along with the opinion of his former minister in that department, that it was quite possible that people could be living in Harbour City in 1971?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I really have not consulted the very excellent former minister of that department as to what his opinions were at a specific date.

Mr. Nixon: He is still waiting for the Premier's call.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): There is very little consultation over there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We have discussed many things since; we have chatted on a number of occasions. I would say that from a practical standpoint, as I understand the Harbour City project, it is highly unlikely that there will actually be people living there during the calendar year 1971.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, there is a small change then?

OSSTF FUNDS FOR RESEARCH

Mr. Nixon: A further question of the Premier: Can he tell the House whether he intends to accept the generous offer of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation to provide \$25,000 to assist in the provision of research to back up the committee of human resources in their investigation into school costs?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that I have not had this offer communicated to me directly, if such an offer is made I shall then make a determination.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Is the Prime Minister still of the opinion that only the assistance of The Department of Education is necessary for the full review that is being undertaken by the committee on human resources?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that I did not venture that particular opinion, I cannot still be of that opinion.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. To whom should the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation make out the cheque for \$25,000, so the research can be done on an independent basis?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I guess one could be very facetious and reply to that somewhat facetious question saying I would be delighted to have it made payable to myself.

I would think the proper course of procedure would be for the secondary school teachers' federation to communicate the offer and the terms of that offer directly to the government so the government could then consider it.

MERCURY POLLUTION OF LAKES AND RIVERS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests: Has there been any change in the policy that no warnings would be made public to fishermen in the northern waters of the province, letting these people know about the danger of eating fish impregnated with mercury?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, no warnings have been issued to those areas in

northern or northwestern Ontario you referred to.

Mr. Nixon: In northwestern Ontario no warnings were issued?

A supplementary question: Does the Minister of Lands and Forests feel that the problem of mercury pollution has in fact been exaggerated by statements made previously by the government and that there is little danger in eating the fish from that area?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I would say this. We know a lot more today than we did a year ago about mercury.

Mr. Singer: Yes, the minister even issued pamphlets about it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Before any signs are posted, we feel that the departments concerned—The Department of Health and The Department of Tourism and Information, and The Department of Energy and Resources Management, and my own—will consult one another.

Mr. Singer: That will be a change.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, this little booklet that we issued gives a lot of information on mercury. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition has not read it I would suggest that he read it.

Mr. Singer: The Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr) did not read it. We read it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: And as time goes on, as I mentioned earlier, every two months or so, I issue a statement in this House on the various lakes in the province. We have more than 200 lakes that are being continually monitored and analyzed and these reports come out periodically, so we are in a much better position to convey information on this important subject of mercury.

Mr. Nixon: One other supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The minister indicated that before the government posts signs there is going to be consultation. Is he not aware that the postings that have been undertaken in previous years have been removed and therefore the impression is widespread that the menace, if such it is, is not nearly as great as was originally supposed? Perhaps there should be some more definitive statement made about that by the minister or one of his colleagues.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the minister: Does he feel that

the Prime Minister and some of his cabinet colleagues endangered their lives by eating Lake Erie perch over the weekend?

Mr. Nixon: That was not the danger.

Mr. Speaker: This is not an appropriate supplementary. The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside has a supplementary.

Mr. F. A. Burr: (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, would the minister consider placing signs of a more specific nature; for example warning people that half a pound of fish per week is considered the limit of safety in certain areas where there is mercury contamination?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, may I refer the hon. member to page 3, where it says:

Is the half parts per million used worldwide?

No, several countries including the USA have accepted this standard but it is not universal. In Sweden only fish containing less than one-fifth parts per million are considered suitable for unlimited human consumption, with the recommendation that fish in the range of one-fifth to one part per million not be eaten more frequently than once per week. The average consumption in Sweden, however, is roughly two to three times greater than Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Further supplementary?

Mr. Burr: My question regarded the posting of signs with that information on them. Would the minister consider posting signs with that information?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, these little booklets are free; they are available at the bookstore, and at any Department of Lands and Forests office; we feel that the information being made available is sufficient for the time being.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River has a supplementary?

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister: What protection, if any, does the fisherman, particularly the American fisherman, have when he comes into waters that are contaminated with mercury, if he does not stop in at The Department of Lands and Forests and pick up one of these booklets? Are these booklets issued at the same time as the fishing licence is issued?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: These booklets are made available in all The Department of Lands and Forests offices, The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs and as many government offices as possible. If we find that certain areas need to be closed we certainly will take those steps.

Mr. Speaker: One further supplementary; the member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: A supplementary of the minister: Does he agree with a recent statement made by the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) that the problem of mercury pollution has been overstated and too much emphasis placed on it; that there really is not the danger there was originally thought to be in mercury pollution in northwestern Ontario waters?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: My own personal opinion, Mr. Speaker, is yes, I do believe it has been overstated and exaggerated; because most of our lakes in the Precambrian Shield we find have a natural background of mercury.

Mr. Stokes: Is the natural source of pollution not as dangerous as the industrial source?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Would the member mind—

Mr. Stokes: When is mercury not dangerous? If it is in excess of five parts per million through natural sources, is that not as dangerous as an equal amount from an industrial or other source?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, my understanding of mercury is that mercury is mercury, regardless of whether it comes from industrial sources or natural background. If you eat fish that has more than five parts per million, and if you eat a steady diet of it, there is a possibility that it could be injurious to your health.

LAYOFF OF TEACHERS

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier if he has undertaken any research, as he indicated that he would some days ago, into the laying off of teaching staff at some of the community colleges associated with the Manpower retraining programmes. Further, is he aware that this is a continuing problem, certainly in some areas—Brantford,

perhaps, more than any other—where the classes have become very large and some of their best staff have been laid off?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have. I hope to have some information for the House either tomorrow or on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

DISCUSSIONS ON RELATIONS WITH QUEBEC

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Premier: Can the Premier table in the Legislature, or indicate to the Legislature, what discussion precisely has taken place at the most senior levels with the Province of Quebec over the obvious deteriorating relationships between this province and that province because of the government's agricultural legislation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that my recollection of the discussions here in the House was that most of the dialogue with the Province of Quebec was of a verbal nature, it would be very difficult to table anything. I am quite sure that the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) would be prepared, from time to time, to keep the House updated as to his official discussions with the Quebec Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, has the Attorney General of Ontario spoken to Mr. Choquette about the number of accelerated threats now relating to the limiting of imports of Ontario goods?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not believe the Attorney General has been in touch with Mr. Choquette; when the Attorney General comes in the hon. member might ask him, but I do not believe he has.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary; Surely, the relationships between the provinces around this issue—

Mr. Speaker: Question! Question!

Mr. Lewis: Is it not true that the relationships between the two provinces on this particular question have seldom been at such a fragile level, and what is the Premier prepared to do to reinstitute some sense of amity in this discussion?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I really do not think relations are that difficult. I expect

I will be seeing the Premier of Quebec very shortly myself and I am really quite confident that these matters can be resolved.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Has the government been officially informed by either the Minister of Agriculture for Quebec or the government of Quebec that if our Act is not rescinded, they will be forced to take retaliatory actions with many other agricultural products?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think this question more properly might be directed to the Minister of Agriculture. I can say there has been no communication to my office from the Quebec Minister of Agriculture, and certainly not from their Premier, who has been out of the country for the past several days. I do not believe that there has been any official notification to the Minister of Agriculture of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, may I ask by way of a final supplementary, whether the Minister of Agriculture has received an official communication from Quebec of its desire, or its intention, of extending the retaliatory action to other agricultural products if the Ontario Act is not rescinded?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I really have not heard any indication of that at all. As I informed the House last week, we have been in constant contact with the Deputy Minister of Agriculture through my deputy minister. In the Province of Quebec, there has been no problem whatever.

An hon. member: It is dark in here all of a sudden.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have heard nothing from the Minister of Agriculture for Quebec that would indicate that there is any retaliatory measure to take place. I read, with as much surprise as any one, the story in Saturday's Globe and Mail.

I was contacted by the Globe and Mail, and I simply related the history of what has happened and what I assume, likely will happen: that the Province of Quebec may pursue its egg marketing plan with more vigour than it has in the past, which has left something to be desired insofar as Quebec's side of this case is concerned.

I have no more control over egg producers in Ontario, or indeed in Manitoba, shipping into Quebec, either through the normal regulatory channels established by FEDCO or

other channels, than does the Minister of Agriculture in Quebec have over those who are shipping broilers into Ontario contrary to the broiler board's marketing permit regulations here.

Mr. Nixon: To the Minister of Agriculture—a supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: No, we cannot do that. I allowed the supplementary to go to the Minister of Agriculture, which I should not have done. There can be no supplementaries to that question.

As the member for Scarborough West has the floor, I will give the Leader of the Opposition the opportunity to ask a question if the member for Scarborough West is done.

Mr. Nixon: All right.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, are there any supplementaries permitted to the Prime Minister in connection with the original question?

Mr. Speaker: No. There have been sufficient supplementaries. We can reopen it with another question later.

Mr. Bullbrook: All right. As I understand your ruling then, on a point of order, you permit the member for York South to ask a supplementary to another member, but you will not permit an additional supplementary to the Prime Minister?

Mr. Speaker: That is about what it amounts to. The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Bullbrook: A strange set of rules, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West has the floor.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker is trying to be a bencher too.

FIELDING LUMBER DISPUTE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, do not be daunted. Your rulings are impeccable as always, sir.

May I ask a question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker? Has the Minister of Labour considered a personal intervention into the dispute between the Fielding Lumber Company in Sudbury and the rock and tunnel workers, given the length of time that has elapsed and the feelings on both sides?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Labour): No, I have not, Mr. Speaker. I have investi-

gated the background of this particular matter to the best of my ability. I have had several correspondence interventions by the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel), which I appreciate, but at the present time no, I have not.

Incidentally, I might mention to the leader of the NDP that we had a ministers' conference the latter part of last week in the same city where other events were taking place and even the Minister of Labour for the federal government intimated that the only time a Labour Minister should intervene would be if both parties wished it.

Mr. MacDonald: Was the Minister of Labour chastised?

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In the Fielding Lumber situation does the minister not feel that he is bargaining in bad faith when the wage offer for the first year of a contract falls below the existing government minimum wage? And does he not think that that is sufficient basis on which his department can step in?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, there have been no allegations made to my department by the people involved that there has been bargaining in bad faith. If so, they could make application to the Ontario Labour Relations Board for leave to prosecute. There has been no mention of that yet.

Mr. Lewis: By way of further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the gross bad faith which the company had evidenced, unprecedented in some number of months, will the minister not endeavour to look into it through whatever agency he employs and bring the full report to this House as to the existing situation?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I will be very happy to look into it once again, Mr. Speaker, and report back to the House, yes.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Sarnia a supplementary?

Mr. Bullbrook: No, an original question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary? The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Has the minister looked into the fact that the federal government is making a loan of some \$64,000 to the Fielding Lumber owner's brother-in-law, who is in the same type of operation and which will ultimately lead this loan—

Mr. Speaker: Of course, this is not supplementary to the original question.

Mr. Martel: Certainly it is supplementary! How can the Speaker determine whether it is going to be supplementary when he has not listened to the entire question? For God's sake!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Right. He has become a mind-reader.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is now asking a question about another operation—

Mr. Martel: I am not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker:—other than that which was raised by the original questioner. If he can relate that to the original question he is in order, otherwise he is not in order.

Mr. Martel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I can finish the question and you will see how it is related. Because of the fact that the loan will go to the second company, which is owned by the first company, does the minister not feel there is something there which is leading to bargaining in bad faith and will ultimately lead to the 50 employees losing their jobs with Fielding Lumber?

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion it is not a question which is supplementary, but if the minister wishes to answer it he may.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's genuine concern in this matter. He has been, as I say, in touch with me on many occasions, but insofar as a loan made by the federal government is concerned I fail to see where I enter into this, other than the fact that it might be one of the factors which might be considered when we look into the whole background.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

REVISION OF OMA FEES

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health: What guarantee does the Minister of Health have from the Ontario Medical Association that its fee schedule will not increase again before the alleged 1973 termination date?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): I have no guarantee, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, then, Mr. Speaker, if in fact their fee schedule can rise again as some have intimated, what basis—what sort of channels or formula—what basis has the government arrived at to negotiate (if the minister will accept the word) with the doctors, to enter into discussion with the Ontario Medical Association to determine subsequent fee schedules since we are now committed to 90 per cent of the cost?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, my hope is that the OMA will be drawn into assisting the department in developing our scale of benefits on a continuing basis. By that I mean that next week, the week after and throughout the whole period of the next year or two years, I hope that the OMA will be directly implicated in the development of the 1973 scale of benefits.

Mr. MacDonald: The former Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) said that three years ago.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, what percentage of Ontario's doctors now bill through OHSIP?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: These figures are not available, partly because of the mixture of private billing and plan billing that heretofore existed. I have heard suggestions that the best guess is that about 70 per cent of the total billing is to the plan directly, but that may be slightly different than saying, "What percentage of doctors bill the plan direct?"

Mr. Lewis: One last supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will it not be an administrative near-impossibility for individual patients to retrieve from the plan 90 per cent of that which the doctor has billed the patient directly? Is the minister not concerned about that?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I do not see, Mr. Speaker, that from an administrative point of view anything is changed in this regard.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Windsor West a supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member announced that that was his last supplementary. Now the member for Windsor West is on his feet. Has he a supplementary?

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Is the doctors' apparent reluctance to accept the new position, under which they must choose, because of the fact that they would then have to bill the agencies rather than the single carrier OHSIP on behalf of a number of their patients?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I am not aware of any general reaction against the change or amendments insofar as the profession is concerned, Mr. Speaker, but I do not see that with the completed phasing-out of the agencies there is any problem here. As far as I know, the last agent will be phased out within a matter of a week or two.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): One supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: The minister said he did not see there was any change from what previously existed. Does the minister not agree that the change is that if the doctor wishes to bill and receive 100 per cent he must bill the patient directly and let the patient then claim from OHSIP whatever portion he is able to get? That changes the picture entirely.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: It does not seem to me that it does, Mr. Speaker. He can bill, as he could have billed directly, 90 per cent, 100 per cent or 150 per cent. If he is billing directly he will now have his whole practice under that system, and the relationship as to the quantum of the bill will be one to be founded on that between the doctor and the patient.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware of any doctors billing in the following manner, that is billing the government for the amount of the visit 90 per cent of the fee schedule, and then, once every four months, billing the patient for the accumulative total, amounting to the other 10 per cent?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I think it irrelevant whether or not this occurred in the past; it cannot occur in the future. Once an Ontario doctor sends any bill directly to the plan, his whole practice becomes plan billing. It will be assumed when the plan receives a bill directly from a doctor that that is the type of practice he has elected to follow.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary: What safeguards will the government have to prevent doctors billing patients once every six months or so for 10 per cent as well as collecting 90 per cent from the plan?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: This will certainly be part of the regulatory sanction required—the law will be that, having accepted 90 per cent from the plan, that is it. From that doctor's point of view not only with regard to that patient but with regard to his whole practice—the 90 per cent becomes, effectively, 100 per cent.

Mr. T. Reid: But the minister will not investigate?

AIR POLLUTION IN TORONTO

Mr. Lewis: One final question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Speaker: What action does the minister intend to undertake in reply to Pollution Probe's allegations that the Wellington Street, Commissioner Street, Grand Avenue and Symes Road incinerators exceed provincial regulations for particulate emission and are therefore subject to lawsuit?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, from time to time Pollution Probe makes claims that some treatment facility, be it water or waste, exceeds some criterion or some standard. I have not heard anything about this latest claim. I do not know if it is a continuing claim; whether the incinerator is continuously breaching our criteria, our regulations, or whether this happened at a certain time when people from Pollution Probe happened to attend and make some sort of a test. I would like to have the information as to what type of test was made, how they monitor those incinerators and just how they come to this conclusion.

However, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member probably knows it is hoped that these incinerators will be replaced by new, more up-to-date incinerators in the Metro area. Plans are now underway to replace these incinerators with a better type of disposal facility and in this way we will avoid the necessity of using these existing facilities in the event that they do breach our regulations.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the plan for the new incinerators include tying in the waste heat for local heating purposes so the stack temperatures can be dropped, as is the case of most of the European incinerators, which thus reduce the fly ash and particulates?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that one of the reasons for the delay, particularly in the new Toronto incinerator, is because of the study of the latest incinerator methods, which are being used, I believe, in Germany at the present time. There is some question regarding the cost—it will be substantially more, I understand—although the recovery would in some way benefit this initial investment. We, as well as certain members of the Metro council, are hoping that these latest methods will be used by Metro.

Mr. Deacon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would Ontario Hydro be a buyer of waste heat from those incinerators and thus provide a basic level of buying support for the waste heat production?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: This can always be a possibility, Mr. Speaker, yes.

Mr. Speaker: Are there further supplementaries? The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Because of the very high figures indicated in this Pollution Probe release, and taking the department's own figures of monitoring through 1969 as to dust fall in the metropolitan area into consideration, what is the position of the government with respect to the proposed new incinerator, located invidiously in my riding and which is presently before the Ontario Municipal Board?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I will assure the hon. member that it is not being invidiously established in his riding; we really do not want to do anything to harm the hon. member. Apparently the site—

Mr. Lawlor: They are trying to pollute me.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The site is one that has been recommended by and supported by Metro council. It is hoped, as I indicated before, that with this new incineration there will be in fact a facility to eliminate pollution, not cause pollution in Metro. One of the problems, as indicated I am sure—and I have not seen the Pollution Probe report—has been the delay in getting these new incinerators established; that is why the older ones, which really do not, possibly, do the job properly, are still being used.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West; has he completed? Does the Leader of the Opposition wish now to place that question?

ONTARIO REPRESENTATION AT SUPREME COURT HEARING

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Agriculture and Food if the Ontario department which he heads will be represented either directly or in an observer's capacity at the hearings before the Supreme Court of Canada, scheduled for May 31, on legislation similar to that enacted by Bill 10, which is being considered by the Province of Manitoba?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of the date that the hearing would be held before the Supreme Court of Canada, but we have given notice that our department will be represented at the Supreme Court hearing.

Mr. Singer: Oh well, well! Why did the minister deny it before?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend, Mr. Speaker, seems to get quite annoyed. I did not deny it before—

Mr. Singer: The minister certainly did.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I did not; and if the hon. member suggests that I did, he does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is on a point of order that I have the floor!

Mr. Singer: He said no.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I did not say no.

Mr. Singer: He certainly did.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I did not, and if the hon. member had been here listening to the debates instead of down at the hockey game—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —he would have been here to hear me answer, in reply to the member for York South, that when the request was made to this government and information given to this government that an application was being made to the Supreme Court, we would then make a decision. When that word reached our department we made the decision and we will be represented. I have done exactly what I said I would do that night.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): We forced that admission from the minister in the debate if he will recall.

Mr. Sopha: By way of supplementary, when the minister says to the House that his department will be represented at the hearing, surely he means the law officers of the Crown under the direction of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Speaker: Is that a question or a statement?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The member is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary: Will there be any position taken by the representatives of the province in this hearing, or are they simply going to report to the minister what happened?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We will determine that in the fullness of time.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Renfrew South.

Mr. Singer: The minister does not remember from one day to the next what he says.

Mr. Yakabuski: Mr. Speaker, I have—

FARMERS USING BRAZILIAN BALER TWINE

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Yakabuski: I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Is the minister aware that Ontario farmers this summer will be using Brazilian baler twine? And, number two, is it because that 100 per cent pure sisalana Brazilian twine is superior to that manufactured in Ontario? Or is it because again in this commodity, in manufacture and labour, we have priced our product off the market?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I have not heard the comments made by the hon. member before this. I do not know anything about the comparative prices, but I would assume that whoever is bringing the baler twine into the province—and I am not sure what company is doing it—is doing it on the basis of economics. As far as I know this is the only reason.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): This obviously was not set up.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: On page 353 of Hansard, the following remarks are quoted:

Mr. Singer: All the more reason why the minister should intervene.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Exactly opposite.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: That, of course, is self explanatory and leaves the minister in the same position as he was, and as he expressed himself today.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Is this an apology from the hon. member?

ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT

Mr. Bullbrook: I have a question of the Attorney General. In view of the concern—

Mr. J. Renwick: What concern?

Mr. Bullbrook:—both in Ottawa and Washington as to the use of electronic surveillance equipment, and in view of the indisputable constitutional ability the government has to direct the weaponry used by police in this province, could the minister tell us whether he has done anything since we brought this matter up 10 days ago in the Legislature?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have done something.

Mr. Bullbrook: Could the minister tell us what he has done?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am trying to find out, Mr. Speaker, just exactly the type of equipment the municipal police forces of this province have in this field. I am trying to find out the instances where it has been used, who gives the permission for it to be used—

Mr. Stokes: Have the Minister of Labour take a peek!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: In other words, I am really trying to find out just what the whole history of electronic surveillance is concerning the forces of law in this province. However, I should point out that even with this information—which is being gathered at the moment and will take some time to be gathered—I doubt very much if we will be in a position to indicate an Ontario position prior to the emergence from Ottawa of their amendments, which I understand are coming down fairly soon.

Therefore, if my hon. friend feels that there is going to be any great new, startling policy emanating from my office in the near future before some new policy emanates from Ottawa, I am afraid to indicate to the House he is going to be disappointed.

Mr. Bullbrook: Do not worry about me being disappointed. By way of supplementary, if I might, may I ask the hon. minister when he uses the word "trying" does he interpret that to mean "in the process of"—or, to clarify, does the minister not agree that he has every right to know?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I would agree that I have every right to know, but there may be some people who may believe that I do not have that right to know; that is the proposition that I have put forward.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of a final supplementary, and for specific clarification: As the Attorney General of this province, does he agree that he has the right to know from the police forces?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Very much so!

Mr. Singer: On a further point of order, I also want to draw to the attention of the House this extract of Hansard, on page 353—

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Singer: No Mr. Speaker, the minister wrongly advised the House—

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Hon. J. White (Minister of Revenue): The member lost the argument.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

I am perfectly aware of the situation that was taking place prior to my taking the chair, and if the hon. member for Downsview will save his point of order for Mr. Speaker, who will return very shortly, I think Mr. Speaker will rule on it. I do not think it is fair to give me that point of order at this particular moment.

Mr. J. Renwick: A supplementary question to the Minister of Justice: Pending the introduction and enactment of the legislation in Ottawa, would the hon. minister consider instructing the police forces in the Province of Ontario that they are not to engage in electronic eavesdropping without his consent?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

HUNTING OF WOLVES

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests a two-part question. First, did he have the opportunity to read the story in one of the weekend supplements to the Toronto press about the hunting of wolves from aircraft in the district of Kenora? Second, whether he read it or not, I should like to ask him whether there is any prospect that he will order a surcease to this senseless, inhuman destruction of wild animals, such as goes on as described in that article, by people who call themselves sportsmen?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the question, the answer is oui, yes. And the second part is, when this matter came to my attention about two months ago I issued a directive by radiogram to all regional directors in northwestern Ontario that henceforth no *caninus lupus* be killed under permit by means of an aircraft after March 15.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

EMISCO POLLUTION CONTROL DEVICE

Mr. Burr: A question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management regarding the Emisco pollution control device that the Ontario Department of Transport installed in several hundred provincial government cars some time ago: Has this device proved effective in reducing carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons and oxides of nitrogen?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, one of the parts of this experiment has been for various vehicles used by the department to accumulate a certain amount of mileage with this control device installed in each vehicle. We tested it—the mobile lab facilities of my department initially tested these various cars. The results were quite encouraging. We hope that after a certain mileage stage—I believe around 25,000, in that vicinity—if we still have a good report, an encouraging report, and if the device is holding up, we may make some further recommendation as to its general use.

Mr. Burr: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Are any other forms of pollution increased by the device and are there any other disadvantages?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As far as our own testing is concerned, which is mainly for carbon

monoxide emissions, as I have said to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, the results were encouraging. I am not sure whether or not we have been looking for other sources of contamination as a result of the use of this device. I will have to check that.

Mr. Singer: On a further point of order: A few minutes ago I read—

Mr. Speaker: If it is the same point of order, then—

Mr. Singer: Well no, there is a subsequent quote which is more clear, Mr. Speaker. At page 353.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member, of course, has a right to rise on a point of order, but he might perhaps wait until we have finished this question.

Mr. Singer: I thought the question was finished, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I have not inquired if there are supplementaries. Any supplementaries?

The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, has the device increased the mileage obtained; and does the hon. minister mean that at the end of 25,000 miles the device would need to be replaced?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I assume the hon. member means, has the device increased the mileage per gallon of gasoline. Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker; it is very doubtful that it would do that. As far as the accumulated mileage is concerned, or the 25,000 miles, the idea is to see if this device holds up under normal operating conditions. If it does we may test it even further—another 20,000 or 25,000 miles—so that in this way we have a complete picture of the effectiveness of this device before we make any recommendations.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question?

Mr. Burr: Then the minister is saying that in the next 25,000 miles he would test for other pollutants at the same time?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview wishes to rise.

Mr. Singer: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I read an extract from page 353, but there is another extract at the top of page 353 that says this:

Mr. Singer: The minister did not answer the third part. Is the province going to intervene in the hearings presently pending before the Supreme Court of Canada?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, Mr. Speaker, we have no intention to intervene.

Who was misleading and why?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener has the floor for a question.

COMMENTS BY TAXING OFFICER IN ONTARIO REPORTS

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Is the Attorney General aware of the comments by the taxing officer, Mr. McBride, at page 141 of the current Ontario Reports, whereby he refers to the charges made by special examiners as "legalized larceny which has been practised on litigants for many years"? He further states that "the special examiners who are officers of the Supreme Court of Ontario have been mocking the tariff provisions regularly for years."

Secondly, is the minister further aware that the comments of Mr. McBride suggest that the changes in the tariff should be made so that, as he states, "it could not then be readily demonstrated at least that one group of officers of this court is regularly and routinely breaking the law"?

Will the minister investigate that and advise if he proposes changes to the tariff with respect to this rather serious charge?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: May I take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: The question period has expired. Points of order and privilege are always available to a member.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, on page 268 of Hansard I am reported as saying that the approximate cost of combining the sewers in the city of Toronto, which are presently separated, would be \$300,000.

The correct figure is \$300 million and I ask leave of the House to correct that.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure that that correction will appear in the Hansard of today.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. Nixon: Let us have a chorus of "O Promise Me" before 3 o'clock.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: A contradiction of what he said last week again.

Mr. Speaker: The next order of business, of course, is orders of the day. Hon. members will realize that in view of certain arrangements we have interregnum, so I shall call—

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might request the permission of the House—I have a very brief statement I should like to make—if we might revert to statements by the ministry.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreeable to the House that we revert to statements by the ministry?

Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to invite all our hon. members to join me for the official unveiling of the Ontario Consumer Caravan on Thursday, April 29—that is this Thursday—at 10:30 a.m., outside the main building of the Legislature.

The caravan is an important feature of the consumer information and education programme of my department. It represents a significant initiative in assisting Ontario consumers to better understand their rights and responsibilities in the marketplace. It is the first of its kind in Canada.

Mr. Nixon: It will be backed up by radio and television ads.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The caravan will visit many parts of the province in the next several months, Mr. Speaker. I am hopeful that as many members as possible who will be free Thursday morning will attend this preview showing. That is at 10:30 a.m. this Thursday and I think the members will find extremely interesting and valuable the information which we are going to make available to the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker: Any further statements, now that we are in that order of business?

There has been a suggestion made from Mr. Speaker's left that we have seven minutes and we might perhaps use five of them for an extension of the question period if that would be agreeable.

The hon. member for Waterloo North.

USE OF STUDDED TIRES

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Highways and Transport. Due to the high cost of removing studs from tires, and especially if the tire is a relatively new one, and in view of the large number of tires which would be wasted because of the ban, would the minister consider the position of allowing existing tires that have been sold and are in use to be used until such time as they are worn out without removal of the studs?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, that a ban is a ban or it is nothing at all. I do not think the cost of removing studs is all that high.

Mr. Good: Has the minister looked into it?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that the cost of removing studs from a tire is \$8, which is quite substantial?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It costs nothing if it is done by the automobile owner himself, and it is not difficult to do.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brantford.

COMPENSATION TO FISHERMEN

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests. In the meeting with the fishermen, the minister promised that the fishermen would get adequate compensation for the damages they suffered as a result of mercury pollution; this is a meeting at which I was present, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that adequate compensation has not been provided by ODC, what are the next steps that the minister will take to reconcile his promise to the fishermen and the actions of the government?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in those areas where the fisheries are closed we have renewed The Fisheries Loans Act at 100 per cent of the cost to the Ontario government; and in those areas where some of the species can be fished there is provision under The Department of Trade and Development, ODC to be more specific, for loans for capital assistance, as well as for financial assistance to enable them to operate.

Mr. Makarchuk: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: In this particular instance it was the Eriean fishermen who were promised adequate compensation for the damages. They have not received adequate compensation and they are not happy with what they have received from ODC. Is the minister intending to hold other meetings with the fishermen?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: My information is that the great majority of the Eriean fishermen have received assistance under ODC. There may be one or two where the matter is still under consideration.

Mr. Makarchuk: A further supplementary: Would the minister try to ascertain from the Eriean fishermen whether they have received adequate compensation, or rather have not received assistance?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of University Affairs (Mr. White); I guess he has left.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of University Affairs is not there. The Leader of the Opposition has a question.

REPORT ON OWNERSHIP OF RESORT AND RECREATION LANDS

Mr. Nixon: Is the Minister of Lands and Forests going to table his report on the ownership of resort and recreation lands, which he indicated was in a state of advanced preparation and which I think he has been carrying in his hip pocket for the last two weeks?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest of the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the NDP and also of our own members, I have asked that copies be made available to everyone, and I hope to be able to table the report this week.

Mr. T. P. Reid: By way of supplementary, because there is still some confusion, particularly outside of Toronto, is the ban on the sale of cottage lots final or pending the publication of this review?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that in the Throne Speech it was clearly indicated that Crown land for summer cottage purposes would be leased only from then on.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

REVENUE PAYMENTS TO MINING MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the government finally settled on a formula for mining revenue payments to the mining municipalities of the province?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, that will be dealt with in due course, and probably in the very near future.

Mr. MacDonald: Probably this afternoon.

Mr. Ferrier: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell us when we will be told the time at which these payments will be authorized to the municipalities?

An hon. member: In the next half hour.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Well I think I have already indicated that matter.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

LOWERING OF VOTING AGE

Mr. T. P. Reid: A question of the Premier: Does the Premier agree with the statement of the Attorney General on the weekend that the voting age and age of majority should be lowered immediately to 18?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall the exact phraseology used by the Attorney General. There was some general discussion—

Mr. Nixon: That the voting age should be 18?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that the matter of the voting age should be considered along with the total question of the age of majority.

Mr. T. P. Reid: May I ask, by way of supplementary, will there be any indication from the Premier before the next election that there will be such a lowering of the voting age?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that there has been no determination as to the date of the next election, of course it makes it very difficult to answer that question for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: I doubt if we have sufficient time now for a further question. I thought we might have more supplementaries but not that one. We have just a minute to go.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): How can one answer a question which has not been asked?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have a message here from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, signed by his own hand.

Mr. Speaker: By his own hand, W. R. Macdonald, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1972, and recommends them to the legislative assembly, Toronto, April 26, 1971.

Clerk of the House: Government notice of motion No. 2.

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves that this House approve in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): It is the start of the amateur hour now.

BUDGET ADDRESS

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, on March 19, 1943, a predecessor from my riding, from the town of Wallaceburg—the then riding of Kent West which is now the riding of Chatham-Kent—introduced his first, and as it turned out his only, budget. At that time he forecast revenue—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): History is about to repeat itself!

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Why does the hon. member say that?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): This is an auspicious beginning.

Mr. Sargent: This is the amateur hour!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —of \$102 million and ordinary expenditures of \$97 million, or a surplus on ordinary account of \$5.5 million. I am not so sure that the picture will be quite the same today.

That predecessor, sir, was the Hon. A. St. Clair Gordon, who was known to most of us in Kent county as Bill Gordon. To a

10-year-old boy, which I was then at that point, he was my Uncle Bill Gordon. He was Treasurer for some six months. He was the member for my riding for about 10 years and we are very proud of his record of service to our area and his contribution to the province.

He was followed, of course, by the hon. Mr. Frost, who is in the House today. We are always glad to have him with us. Mr. Frost was followed by the hon. Dana Porter. In 1958, a person who is still a member of the House, the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan), became Treasurer for some eight years; and then from 1966 to March 1 last, the member for Huron (Mr. MacNaughton) was provincial Treasurer.

Those shoes, sir, are large shoes to fill. They are a distinguished group of people who have given great service to our province and indeed our country. I refer, of course, in particular to my immediate predecessor. He made a contribution to good government, maintained the credit of this province and provided good financial management of this province in the usual sense.

Over and above that, I think all of us take some pleasure—those of us who have sat in the House—in sharing with the former Treasurer his contributions to the cause of national tax reform; to the beginnings of the regional development programme and economic planning yesterday; his contribution in opening to this province the foreign markets of the world for investment in Ontario securities; and his stress on the productivity of government. I refer particularly to the establishment of that committee and I join with all members in paying tribute to the hon. Charles Steel MacNaughton for his distinguished service.

I pay tribute of course, sir, to my staff, particularly to my deputy minister, Mr. MacDonald, to the present secretary of the Treasury Board, Mr. Brannan. They and a number of other people have for the last few weeks, few months, been working very diligently on this budget. I received several calls on Easter Sunday morning, for example. I can only say that I understand tonight they will do more than their share in contributing to those revenues which flow to the province from the Liquor Control Board of Ontario and they deserve so to do.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first budget of the new government of Ontario. Accordingly, it represents a careful review and assessment of all our policies and programmes and their effects on the citizens of this province. The

budget which I am presenting today is a reflection of those policies and programmes in the form of an imaginative and forceful fiscal plan for Ontario. It aims to achieve four major objectives:

To restore full-employment economic growth in Ontario by encouraging expansion of the activities of the private section;

To maintain firm control over public spending in order to contain tax levels and the generation of inflationary pressures;

To advance provincial-municipal reforms in line with the long-term programme we announced in 1969; and

To ensure the attainment of the other priorities of government policy such as greater Canadian participation in our economic life, preservation and conservation of the environment and a fulfilling quality of life for all our citizens.

The taxation and expenditure policies in this budget give maximum expression to these objectives. With the approval of the members and the active co-operation of the total community, I am confident that the fiscal programme which the government has drawn up will move this province ahead toward greater prosperity and a more rewarding life.

Following the practice of past years, I have included the three budget papers as part of my overall budget presentation for 1971. These papers provide supporting documentation and perspective on the economic, fiscal and reform policies which the government will continue to advance.

Before proceeding with the policies and details of this budget, I should like to report on the fiscal and economic aspects of federal-provincial affairs and on Ontario's place within the Canadian federation. Over the past several years, two things have become clearly evident. First, the federal government is firmly bent on a course of greater centralization and concentration of power in its own hands. Second, Ontario has been singled out for a reduced role in the building of our nation. Not only is the federal government disregarding the needs of this region but it is also pursuing policies which are seriously reducing our economic strength.

The evidence of the thrust toward centralized power grows every day. It is most apparent in the vital matter of finance. Not only has the federal government refused to consider further tax sharing—which is an obvious requirement in Canada because the major public problems and expenditure priorities lie at the provincial-municipal level—

but it has also effectively pre-empted increased provincial tax effort by its own heavy use of the income tax field.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, you will recall the imposition of the social development tax. Moreover, the federal tax reform proposals overtly provide for an even greater concentration of fiscal resources at the federal level. The initial federal white paper proposals would generate large revenue gains for the federal government and reduce provincial sharing in capital gains revenues and other base-broadening reforms in the personal income tax field from 28 per cent to 22 per cent.

There has also been a concerted effort by the federal government to squeeze provincial pocketbooks by cutting back on its future financial commitments in shared-cost programmes. In the field of health insurance, for example, the federal government is advancing new sharing formulas which would work to reduce the maintenance of its financial commitment to these established programmes. At the same time, the federal government is attempting to extend its authority and involvement into areas of provincial jurisdiction such as consumer protection and securities regulation, notwithstanding the practical difficulties this will create and the significant progress which has already been made in inter-provincial uniformity and co-ordination.

In the thrust to expand federal primacy, it is also evident that Ontario is marked out for particular attention. Our regional needs obviously have been neglected by the federal government, particularly in such key fields as manpower and regional economic development. More important, however, federal economic and fiscal policies have been aimed deliberately at the curtailment of economic growth in this province.

The severe deflationary policies of the federal government since 1969 have driven the Ontario economy far below its potential and created unemployment levels that are the highest in a decade. The "temporary" surtaxes on personal and corporate incomes, of which over 50 per cent is collected in Ontario, have been extended rather than removed, while the federal government has initiated selective fiscal measures such as the depreciation penalty on commercial buildings in Toronto and other key urban centres.

From this, I can only conclude that the intention seems to be one of reducing regional disparities in Canada by diminishing the economic strength and standard of living in Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come now!

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): What a substitute for policy.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In the face of these centralizing tendencies and the weakening of the Ontario economy, this government has only one course. We must act positively to protect the interests of our people.

Mr. Sargent: They have had 28 years to do that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Furthermore, we must reconsider, in a fundamental way, Ontario's basic role in Canadian federalism. The government of Ontario is convinced that national policies detrimental to Ontario are also detrimental to the national interest.

Mr. Sargent: Why not call an election then?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We are also convinced that the proper course for Canada in the decades ahead is toward greater decentralization and recognition of regional differences, not toward centralization of power and responsibility in a single omniscient and distant government.

Mr. Lewis: Are we leaving Confederation? Self-determination for Ontario?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: National tax reform is the single most important issue facing Canadian federalism today. The decisions made on this vital matter of taxation in large measure will determine both the future progress of the Canadian economy and the future direction of federal-provincial relations.

In recognition of this, the Ontario government has made a large and constructive contribution to the process of national tax reform. Indeed, over the past year, we have advanced a complete alternative programme of tax reform which is clearly superior in respect of the two key objectives of equity and economic growth.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Superior to Ottawa!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Our reform proposals are generally supported by a consensus of the provinces and overwhelmingly by independent observers and tax specialists.

Altogether, Ontario has advanced three policy papers and five supporting studies on national tax reform in the interest of developing the best possible national tax system—a tax system that will provide genuine benefits for Canadian taxpayers, contribute to econ-

omic growth and national objectives and be acceptable to the provinces as well as the federal government.

Last June the government of Ontario presented its general proposals for reform of income taxation in Canada, concentrating particularly on those reforms we regard as essential for a fair distribution of individual income tax burden.

We followed this up with a detailed staff study setting out the revenue and incidence effects of Ontario's personal income tax reforms, and showing the advantages of Ontario's selective approach to low-income tax relief.

Subsequently, we developed and proposed a new and effective method of providing tax incentives to small businesses, along with a technical paper outlining how such an incentive system would work in practice.

Early this month we presented a third major policy paper and supporting technical studies showing that integration of personal and corporate income would be impractical and inflexible and should be abandoned as part of national tax reform.

In addition, we have maintained an ongoing programme of quantitative research which has allowed us to analyze the incidence effect and revenue implications both of the federal reform proposals and our own alternative reform recommendations. Our basic research has focused attention on the important matters of the revenue implications of tax reform and has provided major technical assistance to the federal government's capacity to quantify the impact of its proposals.

I believe that these efforts have been productive. They have raised materially the calibre of the technical underpinning of tax reform design. They have helped to ensure that all Canadians have had the benefit of a broad set of well-developed alternatives to the main federal tax reform proposals. Moreover, the federal government has already responded to many of our particular suggestions by agreeing that there shall be no tax increases as part of tax reform, by acknowledging the small-business problem and by magnifying its harsh initial proposals for the mining industry.

The Commons committee recommendations also moved strongly in the direction of this government's reform proposals, particularly in respect of capital gains taxation, retention of tax incentives for economic growth and the need to maintain an income tax system which can be used by both taxing jurisdictions.

But more is still required. In particular the new federal legislation should incorporate tax credits and selective low-income tax relief measures instead of universal tax exemptions, the integration proposals should be abandoned entirely, the federal surtaxes should be removed and the remaining reforms should be implemented on a priority basis and in manageable stages.

I am optimistic that the federal government will now recognize these requirements and produce final tax reform legislation that is broadly acceptable to the provinces and in the interests of Canadian taxpayers generally. We intend to continue our efforts toward the realization of this goal.

However, let me say that if the essential objectives that we seek are not met, or are thwarted by the new federal tax legislation, the Ontario government is prepared to proceed independently to achieve the maximum in reform for our own taxpayers. The situation demands nothing less.

Over the past five years Ontario and other provinces have repeatedly pointed out the fundamental fiscal imbalance in our Canadian federal system. The federal government enjoys a preponderance of elastic tax resources while the provincial governments and their municipal partners face the largest and fastest-growing expenditure commitments. This fiscal mismatch has been clearly documented by the tax structure committee, first in 1966 and again in 1970. It has been confirmed by the Economic Council of Canada, by several independent studies, and by Ontario's own recent study of revenue growth to 1980.

The facts, Mr. Speaker, are clear. Under the present division of taxing powers and expenditure responsibilities, the federal government commands vastly larger revenue resources than it needs to finance its expenditure programmes. The provincial-municipal sector, by contrast, is chronically under-financed.

The only sensible solution to this problem of basic fiscal imbalance is to transfer tax resources to the provincial-municipal level where they are needed to finance existing and emerging public priorities. In short, Canadian federalism needs a new deal in tax sharing, a deal which provides all levels of government with tax resources commensurate with their expenditure responsibilities.

The Ontario government will continue to press strongly for this overdue reform. This is what is required to contain total tax levels in Canada, to ease intergovernmental ten-

sions and to reverse the trend toward central domination of the Canadian federation.

Reform of federal-provincial finance requires equally fundamental changes in the related area of shared-cost programmes. In fact, the existence of major shared-cost programmes demonstrates the essential contradiction in our system—the federal government has the money while the provinces have the responsibilities.

In preparation for the renegotiation of the existing shared-cost agreement, the federal government has increasingly been developing various new formula approaches in such fields as health insurance and post-secondary education. While there is some merit in these formulas themselves, the one obvious feature of them is that they reduce the future federal financial commitment in these established shared-cost programmes. If these formulas were implemented, therefore, the provinces would find themselves in an even worse financial predicament, while the federal government would acquire added capacity to invent new programmes and to further encroach on other governments' responsibilities.

This government cannot accept this application of federal leverage on its future budget flexibility. Accordingly, I wish to state now our clear intention to assume complete responsibility for the established shared-cost programmes in exchange for fiscal equivalence, and to resist rigorously the establishment of new shared-cost programmes. In the long run this solution will serve all governments better. It will eliminate complex bureaucratic procedures and leave each level of government the full responsibility to plan and finance its own programmes within its own framework of priorities.

Since 1968 the government of Ontario has participated actively and constructively in federal-provincial meetings to review the constitutional basis of the Canadian federation. What has emerged from these meetings is an awareness that there must be clearer jurisdictional demarcations and a major redistribution of powers to resolve the fiscal and functional problems of our federation.

At the heart of the problem, however, lies the financial impasse between the federal government and the provinces. Until there is substantial progress in tax sharing and unless the provinces achieve better financial arrangements with the federal government, I can see major obstacles in the way of any substantial advance in the other aspects of the

constitutional review. Without this real reform of intergovernmental finance, other legal and jurisdictional improvements will be largely illusory, contributing little to the real capacity of governments in Canada to solve the day-to-day problems of our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, let me proceed to the first of the priorities in this budget—the policies which we are proposing to reduce unemployment and to restore vigorous economic expansion in Ontario.

In early 1970—over a year ago—and again in last year's budget, the Ontario government warned the federal government that the single-purpose thrust of its policies to reduce inflation would create unacceptably high levels of unemployment throughout Canada. Unhappily, the accuracy of that prediction is now all too clear. Unemployment mounted steadily in 1970 and now stands at 4.9 per cent of the labour force in Ontario, and six per cent nationally.

These bald statistics do not, of course, reveal the true human meaning of the situation. Low-income workers have been particularly hard hit, as have young people and students who find themselves unable to enter the labour force in ways which fully utilize their abilities and training. During this period of forced slowdown, large numbers of older employees have lost their jobs and many of them will find it difficult, if not impossible, to secure equivalent positions when the economy ultimately recovers.

The real cost of unemployment to these people has been enormous, not just in terms of lost incomes but also in terms of human dignity and family security. In addition, there has been a heavy cost to the community at large in lost output and weakened confidence. The Ontario government did not agree a year ago and does not agree now that this deliberate federal policy of high unemployment is a sound and just way to fight inflation.

Recently, sir, the federal government has relaxed its deflationary monetary and fiscal policy and the economy has shown modest signs of recovery. However, the revival of employment is likely to be both slow and delayed, so that unless further expansionary measures are taken, unemployment is likely to remain at high levels throughout 1971.

I strongly urge the government of Canada to introduce further positive measures to reinforce expansion and create jobs. Let me say, however, that I do not regard increased federal spending as an appropriate means to this end. Canada's experience over the past few

years surely has proved that governments cannot spend the country back to prosperity. Rather, I would recommend the following steps:

Eliminate the federal three per cent temporary surtaxes to increase personal and corporate incomes by \$250 million across Canada; introduce income tax credits to reduce the tax burden on low-income Canadians; and take positive measures to reduce long-run interest and mortgage rates and to lower the exchange value of the Canadian dollar.

Such measures by the federal government would increase consumer purchasing power, stimulate exports—

Mr. Sargent: They have their own plans. They do not need the Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and restore business confidence and willingness to invest. As such, they would constitute a national policy for economic revival which would benefit all the regions of Canada, and would provide an overall policy framework within which provincial actions could be developed.

The new government of Ontario has promised the people of this province that it will combat the current intolerable level of unemployment with every means at its command.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): That is really new.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Our objective is to reduce unemployment to three per cent as quickly as possible.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): How?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: To achieve this target, 150,000 new jobs are needed in Ontario this year.

Mr. Lewis: Have you not already got 132,000?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This budget has been designed to commit the maximum resources at our disposal to achieve this goal. However, I must stress again that we cannot do it alone. It is critical that our actions be reinforced by the full use of the major fiscal and monetary policy instruments at the disposal of the government of Canada.

As we indicated to the House last fall, the government of Ontario's budgetary operations became increasingly expansionary during the 1970-1971 fiscal year, in response to deteriorating economic conditions. The original budgetary target for 1970-1971 was a modest

surplus of \$11.3 million. However, in the course of the year we decided it was appropriate to increase expenditures by advancing the implementation of certain high priority programmes and introducing measures to combat unemployment directly. As a result the budgetary operations for 1970-1971 moved to a final deficit position of \$115 million, which represents an expansionary swing of \$126 million.

To meet our economic objectives it is necessary that our expansionary policy be continued and increased. Consequently the budget plan which I am presenting today calls for a deficit of \$415 million, an increase in the deficit of \$300 million over last year. While a deficit of this magnitude can be expected to exert a significant stimulus to the economy in an aggregate sense, the composition of the deficit is also of prime importance.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): How much for housing this time?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Generally, governments can achieve deficits either through expenditure increases or tax cuts. As I have said, it is the view of this government that a sound plan for economic recovery in Canada involves more than merely incurring large deficits by indiscriminate increases in spending. Large-scale expenditure increases may appear to be appropriate in recessionary periods, but they can also work to impede economic revival.

The expansion of the government sector can be distortionary as the economy moves back to full employment, insofar as it pre-empted economic resources that can be used more productively in the private sector and ultimately result in tax increases. Each of these factors can generate inflationary pressures and precipitate a second wave of restrictive fiscal and monetary policy.

For these reasons the government has decided to pursue the alternative route of stimulating the economy primarily by tax reductions, while containing expenditure growth within the limits of our long-term financial capacity. By these means we plan to increase private economic activity in investment and to expand employment without reactivating inflationary pressures.

Our budgetary policy for 1971-1972 is based on the use of the full-employment budgeting approach to fiscal policy formulation. This new technique is fully explained in the accompanying budget paper A. Full-

employment budgeting is particularly relevant to the current economic situation and the problem of fiscal policy co-ordination in the Canadian federal system.

Budgetary deficits are commonly understood to be expansionary. However, the full-employment budget adds a new dimension to this conventional approach to fiscal policy formulation. It emphasizes the way in which revenues increase as economic activity revives and exert a "tax drag," thereby slowing down economic expansion, possibly before full employment has been achieved.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): John Maynard Keynes resurrected!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: At the present time the Ontario economy is operating at about five per cent below its full employment potential, which means that we are losing some \$2 billion in potential gross provincial product, and about \$250 million in potential provincial revenues. As we demonstrated in our 1970 budget paper B, the federal government's budgetary operations in Ontario involve a permanent surplus; which first exerts a continuing contractionary impact on our economy regardless of the level of economic activity, and second increases rapidly as activity increases.

Our plan for offsetting the slack in the economy and counteracting the federal government's tax drag in Ontario is explained in an accompanying table (see appendix). This shows two main actions:

1. In line with our objective of controlling the growth of the public sector, our expenditures have been held to a level of \$4.26 billion. This closely matches the level of expenditures which would be appropriate for us if the economy were operating at full employment.

2. We have cut taxes in a way which restores the growth potential of our economy.

Thus without any tax cuts our revenues at full employment could be expected to increase to some \$4.17 billion with a resulting deficit of \$80 million. However, by cutting taxes we will reduce the growth potential of revenues at full employment by about \$70 million to a total of \$4.1 billion, with a resulting deficit of \$150 million.

Most important, however, the tax cuts in this budget are designed to offset part of the fiscal drag of federal revenue growth, as the economy reacts to our planned budgetary deficit of \$415 million for 1971-1972. To the extent that our fiscal policy is successful in

reviving economic growth and employment in Ontario, our ultimate budgetary deficit could be reduced.

I turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the section dealing with expenditures. The overall policy thrust of this budget is comprised of a set of carefully co-ordinated expenditure and tax actions. On the expenditure side, I am advancing a plan amounting to \$4,262 million for 1971-1972, which is an increase in spending of 10.7 per cent over the 1970-1971 fiscal year.

This level of expenditure will allow the continuation of our existing programmes, the introduction of several important new programmes and progress toward increasing our financial support to school boards and municipalities. The expenditure programme which I am presenting today is a programme of priorities and a plan for the controlled use of public resources.

Although there is a substantial slack in the provincial economy, the government has resisted pressures to embark on uncontrolled increases in spending in order to generate an expansionary economic impact. Rather, we have held down our spending to make room for the private sector, to permit expansionary tax reductions and to stay within the discipline of the normal growth of our revenues.

We have exercised a maximum of restraint on cost pressures within the provincial sector itself, and we have requested our local government partners to exercise similar restraint. We have consciously striven to reduce the administrative and overhead components of our expenditure programme and to increase the delivery of real services.

Finally, we have continued to allocate our limited resources toward the most essential needs of our growing society and toward our long-term provincial-municipal reform programme.

We have tackled the job of controlling public spending in four main ways.

First, we have introduced expenditure guidelines for school boards in order to relieve the pressure on property taxes and to provide scope for other priority areas of local spending. Second, we have imposed strict constraints on the province's own-account spending and on cost increases within the public service.

Third, we have begun a basic reorganization of our departmental structure in order to streamline decision-making, realign programme responsibilities and achieve the maximum economy within government itself.

Mr. T. Reid: What about the cabinet?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Fourth, we are evaluating all our programmes and grants with a view to eliminating those which have outlived their original purpose, simplifying wherever possible and generally getting more value for our money.

Mr. Sargent: Like 24 cabinet ministers.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As the hon. members are aware, Mr. Speaker, the growing demand for essential services has placed enormous pressure on the financial resources of the province and its local government partners in recent years. Nowhere has this been more evident than in the field of education. In the past we have concentrated vast resources on the expansion and improvement of Ontario's school system in order to accommodate burgeoning enrolment and to provide the best possible education programme for our young people.

Now the growth pressure on our elementary and secondary education system is abating and this gives us a real opportunity to stabilize costs and reduce education levies without any sacrifice in the quality of education in this province.

The school board cost guidelines which we have established this year aim to achieve these desirable objectives. The expenditure ceilings already announced are sufficiently generous to permit every school board to maintain and even improve the content and quality of its service while preventing excessive increases in overall expenditures. In conjunction with this necessary and desirable control on school board spending, the province has budgeted for a further large increase in its legislative grants in 1971-1972. Over and above the legislative grants to finance last year's 51 per cent support we have provided an additional \$72 million to raise the province's share of education financing to 55 per cent in 1971-1972.

Mr. Sargent: Should be 100 per cent.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am convinced that these two measures—expenditure control and increased provincial support—will ensure an improved cost performance in the education sector without any deterioration in quality and a reduction in school property taxes across the province generally.

The second major policy of restraint which we have pursued is in the area of the spending for administration, overhead and public service costs. In the estimates review

process we placed major emphasis on limiting the growth in the size of the civil service. As a result the province's civil service complement will increase by only 1.6 per cent in 1971-1972.

Many departments will operate with no complement increase at all. Where staff additions have been approved, we have given the highest priority to those programmes which provide a direct service to the public rather than to those which increase the overhead costs of the government.

The Department of Correctional Services, for example, has been allowed a complement increase of 192 staff to operate the new Sudbury Training School and two Outward Bound camps. The largest increase—332 additional complement—was approved for The Department of Health, almost all of whom were required to staff our hospitals for the mentally retarded and our new school for retarded children at Picton. Increases in The Department of Justice and the Ontario Provincial Police have been provided to speed up the processing of cases through our courts and to maintain effective policing across the province generally.

Increased staff is also required to continue our municipal assessment programme, to provide additional services to municipalities in community planning and to handle the increased welfare case-load arising from high unemployment. The Ontario Housing Corporation has been allocated 93 extra complements to handle the 10,000 additional housing units it will administer in the coming year.

These departments account for the bulk of the 1,129 overall increase in staff approved for the new fiscal year. The remainder is distributed among a number of departments in recognition of increasing work loads and the introduction of new services. The accompanying table shows the public service complement for each department as of April 1, 1971, and the minimal increases planned for this year except in those areas of proved need.

In addition to limiting increases in civil service complement, I am also aiming to contain the increase in wage and salary scales to an average of five per cent for 1971-1972. This cost-control target will minimize the impact of provincial wage settlements as a potential source of inflationary pressure in the economy. To reinforce this measure the government is conducting an intensive and thorough investigation of ways and means to improve productivity over the whole spectrum of Ontario's public sector.

I am confident that our efforts in these directions will pay off in terms of a more efficient public service, more value for public money spent and more resources for use by the private sector and by taxpayers themselves.

The third means by which the new government aims to control spending and improve performance is by reforming the structure of government itself. As announced in the Speech from the Throne, we plan major departments along modern functional lines to ensure that government remains a positive and responsive instrument of our citizenry.

For example, the main branches and agencies in Ontario departments that deal with environmental management, conservation and protection will be brought together in a new Ontario Department of the Environment. Equally important consolidation of functions is planned in the areas of transportation, in communications, post-secondary education and health care insurance. In addition the government is implementing the recommendations of its committee on government productivity.

These internal reforms and departmental reorganizations are vital for the realization of long-term economies in government and controlled management of the Ontario public sector.

Fourth, we are continuing and intensifying our review and evaluation of all programmes and grants in terms of their costs, their benefits and their relative priority. Through our programme budgeting system we are emphasizing policy objectives and least-cost methods of achieving these objectives so that the province's limited finances are used with maximum effectiveness. This is an immense long-run task, but one which is imperative if the government is to achieve maximum economy and expenditure management.

One elementary fact must be recognized. If government spending is to be contained, then some existing programmes must be cut back or eliminated in order to make room for more urgent priorities. Certainly we cannot add new programmes on top of all our existing programmes. Rationalization and simplification of our grants to local government is a major goal of this overall review and evaluation programme.

As discussed in budget paper B, our aim is to eliminate many existing grants, reduce the number of provincial and municipal civil servants occupied in processing grants and unconditionalize provincial financial transfers

to permit greater budget autonomy for our local governments.

Having indicated, sir, some of the ways in which we are moving to control the growth in basic cost elements in the government, let me turn now to the composition of our expenditure programme for this year. Net general expenditures of \$4,262 million have been planned in 1971-1972. Of this total programme, some \$2,666 million will be taken up by transfer payments for operating purposes to other spending units—to school boards, municipalities, institutions and people.

A further \$287 million will be transferred in the form of grants for capital purposes. The province's own capital programme will amount to \$300 million and the remaining \$1,009 million will be taken up in direct operating costs. In terms of overall structure, therefore, 69 per cent of 1971-1972 spending consists of operating and capital transfer payments, seven per cent is direct capital spending and 24 per cent goes to operate our own provincial programmes.

This distribution of the 1971-1972 outlays continues the dynamic shift in our expenditure structure that was documented in the 1970 budget. Transfer payments are taking up a larger and larger share of total expenditures, while our own account spending and investment are diminishing in relative importance.

Net general expenditures are planned to increase by \$411 million or 10.7 per cent in 1971-1972. Transfer payments for operating purposes will account for \$304 million of this increase, up 12.9 per cent over last year. This large additional commitment is required both to continue our programmes of financial support to local governments, institutions and people, and to advance our provincial-municipal reform programme. Direct provincial spending will increase by \$95 million or 10.4 per cent over 1970-1971.

The bulk of this increase will go to provide better services to the public, such as new facilities for emotionally disturbed children, expanded facilities for juvenile offenders, improved police protection and to meet increased interest costs on our public debt. As I have already said, we instructed our departments to cut administrative and overhead costs rigorously in order to provide scope for this expansion in essential provincial services.

On the investment side, we have placed our major emphasis on loans and advances rather than on direct capital spending and grants. Direct capital spending and capital

grants have been increased by only \$11 million while loans and advances are up \$109 million or 17.9 per cent. These loans and advances to municipalities and school boards, post-secondary education institutions, hospitals and our housing agencies have the same economic impact as direct investment by government departments.

I have given emphasis to those areas of capital spending and lending which have a social priority and economic growth impact. Accordingly, the largest increases have been allotted to housing, environmental management, hospital construction and our new programme for land acquisition.

An accompanying table (see appendix), sets out these major dimensions of our expenditure and investment programme for 1971-1972 and shows where we have allocated our increased resources. I would call your attention, in particular, to the increased resources we are devoting to the broad field of education. In total, our allocation to school boards, universities, community colleges and Ryerson will increase by over \$220 million in 1971-1972.

The bulk of this overall increase is accounted for by legislative grants and by our financing of the colleges of applied arts and technology. Payments to universities will increase by only \$9 million, but this arises because of a change in the fiscal year-end of our universities from June 30 to April 30. We have established a value of \$1,730 for the basic income unit in 1971-1972 and we have agreed to increase this measure of support to universities to \$1,765 in 1972-1973. We have also agreed to increase the weighting of part-time students in the determination of basic income units; the present weighting of one-sixth will be changed to one-fifth over the two years, 1972-1973 and 1973-1974.

The composition of our overall spending and investment programme is summarized in budget paper C which accompanies this statement. I would also remind members that the complete details of our expenditure programme for next year are shown in the government's 1971-1972 estimates which have been tabled along with the budget. In passing, it should be noted that the format of the estimates has been changed substantially in line with the recommendations of the public accounts committee. In the remaining discussion of the expenditure side of this budget, therefore, I should like to focus on the policy highlights of reform and increased employment and to outline the major new dimensions of our programme for the future.

Progress toward reform in provincial-municipal taxation and finance is one of the highest priorities in this budget. We are unequivocally committed to the long-run goal of increasing our financial support to local governments in order to reduce the burden of financing that falls upon the property tax. In this budget, I have allocated a further \$78 million toward permanent reform.

The bulk of this will serve to increase our financial support to school boards to 55 per cent in 1971-1972. In addition, we propose to broaden the local tax base by permitting municipalities to tax the presently exempt properties of our colleges of applied arts and technology, as well as our provincial parklands. We are also providing major assistance to the recently established York regional government, the Muskoka district government and our other regional governments.

While these new reform measures will require \$78 million in 1971-1972—

Mr. MacDonald: The Treasurer is not really happy.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —their costs will grow each year in future as the local expenditure base expands. This is amply demonstrated by looking at the additional cost in 1971-1972 of last year's reform move from 46.5 per cent to almost 51 per cent of school board support. Because school board spending will increase by some \$172 million from 1970 to 1971, the four-point increase in provincial support implemented in last year's budget costs an additional \$7 million in this budget.

The costs of our other reforms have also mounted in value in each succeeding year after being implemented and this tendency can be expected to continue in the future. The combination of previous reform moves made over the past three years, the accumulating value of these reforms and the \$78 million in additional reforms in this budget result in a total reform effort by the province of \$461 million in the 1971-1972 fiscal year, as shown in budget paper B.

Budget paper B accompanying this statement provides a complete progress report on our long-term programme of reform in provincial-municipal finance and property taxation. It shows how the province's reform policies have taken hold since 1968 to alleviate the financial squeeze on local governments and reduce property tax burdens. Property tax increases between 1967 and 1970, for example, decelerated to half their annual rate of growth in 1960-1967. In 1971

we look forward to no increase in education taxes and only a moderate increase in municipal taxes. This great improvement has been due almost entirely—

Mr. J. Renwick: That is a reduction—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —to our greatly increased provincial grants. Without this on-going shift in financing from local governments to the province, an additional \$461 million in property tax revenues would have been required to maintain local services in 1971-1972.

I would call your attention to one particular reform that this government intends to implement in 1971-1972. This concerns the method by which we make payments to mining municipalities.

The new formula which we intend to implement will involve a net increase of \$400,000 in payments to the municipalities and school boards in mining areas in 1971-1972. The payment for municipal purposes will increase by a further \$1.25 million in 1973-1973, and when the formula is completely operative in 1973-1974 the payment will again increase by \$1.25 million. Taking into account increased costs, it is anticipated that the additional revenue transferred will exceed \$3 million by that time.

The new formula will also improve the distribution of these payments by more closely reflecting the fiscal capacities of designated mining municipalities. This programme will be, in effect, a first step toward a "needs-resources" type of grant system. Consequently, the new formula will relate future payments to both the level of equalized per capita assessment and the level of expenditure for municipal purposes in each municipality. In those municipalities in which less than 10 per cent of the population is directly employed by the mining industry, the payment will also be related to the ratio of resident mining employees to population.

We are also working to implement two further reforms to strengthen the financial base of our municipalities.

First, we propose to introduce in January 1972 an improved system of unconditional grants. The new unconditional grant will be designed to eliminate the criticism that the Ontario Committee on Taxation made of this programme, particularly the sharp cutoff points based on the size of population, and to recognize the cost of providing policing in those municipalities which provide their own services. The additional benefits that

will accrue to the municipalities under these reforms will be in the order of \$16 million annually, and the province will ensure that no municipality receives less than it would receive under the existing system.

Second, we propose to accelerate the timing of our payments to municipalities, particularly in the areas of regional government, unconditional grants and highway grants. While this move will not involve any additional cost to the province, it will help municipalities achieve a better balance between inflows and outflows during the course of the year. Full details of these new schemes will be announced by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales).

As I stressed earlier, this government is committed to the goal of restoring full employment in Ontario. We are convinced, however, that the way to achieve this objective, and to achieve it as quickly as possible, is by tax cuts which encourage investment and expansion of private sector activity and not by wholesale expansion of government spending.

The expenditure method of tackling unemployment has major drawbacks. There is a substantial lag between the time money is budgeted for expanded programmes and the time it is actually spent and begins to work its way through the economy, thereby creating jobs.

Moreover, temporary increases in government spending tend to become permanent, they get locked into the programme structure and continue long after the original need has vanished. There is a role for expenditures, however, in relieving severe winter unemployment and student unemployment. This budget allocates substantial funds for these specific aspects of the overall unemployment problem.

The government has already taken steps to ease the immediate unemployment situation. Last fall we established a cabinet committee to develop policies for alleviating winter unemployment. A package of programmes which included parks cleanup, removal of diseased elm trees and acceleration of highway construction was quickly assembled and by late January some 1,200 were employed.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It went over big in northern Ontario!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This Ontario seasonal employment programme was subsequently expanded to provide employment for almost 4,500 men at a cost of \$8.75 million—

Mr. Sargent: Not even one per cent.

Hon. Mr. McKeough:—and has now been extended to the end of April. In addition, a special municipal works incentive programme was established at a cost of \$7.5 million to encourage municipalities to hire additional workers during the period April to June. We expect that this direct and simple grant programme will create an additional 7,500 jobs. In total then, Ontario's direct contribution to relieve immediate unemployment has reached over \$16 million and should create an estimated 12,000 seasonal jobs.

Mr. Sargent: Not 132,000?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In contrast to these positive efforts of the province itself, let me report on the federal loan programme for relieving winter unemployment. The federal programme was announced in the December 3 budget, with \$17 million allocated as Ontario's share of the national loan fund—I say, sir, hardly a generous amount in relation to the size of our unemployment problem.

In fact, at one point after the programme and provincial allocations were first announced, Ontario's share was actually reduced to \$9.3 million. Moreover, it became quickly apparent to us that the federal loan programme was restrictive in respect of eligible projects, ungenerous in respect of the interest rate and repayment terms, and overly complex in its administrative and accounting requirements.

We bargained hard to remove the complicated bureaucratic procedures, to restore the original allotment and to extend the repayment term to 25 years. It was not until late January that our allotment of \$17 million was confirmed and not until early March that we received a final decision that the repayment term would be 20 years.

In any case, the Ontario government is acting only as a financial intermediary to channel the \$17 million in federal loans for approved capital works programmes to our municipalities. We have, on our own account, extended the repayment period to 25 years and fixed a maximum interest rate of seven per cent.

Mr. Sargent: Three and a half per cent in Nova Scotia!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We will pass on to the municipalities any savings if the actual rate under the federal formula turns out to be lower. Because the federal programme is concerned with capital projects and our

municipalities have already finalized their capital budgets for 1971, I must state candidly that I do not expect it will have any major employment impact in Ontario until next winter.

In consideration of the problem of student employment, funds have been provided in this budget to expand greatly Ontario's direct efforts to provide job opportunities during the coming summer. Our departments, agencies and commissions themselves will employ 14,000 students, an increase of 3,000 or 27 per cent over the number hired last year. By contrast, the federal government has announced that it will increase its direct student employment by only 500 to a total of 23,000 this summer.

The payroll cost of Ontario's student employment programme will exceed \$17 million. We will also spend about \$1 million to provide summer activities and opportunities for young people in various athletic, artistic and social programmes. Beyond these steps by the province itself, we intend to actively encourage the business community and the private sector to offer the maximum job opportunities possible for our student population.

While we have concentrated on cost control, continued reform and employment generation within our on-going expenditure programme, this budget also provides funds for major expansions in priority areas and for new initiatives. In the field of housing, for example, we have doubled our commitment for direct lending. This provincial financing, along with funds from CMHC and the chartered banks, will generate a high level of housing starts in 1971 and beyond.

We have allocated funds within the highway estimates to provide financial assistance to urban transit systems, which is a real and pressing need in our increasingly urban and mobile society.

Similarly, in the area of environmental control we have allocated large additional funds. The capital spending to OWRC alone will increase by 27 per cent to a level of \$50 million for the coming year. Along with outlays in operating costs, direct investment, loans and transfer payments, our total environmental management programme will amount to \$92 million in 1971-1972.

In this budget I have set aside \$20 million for a new land bank programme to be operated by the province. This will be the initial funding of the new Ontario Land Acquisition Corporation. Its purpose will be to acquire

land for future public use, particularly land in and around our urban centres and recreation areas. With such a land bank programme, the province will be in a better position to implement its policies in the areas of regional development, urban development, recreation, transportation and communication and housing.

The corporation will also serve as the vehicle to co-ordinate land use planning and research as well as the land acquisition programmes now undertaken in a number of departments. Over the years the corporation will require greatly increased finances from the province as it builds up a large land holding. We intend to set aside the maximum resources possible for this purpose and thereby preserve for future generations of Ontario citizens an adequate stock of public land in every part of the province.

Though not specifically reflected in budgetary expenditures, regional development is a major consideration in all our spending decisions. The regional development programme is one of the most important responsibilities of the Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics. Consequently, I intend to ensure that all proposals coming before cabinet and the Treasury Board with regional implications will be reviewed and assessed in the light of our regional development policies. I will also endeavour to ensure that in the development of long-run expenditure plans and priorities within individual departments and agencies, the regional component will be clearly identified and stressed.

I will also carry forward the work of my predecessor aimed at ensuring that federal expenditures within Ontario will complement the province's planning objectives. The new international airport is a case in point. This large project will have far-reaching effects within Ontario; hence we have insisted that the location and construction of such an airport must be co-ordinated with provincial development objectives and expenditure programmes.

The Toronto-centred region is perhaps our largest single regional development priority at the present time. On the basis of favourable reaction to our development concept and our own followup work since last May, the government has decided to endorse the principles of this basic plan as the guideline for provincial decision-making in the Toronto-centred region. We intend to apply the main elements of the Toronto-centred region concept in assessing and deciding on proposals

submitted by municipalities. This reaffirmation of provincial intent should help to resolve a number of outstanding conflicts which have emerged since the Toronto-centred region concept was announced. To accelerate provincial planning in the Toronto-centred region, and in other regions generally, we have allocated more resources to The Department of Treasury and Economics and other departments.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that commencing on April 1, 1972, Ontario will expand further its health care insurance programme to cover nursing homes and home care services.

Mr. J. Renwick: Not until 1972?

Mr. MacDonald: Why wait until 1972?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, an expansion of this dimension requires a lead time of at least nine months to bring new facilities on stream. We are preparing a comprehensive plan for orderly integration of these presently uninsured services into our health insurance programme and to develop further, as rapidly as possible, the related programme of community home-care arrangements.

This major extension of our insured services means that Ontario will have one of the most comprehensive health insurance systems anywhere in the world.

The benefits flowing from this move are abundant: A heavy burden of financing will be lifted from individual families and spread over the population as a whole; the demand for active treatment hospital beds will be relieved and many patients will be able to receive care in their own homes and in their own communities.

It should be recognized that the costs of this major improvement in our health insurance system will be high. I estimate the net cost of this extended care to be over \$50 million in 1972, rising to \$100 million by 1975. This assumes that a fee of \$3.50 per day will be charged. There will be some offsetting savings from a reduced need—

Mr. Lewis: That is quite an insured service!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There will be some offsetting savings for a reduced need for active treatment beds, but these economies will only appear over a number of years. The federal government has been unwilling, at least up to the present, to assume any share

of these increased insurance costs, despite the fact that in the long run this co-ordinated and comprehensive programme would be more effective and economic than our present arrangements. We hope that the federal government will eventually agree to participate in the financing of these additional services.

Mr. Lewis: Does the Treasurer mean elderly people at \$105 a month can afford nursing home costs? A deterrent fee for elderly people? Is that what it is?

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): The member should worry about the mad professor and just leave the economy to us.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They would be receiving \$111-plus in GIS.

Mr. Lewis: They receive \$135 and they pay \$105. That is a very generous programme.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): We will explain it to the member.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We hope that the federal government will eventually agree to participate in the financing of these additional services, but in the meantime the Ontario government is not willing to wait any longer for a federal decision and is prepared to carry the entire financing on its own. My colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) will be announcing the full details of this major provincial initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I come now to the vital matter of tax policy—the key initiative in this budget to stimulate a revival of economic growth and job opportunities in Ontario. As I stated earlier, the government of Ontario is convinced that the best way to achieve economic recovery is by reducing taxes.

In particular, we believe that immediate and significant tax cuts are required in two main areas: First, personal income taxes should be cut in order to bolster consumer purchasing power, and second, corporate taxation should be reduced in order to restore business confidence and stimulate investment and economic growth.

Let me say that I would have liked to reduce personal income taxes, but for several reasons this option is not realistically open to us.

First, under the terms of the federal-provincial collection agreement, Ontario cannot change its personal income tax rates before January 1, 1972.

Second, moreover the only type of change we could make is a costly across-the-board decrease in rates. We cannot make the less costly selective reductions for low-income groups of the type we think are needed and would be in line with our long-run reform proposals.

Third, the pressures of Ontario's long-run revenue requirements mean that we can only afford to finance a temporary tax cut, whereas a permanent reduction in personal income tax is required. It would be incongruous for Ontario to cut its income tax rates while the federal government continues its so-called temporary surtaxes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: For these reasons, therefore, I have decided to concentrate our limited capacity to finance tax cuts on a major move designed to produce a massive stimulus to business investment.

Mr. Lewis: Who are the minister's friends in this budget?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Tax cuts in this area can be more appropriately implemented for a limited period; and they have the important effect of expanding the economy's productive capacity in ways which relieve inflationary bottlenecks. While we are unable to increase individual incomes through direct income tax reductions, several of our actions in the area of municipal finance will have important indirect results to this effect. The control of school board spending, increased municipal and education grants and increased property tax rebates will work to reduce and contain the impact of property taxes on disposable incomes.

Mr. Sargent: And efficient overtaxation!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In moving on the investment side, I must emphasize that our measures alone cannot be expected to return the economy to full employment. For this reason we expect the federal government to add its weight to our policies by implementing complementary tax cuts in its forthcoming budget.

In particular, as I have already said, we invite the federal government to complete the pattern of tax cuts by reducing personal and corporate income taxes on a national basis through the elimination of the "temporary" three per cent federal surtaxes.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Economic illiteracy.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I intend to incorporate a major new incentive in the province's corporation income tax to stimulate business investment and to create new jobs in Ontario. The incentive which I am proposing is a five per cent tax credit for investment in machinery and equipment that is purchased after midnight this day, April 26, 1971, and put in place and used in Ontario by March 31, 1973. In other words, for every \$100 of investment in machinery and equipment during this period, companies will be eligible to reduce their tax payments to the province by \$5. On \$1 million investment the tax saving would be \$50,000.

Mr. Peacock: Why does not the Treasurer just exempt it from the sales tax?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: On a \$20 million investment programme a company could reduce its taxes by \$1 million. I expect—

Mr. MacDonald: Three cheers from those who contribute to the Treasurer's election fund.

Mr. Pilkey: What about the little guy? Where does he fit in?

Mr. Sargent: That is on new equipment? Twenty million dollars on equipment?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I expect this measure to be a powerful incentive for business expansion in Ontario; hence I am anticipating a gross revenue loss of \$125 million in corporation income tax in 1971-1972, and perhaps an equivalent loss in 1972-1973.

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer will need more help than this.

Mr. Sargent: How many jobs will the budget create?

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer's corporate friends will be happy, if not the people in the province. That is Tory budgeting.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This tax credit approach to stimulating investment, economic growth and job opportunities in Ontario has major advantages over alternative measures.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They should tell us about their Waffle friends.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

I would suggest that the hon. members of the House, like the rest of the people of this province, would like to hear the Treasurer's

budget speech. Over the years the tradition has been that there would not be too much interruption. I would ask that the Treasurer proceed.

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer can charge \$3.50 a day to give corporations a cut. Just a gentle word.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that as long as the member for Grey-Bruce wants to go on embarrassing his leader and his party he is welcome to do it. He is not interrupting me.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I guess this will be the Treasurer's last budget.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The people of Ontario should see it.

Mr. G. Demers (Nickel Belt): The NDP leader has got a yellow smile on his kisser.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, this tax credit approach to stimulating investment, economic growth and job opportunities in Ontario has major advantages over alternative measures. It will have an immediate impact because it produces immediate tax savings to companies that invest in economic expansion. It does not reduce the value of basic capital cost allowances. It is simple to understand and administer. It can be implemented and removed without distorting long-run arrangements. It will assist in the modernization of capital stock in this province to increase the long-run productivity of Ontario industry, and will help to achieve other social and economic objectives, particularly increased investment in pollution abatement equipment.

This five per cent tax credit—

Mr. Bullbrook: Will it help the people?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This government will help the people by getting the people back to work.

An hon. member: I thought the member for Sarnia would not understand.

Mr. Bullbrook: A typical Tory approach.

An hon. member: It must be good. The opposition is upset.

Mr. Pilkey: Which is part of those 132,000 jobs?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, this five per cent tax credit will be available to every

company paying tax or liable to pay corporation income tax to the Ontario government. It will not be restricted to particular industries or particular sizes of companies, nor will there be upper or lower limits on the amount of investment that will qualify. Machinery and equipment investment will be defined generously to include most types of equipment, new or used—

Mr. Sargent: The Treasurer does not know how he is going to do it, but he is going to do it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —but will exclude leasing arrangements, trucks, cars and buildings. I have excluded trucks and cars on the grounds that no specific incentive is warranted for this type of investment. Buildings have also been excluded because an incentive geared to machinery and equipment investment will stimulate new construction to house these assets in any event. This investment tax credit will also not affect the normal capital cost allowance write-offs by corporations; rather, it is in the nature of a temporary bonus over and above the regular depreciation system.

Finally, to ensure that all Ontario corporations can take full advantage of this incentive, loss companies will be allowed one additional year, to April 1, 1974, to generate profits against which the investment tax credit may be deducted.

Fuller details of this tax change, and the following tax changes, are provided in the appendix following the budget statement.

A major anomaly of present Canadian tax law is that foreign companies enjoy a tax advantage over Canadian companies in bidding to take over other companies. This advantage arises because foreign purchasers, particularly United States corporations, can deduct the interest costs of funds borrowed to purchase shares in other companies, including Canadian companies, whereas a rival Canadian buyer cannot deduct comparable interest costs. This unfortunate and illogical situation has been allowed to continue on the grounds that income from purchase of shares is exempt from tax, hence there should be no deduction for exempt income. Whatever the validity of this tax principle, this feature of our tax law has undoubtedly been an important factor in the ability of foreign companies to acquire Canadian firms.

The Ontario government is convinced that the present restrictive rule should be removed immediately.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Consequently, I am proposing to amend Ontario's corporation income tax legislation to permit deduction of the interest costs on money borrowed to purchase shares in other companies. This amendment will undoubtedly entail revenue losses. I am convinced, however, that such losses are fully warranted in order to achieve the objective of greater participation by Canadians in the economic development of this province and of Canada as a whole.

In my recent policy paper on the reform of the taxation of corporations and shareholders, I urged the federal government to include this step in its tax reform legislation. I take this opportunity to stress again the common sense and the urgency of such a move. Relaxation of the federal tax law to allow deduction of interest costs, along with the move Ontario is now making in its corporation income tax, would put Canadian companies on a more competitive footing with foreign companies in bidding for shares in Canadian and non-Canadian companies. It would mean, in effect, that potential Canadian buyers would be able to finance acquisitions on the same terms, at least in respect of taxes, as rival foreign buyers; hence they would presumably enjoy greater success in maintaining Canadian control and participation in Canadian business.

Mr. Sopha: Has the Treasurer got anything for the poor people?

Mr. Bullbrook: Nothing at all!

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Nothing for the lawyers!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Let me reaffirm the intention of this government to vacate—

Mr. Bullbrook: Lots for the corporations!

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): How about that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —the succession duties field of taxation. This policy was formulated in 1969, following the introduction by the federal government of a completely revamped Estate Tax Act. We proposed to relinquish the death duties field to the federal government in exchange for 75 per cent of the revenues that accrue in Ontario from full application of the federal estate tax. This would put Ontario in the same position as the seven provinces that have no death duties of their own.

Mr. Bullbrook: That really helps the poor people, does it not?

Mr. Sopha: The fairest tax ever invented by man.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We have decided not to eliminate our succession duties in a single step. There are three sound reasons for such a gradual approach.

First there is the matter of revenue losses. Complete elimination of succession duties would entail a loss of revenues to the province of about \$25 million a year.

Mr. Sopha: That would be immoral.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Second, the continuation of Ontario's succession duties, along with the half-application of the federal estate tax, will result in lower total taxation in many instances than under the full application of the federal estate tax alone.

Mr. Sopha: Shame on you!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Third, it is important to establish a connection between estate taxation and capital gains taxation. The Ontario government believes that death duties should be reduced as capital gains taxation comes into effect. The federal government, by contrast, has not recognized the interdependence of these two taxes on wealth and the consequent need to make compensating reductions in estate tax when a capital gains tax is introduced. It is prudent, therefore, for the province to retain some presence in the succession duties field until we see what form of capital gains tax is finally legislated and to ensure that the province participates fairly in the revenues.

Our interim policy, therefore, is to reduce succession duties progressively until the combined succession duties and estate tax revenues generate no more revenue than full application of the federal estate tax alone.

Mr. Bullbrook: Blatant regard for the rich!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: To advance another significant step in this budget, I am recommending the following changes in our succession duties legislation in respect of deaths occurring after midnight this day, April 26, 1971:

The exemptions for widows and widowers will be increased from \$125,000 to \$250,000.

The 15 per cent surtax will be eliminated for preferred beneficiaries which include children and grandchildren;

Preferred beneficiaries will not be subject to duty on estates valued up to \$100,000, as compared to the present level of \$50,000; and,

The exemption for non-commutable annuities will be raised from \$1,200 to \$10,000 in aggregate.

This package of amendments will effectively eliminate succession duties on the vast majority of estates. I estimate that as a result of these changes, fewer than 5,000 estates per year will be taxable.

The tax burden in the case of transfers to children and grandchildren, and particularly spouses, will be significantly reduced. These changes will drastically reduce the tax burden on farm estates and in most cases makes the difference between selling out or continuing to operate a family farm. Family businesses will also benefit because the tax cost of passing on a business to a child or grandchild will be greatly reduced.

The pressure to sell out small firms and family businesses either to pay death duties or to avoid such taxes will be alleviated. Since these kinds of businesses are often sold to non-Canadians, this reduction in succession duties should reinforce our efforts to encourage more Canadian control and participation in the Ontario economy.

Let me stress that we regard this as a major and positive step in this direction.

I anticipate that these reductions in succession duties will result in a revenue loss of \$12 million a year as the revised system matures. The revenue decline in 1971-1972 will be somewhat less—perhaps \$6 million—because most of the estates processed during 1971-1972 would relate to deaths occurring prior to the changes I have just announced.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister of Highways and Transport (Mr. MacNaughton) was a socialist compared to the Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, beer prices in northern Ontario are currently about five per cent—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Now the Treasurer is getting to it.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Now the necessities of life.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —or 26 cents a case higher than in southern Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This differential pricing policy was established to reflect higher costs of handling and transportation in the north. While the economics of supplying beer have not changed, I believe that beer drinkers in the north should not have to pay more than those in the rest of the province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Accordingly, I propose to equalize beer prices in northern and southern Ontario effective May 1, 1971.

The mechanism for achieving this equalization of beer prices will be an additional two cents on the gallonage tax to be used to reduce northern beer prices by 11 cents a large case. At the same time, beer prices in southern Ontario will be increased 15 cents a large case. These two changes, sir, will mean that a case of 24 bottles of beer will cost \$4.65 everywhere in Ontario, which, Mr. Speaker, is still the lowest price in Canada.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, at present Ontario residents must purchase an angling licence at a cost of \$3 per year in order to fish in this province. This licence fee was introduced in 1968 as part of a general move to bring user fees more in line with the costs of services provided by The Department of Lands and Forests. While this objective remains generally valid, I would point out that it generates only \$1.6 million in revenue—

Mr. T. P. Reid: I pointed that out to the government!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —is costly to collect and is generally a nuisance to fishermen.

Mr. T. P. Reid: It took the government two years to find that out!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I propose, therefore, to abolish the resident fishing licence, effective retroactively to January 1 of this year.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Any residents who have already purchased a 1971 licence will be entitled to a refund by sending their licence to The Department of Lands and Forests at Queen's Park.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude this section on tax changes by discussing Ontario's long-run policy for the taxation of mines. Since the announcement last August of revised federal proposals for the taxation of the mining industry, we have been studying the various proposals to determine the Ontario government's future policy on mining taxation. This was necessary since the revised federal proposals shifted to the provinces the responsibility for establishing the ultimate tax burden to be borne by the mining industry.

I believe it would be premature to make a categorical declaration of provincial policy before final tax reform legislation is brought down by the federal government. Nevertheless, I think it important to set out at this time the objectives and general thrust of our long-term policy in order that Ontario mining companies can take the provincial tax dimension into account in their forward planning and long-term investment decisions.

My department has undertaken an intensive policy review in this complex area. We have devoted particular effort to analyzing as fully as possible the potential impact of the revised federal proposals on our mining industry and on Ontario's finances. In undertaking this review, we received the full co-operation of the mining industry in providing essential data and information. This type of co-operation between government and industry is essential for the development of sound tax policies.

Let me summarize briefly the results of our analysis and the implications for our own mining tax policy.

The total package of federal mining tax reforms—the original white paper proposals and the revisions announced last August—would not involve any reduction in the total tax burden on the mining industry in Ontario. The reduction of the federal corporate rate from 40 per cent to 25 per cent would be almost or completely offset by reforms widening the tax base: the non-deductibility of provincial mining tax, the change from automatic to earned depletion and the elimination of the three-year exemption.

The reduction in the federal corporate rate to 25 per cent would not open up major tax room for Ontario to pass benefits on to the mining industry or to take up in increased provincial corporation or mining tax rates. If we simply maintained our existing rates, Ontario would enjoy a modest revenue gain from the base-broadening re-

forms noted previously while the federal government would suffer an equivalent revenue loss, but the total federal-provincial tax burden on mines would remain about the same as at present.

The revised federal proposals would involve a marked change in the distribution of the total tax yield among Ontario mining companies. In general, high profit companies and companies able to earn maximum depletion would pay less tax than at present while smaller companies, new companies and companies unable to earn maximum depletion would pay more tax.

These findings have an important bearing on the formulation of our own long-run policy. Not only will the province have little or no scope to increase its own corporate or mining tax rates without raising the total tax burden on the industry, but will also face the new problem of evening out or compensating for the shifts in tax burden among companies that will arise under the proposed federal system.

Mr. Sargent: Why not give the same break to the farmers?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: With these and other considerations in mind, Ontario intends to pursue a mining tax policy which aims to achieve the following objects:

In the short run: Maintain the total tax burden on the mining industry approximately at its present level, at least until the impact of the new tax system can be determined.

In the long run: Increase mineral processing in Canada—to this end we are prepared to introduce further provincial tax incentives and to use our regulatory powers; preserve provincial revenues and revenue growth capacity from the mining industry as a whole; and ensure a relatively even impact of the new tax system among different mining companies.

We intend to compensate for tax shifts which otherwise would provide unwarranted tax reductions to some companies and endanger existing small mines and dependent mining communities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, given our taxation and spending policies, I expect Ontario's gross provincial product to reach \$38.1 billion, an increase of 8.9 per cent over 1970. On the basis of this forecast, total net general revenue is expected to reach \$3,847 million. This revenue estimate allows for a gross loss of revenue from the corporate income tax of \$125 million, and a further \$6 million loss from reduced succession duties.

Part of the loss from the corporate income tax will be recovered through the inevitable economic stimulus caused by this major tax decision. Yet our total 1971-1972 revenue will be only \$110 million higher than in the previous year.

Mr. T. Reid: But the Treasurer will be borrowing from the US?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As I have already indicated, our budgetary spending plans for 1971-1972 amount to a total of \$4,262 million. Our spending and tax policies for the current year constitute a responsible plan with immediate revitalization of the economy as its foremost rationale.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The expenditure policies, together with the significant tax reduction, will generate what I believe to be an appropriate budgetary deficit of \$415 million. This is indeed, sir, the largest deficit for Ontario on record but its composition, notably the tax reductions—

Mr. Sargent: It is not bad for the Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —should be an important factor in bringing the economy toward its potential. As such, it should reduce future financial problems of this government through increased generation of tax revenue. It is, however, a matter of some chagrin that the lion's share of such ultimate gains will go to the federal government because of its predominance in the direct income tax fields.

During the 1971-1972 fiscal year we will require \$49 million to retire maturing debt issues. Together with our \$415 million budgetary deficit, this would raise our financing requirements to \$464 million. Surplus non-budgetary sources of finance are expected to amount to about \$71 million, leaving our overall cash requirements at over \$393 million.

Our government has been able to avoid any borrowing in the Canadian capital market since February, 1968. This policy has proved particularly valuable as federal money policies created tight market conditions and high interest rates and inflationary demands on capital markets had to be avoided. We feel that the economic outlet for the current year is such that this government should once again enter the capital market.

Mr. T. Reid: Where?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: However, through the judicious use of our liquid reserves, and guided by economic and financial developments, we expect to choose the time and the place for our borrowings without adverse effect on capital market conditions, the value of the Canadian dollar or our high credit rating.

Mr. T. Reid: Impossible!

Mr. Sargent: The Treasurer may get a trip to Germany out of it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I have put before you the first budget of the government of the new Prime Minister (Mr. Davis). It has been framed in a climate of great economic uncertainty in this province and strong federal-provincial tensions in this country.

Mr. Breithaupt: And the last!

Mr. Sopha: It is exacerbating!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The 1971 budget faces these challenges with resolve and determination and charts the course for a renewed prosperity in Ontario and a strengthened federalism in Canada.

It proposes positive new measures—

Mr. Sopha: The government is at war with the federal government.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —to revitalize the economy and restore full employment in Ontario.

It cuts taxes to stimulate economic expansion and employment. It restrains government spending to free greater resources for individual taxpayers and private sector activity and heads off renewed inflation.

It advances long-term reforms aimed at strengthening local governments and relieving property tax burdens.

It launches new initiatives to provide a better quality of life for our citizens and to conserve public resources for future generations of our people.

It encourages Canadian ownership and participation in Canadian economic development.

Mr. Pilkey: I thought the government did not believe in that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It rejects unequivocally the trend toward greater federal domination of Canada's tax system and public programmes.

It asserts firmly the central importance of Ontario in building a new confederation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am confident, sir, that under the bold fiscal programme outlined in this budget and under the courageous, wise and imaginative leadership of the Prime Minister—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —with that kind of leadership, sir, Ontario will realize an even more dynamic and productive future, and, Mr. Speaker, a progressively Conservative future.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I understand we will have an opportunity to discuss this interesting document later this week. At this time I would like to move adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Nixon moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: With the concurrence of the House we will revert to introduction of bills.

Agreed to.

CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PLANNING ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this bill contains a number of features intended to facilitate the operation of committees of adjustments and

the land division committees in the field of subdivision control. It also provides for the automatic termination of approval of draft plans of subdivisions if final plans have not been submitted and approved within three years. It further provides for overcoming a means for circumventing section 26 of The Planning Act.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): The Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) mistakes again.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): All our friends!

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I should inform the members that tomorrow it is proposed to proceed with the estimates of The Department of Agriculture and Food.

There will be no sitting this evening and the House, therefore, would adjourn until tomorrow.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): The Treasurer is the greatest Tory of them all.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the government House Leader if he intends to refer that estimate outside the House to a committee?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I beg the member's pardon. I could not hear the question.

Mr. Peacock: May I ask if he intends to refer the agricultural estimates outside the House to the committee?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, here in the House. Mr. Speaker, I might suggest that we might also deal, perhaps, with second reading of the bill the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) has just introduced.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, is the House leader in a position to indicate which estimates are going to be referred outside of the House?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Not at the moment, but very shortly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Peacock: In the summer session, after the election.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4:45 o'clock, p.m.

APPENDIX

(see page 867)

ONTARIO'S FISCAL PLAN FOR 1971-1972
(\$ million)

1. At full employment before tax cuts	
Revenues	4,170
Expenditures	4,250 ¹
DEFICIT	-80
2. At full employment after tax cuts	
Revenues	4,100
Expenditures	4,250
DEFICIT	-150
3. Actual budget plan	
Net general revenues	3,847
Net general expenditures	4,262
BUDGETARY DEFICIT	-415

¹Net general expenditures at full employment will be \$12 million less than projected actual expenditures largely as a result of lower welfare expenditures as unemployment is reduced.

(see page 870)

COMPOSITION OF ONTARIO'S EXPENDITURES AND INVESTMENT

	1971-1972 Budget	Increases Over 1970-1971	
	\$ million	\$ million	%
Net general expenditures			
Transfer payments: operating			
School boards	1,014.0	179.7	21.5
CAATS, Ryerson	121.2	31.9	35.7
Universities and student awards	440.7	8.9	2.1
Property tax reduction ¹	237.9	17.5	7.9
Municipal road maintenance	75.9	13.1	20.9
Major health and welfare programmes	595.6	30.5	5.4
Other	181.1	22.7	14.3
	2,666.4	304.3	12.9
Transfer payments: capital	287.1	3.5	1.2
Direct capital spending	300.3	7.7	2.6
Direct operating spending	1,008.6	95.1	10.4
TOTAL NET GENERAL EXPENDITURES	4,262.4	410.6	10.7
Loans and advances			
Housing	142.2	41.9	41.8
Environmental and land management	77.6	31.7	69.1
Education	379.5	3.0	0.8
Other	117.9	32.1	37.4
TOTAL LOANS AND ADVANCES	717.2	108.7	17.9

¹Residential property tax reduction grants plus farm tax rebates, plus supplementary tax relief to pensioners, plus unconditional grants to municipalities.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 26, 1971

Ontario's position on continuation of the Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	849
Reassessing position re Harbour City project, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Singer	849
OSSTF's offer of \$25,000 to assist in research into school costs, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. T. Reid	850
Warnings to fishermen in northern waters re mercury pollution in fish, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Singer, Mr. Burr, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Stokes	850
Laying off of teaching staff at some community colleges, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	851
Deteriorating Ontario-Quebec relationships over agricultural legislation, questions to Mr. Davis and Mr. Stewart, Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald	852
Dispute between Fielding Lumber Company and rock and tunnel workers, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Martel	853
Guarantee from OMA that fee schedule will not increase again before 1973, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Peacock, Mr. Deans, Mr. T. Reid	854
Certain incinerators exceeding regulations for particulate emissions, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Lawlor	855
Representation at Supreme Court hearings on marketing legislation, contested by Manitoba, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Sopha	856
Farmers using Brazilian baler twine, question to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Yakabuski	857
Concern over use of electronic surveillance equipment, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. J. Renwick	857
Hunting of wolves by aircraft in Kenora area, question to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Sopha	858
Effectiveness of Emisco pollution control device, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Burr	858
Comments by taxing officer in Ontario Reports re charges by special examiners, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Breithaupt	859
Unveiling of Ontario Consumer Caravan, statement by Mr. Wishart	860
Continued use of existing studded tires, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Good, Mr. Braithwaite	860
Compensation to commercial fishermen for damages through mercury pollution, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Makarchuk	860
Tabling report on ownership of resort and recreation lands, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Nixon, Mr. T. P. Reid	861
Formula for mining revenue payments to mining municipalities, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Ferrier	861

Lowering of voting age and age of majority to 18, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. T. P. Reid	861
Budget address, Mr. McKeough	862
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Nixon, agreed to	881
Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Winkler, first reading	881
Succession Duty Act, bill to amend, Mr. Winkler, first reading	881
Planning Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading	881
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to	881
Appendix, Ontario's Fiscal Plan for 1971-1972, and Composition of Ontario's Expenditures and Investment	882



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, April 27, 1971
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

**(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests in the east gallery this afternoon are students from Main Street School in Toronto and Brighton Public School in Brighton. In the west gallery are students from Hillside Public School in Clarkson.

Later this afternoon we will have students from Holy Rosary Separate School in Toronto. This evening we will have with us the 15th Humber West "C" Cub Pack from Weston and the 125th "A" Toronto Scout Group from Toronto.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have two documents prepared for the members of the Legislature and members of the press gallery, the first of which sets forth the 1971-1972 capital support programme for Ontario universities; the other of which deals with operating support for provincially-assisted universities in Ontario for 1971-1972 and 1972-1973.

These are lengthy and complicated documents with statistical exhibits attached. With Mr. Speaker's permission I will not read them, but rather table these reports and distribute copies to the members of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Good Lord! No ministers present! I guess the Premier (Mr. Davis) is in Scarborough North to save again the seat of the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Wells).

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I was looking for the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough). I have a couple of questions for the Attorney General.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): I am sure the member for Downsview has

REDUCTION OF VOTING AGE

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney General can advise the House as to whether or not the government has accept-

ed his advice that the voting age be reduced to 21?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The government is working on it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): The government has been working on it for four years.

An hon. member: The member for Downsview will have to do better than that.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions from the deputy leader?

Mr. Singer: Not at the moment, Mr. Speaker, until more ministers come into the House.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Scarborough West any targets?

Mr. Lewis: Many targets but no people, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

AGENCY STORES DISPENSING ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the the Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship.

Is the government considering setting up agency stores to dispense alcoholic beverages?

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister know what they are doing? They are going to call the election with the minister in the front bench. He will be surprised.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, the policy with respect to the establishment of agency stores in Ontario has been a policy of this government for quite some time.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Will these new agency stores be operated by private individuals and not by civil servants?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, as I have explained to the hon. member, it has been

the policy of this government for a number of years that agency stores, operated primarily I think in conjunction with camp operations—resort operations in northern Ontario—have been in existence for quite some time.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary question: Will there then be agency stores set up in Essex county?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

BAIL PROCEEDINGS

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Correctional Services.

Would the minister report to the House what steps his department has taken to implement the question of the procedure of granting bail to inmates of the institutions under his control in line with the statement which was made a few days ago by the Minister of Justice and Attorney General?

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question, we have always issued instruction to the various jails that they are to co-operate fully in making the information available to anyone who wants to pay bail. In other words, instructions have gone out that in the case of anyone wanting to put up bail, if the justice of the peace or bail magistrate is not there they are to give that person the names of the police officers who can give them the information where they can get the justice of the peace.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary question: Does the staff of, for example the Don Jail, under instructions from the governor or through the governor from the minister, take the initiative to approach the persons who are held in custody because of their failure to raise bail, specifically to explain to them what their rights are with respect to the bail system?

Hon. Mr. Apps: I am not able to answer that question exactly as to whether they take the initiative, other than the fact that I have with me these information booklets that have been given to the various jails with instructions to make sure that everyone coming into the jail gets these information booklets. I think the information is in the booklet, which would tell them exactly how they could go about asking to get bail.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary: Then the specific question of approaching a person who is held in the Don Jail on the subject of the provision of bail, is that it is not brought directly to his attention by verbal communication from the staff of the minister's institution?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite able to answer that question whether the people in the jail specifically tell them how they can get bail. I think the same purpose is accomplished by giving them the booklet, which outlines the procedure they should use in order to get the necessary information to get bail.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex South.

TOURIST, ANGLING ADVERTISING

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Tourism and Information: Is his department going to increase and redirect its advertising in relation to angling or sport fishing in the Province of Ontario and what programmes is he going to initiate to attract the sportsmen from the United States area who normally come into Ontario?

Hon. R. Guindon (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, we may redirect our programme, our advertising, by appealing to families for family fun. That is one of the changes we are contemplating right now.

Mr. Paterson: As a supplementary, did the minister or his department do any advertising this winter in relation to ice fishing? It was especially noticeable as being absent in the Detroit area this year.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I know of one programme in the Barrie area where it is put over the air by one of our representatives. As far as papers or television are concerned I would not know.

Mr. Paterson: Specifically with regard to advertising in the United States to attract tourists to come to Ontario, is the minister increasing this or not?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I think we are increasing some. As the member knows our budget for last year was \$1.6 million—

Mr. Lewis: Is that a proclamation on the Premier's desk?

Hon. Mr. Guindon —for advertising in the United States.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) have a question? He was on his feet a short time ago.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary!

Mr. Deacon: A supplementary to the minister: In view of the fact of the new change in status of fishing in northwestern Ontario, particularly with regard to the ban on eating the fish up there, is there going to be any real promotion to let people know they no longer have to fish just for fun there?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, we are looking at it right now.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF JOCKEY CLUB

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. I would like to ask him what intervention he contemplates in the public interest in respect of the proposed reorganization of the Jockey Club, the public corporation, in reference to its plans to turn itself into a so-called non-profit organization. Is he aware of the criticism of that reorganization that has been extant?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have heard of this proposal but it has not come officially to our attention. I presume an application will come through in due course and we shall then examine it very carefully and determine the matter of policy with regard to it.

Mr. Sopha: By way of supplementary, surely the minister is aware, reading the daily newspapers, of the nature of the criticism there has been? In the light of that, what does he propose to do?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am aware of what I have read, Mr. Speaker, as I said I am aware this has been published as to intention. The matter will definitely come through our department for examination and consideration and we will then decide what to do with it.

Mr. Speaker: Any further supplementaries?

The member for Scarborough West may now have the floor to complete his questions and thereafter the deputy leader of the Liberal Party.

CREATION OF NEW JOBS THROUGH BUDGET PROPOSALS

Mr. Lewis: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A question, first, of the provincial Treasurer. Could the provincial Treasurer indicate to the House the multiplier effect by way of jobs created with the five per cent rebate on the purchase of machinery and equipment in Ontario?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): No, I could not; nor did I indicate how many jobs would be created.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, this was referred to in the budget as the major economic proposal for creating jobs. The figure of 150,000 was used in the Treasurer's own text. The accompanying budget paper said, "100,000 to 150,000 jobs." On what basis are those jobs calculated, in relationship to, I assume, an index the Treasurer must have of job creation given the five per cent machinery allowance?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We need 150,000 new jobs in this province to get down to the three per cent rate of unemployment.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: What proportion of those jobs will come as a result of the minister's five per cent rebate on the purchase of machinery and equipment?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Well that is the programme of the government.

An hon. member: In the fullness of time.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): The government does not know the answer.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am not going to answer that question directly because I do not want to get into a numbers game on the new jobs which are going to be created.

Mr. Lewis: That we know, Mr. Speaker. I consider this profoundly serious because it is like the housing programme—it will evaporate under analysis.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: It will just disappear in 48 hours.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Sure it is. First the Throne Speech is a disaster, now the budget is a disaster.

Mr. Speaker: Order! If the hon. member has a question he will place it.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, by way of a new question, then, Mr. Speaker; by way of, I am sorry, a supplementary to this question—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Downsview has a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: I want to make a further supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: A further supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: If the minister indicated a loss in revenue of \$125 million by virtue of this programme, am I right in thinking, therefore, that the total expenditure he anticipates on machinery and equipment will be in the order of \$2.5 billion?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Right!

Mr. Lewis: Right! And by way of further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, how does that relate to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics private and public investment in Canada outlook, during 1971 for the Province of Ontario? When you subtract the cost of purchases for transportation and government, which the minister himself subtracted, this leaves an estimate of \$2.6 billion on machinery and equipment. Why is the minister paying five per cent to those whose projected purchases are identical with what the budget intends to stimulate?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Because, Mr. Speaker, although that report was released with a great deal of fanfare a week or two weeks ago by the federal Department of Industry, if the member will read that report he will find that it indicated that the increase in economic activity would come from governmental spending, from institutional spending and from housing. But it indicated that the increase in spending on manufacturing facilities was very, very slight.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, could the minister tell us, insofar as this five per cent refund on corporation tax

is concerned, whether or not there are going to be any controls if machinery is purchased in the United States and in fact supplies no new Ontario jobs?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It will supply the jobs, of course, wherever it goes to work.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): How many jobs?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The limitation is that it is machinery that is to be located in Ontario. Where the machinery comes from is not a limitation.

Mr. Singer: All right. By way of further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could the minister advise us whether any control is going to be asserted by government in the event that the machines replace jobs—in other words, that further automation takes place by reason of the purchase of machines and people are put out of work?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, naturally we are concerned, we have been concerned for some time on this side of the House, that increased productivity and modernization of plants can reduce the number of jobs—

Mr. Lewis: It does reduce jobs.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Oh, the member would have thrown the spinning jenny in the canal too!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But we happen to believe on this side—

Mr. Lewis: I should take that from a Luddite like the Attorney General?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member for Scarborough West will await his proper turn.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We happen to believe, Mr. Speaker, that if this province and this country are going to be productive and are going to be competitive in world markets then we must modernize and we must increase our technology, and we must make sure that our manufacturing facilities have the most modern equipment and are in a position to compete on world markets.

Mr. Lewis: All very impressive!

Mr. J. Renwick: All very fine, but that is not what the minister said.

Mr. Singer: By further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could the minister advise us why this benefit is limited only to corporations and that those who are not incorporated are not going to be able to take advantage of it, perhaps by way of the same opportunity in sales tax?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member, of course, is aware that we do not control the form of the personal income tax. If he is worried—

Mr. Singer: Sales tax, I said!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member asked why we were not making this benefit available. It is not open to us to make this available through the personal income tax form, as the member well knows.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, why could the minister not make it available by adjustments in the provincial sales tax, which he does control?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member is talking about two different groups of machinery and equipment.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Scarborough West wish a supplementary? Then the member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary: Is it not possible that this allowance, if it has the benefit that the minister believes it to have, could be extended to the small businessman who conducts an unincorporated business, having regard to the concern which this government always expresses for the small businessman?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, I would hope Mr. Benson would do something.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Would the minister consider restricting the credit to equipment purchased in Canada, unless such equipment is not available in Canada? In other words, is there a list which the federal government has that gives credit only if the foreign equipment is available on a better basis?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Presumably, Mr. Speaker, a great deal of this comes out in the tariffs themselves. What we want is a simple, uncluttered programme. We want to get this economy—

Mr. Pilkey: It sure is simple.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We want to get this economy rolling and we want to get it started today. We are not interested—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): They have achieved their objective.

Mr. J. Renwick: Why does the Treasurer not provide for an increase in consumer spending?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I can only say to the Premier, that I am glad we have got to them with this budget in the way we seem to have.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: Oh no, no! I was excited.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: My leader, Mr. Speaker, walked in with the orders of the day and the leader of the New Democratic Party was petrified that we were going to the people today. Just petrified!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: I thought he was going to challenge the socialists in an election.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Just petrified!

An hon. member: The member for Scarborough West had better go and talk to his daddy about it.

Another hon. member: The six per cent did not look too attractive.

Mr. Singer: Meanwhile, back on the budget. I hope the government can do better—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Perhaps we would allow the minister to complete his answer if he has not done so.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think I have answered it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): If he has an answer.

Mr. Stokes: It was just editorial anyway.

Mr. Speaker: This will be the final supplementary on this question.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Is the minister aware that of the \$2.5 billion which is expected to be spent by incorporated firms located in Ontario over the next 12 months, approximately \$1.8 billion is spent outside of Canada? And if so, would he not consider

restricting that specific incentive to equipment that is produced in Canada?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I do not accept the validity of the figures to begin with. I would simply say this—

Mr. T. Reid: What are the figures?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —what we wanted, as I started to say—

Mr. T. Reid: What are the correct figures?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —as I started to say, Mr. Speaker, what we wanted was a simple way to get this economy rolling today.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We are not interested in setting up a maze of bureaucratic procedures to decide whether they buy equipment here or in Hong Kong. Let us get on with this job.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): That is a change.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I come back to a slightly different variant of this matter, which is surely important. On page 24 of the budget the Treasurer described this as “a major move designed to produce a massive stimulus to business investment.” How did he arrive at the creation of 100,000 to 150,000 jobs through this programme?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I have already explained, Mr. Speaker, that the 150,000 jobs which we believe it is necessary to create in this province would bring the rate of unemployment down to three per cent.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, but if I understand properly the Treasurer cannot at this time guarantee that this programme will produce a single job. Indeed, the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Lewis: Introduction of equipment can frequently automate jobs—it is not unknown.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): On a point of order!

With great respect, I enjoy the question period, but I sense these are matters that

should be discussed when the members opposite make their contribution in the budget debate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the member for Scarborough West wants to make a speech he is going to have his opportunity to do so. And if we want to start making speeches during the question period—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Is the Premier in the chair?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —then members of the cabinet will be forced to do the same thing.

Mr. Singer: He is being rather sensitive.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not, but you know—

Mr. Singer: He is very touchy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

I have frequently pointed out to the members that the question period is their period of time, and if they use it in a manner which could be used better in question period time, and what is said better said in other debates or otherwise, then they are the losers thereby.

I would also hope that we would get on to questions which are of immediate public interest, after we have explored a reasonable amount of the budget statements yesterday. I think it is a proper place for questions, but I would also point out that the members are becoming quite adept at turning a statement into a question. It has been allowed up to now, but I think we will have to watch that more closely, otherwise the government is tempted, of course, to make a speech in reply and then nobody is happy.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): Why do you not just muzzle them?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West has the floor for a further question.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If I might answer that question, Mr. Speaker. The member has asked for guarantees—

Mr. Lewis: Of additional jobs.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I will guarantee the member this, that a programme to assimilate the private sector—which happens to be in line with the philosophy of those of us on this side of the fence—is guaranteed to do a better job than the—

Mr. Brown: It has taken them 25 years!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —socialist claptrap spending programmes which the member for Scarborough West advocates.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: I would like to deal with this balkanizer of Canada across the way.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: This man who makes a fetish of wrecking Confederation in the name of parochialism—

Mr. Speaker: Order; order; order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you, sir—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: —to prevent these provocations to the members of my party who sit quietly in the opposition and await.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, what wonders, precisely, the private sector will perform? How many jobs? I want to hear it in the House.

Mr. Speaker: Unfortunately the hon. member is re-asking a question which the member has asked. He is repetitious. I rule that question out of order.

Mr. Lewis: Okay! Well, may I point out, Mr. Speaker, you should rise to protest—

Mr. Speaker: Order; order!

Mr. Lewis: —against this fraud yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Stokes: It is as much of a fraud as the government's housing programme.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the provincial Treasurer on another matter.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we would give the member for Scarborough East the opportunity to ask a supplementary and the House will make sure that he is not repetitious also.

Mr. Deans: The question is out of order.

Mr. Lewis: If my question was out of order, I fail to see how a supplementary can be permitted.

An hon. member: It was ruled out of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member was not asking a new question, he was asking the same question again.

Mr. Lewis: No, no, no. I am asking a separate question.

Mr. Speaker: No, when the hon. member asked about the number of jobs he was asking the same question as he had asked before. Therefore there could be supplementaries—

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Speaker: —because it was the same question as before. Therefore, in my opinion, the hon. member for Scarborough East has the floor for a supplementary.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

Mr. Lewis: Ask how many jobs.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, could the Treasurer explain to the House how small incorporated businesses can take advantage of this five per cent incentive when they cannot borrow money below eight per cent?

Mr. Speaker: In the first place, that is not a supplementary question. In the second place, the question has been more or less previously asked.

The member for Scarborough West has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: More, not less Mr. Speaker, more!

I have a question of the provincial Treasurer as I look for another jewel in his budget. It relates to the section on nursing home care.

Mr. Speaker, can the Treasurer say why the budget baldly states: "This assumes that a fee of \$3.50 per day will be charged," but in the Treasurer's press release he referred to a needs-test principle. Does the Treasurer intend to have a needs-test principle for the nursing home coverage?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Give the member for Scarborough West another jewel.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence), will announce the details of the programme.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: It is the Treasurer's budget; he must know something about it.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member—

Mr. Lewis: Admittedly we know very little, as the last few minutes have demonstrated.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Scarborough West will address through the Chair.

Mr. Lewis: This is a legitimate question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Treasurer setting a flat \$3.50 per day or will there be a needs-tested formula for those in receipt of pension?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I can only say that if the leader of the NDP will remain patient, my colleague the Minister of Health will in due course supply the member for Scarborough West with the details which he is so desperately trying to find out.

Mr. MacDonald: There is no cabinet decision on this yet?

Mr. Lewis: There is not a document that the Treasurer has produced which is intelligible.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, of the provincial Treasurer, in another aspect of his budget.

Mr. Speaker: At 2:30 exactly we will cease debating the budget and we will go to other questions.

An hon. member: What does Mr. Speaker mean, "debating"? I thought we were going to have a budget debate. This is the oral question period.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—we are not debating the budget.

An hon. member: Well who is debating it?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: The budget is the most important single document that this government has produced to date; surely we can question about it through the whole extent of the question period?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is quite correct. There is nothing to prevent the hon. members from asking questions on the budget, but not debating it. This has developed into a debate. If the members will ask questions it is perfectly agreeable, but we will cease the debating. Questions will be asked and answers will be given and there will be no debate.

Mr. Lewis: I will debate for only two minutes more, Mr. Speaker. May I ask a question of the provincial Treasurer about the civil service guidelines, the mandatory wage imposition in his budget. The civil service has been negotiating since January in good faith with the government. I gather they are now going to arbitration, and unbeknownst to them, without advance news of the five per cent ceiling. Will the Treasurer accept binding arbitration if it grants an increase above five per cent?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: To begin with of course, Mr. Speaker, that is a hypothetical question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Let me say this: The budget does not speak of guidelines. It speaks of our aim to limit on the average this year's salary increases to an average of five per cent. It does not speak of guidelines.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary: If the arbitration in which the Civil Service Association is now engaged results in an increase on the average beyond five per cent, will the Treasurer accept the position of the arbitrator?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is a very hypothetical question.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Did the Treasurer not say at a press conference yesterday that he did not view an arbitration award as binding on the government if it exceeded five per cent?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I did not say that. I said that an arbitration award, whether it is five per cent, 10 per cent, 100 per cent or no per cent, is not necessarily binding on the Crown. It so happens that we have accepted, to my knowledge, each of the arbitration awards; but they are not binding on the Crown. The Crown cannot be bound. The member should know that.

Mr. Lewis: Why is the government making a scapegoat of the civil service?

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): I would like to ask, by way of supplementary, where the Treasurer and his government were last year when the federal government sought to set down a six per cent wage guideline. Do they not think they are a little late?

Mr. Brown: They are playing politics.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West has a further question?

Mr. Lewis: I think I should leave it now.

Mr. Speaker: The deputy leader of the opposition.

SUCCESSION DUTY CHANGES

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer.

In view of the fact that the changes in succession duty announced by him would reduce the number of estates to be taxed, would it not have been reasonable to announce at the same time a very substantial reduction in the number of civil servants and the office expenses required to continue to maintain the succession duty department of the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I believe this member will find that The Department of Revenue, as I recall, actually has a complement decrease this year.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, and in further relation to succession duties, if the minister is able to work the same arrangement that four other provinces have already worked, is there any reason why Ontario should continue in the succession duty field when the changes he announced yesterday bring the Ontario Act more in line with the federal Act than ever before?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): We are fighting centralization.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think the answer to that question is set out in the budget. There is a matter of a revenue loss somewhat larger than we would want to have in one year. There is also the matter that by our being in the field, succession duties in total are less than they would be if we got out of it and simply took the Ottawa share.

And there is the third point, which is most important, that we believe we should maintain a presence in this field because of its relationship to capital gains taxation. Until such time as the intentions of the federal government are clear as to capital gains taxation, we think we would be most unwise to surrender this related field in one fell swoop. We want to know first.

Mr. Singer: A further supplementary: Is it not equally true that the province is holding onto succession duties as a further bargaining point, notwithstanding the inconvenience to those people whose estates have to be dealt with by two departments and have to incur very substantial extra costs?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The conclusion of that is not necessarily correct. Certainly what I have said is that we believe it is prudent to keep hold of this tax until we know what is going to happen at Ottawa. I suppose that could be said to make it a bargaining point. I would point out to the member that for many years, for example, our corporation tax changes followed those changes that were made in Ottawa—followed to the letter—and there was always doubt, I am sure in the member's mind and my mind, as to the wisdom of maintaining our own corporation tax. Yesterday's budget, and the changes which we made in two areas, surely prove the worthwhile aspects of maintaining control over some tax fields.

EQUALIZATION OF BEER PRICES

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of another question of the Treasurer, is it not true that the reduction of beer costs in the north and the readjustment of beer costs in the south in fact produce to the Province of Ontario substantial extra revenue as well as producing to the brewers substantial extra revenue, so in fact the government has given nothing away at all?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It produced, as I recall, about \$2.5 million to the province, about \$2.5 million to the industry—which has not had a raise in its prices since January, 1968; and by one of the anomalies of this whole thing it produces something like \$3 million or \$4 million for the government at Ottawa through excise taxes. I must say that is a matter of some chagrin also.

Mr. Singer: Not really quite Santa Claus.

Mr. Singer: I wonder if the Treasurer could—

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question?

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): By way of supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Treasurer whether the principle that has been applied to equalizing the cost of beer across Ontario will now be applied to equalizing the cost of gasoline and fuel oil across Ontario, both of which are very high in northern Ontario?

Mr. Speaker: This of course is not supplementary to the original question. The deputy leader has the floor.

FISHING LICENCE FEES

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Treasurer could advise us whether the revenue expended in collecting fishing licence fees, and the cost of administration of that department, in fact exceeded the money that came in?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, the amount of resident fishing fees was about \$1.6 million net; the gross was about \$1.8 million. The cost ran in the neighbourhood of 10 per cent of the amount collected—which of course is rather high.

Mr. Singer: Of those people who bought fishing licences, could the Treasurer tell us what percentage that is of those people who fish?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: How effective was the enforcement?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have mine on the wall. I hung it up on a plaque. I did not get it fixed.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The hon. member, I think, is asking how many people were fishing without a licence. Well, we have no way of knowing that. There were some charges, as there always are, laid by the conservation officers and others. That was not a large part of the consideration. The people of this province are generally law-abiding people who obey the law and would have bought a licence. We are sure of that. We trust the people over here.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A supplementary question. How much revenue will be lost by commissions paid on licences

already issued this year which will be refunded?

Mr. Sargent: One hundred and fifty thousand!

Mr. Speaker: I am sure that is neither an urgent question nor is it one that should be asked in the oral question period.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: It may be a good question but this is not the proper place. The hon. minister does not have that information.

PURCHASES BY LAND BANK

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have one more question of the Treasurer. Will any of the \$20 million that is set aside for the land bank be made available to assist the borough of North York in the purchase of York Downs golf club?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I will be introducing legislation, or one of my colleagues will, in due course, and I would prefer to wait to answer that question until that time. I think there is assistance for the land bank corporation.

I notice there are press reports today indicating that it might be used for housing land. We already have such a programme through Ontario Housing and we are not envisaging in this corporation, purchasing land for housing. If the land bank goes ahead through OHC and through, in some instances, joint arrangements with Central Mortgage and Housing—whether York Downs is the sort of thing that we are talking about specifically here—I am not prepared to say at this moment or to give a definitive answer. Assistance, I think, would be available to Metropolitan Toronto or the borough of North York through perhaps a couple of other programmes—The Parks Assistance Act and The Conservation Authorities Act. Really what we are looking for is something very much in the future. We see land daily—

Mr. Lewis: Right, like Caledon Mountain Estates.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —which is not needed today for park purposes within an area—

An hon. member: Or Malvern!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and perhaps will not be needed for 10 or 20 years, but in the long-term public interest should be purchased now.

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It may be that this will eventually become a revolving fund.

Mr. Stokes: Like Manitoulin!

Mr. Lewis: Like the Niagara Escarpment perhaps?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Niagara Escarpment, for example.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary. In view of the fact that the minister in his budget statement, page 22, dealing with this Ontario Land Acquisition Corporation, said that these moneys are going to be used to maintain, in public use, particularly land in and around our urban centres, does that tie in with the answer he just gave us? Or does the answer he just gave us differ from that statement?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, it ties in.

Mr. Singer: Is the government going to make money available out of this fund to municipalities, such as North York or Metropolitan Toronto, which have a one-time chance to maintain in public ownership a large golf course?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think this is a hypothetical question until the legislation is here. We are thinking mainly at this point—we have not developed all our thinking on this completely—but mainly of provincial purchases rather than assisting in municipal purchases.

Mr. Speaker: Any further supplementaries? If not, the hon. member for Ontario South.

Mr. Lewis: The minister should bring in another budget.

Mr. MacDonald: He is outdoing Walter Gordon.

INCLUSION OF PROVINCIAL BUILDINGS FOR TAXATION

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): I should like to ask the Treasurer when is the minister going to include provincial public buildings serviced by municipalities for taxation purposes?

Mr. Lewis: That is a hypothetical question.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I say to the hon. member for Ontario South that the long-term aim of the government in tax reform is to

make provincial buildings and provincially assisted land and buildings fully taxable. We took another step in that direction yesterday in that the community colleges will now be eligible for tax to \$25, as will provincial parks. Buildings are another step along the way, and given the constraints of revenues of the province. I do not know just when that will happen, but it certainly is part of our long-term aim.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Paterson: On what basis will, say provincial parks, be assessed? At their current rate of value or that at the time when the land was acquired for the purpose of the taxation?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) will be announcing the details of that programme. I am not going to stand here and give the details of the programmes of a number of other departments.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Correctional Services advises Mr. Speaker that he wishes to correct an answer which he gave earlier today. I think he should be given that opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Speaker, thank you. In order that I will not leave any incorrect impression with the member for Riverdale, I would like to advise him that the information booklet I held up is distributed in the correctional institutions rather than in the jails. They are not available in the jails but are being made available to the correctional institutions around the province. I wanted to clarify that.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kent.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. J. Renwick: A question then! Am I correct, then, that there is no booklet issued by the minister's department that is available in the institutions throughout the province, such as the Don Jail, relating to the question of bail information?

Hon. Mr. Apps: No. At the present time there is no information, but I understand that our department is discussing this with the Attorney General's department, making this information available in the jails.

Mr. Lewis: Is that so? The minister just prints it and hands it out?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for Kent has the floor.

NOVA LASER SYSTEM

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of University Affairs.

Is it true equipment owned by the University of Windsor, known as the Nova Laser system, is being used by a contractor in the Province of Ontario which other construction companies feel is unfair competition?

Hon. Mr. White: I have no knowledge of that, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member would provide me with details of that report, I will be very happy to explore it.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary? The member for Sudbury East.

SUDBURY LABOUR COUNCIL REQUEST FOR MEETING

Mr. Martel: I have a question of the Minister of Health.

In view of the fact that on two occasions in the past few months the Sudbury Labour Council has written the minister for a meeting with members of the medical profession in Sudbury, the unions and the minister's staff to discuss the hospital crisis, can the minister indicate when he intends to reply to these requests by the labour council?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): I had not known that the replies had not been forwarded, Mr. Speaker. I will do so this week.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO STUDY OF TOURISM

Mr. T. P. Reid: I have a question of the Minister of Tourism and Information.

Can the minister indicate the purpose of the study that is now being undertaken of tourism in northwestern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I should like to know if this is a study concerning tourist councils. To which study is the member referring?

Mr. T. P. Reid: I believe it is a study commissioned by the minister's department to some firm in Toronto. They are going around visiting, in my area particularly, and spending two hours and turning out a report of some kind. I would like to ask, by way of further question, if this further study means that the one done by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Company, and presented to the government in 1968, is now redundant and of no value to the government?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of such a study going on in northwestern Ontario, but I will check for the member and let him know.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Tourism and Information or the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. Speaker: The member might please say to which minister he is addressing it.

Mr. Sargent: I guess it is to the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. Speaker: The Provincial Secretary.

LIQUOR LICENCES IN RESORT AREAS

Mr. Sargent: With regard to the new legislation granting liquor licences to resort areas, is the minister involved now in granting these licences and how many has he processed?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that licences under the resort areas programme have already been issued, but I would be very pleased to check into the matter for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

CORPORATION TAX

Mr. Deans: I think this is a question of the provincial Treasurer.

Is it the intention of the government to phase out corporation tax as a major source of revenue for the province and to replace it with personal income tax?

An hon. member: That is a stupid question!

Mr. Deans: Might I ask then, by way of a supplementary question, how the Treasurer explains the continuous decline in the use

of corporation taxes as a major source of revenue and the fact that personal income tax has replaced it in the Province of Ontario over the last 10 years?

Mr. Yakabuski: The hon. member will never become leader asking a question like that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The personal income tax, of course, is a much more elastic and growth tax than is the corporation tax.

Mr. Lewis: Growth tax?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The personal income tax grows much more quickly than the corporation tax, given the same rates. The rates have been the same for both taxes for the last few years. I do not know when they were last changed. Percentage-wise, it is quite correct to say the personal income tax has been providing a larger share of provincial revenue proportionately than corporation tax.

The only way around this, of course, would be to raise the rates of corporation tax or to lower the rates of personal income tax.

Mr. Deans: Not a bad idea. It might have been useful in this budget.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The other reason, of course, which shows up rather dramatically, as to why corporation taxes have declined, in the last year particularly, was simply that there was not the same amount of dollars of profit there to pay taxes on.

Mr. Deans: Nor were there the same number of people working.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East has the floor.

CAPITAL EQUIPMENT INCENTIVE GRANT

Mr. T. Reid: I have a question of the provincial Treasurer.

Could the provincial Treasurer explain to the House how the five per cent incentive grant on capital equipment will create employment in the mining industry in this province, when in that industry employment has been falling, partially and primarily because of the introduction of equipment?

Could the minister comment on that fact when, I believe of the \$2.5 billion spent on equipment in this province, approximately \$500 million is spent by the mining companies? Will this not in fact decrease employment in that area?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Put it on the order paper, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order paper!

Mr. T. Reid: If the hon. minister does not understand that question, the hon. minister does not understand his budget.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

PATIENTS TO HOMES FOR SPECIAL CARE

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health.

Has there been a freeze on the movement of patients from Ontario Hospitals into homes for special care? If so, is it province-wide; when did it begin; how long will it last; and what is the purpose for such action?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I know of no freeze, but may I take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

EQUALIZING BEER COSTS

Mr. Knight: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to re-put a question to the provincial Treasurer. I would like to ask the Treasurer whether the principles applied to equalizing the cost of beer across Ontario—and thereby lowering it in northern Ontario—are, as it were, the tip of the iceberg? If this experiment is successful, will it be applied to equalizing other costs, like fuel and gasoline?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that is within the power of this government and as long as we are able to discharge our duties, that will happen.

Mr. Martel: That will not be much longer.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): The hon. member knows better.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Mr. Singer: This experiment will give the government another \$2.5 million worth of revenue.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the report on the coroner system in Ontario by the Ontario Law Reform Commission. And if I could have your leave, sir, because it is such an important report, I would like to make a few remarks; they are not too brief.

By a letter dated April 27, 1970, the Ontario Law Reform Commission was asked by the then Minister of Justice and Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), my predecessor, to undertake a review of The Coroners Act and related matters with particular attention to the recommendation in relation to coroners made by the royal commission inquiry into civil rights.

The commission has now completed its report, sir, and the report is what I have just tabled. Copies of it are available and are being distributed to the members. The report covers three major areas in relation to the coroners' system: constitutional matters, procedural matters and organizational, structural and functional matters. Each of the 15 recommendations of the royal commission inquiry into civil rights was considered in one or more of these areas and was made the subject of appropriate recommendations. The Law Reform Commission made many additional recommendations.

Firstly, on constitutional matters, it is not within the constitutional competence of the Legislature of Ontario to enact laws in relation to procedure in criminal matters, this being within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada. The coroner's inquest is classified at common law as a "court of criminal record."

The province has never exercised its jurisdiction under section 92(14) of The BNA Act to create the coroner's "court of criminal record," but rather has accepted the coroner's court as constituted at common law. Without deciding the matter and without developing it, there is *obiter dictum* of the Ontario Court of Appeal in which support is given for the view that because an inquest is a common-law criminal court, matters of inquest procedure are within federal and not provincial jurisdiction.

If this view is correct, all of the existing procedural sections of The Coroners Act are *ultra vires*, as would be any attempt by the Legislature to implement the improvements in inquest procedure recommended by the royal commission inquiry into civil rights—such rights, for instance, as creating a right to counsel, a right to be heard and other fundamental rights.

A court of five judges of the British Columbia Court of Appeal disagreed with this view of the Ontario Court of Appeal. It was held in British Columbia that with the exception of sections that do not appear in the Ontario Act, the procedural sections of the British Columbia Act are *intra vires* provincial government.

The Law Reform Commission therefore sought a sound basis for provincial legislative jurisdiction. This it did by recommending the repeal by the provincial Legislature of "so much of the common law that particularly relates to coroners or the coroner system as is within the constitutionally assigned jurisdiction of the legislative assembly of the Province of Ontario." The effect of such a repeal would be to do away with the constitution of the coroner's court of criminal record—an abolition that is within provincial jurisdiction by virtue of The BNA Act.

In place of the common law coroner and the common law coroner's inquest, the commission has recommended in this report the creation of a provincial system of public inquiries into deaths. The historical terminology of "coroner" and "inquest" is to be retained, but only for convenience. An inquest under the legislation recommended by the commission would not be a court of criminal record but a form of public inquiry which, in essence, is not relative to the criminal law but to public safety, public health and matters well within the jurisdiction of this House. The procedure prescribed for such an inquiry is likewise within the jurisdiction of the Legislature.

Mr. Singer: That makes sense.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: In respect of procedural matters, the purpose of the constitutional analysis and recommendations was to ensure that the procedure followed by Ontario coroners would be characterized throughout by natural justice and by due process of law. The commission has recommended a system whereunder the ancient inquisitorial procedure of the coroner would be substantially modified in favour of the approach for securing civil rights set out in the royal commission inquiry into civil rights. This was accomplished by recommending that procedures be adopted which would have the effect of securing to persons with a substantial and direct interest in the matter under inquiry essential rights for a fair hearing. That is, sir, the right to notice, the right to counsel, the right to be heard, the right to cross-examine, the right to a public hearing and the right to an unbiased jury.

It was recommended that the powers of the coroner over the liberty of the subject be considerably curtailed. In the event that a witness fails to attend, refuses to answer a question, or does any other thing which before a court would have been contempt, the commission has recommended that the coroner be required to state a case to the supreme court, where evidence would be considered and a proper order made in the circumstances.

The commission has recommended that no person charged with a criminal offence arising out of a death be a compellable witness at the inquest touching the death. The commission has recommended that all other persons be made compellable witnesses, subject to the legal rules concerning privilege. It may be a possibility that a criminal charge respecting a death could be withheld, in order to exploit the inquest as part of the criminal investigation. However, the commission is of the view that should such an improper course ever be taken, a person who refused to testify because he apprehended that he was being compelled to incriminate himself would be protected by the fact that he would be entitled to a hearing before the Supreme Court before being punished for refusal to testify. In a proper case, the Supreme Court would simply refuse to make any order for punishment.

Finally, in respect of organizational, structural and functional matters, sir, the report contains a series of recommendations designed to strengthen the supervisory and disciplinary aspects of the coroner system. It is recommended that a code of ethics for coroners be promulgated, and that a coroners' council, similar to the judicial council established under The Provincial Courts Act, be established. The coroners' council would function in an advisory capacity in the matters of appointment, discipline and termination of appointment of coroners.

It was recommended that the chief officer of the coroner system be called the chief coroner of the Province of Ontario, and have both more clearly defined responsibilities than those now conferred on the supervising coroner. This officer should be a coroner but because of the nature of his duties he would not conduct inquests unless directed to by the minister. The office of a full-time deputy chief coroner was recommended and the creation of a limited number of officers known as regional coroners. These should provide local supervision in populous districts under the direction of the chief coroner. The commission made proposals aimed at answering

the questions of whether some areas require full-time coroners and whether Ontario has the proper number of coroners.

Recommendations were made concerning the appointment of coroners with province-wide jurisdiction and a number of detailed procedures that are associated with the present limitations on the coroner's jurisdiction by county or municipal boundaries. Included in these are procedures relating to the powers of the local coroner, the local Crown attorney, the chief coroner and the Minister of Justice in transferring jurisdiction between coroners, ordering inquests and intervention into investigations being held by the coroner who has issued the warrant for the possession of a body.

The commission recommended that the Minister of Justice have power to appoint commissioners to conduct inquests in special cases and to appoint assessors to sit with the presiding officer at an inquest to provide specialized knowledge when required, for example where a death has resulted from alleged medical malpractice, or a disaster arising out of the collapse of a bridge or an aircraft tragedy.

Recommendations were made and designed to ensure that the coroner's powers of entry will be exercised in a manner that is consistent with accepted norms of civil rights. Recommendations were also made concerning the coroner's powers of seizure and his power to delegate his powers of entry and seizure to a police officer or even to a physician.

The commission recommended that public discussion or disclosure of matters that have come before a coroner in his official capacity should be limited. The commission concluded that this matter should be dealt with through the coroners' code of ethics rather than by legislation.

Finally, sir, it is not the intention of the government to proceed with legislation on this subject at the present session since the report obviously requires very serious consideration. We expect that further constructive comment may be forthcoming in the light of these recommendations and the publishing of the report so that they may be considered by the government over the next few months in full detail. The proposals of the commission are most interesting and helpful and I hope will assist all of the hon. members in considering the reform, the total reform, of the coroner system.

Mr. Sopha: Is a question for clarification in order?

Mr. Speaker: Really, questions, even for clarification, are not in order, but we have been in the habit of allowing a very limited number. I would allow the hon. member to ask it.

Mr. Sopha: Mine is very brief. Was there anything in that report about the replacement of medical people by lawyers as coroners as recommended by the Gregory commission in 1922?

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, there is comment on that. I would suggest that hon. member will have plenty of opportunity to study those aspects in the report.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): **Mr. Speaker,** I would like to table a report containing some information with respect to licence issuing that was requested a few days ago.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

CITY OF HAMILTON

Mrs. Pritchard moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PROVINCIAL PARKS ACT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Provincial Parks Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): The purpose of this bill, **Mr. Speaker,** is to provide for stop signs at entrances to and intersections in provincial parks.

FORESTRY ACT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Forestry Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The purpose of this bill, **Mr. Speaker,** is to provide for supplementary agreements.

GANANOQUE LANDS ACT 1961-1962

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Gananoque Lands Act, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: **Mr. Speaker,** the purpose of this bill is to provide an alternative method of disposal of the ungranted land described in the schedule of the Act.

FISH INSPECTIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Fish Inspections Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: **Mr. Speaker,** the purpose of this bill is to bring the Act in line with recent amendments to the complementary federal Act.

ELECTION ACT, 1968-1969

Mr. Young moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Election Act, 1968-1969.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Singer: Legalize the Waffle!

Mr. Lewis: The member will not get that from us.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): **Mr. Speaker,** the purpose of this bill is to lower the voting age in the Province of Ontario from 21 to 18.

Mr. Singer: That is good, we will go along.

Mr. Lewis: Another first. I did not hear the Minister of Trade and Development applaud.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day, there is a matter I would like to bring to the attention of the House. On Thursday, April 15, in response to a request from the member for Riverdale, I made a statement with respect to the participation of ministers of the Crown in committees of the House.

In my previous ruling reference was made to the practice of the Province of Manitoba, and the question was asked why other jurisdictions were not included. In answer to this suggestion communication has now been made with all other jurisdictions in Canada, with the following results:

In Newfoundland, ministers are always on committees. While at the time that communication was made the standing committees for the present session had not yet been struck, it is interesting that three of the five members of the striking committee are ministers. There also exists at the present time a select committee on fisheries, of which two of the seven members are ministers.

In Prince Edward Island ministers are always included in committees, usually at the ratio of two out of six.

In Nova Scotia, on the latest public accounts committee, there are two ministers, and on other committees there is usually one minister out of seven members.

In New Brunswick ministers are on all committees, except the public accounts committee, usually at a ratio of one minister in every four members.

In Quebec ministers are on committees, the only ruling being that a minister may not be a chairman of a standing committee.

Manitoba, of course, was covered in my previous ruling.

In Saskatchewan there is no hard and fast rule. Ministers are on some committees in the same way as other members of the House. At the present time there are three ministers on the education committee out of 24; five of the 26 members on the law amendments committees are ministers; one minister is on the 11-man public accounts committee; two of the five members of the select striking committee are ministers.

In Alberta it is the regular practice to have ministers on committees. At the present time seven out of 25 members of the privileges and elections committee are ministers; seven out of 25 on the law and regulations committee; six out of 35 on the public accounts committee; 17 out of 64 on the public affairs, agriculture and education committee; and nine out of 28 on the private bills and printing committee.

In British Columbia, ministers are put on the committees as a matter of course, on the same basis as other members of the House.

Even in the House of Commons of Canada, where the very large number of members make the participation of ministers less necessary, there is no hard and fast rule. While ministers are omitted from the majority of the committees, there are very frequent occasions when ministers are included.

The member for York South appeared to think that there was some reason for start-

ing the previous research into the practice of this House in 1946. As I explained at that time, this was done simply because 1946 marked the even quarter century. However, to resolve the hon. member's doubts, research has now been completed from Confederation, and it has been found that the participation of ministers in the years from 1867 to 1945 has been consistent.

For example, in the session of 1867-1868 there were four standing committees in which ministers were represented in the numbers five, three, three and one, the Prime Minister being on three of these committees. It is also interesting that the Prime Minister chaired the striking committee.

In the session of 1868 the number of standing committees was increased to five, the new committee being the public accounts committee, on which the Treasurer was a member, and the Prime Minister continued to sit on three committees.

Over the ensuing years the pattern remained consistent, ministers being represented on almost all committees, and the Prime Minister very often being a member of many committees. In the session of 1923, during the Drury ministry, it is to be noted that the whole cabinet were members of the private bills, municipal law and public accounts committees. During the Liberal regime of the 1930s and early 1940s, the practice remained unchanged. The Prime Minister was on all committees and the whole cabinet was on the public accounts committee.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: What happened during the NDP regime?

Mr. Speaker: I am much indebted to the new staff in the Clerk's office for a great deal of this research, which I think has been done very well.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, sir, I wish to put a question to the House leader as a prelude to some clarification which the deputy leader of the Liberal Party and I are seeking at 3.30 from members of the Prime Minister's staff. It was our understanding that in line with tradition practised in this House the leaders of the opposition parties would have an opportunity to reply to the budget with the full flood of television upon them. Our understanding is that for some reason the past practice is now under question and I wonder what the government's position is?

Mr. Brown: They are scared.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I have had no concern or anything to do whatever, either for the government or for the opposition parties with the television or other arrangements in this chamber. I know nothing of what arrangements were made or are going to be made.

Mr. Lewis: If I may continue the questioning, Mr. Speaker, has the House leader determined the speaking order for the budget? It was our general understanding that the leader of the Liberal Party—of the official opposition, if it makes my friend feel better—would speak on Thursday and that I would have the opportunity to follow on Monday with an hour time slot given as in previous years for television coverage.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The hon. member was such a disaster on television last night, I do not know why he does not just give up while he is ahead.

Mr. Pilkey: The Treasurer fell flat on his face.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Scarborough West has just set them forth, is the way I understand the speaking arrangements—the Leader of the Liberal opposition on Thursday and the member for Scarborough West the first of the week.

Mr. Pilkey: The colour was good though—the Treasurer's shirt and tie looked good.

Mr. Lewis: But, Mr. Speaker, what has happened to the agreement which was, I understand, negotiated with the CBC and which operated last year and the year before? Why is it suddenly being altered in an election year?

Mr. Speaker: I think in view of what the House leader has said that he is not in any position to answer the questions. Mr. Speaker is also concerned about it because the last that he heard about it was very much as has been said on the floor of the House, and I would undertake—and I am sure the House leader would—to look into the matter and try and advise the member, because I have no information on it at all at the moment.

Mr. MacDonald: On this point of order, Mr. Speaker. Speaking from past practices, if there is any departure from the normal procedures of this House, it can be done only with your approval and it was done with your approval. I know something of the matter because I was involved in the consultations that went on with the leaders

of the various parties in conjunction with yourself for the permission of the television cameras to come in.

Now it is passing strange, I would suggest to you, sir, if there has been unilateral action on the part of any media to come in and pick what they want without your approval or consultation, so that in effect, the opposition parties have been excluded. I would suggest, sir, that this is a matter that you should look into and report at an early date to the House.

Mr. Speaker: I must say that I had no knowledge that the lights were out here until I came in here today. I notice there are still cables outside—I nearly fell over one at noon—so that I was of the impression that there was no change. No one has been in touch with me, so I will be glad to look into it and I am sure the House leader will also, and we will get in touch with the—

Mr. Lewis: I suspect it is a nefarious plot on the part of the government.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, let me say I will be most happy to look into the matter. I know nothing of what arrangements were made, how they were made or for what duration. I shall certainly find out.

Mr. Lewis: I would choose the minister as an advocate every time.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, if I may add the little bit I know. There seems to be a—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I detect, Mr. Speaker, some criticism of the media, of the CBC. I am not normally one who would defend the CBC or the television media generally, however I think it must be said if they have decided after the events of last week that they have had a bellyfull of the socialists on television, I agree.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, speaking to that point of order—

Mr. Lewis: It was yesterday's budget which drove them into hiding.

Mr. Brown: We know how to run our affairs. They cannot even put on a convention!

Mr. Singer: I would advise you, sir, that a meeting has been convened in the lobby out here for 3:30; at which the hon. leader of the NDP and I will be present, along with, apparently, a representative of the Premier's office. But I would think that either the House leader or the provincial Treasurer—who are so knowledgeable about this and so anxious to defend equal rights for all people in this House—should make themselves present, because they could speak more authoritatively on behalf of government than the representative of the Premier's office.

Mr. Lewis: They have probably scuttled the public corporation.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. Lewis: First the attack on the public sector. That is right on CBC.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day. Has the House leader any order of the day?

Mr. J. Renwick: Move the adjournment again!

PLANNING ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 28, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I may.

At the time of the adjournment yesterday afternoon, the House leader announced that it might be possible that bills would be called. While we were in caucus this morning we received a notice from the whip of the Conservative Party advising us that all day today would be devoted to the estimates of The Department of Agriculture and Food.

We are of course ready to proceed, as we always are, but I think it would be most helpful in organizing the work of our caucus if it were possible for the House leader, for the government and the whip of the government to consult together before they dispatch notices to caucuses.

I would ask the House leader's co-operation in this matter.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, when the House rose last night I announced the order of business for today. If the hon. member will look at Hansard, he will find that I—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): What did the minister send around today?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —I specifically mentioned the bill introduced by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, this bill, No. 28—and I said that we would go to that secondly. So that is the order of business. If the members would listen, they would have it.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

There were three bills introduced yesterday, and while I was not here at the conclusion of the proceedings and did not hear what the House leader said, certainly—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is all in Hansard.

Mr. Singer: Well, the Hansard is not printed yet.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh yes it is.

Mr. Singer: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, one would think it would be the greater part of common courtesy that we should have a reasonable time available to look at the bills. In fact, we got no notice. In fact, we understood that it was the intention of government—and we did not find out until mid-morning that they again had changed their minds—to call the bill relating to the five per cent refund corporation tax and to call the bill relating to the changes in succession duties.

Now a bill having been introduced yesterday, Mr. Speaker, it is most unusual if the bill happens to be in our books today. It has just never happened before in that way. One must conclude that the government has been sitting on these bills because this was obviously printed in advance and could have been made available to us if the government had been able to properly organize their business.

Now this bill—we have been over the photostat copy of it; that was all that was available to us when we had a chance to discuss it. I say, sir, that is thoroughly unfair.

It is not a controversial bill. We are prepared to proceed, but we object most strenuously to the cavalier way in which the government tries to run the business of the House. Either they are cavalier and uncaring or they are just stupid.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): I vote for the second.

Mr. Speaker: Is this on the point of order?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, if I may just speak to second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will wait, because the minister always has the right to speak on the introduction of a bill, and also to close the debate.

On the point of order?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, just further on that point of order. I recognize that on occasion bills are printed and inserted in the book during the course of the morning. Surely it is a matter which should be referred to our standing committees—that when bills are shown on the order paper as not printed we can follow the order paper for the purpose of determining what business is going to be called?

Mr. Speaker: While the hon. member's point is perfectly good, I would point out to him that this is a debate proceeding in the House upon which a member may only speak once. I had not noticed it before he got speaking, unfortunately. I trust that the hon. members will watch this in the future.

Mr. J. Renwick: I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It would be just as easy for the hon. member on his left to convey the same views. Is the minister ready to proceed?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I want to speak briefly to the point of order again, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): He has already spoken.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has spoken twice to the point of order and it is not in order. I think we should not perpetuate the matter because I think it has been brought to the House leader's attention. I think he has indicated that he did make the necessary announcement yesterday in the House and also that the government, of course, must supervise the running of the House. I will take it upon myself to speak to the government whip to ensure that such an occasion as happened today, I hope would not happen again in the future.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege if I may. I think this is privilege. I would point out that when this bill was introduced, and before it was introduced, there was a great demand on the opposite side of the House that it be dealt with most expeditiously.

Mr. Martel: That is a red herring.

Mr. Singer: There are 50 bills we want to have introduced.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Therefore, to accommodate the House, this was done.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Municipal Affairs has a wish to speak on the introduction of the bill.

Mr. Singer: This is probably the most inefficient House since 1867.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to unduly prolong this particular discussion, but I would simply say that yesterday I undertook to the hon. member for Peterborough that if the bill could not be printed, I would see that mimeograph copies would be made available to all members of the House. I checked this morning and the bill was printed and, I was told, in the books even though on the order paper, since the staff did not really have time, it was marked as not printed. Members of this House have requested that this matter be dealt with as expeditiously as possible once it was introduced and that is the reason we are proceeding with it in this manner.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps then the hon. minister would wish to proceed with the bill. Does he wish to make any statement at the beginning of the debate?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I think not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North?

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): I must say that I thought the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) was unduly—there were times when he would bring in six or eight bills in the last two weeks of the House and expect them all to get passage. This bill, having received first reading yesterday and being dealt with in second reading today, of course, puts that much more pressure on us in opposition.

I do wish to thank him for sending a copy of the printed bill to me at 1:10 this afternoon. The copy which came to our caucus was of course, one copy only with which we had to deal overnight.

The bill itself deals with many amendments, some of which are amendments to Bill 162 of last year, which I thought was going to take care of certain situations which needed looking after. Evidently additional amendments were required, so we have various principles in this bill, to all of which we give agreement—the first one, particularly, will plug loopholes that have been used on various occasions across the province to get plans of

subdivisions through, or separations of parcels of land on which devious methods were used, without getting proper consent.

We agree heartily to the amendment and the principle in the first section of the bill whereby the fee will remain with the grantor. Therefore consents will be required through the proper channels before property separation or plans of subdivision can be established.

A section deals with the consents, of course, which must be utilized within two years after the date upon which the consent was granted, otherwise they lapse. This, of course, was just an amendment to the bill of last year when one year was the time factor. I suppose the extra time involved is due to the fact that quite often one year is not sufficient for the proper operations to proceed.

On the principle by which the land division committee will not have jurisdiction in areas where a committee of adjustment is in operation, or an official plan has been filed with the minister, except by permission of bylaws of that municipal council, I suppose, as the land division committees become more sophisticated, some municipalities would in fact want to hand over their consent authorities to the land division committee.

I presume that is the reason for this being in there. I could not think of any other. Perhaps the minister will give us that idea. Will he give me a more definite answer on that, the reasons for that section?

The use of the approval: Draft plans of subdivision must be used now in a period of three years otherwise they become invalid according to the principle of this next section. I would judge that this is to prevent trafficking or the resale of land on which draft plans have been approved prior to complete plans of subdivision. Now we all know that land on which draft plans approved for subdivision are available would command considerably higher value.

If this in fact is brought in for that purpose—to prevent trafficking in land which has these plans of approval, these draft plans of subdivision, for a three-year period only—I would greatly favour the principle that is involved there. This I understand—I see by the second part of the section—could be extended by the minister. I suppose it is certainly common or not unthinkable that it is going to take more than three or four years to get final approval through that department over at 801 Bay Street. If conditions get much worse than they are now this may even have to be extended even more than that.

The minister here can extend the draft plan approval beyond the three-year period if for one reason or another, because of delays, final approval cannot be had in three years.

The bylaws establishing committees of adjustment must now give 30 days' notice before the committees of adjustment can become legal. I would hope in that 30-day period after the department has been given notice that the municipality has passed bylaws to establish a committee of adjustment, that The Department of Municipal Affairs would then see that this committee of adjustment is properly schooled and trained in its duties regarding severances and matters over which it would have control; especially relating to minor boundary changes where you have people who are not in their proper zoning areas. I would hope that this 30 days' notice is in here for that particular purpose.

The principle of raising the fee of an applicant to a committee of adjustment from \$25 to \$50, I presume, has been figured out to be in keeping with present day inflated prices, so basically, Mr. Speaker, we will support this bill on second reading.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a few comments on this.

My colleague, the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman), had asked the minister that this be hurried through, as he was concerned about what had been taking place in the Peterborough area. I want to say on his behalf that he had done so, not in an effort to frustrate development, but to stop the desecration of the area. White Rock Estates, in their actions of last year, showed pretty clearly how easy it is to destroy a local township by the use of the legislation that this is intended to correct.

In the case of Peterborough, for example, there was a recent hearing. Prior to that there had been something in the order of 12,000 lots created in the Victoria, Peterborough, Renfrew and Sudbury areas within about a one-month period. So in actual fact this legislation is going to be complementary to the planning legislation of the province and will enable the local municipalities to carry out a proper planning function without permitting developers to abuse what had been previously a loophole in the legislation.

It is interesting to note that some of the plans of subdivisions had been turned down by the community planning branch and I am

curious to know why that had taken place. They are now registered and it is also interesting to note that the Lindsay registry office, prior to this legislation—perhaps it has increased even to date—there had been 800 lots registered. It seems that the solicitors and the developers had found a pretty genuine loophole that was being used to convey the holdings of major developers—land speculators in most instances—to convey these and parcels of land by the use of one single deed.

I am certainly hoping that this legislation will pass through here today and that we will be able to put an end to what has been a frustrating experience for many municipalities in the province of Ontario.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): There is a very grave problem, Mr. Speaker, which concerns the efforts of the government minister to make this legislative requirement more effective and more speedy, and the minister is probably aware, as my friend the last speaker says, that the community planning branch of his department is very intimately involved in these matters. There is a syndrome of great irritation and complaint within that branch of the tardiness with which plans of subdivision are dealt with. It is no exaggeration to say that in the districts of Sudbury, with which I am most familiar, anything up to 18 months is involved from the first filing of the plan until final approval by the minister.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): The hon. member is lucky.

Mr. Sopha: We are lucky?

Mr. Gaunt: The hon. member is lucky.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I hear my colleagues in the profession saying that it is up to 18 months and I refer the minister to the fact of which he is aware and with which I acquaint the House that in the district of Thunder Bay his predecessor designated an official who apparently has power to make the final decision.

The Thunder Bay people were effective, I suppose, on the basis that geographically they are so far distant that they needed a local mechanism of control. I have written to the predecessor of this minister pleading with him for the designation of a similar official, armed with appropriate powers, in Sudbury.

The previous minister, of course, always an aspiring figure, to great and dizzy heights, was not a man who was known for the

rapidity with which he answered his correspondence. That was not one of his more fetching qualities. I did receive a vague reply from him that the matter was being considered.

I raised this with this minister at the time of his last visit to Sudbury and I can only, again, on behalf of those people that are involved, plead in this form with him for an early resolution of that difficulty. We, on this side of the House, believe in decentralization and one thinks of the "very far-reaching limbs," to use Toynbee's words, of this province, whereon there is every good reason for the decentralization of bureaucratic functions such as this. The man does not have to be under the eye of the minister—constantly under his surveillance. And, of course, it is very closely related to the desperate housing problem.

It is a remarkable thing—just to put it in real terms, for the edification of my friend from Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. R. G. Hodgson)—that International Nickel Company is scouring the nation and other parts of the world for workers, 18 years of age, at least 150 pounds, in good health, with nothing wrong with their spinal column—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we could get back to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Sopha: Well, half the population of Inverness has moved to Sudbury to work in the mines and they need houses. The two things go together.

This is directly related to the function of The Planning Act. It is quite wrong for bureaucratic and legislative controls to thrust themselves between people's human need for housing—their right to it—and the efficient functioning of the economy and the response of those of us who are in charge of providing them with decent housing.

I hope the minister, when he addresses some remarks, will be able to assure me that at least in that area, perhaps for all of north-eastern Ontario, that in short he will designate an official with the powers to decide on subdivisions.

As a lawyer who does not practise in this area I see no reason why it would need more than perhaps three months at the outside. Surely all inquiries could be made within 90 days to enable the minister to make his decision on it. We all believe in the social-controlled regulation of land resources, but also we have a deep obligation to respond quickly. When he rises I hope he will tell me

that these pleas will be given a sympathetic ear by him and the difficulty—as far as it is a human one—will be removed.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is obviously fire engine legislation. I remember a previous occasion a year ago when this same section of the same Act which is being amended today was brought before us. Within a period of hours the minister, as he then was, of Municipal Affairs, had sent the developers, the land speculators—not that I have any great feeling for them—and the legal profession as a whole which dealt in conveyancing into a tailspin with respect to the problem of consent on abutting lands. Very few registrations were going through the registry offices of this province for many days thereafter until the problem became obviated in terms of what that consent meant.

Surely the problem that it is being sought to remedy here has been long known to The Department of Municipal Affairs? Those loophole lookers, those fellows who spend time, and are rewarded for devising means of getting around the law, found the department's previous legislation was too precipitous and not sufficiently thought out—as I hope this is not the case with this bill. They found a number of devices—two or three ways—in which to get around the previous legislation.

This wiped out that 10 acre business and made all land in the province subject to, in one form or another—either by registration by an official plan or through various forms of consent through planning boards, committees of adjustment or, finally, where these were not available the minister himself—all subject to these approvals prior to registration irrespective of the size of the land.

Having come up against that particular problem, where they could not convey without either of these two conditions being present, they then begin to embody into a single deed—not a multiplicity of deeds—conveying, or mortgaging, or in any way dealing with the signing, or what not, of various parcels of land singly. They would take a strip of 100 lots and embody them in a single document.

In the body of the document would be such wording that the grantor grants to 100 different names, if you will, and as the case was in some instances. Many of these names were nominees. Many of these are fictitious

names. The secretary in the legal office might become the happy beneficiary of a block of land.

If it was done that way, done with simultaneity, done all at once, the purpose of the Act was then undermined and the loophole was created because there was no residual land, there was no abutting land left. It was all caught up into a single conveyance and swung over to other names, however fictitious that whole procedure might have been. This is what this present legislation is designed to do.

Another way of effecting it, I understand, is that the solicitor would arrive at the registry office with an envelope containing quite a number of single deeds conveying the property in whole over to another individual. The thing would be set up in advance. He simply handed the envelope over, the total conveyance; delivery of title was effected on the spot at a single instant. The important thing there being that it is not the question of time of registration, which has to be done obviously *seriatim*, even if only a few seconds apart; that is the determining factor at the time of delivery to the other solicitor.

Deeds and even other mortgages, for that matter, or any conveyances, need not be registered on titles in this province in order to constitute them valid and binding. It is a simple relation between two private individuals and if they see fit, as in all prudence they ought to do, to register the documents subsequently, so be it.

Perhaps some thought should be given on the principle of this bill, in obviating the difficulties there are under this present section, to making registration mandatory. Certainly that would solve an awful lot of difficulties, and moreover the specific difficulty we are confronting here. If registration were the time—the formal, explicit, legal time—at which title in any of its various modality passed—the time should be that of registration. Anyone who does not register is already foolish as things presently stand, because if he does not seek, as in the case of a deed, to register the document, surely the other fellow can sell it to somebody else tomorrow and pass title and the binding effect would lie, subsequent thereto, in the registered document. It would have priority in law in the form of notice, although it could be contested as to its fraudulence over and against the person so doing.

These thoughts are the background situation with respect to this legislation. We in this party will support the legislation. I did

not raise my voice at all with the expedition with which this is to be carried forward. As to specific nice points which might be mentioned, I would ask the minister to consider, even if it is this afternoon, putting it through the Committee of the Whole House so that more time will not be taken in this debate on principle with respect to various matters which may be brought to his attention with respect to the provisions touching lapse. There are two different provisions under that particular heading which I will not go into, and other rather minor matters which affect this legislation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ontario South.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to first commend the minister for introducing Bill 28. The bill is certainly needed here in the Province of Ontario to cover the loopholes in The Planning Act. However, I am a little concerned about section 5.

I realize that by raising this fee from \$25 to \$50 it probably helps to cover the cost of operation of our committee of adjustment. However, I find in my own area and, I am sure, in many parts of the province that many people suffer who make application to the committee of adjustment to be heard and only to be turned down and have to pay a \$25 fee.

The person I am concerned about is the person who has a small lot and wants to make an adjustment on it and is going to have to pay a \$50 fee, because I am sure if it is permitted it will be done by these committees of adjustment. I would like to ask the minister to explain the reason for this increase; and secondly I would like to know if this bill will have third reading and royal assent today.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): I too would like to see this legislation passed if possible today, Mr. Speaker. I believe the member for Wentworth has pointed out the extent of my concern. I did mention before in the House—you will find some remarks on page 596 in Hansard. I also would like to ask the House to give every consideration to the expediting part of this bill through the process here today, as I believe that if we have planning at all it must be proper planning. For those reasons, sir, I would urge the members to speed this process.

Mr. Speaker: Is there further debate before the minister closes? The minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, dealing with the various points that have been raised in reference to this bill, I would just mention that when we provide legislation which does restrict the normal conveyance or the pre-conveyance of land any way one would like, there is bound to be, from time to time, ways devised to circumvent the provisions of the law. In this instance there was a decision before one of the county courts and, taking that decision into consideration, it was necessary to devise legislation which would meet the problem created by that decision and thereby prevent the division of land in irregular and improper ways that people might decide upon at some time in the future. For that reason, section 26 has been amended as provided under section 1 of this bill, and it will, I think, meet the requirements. We have drafted it carefully, and taking into account the particulars of the decision—

Mr. Brown: Is that what the minister did the first time around?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I beg pardon?

Mr. Brown: Is it drafted more carefully than the first time?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, it is a decision that was made only recently and is the result of the rather ingenious way of dealing with the particular problem of land division, a way that I think—

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Who did that? Lawyers have circumvented it?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I am not sure just whether it was lawyers or who it was, but somebody devised a way.

Mr. Brown: Was it circumvented by law or was it a legal fault in the Act?

Mr. Speaker: The operator will not put on microphones for members who are interrupting a speaker.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, dealing with the other sections; in certain circumstances when a consent to land division has been properly obtained, and not necessarily by delays but by reason of many factors, transactions were not completed within the period of a year and through no fault of the individuals involved. It was therefore decided that we should extend that period of time after the consent was given for the completion of a matter to two years to give people adequate time to deal with these matters.

Some of these points have been raised with me by various members of this House, particularly the hon. members for Victoria-Haliburton and for Ontario South, and the hon. member for Peterborough has spoken to me. For that reason we have assessed these matters in the department ourselves, and want them to be dealt with and corrected.

A year ago, in 1970, arrangements for the land division committee were brought forward. At the present time, under the legislation, a majority is required to constitute a quorum. That may prove to be a difficulty for the proper functioning of those committees and since we have amended the legislation so that it limits the quorum to three members if they are more than three on the committee. If there are only three it would be limited to a majority of two.

Another section that we are dealing with in the legislation touches on the matter of draft plan approval and there has been some comment about that process and about the community planning branch. The members will appreciate that draft plan approval must be obtained before a developer or the one planning a subdivision can proceed with the other matter of the plan through the local municipality and so, once the draft plan approval is given then it leaves the control of the department itself, or the community planning branch of the department, and is in the hands of the developer in his negotiations with the municipality. It is not simply a case of the community planning branch having day-to-day control of that subdivision.

There are many processes it must go through; the engineering must be done; we must take into account matters of water resources and so on; so it does take a period of time. On the other hand there are changes in municipalities by way of completion of official plans and other arrangements, and a subdivision for which draft plan approval may have been obtained may not be in accord with subsequent changes.

At the present time, once draft plan approval has been given there is no limitation on it as to time, and certainly its marketability is increased once that draft plan approval is obtained. Under the circumstances I felt, and the government concurred, that we should set a limited period of time—three years—within which final approval would be obtained, or within such further period as might be granted on the basis of application for extension of the period.

We want to facilitate these things, but on the other hand we do not wish to impede

the proper development of municipalities by leaving draft plan approvals hanging fire for a long period of time, and I have found since coming to the department there have been a few cases where they have been in existence for a long period of time.

In reference to the committee of adjustment, the members will appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that where there is no committee of adjustment the minister has the obligation to deal with the matter of consent. When a land division committee is established by a county or an area then there is a period of time before it becomes properly organized and is ready to deal with matters before it. Hence we allow that period of time. The municipality has to pass a bylaw and notify the ministers and there is a period of 30 days after the passing so that there is a clear division of responsibility; the minister's responsibility ends at a certain point of time and the local board takes up its obligations and responsibilities.

The other section has reference to the application fee. At the present time the fee is up to \$25, and we have found that a number of land division committees and municipalities have realized that the cost of operating a land division committee is not met by the fee that is charged to the applicant. Some applications do require a great deal of time and work by a municipality and the committee, and hence we felt it is advisable to increase that fee to a minimum of \$50.

It was suggested that we might strike out any limitation, but I do not think that would be proper because then you would leave it open to a very large fee at times and I think it would be unfair to the applicant. In this way he knows the limitation of the fee that can be imposed on him.

I believe I have dealt with most of the matters. The hon. member for Sudbury did raise one matter about local planning consent and I have talked to him separately in reference to that matter. We are as anxious as he that the final approval should be given as quickly as possible and the community planning branch is working toward that, and certainly the suggestion he has made, as others have made, is being given careful consideration.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be directed for third reading?

What committee?

Committee of the Whole House.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is directed to the Committee of the Whole House, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: House in Committee of the Whole; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

PLANNING ACT

House in committee on Bill 28, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 28, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Are there any comments, questions or amendments to any section of this bill? The hon. member for Wentworth; which section?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): A question on section 2.

Mr. Chairman: Section 2. Anything on section 1? We will proceed to section 2 then.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Deans: I would just like to ask the minister if he could tell me why they made this change to the quorum. Why it was not a matter of "in excess of 50 per cent"?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I could not hear the hon. member.

Mr. Deans: I am curious to know why the minister made the change in section 2(3)(a), that where a land division committee is composed of three members, two members constitute a quorum, but where that committee is larger than three members then three members constitute a quorum. Why does he make that kind of a ruling? Why not in excess of 50 per cent of the total members?

Hon. Mr. Bales: At the present time, Mr. Chairman, it is a majority of the members, but we have found that there is a difficulty created in that if we had a committee say of nine, sometimes they do not always have five in attendance and for that reason the work of the committee and the applications before it have on occasion been held up.

On the other hand, I think we must have a reasonable number of people dealing with these matters; we should not permit them just to have a very small committee. I think three is a reasonable number under the circumstances. I certainly would not want it

less than three, unless of course it is a committee only of three. I felt in that case the majority of two would be better.

Mr. Deans: I am always a little concerned where we set a quorum at less than a majority. I think that if a committee is structured with nine persons on it and they cannot get five out, then they should replace the people on the committee.

On the matter of setting the quorum at three, if as the minister said there were nine and they could only get three out, there is something wrong with that committee and the manner in which it is operating—and I really do not agree with setting a quorum at such a low level. I think it leaves room for a great deal of lobbying, for one thing, in the case of only having to speak with three members.

Now I am not suggesting that there is anything that goes on that is wrong, but I think that if it is necessary that a majority of members on any committee, particularly one dealing with a matter as important as this, if the quorum is set at a majority then we are sure that we are hearing the opinion of the entire committee; we are hearing the opinion that would have carried the vote in the committee regardless.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, if I could comment on one other matter mentioned: I used the figure nine as an example only. In most cases the committees of adjustment are either five or seven, so far as I have been able to ascertain, and I think three is quite a reasonable number taking into account that average of five to a committee.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on section 2? If not, section 3.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, the minister said that the reason for the automatic termination of draft plans—it says after a three-year period—was that he wanted to speed this up, he did not want them lying around and not being dealt with. If that is the case then why the three-year period? Why not two as an illustration, if it is an effort to speed up? I just wondered why the three-year period as opposed to any other period?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, you must have a reasonable period of time for people to complete their engineering plans, their applications to the municipality, and so forth.

I think three years is a reasonable period, particularly when there is included the power of the ministry to extend the period of time, if necessary, on application.

If you leave it an indefinite period as at the present time, then, as I explained, there may be changes in the municipality's plans, or an official plan may be established, and the draft plan and the approval obtained from the municipality may be at variance with the official plan arrangements. A person has had a plan approved by the municipality and it is at variance—I do not think that is a very good thing.

Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet, if I may, there is a slight amendment in reference to this section. If I could, I move an amendment simply changing a section number in section 3, sub-section 2, in the second line; instead of section 26, it should be section 28.

Mr. Chairman: Hon. Mr. Bales moves that—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): How can the Minister of Municipal Affairs deal with an amendment when he has not got it in writing?

Mr. Chairman: I assume that it is going to be coming in writing, I trust, from the hon. minister. It is such a brief amendment that if the—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The minister will have to write it fast.

Mr. Singer: The minister will have to write it out the same as we have to do.

Mr. Martel: The minister is not even trying.

Mr. Chairman: In view of the briefness of the amendment I was agreeable to accept it without it being in writing but under no circumstances—

Mr. Singer: No, I did not think Mr. Chairman would. Here it comes.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): Where is all the care that went into this? Some care! The minister ought to take it back and do the whole thing over again and then come back with it.

Mr. Chairman: —would I now put the motion. May I please have it in writing?

An hon. member: There ought to be a motion—

Mr. Singer: Listen to the barracking! There has been many a time when I did not get a similar amendment in writing from that side.

Mr. Chairman: Hon. Mr. Bales has moved that subsection 2 of section 3 of the bill be amended by striking out "26" in the second line and inserting in place thereof "28."

Mr. Singer: All right. That sounds better.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Just a minute.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. member wish to speak to the amendment?

Mr. Good: This still allows the minister complete authority to change or withdraw consent of the draft plan at any time during that three-year period? Section 28(11)?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Section 28 (11) under the Act says:

Upon settlement of the draft plan, the minister may give his approval thereto and may, in his discretion, withdraw his approval of a final plan for registration.

Mr. Good: The minister has until 1974 on anything that is approved now?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That is correct. It takes it to July 1, 1974, so that they are not cut out from their present status.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Any further comments or questions on section 3?

Sections 3 and 4 agreed to.

Mr. Pilkey: On section 5.

Mr. Chairman: Section 5?

On section 5.

Mr. Pilkey: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Ontario South (Mr. W. Newman) asked the minister why the \$50 fee as opposed to \$25? Why the change? Was it a question of the cost factor to the municipality?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That is what I explained previously. We felt that there should be a limitation put in there so that an arbitrary figure was not picked.

Mr. Deans: It already was.

Mr. Brown: Is it not true that, in fact, this is going to provide a hardship on precisely landholders, the small farmers who want to separate one parcel of land? To a developer it means nothing—\$25 is nothing—but to the ordinary person living in the rural areas of

Ontario who wants to separate a small piece of land, that is a substantial amount of money. It is the typical kind of thing that comes from the Tory party. Debit the poor who cannot afford it and make it easy for the person who can afford it.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, that reasoning is completely fallacious. There is nothing like that to it at all. We are going to establish land division committees and if they are going to function properly then the costs of the matter must be borne by those who apply. There is no obligation to charge the \$50. It is up to the municipality or to the area to set its own fee. There is simply a maximum set. When we are setting a maximum we are protecting the individuals so that they cannot have an indefinite or indiscriminate amount allocated as a charge.

Mr. Brown: Why does the minister not set it on the basis of the amount of land involved, the value of the transaction, rather than on a uniform scale right across the board regardless of the amount?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Then the fee would be higher.

Mr. Brown: Yes, in some cases it would, but it could be afforded.

Mr. Deans: I would like to ask the minister if he honestly believes that municipalities are going to charge less than the maximum permitted?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Some will.

Mr. Good: Sure they will.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Some do now.

Mr. Deans: There was an occasion, I know, when they did not charge anything. I realize that.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): It is up to them.

Mr. Deans: My experience has been that generally when they charge, they charge the full amount. I am just curious to know whether the minister does think that municipalities would charge less than the full amount when they intended to charge?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I think that municipalities will use good judgment in the matter. I think they want to assess their costs and we are anxious that land division committees be established. Unless they are going to be able to charge a fee that will meet the costs in-

olved, we are going to find a reticence by certain counties to establish those committees.

Sections 5 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 28, as amended, reported.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the Committee of the Whole House rise and report one bill with amendments, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report one bill with amendments, and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill 28, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Clerk of the House: The 17th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Chairman, in rising to present the estimates of The Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food for the consideration of the House, I first of all want to pay tribute to the staff of our department who, to me, are among the finest civil servants to be found anywhere in Canada. I know of no more dedicated group of people than they. They work hours long beyond what could be considered normal working hours for the civil service, in providing the service and regulatory functions which our department provides.

This department is a service and a regulatory department. Throughout the entire extension branch, the major emphasis is on helping farm people to make farm management decisions. These involve decisions relating to farm drainage; whether or not to expand the enterprise or to give up certain parts of the enterprise, to specialize in certain lines or to expand the holdings of the farm, whether through a direct purchase or through ARDA acquisition of land.

Certainly, these decisions are based very much on the necessity that modern agriculture demands for making decisions that are sometimes very far-reaching. This really is the job of the extension branch and it is doing an excellent job in this regard.

The budget of our department, Mr. Chairman, is in the amount of something like \$80.75 million this year. I will be prepared to deal with each item, vote by vote, as we proceed through the estimate book and will have a good deal to say, I expect, about various matters that are brought to our attention by the members from all sides of the House in discussing the various items that are up for presentation.

I leave it at that, Mr. Chairman, and hope that we may proceed forthwith with the estimates.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Chairman, I rise to begin the criticism of these current estimates with the disadvantage of having had them in my hands for less than 24 hours, and with the knowledge that Friday's consideration of them may again be preceded by consideration of legislation, so that, in fact, we cannot hope to make meaningful comments and suggestions before the beginning of next week.

We also have had to bow to the computer in the manner in which the accounts are laid out, which, for the first time this year, is in accordance with the so called national accounts coding system. It seems clearer than before but it will need some getting used to.

I will commend the three-year comparison on page 9 of the estimates and also the three-year comparison on the lead pages of each department, which gives effect to a much needed reform we sought in the standing committee on public accounts last year. So I do commend the department on a little more thorough résumé of the various departments. As we get into them, we will be able to deal more specifically with each one.

I would like to make one comment on the junior farmer loans item, that is on vote 102, subsection 7, of course, this is the most shocking in the agriculture production programme economy, particularly since the current year will be the second in which the amount of the loan has declined by \$2 million, the actual amount for 1969-1970 being \$5,624,503, and the estimates for 1970-1971 being \$3,670,040, and the current estimate being \$1,760,800. In fact, on page 21, the Ontario junior farmer establishment loan corporation will have a deficit for 1971-1972 of \$1,600,000, which is

to be made up by the transfer payment from the provincial Treasurer.

This sad state of affairs is just one more example of Ontario's lack of co-operation with the federal government. It is as though we had two governments vying with each other to see how each can put the other down.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Well, that is in the name of the new warfare.

Mr. Innes: That is right. It was quite evident in the budget yesterday.

Mr. Sopha: New warfare. We will be going to war.

Mr. Innes: Or who can be top dog. It is the Ontario junior farmer who is being hurt by this most of all. The federal farm credit corporation has set its interest rate at around eight per cent, but the Quebec farmer is rebated three per cent of this, and the Ontario government sees fit to do nothing about it.

The Quebec farmers, in fact, and especially young farmers, get the kind of break that our own farmers no longer enjoy. The revision in the Ontario junior farmer loan programme was meant to be part of a new deal, but instead it was cut off abruptly, and no deal was forthcoming. This certainly was not the intent of the farm income committee, but it was to be part of a package deal whereby we would have revised the whole financial picture of farm loans in the Ontario segment.

The strength of mixed farming is the ability to follow, or even anticipate the market trends, and to come out on top. Extreme specialization places the individual farmer in the power of the big distributors and the chains, which, by their purchasing patterns, effectively dominate the market and set the effective prices. It is not necessary to have a conspiracy for this. All you have to do is to be big enough, as the packers and the supermarkets are, and the whole pattern of the market is yours to call the shots.

The specialists from Guelph and the department elsewhere who tour the countryside giving advice are all too often people who have themselves never made one cent through practical farming. Nor could they ever do so. They have gone through the academic rigour all right, but they have not got their boots and hands dirty struggling to make a dollar. Field experience is lacking in these people. Yet they presume to give advice, and if the farmer listens, he finds himself trapped, at the mercy of the meat packers and the grocery chains.

Supply management was never more required than at the present time and never more urgently. Hopefully the federal Bill C-176, which is being debated in the House of Commons at the present time, will allow the federal government and the provinces, working together, the combined power and authority to control the market effectively and match production with consumption.

In the meantime, in Ontario, a serious emergency exists, particularly in the hog and poultry industries. Many of these producers will be forced into bankruptcy in the very near future, if some of them are not already in that condition at the moment.

Never has the plight of the Ontario farmer been so bleak as it is today. It is ironical that prices today for certain farm products are less than those obtaining at the heights or, should I say, in the depths of the depression of the Thirties. I have a 1931 newspaper which shows that the farmer in that year got for his eggs 28 cents a dozen for extras; 24 cents for firsts and 20 cents for seconds. Last week, 40 years later, the price for grade A was 23 cents.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Quite a difference!

Mr. Innes: Just a moment. The minister will have time to speak. And the cost of production today is somewhere between 29 cents to 31 cents.

The figures for dressed poultry at that particular time 40 years ago were: birds over five pounds, 26 cents a pound; four to five pounds, 24 cents a pound; and four pounds and under, 21 cents a pound. Today the broiler prices are 20 cents. These figures tell their own story.

What about hogs? Hogs last week were \$21.70 a hundredweight and in July, 1969, they were will over \$36 a hundredweight; for a difference in that short period of approximately \$15 per hundredweight or in the neighbourhood of \$25 per hog. It is almost unbelievable. Certainly there is no sign of any change in this picture for some time until a lot of people are forced out of production.

Mr. Chairman, nearly everyone else is on his way up but the farmer is still in the dustbowl, financially speaking. The only answer is to control production and tailor it to the market. General Motors and General Electric do not continue to produce a given production line when the sales for that item fall off. They immediately slow down or cease that operation. And they are not adverse to building into their actual plan-

ning the deliberate use of the unemployment insurance mechanism to serve their own ends; in other words, they use this fund as part of their production strategy.

The farmer has no such opportunity to shut down. Instead, he is lectured constantly by the specialists and told that he too must specialize in producing certain products in quantity in order to survive. Efficiency, the farmer is advised, will allow him to produce far more of that particular product. But the farmer who listens to this advice too carefully gambles his whole future. He puts all his eggs in one basket.

I feel that The Department of Agriculture and Food must concern itself with this problem of farmers who are about to be forced out of business by these circumstances over which they have little or no control. Many of the victims are young aggressive farmers, and agriculture can ill afford to sacrifice these young people in an industry that must continue to attract young people if it is to survive.

George McLoughlin—who the minister is quite aware of, knows very well—chairman of the Ontario Milk Marketing Board, in a speech to Western Ontario Breeders Incorporated warned against farm enterprises getting too big, too fast and thus becoming unmanageable. He indicated that when operations become too big efficiency goes down, proper management is curtailed and the grip of the operator is consequently lost. This is particularly true, he said, of the livestock industry.

The specialists who are going around the province from the department, handing out advice to the farmers would themselves do well to study what Mr. McLoughlin has said. I am convinced that they are recommending consolidation procedures and other measures resulting in greatly expanded production in spite of a market analysis that would set other goals in priorities. The best interests of the farmer and of the industry must always be those of the marketplace, coupled with the ability of a given operator to manage a given undertaking. These are the only criteria that matter.

The people from Guelph and the department, if they have other criteria, should be constantly reminded that they are off-track. It is not what they are being paid for. They are being paid to ensure that the farmer is made to work in Ontario and to deliver a fair living to those who engage in it. This is their job.

The recent increase in the capital grants structure, which I feel is a reasonably good programme for the farmers across the province, has some features that have been brought to my attention and possibly need a little revision. Comments are coming to me at a great rate from serious members of the farming community who do not like the way the capital grants programme is being put into effect.

In the first place it appears that it is a blanket approach to all farm problems. Large, medium, small and even part-time farmers appear to be treated the same for actuarial purposes. It seems relatively easy to get a capital grant or up to \$3,000. A father can get a grant for \$3,000. A father and a farmer who has a \$3,000 income can get a grant for \$3,000, and in a week or so he can sell that farm to his son and he can also get \$3,000 for an operation that has only a \$3,000 income. Another way is to incorporate, which makes the resultant corporation eligible for \$6,000—double what the unincorporated farmer gets.

I have had complaints about this, and they say to me: "Why should farmers be asked to incorporate in order to receive an extra \$3,000?" It would appear the department is directly encouraging incorporation of farms at a time when many accountants and tax specialists are advising otherwise.

The way in which the grants programme is administered has also had direct implications for conservation and for the environment. George Jones of the crop science department at the University of Guelph has recently published an important article on agricultural practices in Ontario and their impact on the environment. He lists soil erosion as one of the most significant factors affecting the Ontario picture today. I should like to read into the record this quotation from his article:

The increasing number of acres devoted to continuous corn or simple cropping systems using corn, soya beans and small grains can only mean one thing: greater erosion and, consequently, greater erosion programmes.

No one who recognizes erosion as an environmental hazard should ignore the meadow-crop solution, especially in the rolling topography of southern Ontario. A crop man operating in this environment knows that meadow crops flourish here and, along with small grains, have long provided the basic feed for livestock.

The meadow crops provide our last answer to erosion control. This statement goes without challenge. The only problem is how to make money by growing them. As far as I can see, the only hurdle that keeps us from making money from them is how to store them so that the resultant feed is of consistently high quality.

Mr. Chairman, I believe there is a need in capital grants structure for the building-in of an encouragement to Ontario farmers to maintain pasture, particularly in the areas subject to continuous erosion. Last year I mentioned that in Britain there are tax concessions for farmers who keep their land in pasture over a long period of years.

For the moment the concept of a cow-calf operation in Ontario has been an impractical one because of the high cost of land and the burden of taxation. There has been no hope of a profitable operation. However, the cost of replacement cattle to feedlot operators in southern Ontario has continued to rise due to transportation costs from western Ontario.

Here then is an area where the minister could do some promotion. As he knows, the beef industry is one of the brighter spots in the agricultural picture today.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): It is about the only one left.

Mr. Innes: He could kill several birds with one stone. He could prevent erosion and improve the environment at the same time as he was assisting the Ontario farmer and the feedlot operator by an imaginative grant-aided pasture and meadow programme.

Let me turn to the question of Bill 10—we have heard about that bill before—and its effect on relations between Ontario and Quebec and upon the Liberal concept of free trade, which we are only prepared to compromise in the most extreme circumstances.

As the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) has clearly shown, the Minister of Agriculture and Food has misled the House. I will leave it to my colleague to develop all the ramifications, of order and privilege, that may arise from that revelation so clearly documented in Hansard. But I do want to add fuel to the fire, if I may, by quoting from the minister's own submission to the House of Commons standing committee on agriculture's public hearing into Bill C-176—The Farm Products Marketing Act—held at Sutton Place on Monday, January 25

last. The following is a direct quotation from what the minister said on that particular occasion:

The discussions that have taken place at meetings of provincial Ministers and Deputy Ministers of Agriculture in 1968, 1969, and again in 1970 have clearly indicated the need for some legislative mechanism whereby the interprovincial movement and marketing of certain farm products could be conducted in an orderly manner. It is essential to prevent undue distress and unnecessary disruption of production and marketing programmes that have been established by producers in many of the provinces. Provincial Ministers and Deputy Ministers of Agriculture have expressed that philosophy to the federal minister on several occasions. His introduction of the bill under examination today, I assume, is a result of his responding to what we believe to be a positive need in Canada today.

He went on to say:

We have marketing problems in Canada today, problems that we cannot ignore, problems that must be resolved. We believe that effective national marketing legislation is essential. It is true that most of the provinces have acted in an interim way to prevent distress in their own areas, and I admit that Ontario is a party to the establishment of measures—

Now I want the House to get this last phrase—

that can only be described as being less than desirable.

In spite of that January admission, the minister has gone his own way since with his policy of economic separatism, which can only have the effect of erecting a Berlin Wall over Canada and, particularly, at the border at Lancaster.

Make no mistake—this matter can escalate. To show how serious the situation is regarded, I would like to quote from two CBC noon-time farm broadcasts which our research department recorded so we might have evidence to refute the minister in his claim that, while he cannot speak the language of his Quebec counterpart, the two deputies get on like a house on fire.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I did not say that.

Mr. Innes: That is not enough, Mr. Chairman. While I am not a fanatical exponent of bilingualism in every corner of Canada, it

seems clear to me, and surely to all thinking men, that a minister who has had to deal with his opposite number in Quebec on a matter of such immense importance to such a large cross-section of Ontario ought to have some tools to do the job.

The CBC's Steve Casselman was in touch with Quebec officials and here is what he said:

I contacted the hon. Norman Toupin, Quebec's Minister of Agriculture. He feels that if Ontario does instigate Bill 10 and put it forth, this will only develop balkanization in agricultural products.

"We have no choice but to strengthen our position and harden our laws to be on an equal footing with Ontario and other provinces," he said.

I asked him if they would retaliate by possibly reducing the number of fruit and vegetable imports from Ontario, and he said, that he hoped it would not go this far, but that if it should, he realized that Ontario spills over much more agricultural products into Quebec than Quebec does the other way. He emphasized that Ontario is much more vulnerable than Quebec is.

Mr. Chairman, I ask you does this sound like the talk of a minister who has been consulted? The truth is the minister himself was not consulted. This all started and ended at the deputy minister level. It did not extend to an understanding between the responsible ministers who were not even talking the same language.

Meanwhile, the broiler marketing board of Ontario has been using warlike phrases, like "deterrent," "seize" and "destroy missions." After taking inventory in the major food outlets, the board's office told the CBC that it was ready to do just that. Quebec pointed out that they could only hold the material briefly for evidence, not destroy it, and that the maximum penalty was a \$25 fine. The argument that Ontario was escalating the interprovincial trade war thus had great evidential backing. The Ontario fine is \$500 for the first offence and for subsequent offences not more than \$5,000. There are much stronger teeth in Ontario's law than in Quebec's, but the question is who will those teeth ultimately bite?

The Catholic Farmers Union of Quebec is now militant, and has been in constant consultation with hon. Norman Toupin. Their members told him that the Ontario government acts much faster in protectionist legislation than the Quebec government and they

have called for an escalator of the inter-provincial struggle. Mr. Toupin told Steve Casselman that Quebec is now preparing legislation that will increase its own fines against offenders by which, of course, is meant free traders in the Liberal sense.

Now Manitoba has taken its case to the Supreme Court of Canada and, in spite of earlier denials, Ontario has intervened. It is clear that we ought to leave this to the federal government. That is the Liberal position, that we have to have co-ordinated legislation stemming from Bill C-176 and not, to quote the minister himself, "measures that can only be described as being less than desirable."

Mr. Chairman, this is only one of the most glaring examples of lack of leadership on the part of this government in the field of agriculture. Later, I intend to raise the question of taxation and rebates and to illustrate some of these glaring anomalies where the big man has gained again through a loophole which has not yet been plugged. The overtaxation of farmers, followed by paying them back with their own money, has not fooled any one. I shall also touch on agriculture education and the delay in the standardization of farm machinery in later remarks. Thank you.

Mr. K. C. Bolton (Middlesex South): Mr. Chairman, I am happy to enter into this discussion of agricultural policy. Like the Liberal critic, I regret that time has been so short for preparation. I also regret that we happened to pick a day when I have laryngitis, but I hold nobody else responsible for that but myself. I recklessly walked in the snow on Saturday, while trying to raise money to build a swimming pool in Dorchester. I suppose, maybe, it was worth it.

I am happy to have been given the privilege by my party to act, at least for the time being, as a critic of agriculture, because I share with the minister the privilege of living in Middlesex county, a county that is very well known throughout Ontario and throughout the country as being a county of very advanced agricultural production.

My intention is to speak briefly today. I hope my voice returns later to speak at greater length on other subjects in relation to agriculture. But, today, I want to speak about the underlying philosophy of the Agriculture Department. I must take the members back two years to the publication of "The Challenge of Abundance."

Members may recall that, in 1966, there was a demonstration by the farmers who

were concerned about their income. Then, there was a conference in Vineland which reached certain conclusions which the government appeared to accept, the basic principles being that a cheap food policy is not only inevitable but desirable if food prices are to be kept within family budgets. Cheap food is necessary because a great many people are living on very low levels of income, many below the poverty level.

But—and here I move to the second principle—experience has proven that farmers are not now able to earn enough income in the marketplace, even with the assistance of marketing plans. I do not need, in this House, to belabour what should be a very apparent fact that the majority of farmers are in a very serious cost-price squeeze. We find that farmers are leaving the farm at the rate of at least 3,000 a year in Ontario.

The third principle, as it was stated at that time, at the Vineland conference, was that, because of these facts the farm income gained in the marketplace must be supplemented with payments from federal and provincial governments. Such payments should be regarded as a consumer subsidy to keep prices down to ensure farmers enough income to cover their costs of production, capital needs and a decent family income.

Mr. Chairman, following that conference and that discussion we were presented with a splendid booklet—not a booklet, a book—magnificently produced, and containing what I had thought would be a statement of declared policy on the part of the government. I want to refer to some of the issues raised at that time.

The opening statement was:

Agriculture is a unique industry. It is the largest in Canada. It contributes more to export earnings and has increased its efficiency at a faster rate than any other sector in the nation's economy.

Therefore, agriculture deserves the full consideration of all who are concerned about the economy of our province and of our nation.

We would expect, therefore, that the government will present to us, in the estimates and elsewhere, a statement of policy which would indicate a general recognition of the supreme importance of the industry.

Yet, though this industry is so important, we find remarkably little evidence that there is any new thought being given to the grave problem this industry is now facing.

The independent farmer-businessman has lower returns to his investment, management and labour than most other businessmen.

I quote, I remind members, from the document produced by the government itself.

This intolerable situation, to a significant degree, can be attributed to a lack of industry planning, especially in the field of production marketing and the failure of the farmers' organizations.

Then we are asked to look at four of these questions. What sort of changes do we want? Who should guide or institute these changes? Who should benefit and by how much? What costs are involved in change and who should pay for them? How should these changes be instituted?

The special committee on farm income concluded its opening statement by saying, "There has been a long period of dialogue. Now is the time for action." Mr. Chairman, we in the New Democratic Party are asking, "What is the action? What is the intended change?"

We recognize throughout this province and throughout the country a very grave problem. We find farmers who are either giving their milk away or pouring it out on the ground because they cannot get the right prices for their product. We find very considerable unrest in the whole community. We find farmers leaving this industry. We ask, "What is the policy of the government to remedy this situation?"

I trust that in the course of the debates on his estimates we will be provided with some of the answers to these extremely important questions.

Reference has been made already to taxation. Farmers carry a major burden of taxation in Ontario, even though they very rarely belong to the high-income categories. The greatest burden of taxes—mind you, I want to emphasize this: I am not at this moment quoting from New Democratic propaganda or socialist propaganda, if you prefer the term; I am quoting from government documents. Later I shall refer to New Democratic policy—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Or propaganda.

Mr. Bolton: —or propaganda, as you wish.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Great stuff. Good reading.

Mr. Bolton: To continue:

The greatest burden of taxation imposed on farms in Ontario comes through property taxation which bears little relationship to the income position of the taxpayer. The property tax bill does not change according to the ability of the taxpayer to pay.

What is the government's answer to this problem—a rebate of 25 per cent of what they should not have taken away in the first place?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): No Tories would plot that though.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): A real expert.

Mr. Martel: Does not have to be an expert.

Mr. Bolton: May I, with profound respect for the Minister of Agriculture and Food, for whom I do have respect, attempt to answer some of the questions that are posed in "A Challenge of Abundance."

What sort of changes do we want? May I offer some of the proposed answers? What the farmer wants is a chance to carry on his family farm in a way that provides a decent income for himself and the prospect that his sons and daughters will wish to stay in their rural environment.

He wants to have as fair a chance as other workers of securing proper return for his efforts. He wants recognition of the contribution he makes to the economy of his country. With few exceptions he does not demand excessive returns for his labour; certainly if he does, he is thwarted in that intention. What he asks is a chance to live in a rural area providing the needs of his community, sharing in providing for the world one of its basic requirements—its food.

He does not wish to see the efforts of his industry exploited by others. He regrets—and does so with real justice—the regular comment that is made when he asks for a fair price, that he is the one responsible for forcing up food prices. We can give plenty of evidence to show that whatever slight gain the farmer makes is as nothing compared with the gain that is made by the middleman. This needs examination.

May I continue then with the suggestion about the changes we would offer the farmer? First of all, the elimination of monopoly control over the price of many things he buys—fertilizers, weed spray and other basic supplies—through co-operatives where possible.

We suggest the use of chemicals would be limited until the safety seal was awarded. The treatment of land and crops with residual sprays and dusts will be recorded for future reference.

The farmer wants some help with his farm machinery problem. I spent several days at a farm show recently and saw the enormous and the extremely expensive machinery that farmers are required to buy—machinery that breaks down very readily and very consistently, with a long delay in the supply of parts; the machinery for which he pays far too much.

We would propose a Farm Machinery Act to provide for mandatory testing of machinery offered for sale in the province, with the results made known to farmers and manufacturers. We would enforce the stocking of spare parts, so that the farmers would not lose the days they now lose waiting for their machinery to be repaired. We would try to eliminate unwarranted, expensive promotional advertising campaigns.

The Act would provide for the creation of a Crown corporation to act as first purchaser of all farm machinery and as the distributors to local dealers. We would make the burden lighter for farmers by encouraging standardized parts through the corporation's buying power.

Then, too, as I am sure you will recall, more than 10 years ago our policy—very clearly stated—about the burden of education costs on farm lands, as distinct from residential and other farm property. We do not believe that a farmer should be asked to pay education tax on the land he uses for farm purposes. Unless and until we take the tax off all residential property he will be required to pay on that alone but we encourage development of a municipal foundation plan. We will of course move in due course—and may that be soon—to collect at least 80 per cent of the education tax provincially rather than locally.

Land and other productive facilities would be exempt from education taxes and would pay property taxes at a lower rate, where feasible and public ownership where necessary.

We will provide for the farmer long-term credit for the financing of adequate acreage and other capital requirements for modern farm operations, at interest rates more closely related to the earning capacity of agriculture.

We would provide much more generous credit to co-operatives and marketing boards for the development of their operations.

We would encourage co-operative and publicly-owned facilities for storage, processing and distribution of food products. Then, too, we would encourage the development of a Department of Co-operatives with a full-time minister to encourage the greatest development of a programme of self help.

These are just some of the things, Mr. Chairman, that provide an answer to the question, "What sort of changes do we want?" Here are some of them. I invite the minister, when he makes his reply, to tell us what changes are proposed by the government to meet the basic needs of the farmer of today.

Mr. Chairman, for rather obvious reasons, I cannot go on speaking much longer. I shall return when we return to the question of agricultural marketing—

An hon. member: And when he is in better voice.

Mr. Bolton: And when I have more of a voice.

I am in your hands, Mr. Chairman. I want to return to this debate at a later time; I do not want the debate to discontinue. What is my procedure at this point, for withdrawing without the debate closing off?

Mr. Chairman: I am afraid there is no provision for such activity. The normal procedure in the House is for a member of each of the opposition parties to have their critic—

Mr. Martel: He cannot speak.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Have you no cure for laryngitis?

Mr. Chairman:—provide his remarks and then the hon. minister replies. I must confess I have not encountered such a situation before. The hon. member is suggesting that he has more to say?

Mr. Bolton: I will come in on the various votes, then, Mr. Chairman, if I may.

Mr. Chairman: I misunderstood, I am sorry. I thought the hon. member wished to re-enter into the debate as the critic.

Mr. Bolton: No.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You can count on us being there at all times, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bolton: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister wish to respond to any of the remarks?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I really do not intend to respond at any great length. I realize that there will be debate on other items as we come along and I hope the hon. member for Middlesex South will find his voice sufficiently recovered to present his party's position at that time.

With regard to certain suggestions that have been made, I share with my friend from Oxford the concern expressed by a great many hog farmers with the deplorable price of hogs today in this country. There is a very good reason for it.

Certainly his position, which I assume is the position of his party, relative to supply management, is, I think, a move forward in the position of his party as far as that particular aspect of agriculture is concerned. Because there have been many people in the past most reluctant to confess, as farmers—and he is a farmer, and a good farmer in Ontario—that there is necessity for supply management in agricultural production.

I do not know why we have been so reluctant to confess this as farm people. Perhaps it is because of a rugged individualism that so many of us seem to be so proud of. Nevertheless, it is a fact of life. Certainly the manufacturing industry for years has practised supply management, as he points out, using the unemployment insurance fund to offset the unfortunate effect which the lay-off of people from manufacturing plants may have when they decide to implement supply management as far as the production of those respective plants is concerned.

I fancy that if there had been some type of supply management worked out a few years ago regarding hog production perhaps we might not have been in the position we are in today.

But I would point out, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the members of this House that on numerous occasions when one could see the buildup of feed grain supplies in western Canada taking place and the unfortunate lack of sales of that western grain, that it was inevitable that western departments of agriculture would encourage their farm people to diversify, to use that grain for livestock or poultry feed and consequently convert that grain into cash. It was just as obvious as it could be. And they did just that.

Now, we expressed very great concern. As a matter of fact, at various conferences where we were meeting with federal officials and with other provincial officials, we raised the point that the greatest threat facing Ontario

—I should say Canadian agriculture and in particular eastern Canada agriculture—since the depression of the Thirties was the pile-up of feed grains in western Canada.

The dairy industry had already moved to supply management through the effects of the national dairy commission, working through the respective provincial milk marketing boards. To some degree, there have been controls in some other areas in the Province of Ontario, but there was virtually no control as far as the production of hogs and poultry products was concerned, other than in certain provinces—Ontario was one of them—as far as broilers were concerned. In fact, other provinces had the same type of legislation.

I pointed out as well in an address that I had the privilege to make here in Toronto, a year ago last winter that unless some action was taken by the federal government to relieve that incredible concern that was being expressed by western farmers with this buildup of feed grains, that they had no choice but to make that diversification to other agricultural production, particularly livestock feed. I suggested and I urged that all of us, as Canadian citizens, should support the federal government in every way possible in moving that surplus of feed grains and mill-wheat into world export markets, even if it was at the cost to the taxpayers of Canada of a substantial sum. That is why I supported, quite frankly, the lift programme that I believe many people will believe had a very marked effect on reducing the amount of surplus wheat and perhaps encouraging the disposal of a good deal of that feed grain from western Canada.

We agreed completely that something had to be done. We warned the federal government on numerous occasions of the incredible dangers that lay ahead. Here we had had, in the Province of Ontario and, in fact, throughout Canada, a very buoyant hog market. In fact, a buoyant hog market pertained over most of the North American continent. So buoyant that it was in the neighbourhood of \$35 to \$40 a hundred-weight for dressed weight hogs.

This was a substantial price and a good price. I am not saying that it is too high at all, but even during that time we were importing into this country substantial quantities of pork just to meet domestic requirements. There was certainly room for some expansion in the production of hogs within Canada itself.

The buildup of feed grains in western Canada was an open invitation to farmers, and particularly to western governments to

encourage their farmers to diversify. Diversify they did, with an increase in hog production of 75 per cent in Saskatchewan, 45 per cent in Manitoba, and about 35 per cent in round figures in the Province of Alberta. At the same time in eastern Canada we increased production by about 11 per cent.

This was coupled with an increase in hog production in the United States of about 13 per cent. Due to the again buoyant hog market and to an enormous stockpile of feed corn, they looked upon it as being a useful move to change to hog production. The result was that we had incredible over-production of hogs. Fortunately, through efforts of our food council; through efforts of the Canadian swine council; through efforts of the federal Department of Trade and Commerce, we were able to increase the export of pork products out of Canada by 68 per cent in 1970, and that to me was the safety valve that helped a very great deal.

Along with that, the chain stores here co-operated with the Ontario Food Council in promoting pork, to get pork sold. The consumer price was reduced accordingly as the live price had come down, and I think it can be attributed to that major effort that we estimate an increase of about 10 pounds per capita in the consumption of pork at retail level in the Province of Ontario last year, and I believe that figure can be attributed across Canada as well. This was a major step forward.

I will have to confess that it was at the expense to some degree of other meats, particularly poultry products. I do not think it had a very marked effect on the beef trade, but it might have had some effect, and we recognize that there are great difficulties involved in this programme.

What is the offsetting feature? What is likely to take place in the future concerning these products? Well last fall, as you will recall, southern leaf blight had a major effect in the United States corn-growing areas of a substantial reduction in the production of feed corn supplies. In fact, we had quite a threat of it in the Province of Ontario, but I do not think it really affected production very much here, and I certainly hope it will not this year.

The federal government has made extensive efforts to move feed grains and they have been successful in escalating the sale of feed grains substantially over previous years, and I think that most farmers in western Canada recognize that feed grains will not be as cheap as they have been in the past. Many

of them have become disenchanted already with feeding hogs rather than being able to grow grain and sell it to the local elevator and get it out of the country.

This, to me, will be reflected in what would appear to be a turnabout in prices. If all indicators appear to be correct, sometime later this summer we might have quite a substantial change in hog prices. Hog prices have been of a cyclical nature for a great many years, but I venture to suggest to my hon. friend from Oxford that there would be few farmers, if any, in the Province of Ontario who would agree that they wished to submit themselves to quota production of hogs.

I have seen no such indication of that anywhere in anything that I have read concerning the statements attributed to either the Canadian Swine Council or to the Ontario Hog Producers Marketing Board membership, but they do believe that there is necessity to try and gear in some way across Canada production to known markets within Canada and to those markets that can be developed outside Canada for export trade in pork.

We have been encouraged with the opportunities that appear to be developing, particularly in the Orient, in Japan, for pork sales, and I think that there are opportunities here that we should explore to the full. But we must recognize that if we are going to get into the export market on pork products then we are going to have to accept world prices, and if we are going to accept world prices then does that mean that that price should pertain to pork sold not only in the Province of Ontario, but across Canada?

This is where some pork producers are expounding the philosophy—which perhaps has a great deal of merit to it—that there should be a two-price system established for pork. That would entail some administrative problems but I think would, to a very large degree, help to relieve some of the concern that has been expressed.

With regard to capital grants—we will come to that vote later on, Mr. Chairman—my hon. friend advises us that there are farmers who are critical of the double grants to corporate farmers. Well, let me say to him that there were many farmers who were critical of the fact that there was not a double grant to corporate farmers in the past. In the past programme of the capital grants programme we just had \$1,000 which was available no matter whether it was one farmer or whether there were two or three

farmers operating as a corporate entity, and it did not appear to be fair to them.

We have said that where there are two or more farmers operating in a corporate entity, both of whom have an active interest and a working relationship in the partnership, they can qualify for double grants. But even that does not satisfy many farmers. There are farmers coming to us now and saying, "There are five in this family, three or four in another"—and I know one farmer has come to us with 800 acres of land and he said, "I expect that we should be entitled to eight grants." Now where do you draw the line? Frankly, it is not easy to resolve.

I am interested in the suggestion that we should expand Ontario's cow-calf operations. We have been talking about this for many years, and we have been successful, particularly in northern Ontario, in doing just that. Perhaps there are other opportunities throughout southern Ontario and we hope that we can encourage farmers to do it, but I would have some reservations, to provide capital grants for that purpose.

My hon. friend came to Bill 10, and I was delighted to hear him refer to what I thought was a very excellent submission made by the Province of Ontario to the federal standing committee on agriculture.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): That was one of the minister's good days, was it not?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I thought, Mr. Chairman, that my hon. friend might have said that that was a very excellent presentation. Now he did not, and I do not want to put words in his mouth, but by the same token I would have—

Mr. MacDonald: Do not be bashful; say it yourself.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, modesty overcomes me and I just simply cannot do that.

Mr. Innes: Why spoil a good thing?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would have hoped, Mr. Chairman, that my hon. friend, when he quoted from page 2 of that submission, might have continued to read the last sentence of that page: "That in the absence of such national marketing legislation we had no other alternative." And this is what we mean by the introduction of the measures that were taken last September, to which my hon. friend said I had referred to as being less than desirable. And I make no apologies for having that that, because I believe it quite firmly.

Let me say had my hon. friend turned over the page and read from the top of page 3 of that submission and I quote, Mr. Chairman:

I suggest to you that the question facing this committee is not, should we or should we not have national marketing legislation but rather it is, how soon can we expect to have national marketing legislation to bring order and stability to the industry?

Mr. Singer: Why does the minister not ask his Tory friends in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: To continue:

We can scarcely stand idly by and allow our producers who have adopted supply management programmes to become buried under the unplanned production of other areas that is literally dumped on our markets. Until a national Marketing Act has been developed and proclaimed, the provinces will be forced to use whatever measures they can develop to protect the interests of their producers. It is possible that voluntary agreements can be established, but our experience has indicated little success by this method.

Mr. Chairman, that is the position, clearly enunciated, that we took. And in reply to my hon. friend from Downsview who quite properly suggests why do I not say that to my counterparts at Ottawa, let me say that they were in that meeting and heard me say it.

Mr. Gaunt: It is a wonder, though, they will listen to the minister.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Unfortunately, my influence is not as great as my hon. friend from Downsview would have people believe.

Mr. MacDonald: Unfortunately, the minister is talking now the way he used to, or sometimes does when he lapses from his flashes of wisdom. They are rabid free enterprise.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, of course.

Mr. MacDonald: And the minister is encouraging them to put in a socialist programme.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, not a socialist programme. Not by any means.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: When I get on the member's bandwagon, my friend, I will be a great deal older than I am today and I doubt if that will ever happen.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The minister will be a great deal wiser, too.

Mr. Martel: He would have to be wiser.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat distressed the other day to find in this House—and I really am concerned and no little shocked but not really surprised—to note the incredible opposition that was launched by our friends in the opposition parties against our attempt to look after the interests of Ontario producers.

I must confess that I am not against anybody but I see nothing wrong with being pro-Ontario. That is our job in this House—to look after the interests of Ontario producers and it was with, I must confess, Mr. Chairman, a great degree of concern and amazement that I listened to the opposition the other day. In this connection I would just like to quote from an editorial that appeared in *Farm and Country* that has just been brought out I think—

Mr. Innes: How much farming has he done?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think this paper goes into every farm home in the Province of Ontario. It is looked upon as one of the outstanding farm papers in this country.

Mr. Deans: What is the date?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The dateline is April 27, 1971, page 4 of *Farm and Country*.

WHY THE FUROR?

The concern over Bill 10, the seize and detain measure, expressed by both opposition parties in the Legislature was understandable. After all, it is the duty of Her Majesty's loyal opposition to probe, examine and study every measure brought before the House. They are the watchdogs of democracy but there is a difference between concern, which should always be present, and mindless opposition for the sake of opposition. Regrettably, neither the Liberal nor the New Democratic Parties added lustre to their reputations in the recent debate.

Then it goes on to say—

Mr. MacDonald: Why does the minister not quote their article on "OMBILL" of two years ago?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The member did that for me. My hon. friend from York South did that, Mr. Chairman.

This cannot be described as responsible opposition. It smells of opportunism. Possibly the attackers figured there were only 750 broiler chicken growers left in the province, not many votes at the next election, so why not make a little hay? We regret to inform the would-be governing parties—

That is a great over-statement!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: To continue:

—that over recent years, most farmers have been inclined to stick together when trouble looms. Rather than 750 scattered chicken farmers there could be a hundred times that number of other producers who will come to their defence. They should remember this next time. If they do not, it is more than likely that farmers will remember the behaviour of some politicians in the Legislature.

Here, Mr. Chairman, I have a letter over the signature of the general manager of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, dated April 22. He addresses this letter to me:

At the board of directors meeting of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture held on April 15:

The following resolutions were carried unanimously: Be it resolved that the OFA strongly supports the proposed amendment to The Farm Products Marketing Act to empower local boards to seize and detain regulated farm products at the risk and expense of the owner; and be it resolved that the OFA strongly supports the proposed amendment to The Farm Products Marketing Act to provide for a delegation of provincial powers to a national marketing agency.

These two resolutions are brought to your attention to indicate that we do support your actions in both areas mentioned and thank you for your attention.

S. J. Hale,
General Manager

Now, if the Ontario Federation of Agriculture—

Mr. Sargent: Did the minister request that letter from him? Did he ask for the letter?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No. As a matter of fact, that came to me quite unsolicited and quite by surprise. I am delighted to have it.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that not a normal procedure, that things come to you unsolicited?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Of course.

Mr. MacDonald: Why did the minister make the point then?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Because my hon. friend said that I asked for it.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, really? It is interesting that he felt that he had to make that point.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend asked for it. He asked if I had solicited it.

Mr. MacDonald: It is very interesting that the minister felt compelled to make the point that the letter was unsolicited.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I always try to reply to members of the House when they ask me a question. I try to reply honestly as well.

Mr. Singer: Well, is the minister going to intervene?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, we are going to intervene.

Mr. Singer: The minister is?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I told the member that yesterday.

Mr. Singer: Why did the minister say two or three times he was not?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I said once I was not.

Mr. Singer: It was a couple more times. Does he want me to find some more?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend is quite right. We are certainly going to intervene when it comes before us, but the problem is this—and I think it was summed up rather well by the editor of this paper when he refers to the fact in my explanation as to why we require Bill 10. He went on to say:

Mr. Stewart explained that the chicken question was too acute to wait for the federal farm marketing Bill C-176 to become law. In any case, there is no guarantee it will become legislation. The previous marketing bill evaporated when the last session of Parliament ended. Even if passed by this House, this House of Commons, it has to be approved by the Senate. After this, Canada's provinces have to pass complementary legislation and national commission agencies also have to be established. Effective national farm marketing legislation is still a long way off.

This is the concern I have quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, that it is all too far away off. Perhaps it would have been better in retrospect—and I do not say this in any critical way of my friend, the Minister of Agriculture for Canada, when he introduced a bill that was all inclusive of all farm products, all commodities in Canada—perhaps it might have been better had there been a commission established for poultry and poultry products, similar to the dairy commission.

We discussed this last winter in the House during our estimates debate and I thought it was a good debate. I conveyed those concerns to the minister but he believed that rather than go through the exercise of debating this thing every time any commodity group wanted to come under national legislation, it would be far better to draft what he described—some have described—as an omnibus bill which would be all-inclusive. I think the secret of all this thing and the opposition that has been launched against it—and I deplore that, even at Ottawa's level as well as throughout our own province by people who say that it is the wrong thing to have, saying that if this bill goes through no commodity will be safe.

Every commodity will be as safe under that legislation as the respective Legislatures throughout Canada want to make it. By that I mean that each Minister of Agriculture is responsible to the Legislatures and through the government, through his respective government, to the Legislatures in the provinces.

Under the proposed legislation there can only be an extension of authority granted by the province to the federal government to establish any type of a national structure within the province. It means that unless, as a government, we grant to the federal government that right, the Province of Ontario stays outside the terms of the national bill.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, how does the minister gauge that? Does he gauge it by way of vote or does he take it upon himself to say the beef producers should have a marketing plan, we will put them into the federal plan?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is a good question, Mr. Chairman. It can be done in a variety of ways. My friend from Huron-Bruce mentions beef. In Ontario, we have made the decision that beef producers will remain outside The Ontario Farm Products Marketing Act.

Members will recall we made a special Act in 1968 which established The Ontario

Beef Cattle Marketing Act outside the terms and provisions of The Farm Products Marketing Act. It allowed them to make a voluntary deduction but in no way provided the opportunity for any type of a marketing plan to be established for beef. I have used that as an illustration of how we in the Province of Ontario view the fact that beef should be excluded from the national legislation.

With regard to other commodities—

I think my hon. friend had said what are we going to do regarding broilers, we will say, which is a current subject of debate. We would simply say that the broiler producers of the Province of Ontario themselves in 1966 voted, by over a two-thirds majority, to establish quota production of broilers in this province—I should say quota marketing of broilers in this province. I think that is more appropriate; that is really the quota involved—quota marketing of broilers in Ontario.

Having established that quota, I think we would be perfectly in order on their behalf, after having discussed it with them and having their request for us to do it, to ask the federal government to extend the powers to the federal government to cut the national broiler market so that Ontario would get its share of national production. That to me would be the way it would work.

Mr. Gaunt: So any group that has a marketing plan now would automatically be enrolled.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, not automatically at all—only those commodities that would request such action.

Now I do not know if we had used eggs for an illustration. As you know we have had two votes on egg quotas in Ontario and both have been defeated. I do not know whether there will be a vote on eggs this summer or not; I understand that the egg board wants to have a vote and I am not sure whether the power has been granted or not.

But it is in the process of discussion now as to whether there will be an egg vote. A plan is being discussed.

If this vote carries with quota production for eggs in Ontario, I would think that it would be reasonable to expect that our egg producers would want that power of quota marketing extended to the federal government so that all provinces might participate in that and we would all share the national egg pie.

This is the thing I think we have to recognize: that our producers must make

those decisions themselves. Now obviously the federal government cannot, because they do not have any authority, enter into a vote or to call a vote in the provinces of Canada—they do not have that authority. But I believe it is in sections 7 and 17 of the national Act where it states that if a majority of the producers in Canada wants a plan, the federal minister can bring in such a commodity type of plan. The federal minister's interpretation is that he will depend on the province, the minister and the province, to say whether or not there should be that type of request come from that province. To me that brings it right back to the responsibility of the minister and the marketing boards in the provinces to make those determinations.

My concern was expressed, and it was expressed again in this presentation that I made, that if a province decides to opt out of the national legislation, we do not want that province dumping its surplus or expanded production over into the other provinces that put themselves under the national plan. That to me is a very serious and a very definite matter that we want clearly enunciated.

Mr. Gaunt: It is not clear yet, is it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, maybe it is not. But certainly the interpretation that we have from the federal minister is that where a province decides to opt out, that province will be required to dispose of its production within its own border. I think if we have that kind of an understanding then we can make this plan work, and I do not think we can make it work any other way.

Mr. Chairman, these are very complex matters. They are very difficult matters to resolve, and I can assure you that we are as anxious as anyone to proceed with the legislation that is now before the House of Commons on the commodities that we think should be involved—and I think they involve poultry products; I cannot see them going much further than that at the moment. Perhaps they will some day.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister a question in regard to this legislation that we hear is going to be passed in Quebec in retaliation to what Ontario had done by passing Bill 10? As I have been informed they are going to pass similar legislation in regard to eggs and onions. Is that correct? Is the minister aware of any legislation that they are going to pass?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I would answer this question in this way: The minister in Quebec has no more authority to stop broilers coming into the Province of Ontario without the right to—that is, no one is trying to stop them coming in—but the minister has no authority to tell any producer of broilers in Ontario that he cannot sell those broilers in Ontario without a permit than I have to tell the egg producers of Ontario, or the minister in Manitoba has to tell egg producers in Manitoba, that they cannot ship into the Province of Quebec. We both recognize this. We have discussed this many times together. We recognize this to be a fact.

Now since September 3 nobody challenged that regulation that the broiler board had to require anyone who sold or offered for sale broilers in Ontario to have a marketing permit. We did not say they could not ship them in here; we did not say they could not store them here. We simply said that when they sell those broilers they require a marketing permit the same as our own broiler producers require, because they produce under a regulation, under a marketing quota. So all we are doing is saying anybody else selling broilers in Ontario does the same thing.

Mr. Spence: Could I ask the minister—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Now just a moment. If I may—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! It seems to me that this sort of debate across the floor of the House is not proper at this time. The minister is given the privilege of his opening remarks; the opposition critics are given the opportunity to make their contribution. The minister then may reply if he wishes. But debate of this type should take place under the specific vote, so that we have been somewhat out of order with this type of debate.

Mr. MacDonald: Could I ask you, Mr. Chairman, for your guidance? Though the minister has raised a couple of basic policy issues and I agree with you perhaps that there should not be debate now, is it not possible to move to the first vote and under the main office, where many times in the past we have thrashed out these issues and do it there neatly now in sequence. Because I think you will believe me when I tell you that if we do not get it in now we are going to get it in sometime before the estimates are over. Therefore it might be if we move to vote—main office—and let us see if we cannot resolve this.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the hon. member for York South I do agree that this sort of debate is going to be gotten into in the deliberations on these estimates at one point or another; there is no doubt about it. They do have a specific department programme for marketing and it seems to that is where this sort of debate should take place. Now vote 101 is the main office vote—

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: If you are going to allocate any discussion of Bill 10 to marketing, I wonder if we will be barred at that point in talking about some of the legal issues involved because I note under main office there is a vote of \$81,700 that deals with legal services, and it would seem to me that at that point some of the things I want to say should be quite in order.

Mr. Chairman: I would not rule the hon. member for Downsview out of order at that time on that score because the legal services of The Department of Agriculture and Food per se may be discussed as a legal service of that department. If he wishes to bring out the operation and function of these legal services within the department, I would not rule him out of order.

Mr. Singer: And their relation particularly to the—

Mr. Chairman: Now does the committee agree we should perhaps discontinue this sort of across-the-floor debate and proceed with the minister's comments? Does the minister have any further comments?

Perhaps I might take a moment, before we actually get into the estimates and while the deputies are moving to the table, to point out that we do have a new presentation of the estimates this year, as the hon. members no doubt have noticed.

The Department of Agriculture and Food, of course, is found on page 11, on which page is a complete summary of that department.

The hon. members will find on page 12, that the first vote, vote 101 of that department, sets forth the programme under departmental administration and so on until we complete all of the votes of The Department of Agriculture and Food.

Members will also notice that under each specific vote we have detailed items, and those items are covered in detail on the right-hand page facing the vote number. In other words, vote 101, item 1, the main office, is detailed on page 13. If any of the hon. members want to know, for example, what comes

under a main office vote in any department, if they look at page 346 in the index they have a general description.

So it seems to me the presentation is very clear-cut this time, and that we can proceed with the votes in order and take the items as they appear within the vote. If this is agreeable I therefore call vote 101, item 1, main office.

The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, in the main office vote, I presume that we are going to be discussing a number of policy matters that actually do not fall into any of the other categories.

That being so, there are a few comments that I would like to make with respect to the farm tax rebate system and the educational tax, as well as the cost-price squeeze. I presume those would be in order at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Would the hon. member like to detail them again? Which items?

Mr. Gaunt: I am going to be talking about the cost price squeeze and the farm tax rebate and educational costs on farm land, and so on. I cannot find anywhere in the votes where those would fit precisely and since the—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, vote 102.

Mr. Chairman: That is right. The hon. minister says that comes under vote 102, the farm tax rebate.

The hon. member speaks of a price squeeze situation?

Mr. Gaunt: Right, it is basically a policy.

Mr. Chairman: I see, under that heading, therefore, it would be under vote 101, main office.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few brief comments in this respect. The matter has been alluded to by my colleague from Oxford, and the member from Middlesex South also mentioned it. It seems to me that the cost-price squeeze is a continuing problem; I think it will continue for the foreseeable future.

I was very interested to note in the 1970 issue of Canadian Farm Economics, some statistics which were very revealing to say the least.

Using 1935 to 1939 as a base period, when we take 1946 the prices paid by farmers for

goods and services—in other words, their input costs—represented 157. The same period, prices received by the farmers, 204.1. Prices received as a percentage of the price paid, 130. If we go down the line we come to 1951: prices paid by farmers 230, prices received by farmers 296.8, and the prices received as a percentage of the prices paid, 129.

We come down to 1960: prices paid by farmers, 276.7; prices received by farmers, 250; prices received as a percentage of prices paid, 90.

And we go on down to 1966 and 1968. Rather than read the indices for the prices paid by farmers and prices received by farmers, I am just going to read the percentage paid as against the percentage received. In 1966 it had dropped to 89, and in 1968 it had dropped to 77.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, what we are talking about here, basically, is that the farmers in this province—and in this country actually; this was a Canadian statistic—the farmers in this country had roughly 25 per cent less disposable income, or real income, if you like than they had in the 1935-1939 base period.

I think that is a very revealing statistic because if we are talking about farm prices as over and above the prices paid by farmers for goods and services, then we are talking about a period immediately after the depression; the recovery was just starting to take place. As a matter of fact, I was only born in 1935 and I do not quite remember it, but I understand that in reading the various analyses and the various records of the history of things that took place at that time, that this was a recovery period and to think that prices in 1968 were 25 per cent below what they were in that period is really startling, I think, to say the least.

Mr. Chairman, it comes around to the point where many of the older farmers—and we have a preponderance of older farmers in the Province of Ontario. There are more farmers over the age of 50, 45 to 50, than there are under that age. Many times I have older farmers coming to me, as I am sure they come to all members in agricultural ridings. They say: "You know, I really do not know what to tell my son to do. I do not think he should farm. I do not think that there is any real future in farming for a young man, and, if my intuition is correct, I am going to tell my son to get the best education he can, get as good a training as he can, and get into some other occupation."

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I think that is a sad state of affairs. We cannot live without our farmers in this province and in this country. We can live without moon shots. We can do without those, but we cannot do without our farmers. We simply cannot live without them.

I think the highest priority has to be given to our agricultural problems in this country and in this province—in every province across Canada—because it seems to me that with the obvious shifts in population, where we have the concentration of population in our large urban centres, we tend to programme for those people. I realize they have very important problems. They have very pressing problems; transportation problems, housing problems, all of these things, of course, are important. But ultimately, if we cannot feed those people then all of these other things are for nothing.

It seems to me that we have to re-adjust our priorities in this country and devote a little more attention to the agricultural problems than we have been doing up until now, particularly in recent years. I realize that it is not easy. I often sit down and I wonder just what the answers are and I think if any one person in this country had the answer, he would be a multi-millionaire.

No one has all the answers. Of course they do not, but it seems to be that the farm prices—and I realize that that is not the entire answer but I think it is part of the answer—have to come from the marketplace. Increased farm prices have to come from the marketplace, with all the various connotations that means.

Now, whether we have supply management right across the board—I agree with supply management. I think it is the wise thing to do, particularly when it is practiced so adeptly by other segments of the economy.

Farmers are in the marketplace, they have to compete in the marketplace, and if they are going to compete effectively I think they have to have some type of supply management programme. In my view, I think that part of the answer is to get more money out of the marketplace and out of the marketing system, rather than government subsidies and government efficiency payments and government support. We have seen these things in the past and perhaps there is short-term benefit but in the long haul I think these things have done the industry irreparable damage.

I make those comments and I want the minister to respond. I want him to tell me in

his view what he would do if he had a son who was 20 years of age and at the point of making a decision of whether he farms or not; would he in fact tell his son, "No I do not think the future is for you here on the home farm."

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have some comments that are essentially in the same area, put perhaps somewhat different, and so maybe I could throw my two bits into the pot and the minister can reply to both of them at the same time.

I was interested when the minister was deploring the inadequate prices for pork at the present time and then giving a very comprehensive explanation as to why that was the case—it has to do with trade; it has to do with a lot of factors. The point I want to get to is this: is the minister's explanation really relevant? He is evading the main point, and that is: how are you going to assure the farmers of an adequate income?

The minister will agree with me that in any given year any given product is going to face exactly the same conditions that pork products or pork producers are facing today. There is weather, there is the ineffectiveness of supply management, there is trade flow within the country and internationally, and all are brought to bear. So let us not for one moment assume that if perchance you have resolved any given example of this basic farm problem you have gotten anywhere. You have got to solve it in a fundamental way.

If I may go around a little bit I shall come to the point where the hon. member for Huron-Bruce concluded, but my conclusion is a fundamentally different one. The basic problem in agriculture is income and please do not accept my word for it, let us go back to the Challenge of Abundance. The interesting thing is that after all the work that went into this report—and it was not an ivory tower effort; it was chaired by the deputy minister, and I sometimes wonder who is the more influential in shaping policy—the deputy or the minister? We will not explore that for the moment.

There were three practising farmers on it, as well as others who are interested in agriculture and food from the consumer's point of view. After they had made all of this study, as usually happens, a preface was written reflecting the reaction to the whole study. Let me read one paragraph to him, the fourth paragraph in the preface:

Since World War II, confused by wartime policies and misled by the immediate

postwar prosperity of agriculture, the farmer placed his reliance on a series of temporary expedients as a substitute for long-term planning and comprehensive programming. The result is an income crisis of major proportions.

The blame cannot be levelled at any one organization or institution. It is a result of the attitude and the philosophy of a majority of people associated with the industry. Unless immediate steps are taken to tackle this crucial issue the entire agricultural industry faces a violent upheaval that will bring little or no benefit to society but would disrupt and destroy the social and economic structure of rural Ontario. The warning signals have been flying for some time.

One does not have to be revolutionary; you do not need to go out and cry havoc; all you have to do is read that. It pinpoints the basic programme. Now, one year after that report came out the minister and I both attended an annual meeting of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture out at the Skyline Hotel. The outgoing chairman—who was leaving the Ontario Federation of Agriculture to take up his full-time responsibilities with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture—referred in passing to the Challenge of Abundance. And listen to his comment, Mr. Chairman:

It is a depressingly true fact that Ontario farmers have seemingly gained almost nothing since the tabling of the report of the special committee on farm income.

This should not be. The industry is standing still instead of moving steadily forward as it should.

I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that one more year has passed and Charlie Munroe's comments are just as valid today. What are we going to do about it? It is interesting to note that it says, "unless immediate steps are taken to tackle this crucial issue." The minister will counter that this is the farmer's problem, and I am not going to argue with him. To some degree this is the farmer's problem.

Indeed, the farmers have created this problem because of the divisions within their ranks and because of an excessive preoccupation with the mechanism for achieving this—namely the GFO. We all went off on the preoccupation with the GFO and that blew up in our faces; it was an abortive effort. And we are now back where? At scratch! Nothing has happened.

If the farming community, because of the divisions in their ranks or for whatever reason, cannot do anything about it I submit to you that the government is not absolved of some responsibility. The thing that is so depressing, as one thinks about the problems of rural Canada and rural Ontario, is that ever since the end of the war we have gone through an almost endless succession of mechanisms to cope with this fundamental income problem of agriculture. Let us forget about broilers, let us forget about eggs, let us forget about hogs—any one of the products, this is fundamental to all of them. This is basic to the industry.

We talked about floor prices at the federal level. I happened to be at the federal level as a civil servant within the party structure at that time, and I remember watching what happened. Every time there was an agricultural crisis Jimmy Gardiner could not get a business-dominated cabinet to move and acknowledge that something should be done until—it was not a crisis—it was complete calamity, so that any effort taken by that government was only after there was such severe evidence of a crisis that they acted too little and too late.

Next we got to the "deficiency price" stage and we toiled with that. We tried to make it work for a time. Then, in the mid-Sixties, when the crisis provoked the farmers to the point that they came up University Avenue in their tractors like tanks attacking the bastion of Queen's Park and ranged themselves out in the front—another crisis. So, we have a conference, and out of the conference emerges the possibility of united approach, a new idea and a new slogan—"incentive prices." A committee was set up to study incentive prices and somehow the concept got lost in the process. When the report came out there was nothing about incentive prices. The committee evaded the point that it was set up to go after. The government has evaded the point ever since and nothing has happened.

Let me come to the point that my hon. friend from Huron-Bruce mentioned. His comment was that for increased prices farmers will have to go to the marketplace. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, if farmers will have to go to the marketplace to get a fair return in terms of their labour and their capital investment, they will never have it in the future as they have never had it in the past. They have not got the bargaining strength in the marketplace.

Great gods! How stupid has one got to be not to recognize that fact? They have not got the bargaining strength and, furthermore, their bargaining strength is getting less and less. How are they going to cope with the multinational corporation? Sure, they will get a measure of strength through their marketing boards, and, sure, the minister will now give them a marketing board, the strength to seize products at the expense of the owner and things of that nature, but that is peripheral.

The fundamental problem is that they have not got the strength to get what they are entitled to in the marketplace. So if the hon. member from the Liberal Party, in keeping with the basic philosophy of the Liberal Party, says that farmers have got to get it in the marketplace, it simply will not happen. Their philosophy is bankrupt.

Mr. Gaunt: I said that was part of the answer. Do not quote me.

Mr. MacDonald: May I suggest to the hon. member that it is not part of the answer, because we have certainly proved that you can give to farmers strength in marketing boards. They can go so far in terms of getting a fair price and, if they drive the price too far, the product pours over the tariff walls and they have to run for cover. That is what happened in the bean business some two or three years ago.

Mr. Gaunt: All right, what is the alternative—to give them a billion dollars out of the public purse?

Mr. MacDonald: This is where the hon. member has to face up to some facts. We give to the manufacturing industry of this country something like \$2 billion out of the pocket of the public through tariffs.

Mr. Gaunt: All right, I am just asking.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay, they have got it. Now, I do not want to get into any side arguments with my friend for the moment. All I am saying is that, in my view, experience has proven that pointing to the marketplace as the place where farmers are going to get a fair return is proof of the bankruptcy of the policy that he is asserting. The only way that you are going to get it is to get rid of what is known as cheap food prices, which is a real misnomer and really misleading, because it is not cheap as far as the consumer is concerned.

Unfortunately farmers are now only three or four or five per cent of society and no

government—whether Conservative, Liberal, or NDP—is going to be able to survive while permitting a massive increase in food prices. You just cannot survive, whatever may be the intellectual and theoretical validity of it. You are not going to impose that kind of a burden on the 95 per cent, when they think the burden is already intolerable, for the benefit of the other five.

So what do I conclude? I go back to the essential principles of incentive food prices. Let farmers have their marketing boards. Let them get from the marketplaces as much as their strength will permit, or the conditions of the marketplace will permit. But if when that process is over, agriculture is not getting a fair return in accordance with the principles of "The Challenge of Abundance," namely, a fair return on their capital investment, a fair return on their labour, then they are entitled to get it from society as a whole.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: Free enterprisers in the Tory and Liberal Party, may be able to pander the farmers. They may be able to flatter them, and say, "You are the last rugged individualists." But I will tell you what is going to happen, the farmers are just like the small businessmen, who are always praised as being the last champions of free enterprise. They are patted on the back until those who dominate the economy come to the conclusion that the time is ripe to knock them on the head, and out they go!

That is what is happening to farmers. That is what is happening to small business, if the hon. member for Huron-Bruce is correct. It is deplorable that agriculture is sort of fading away. We fritter away our money on shots to the moon, but the people who produce the food, the people who want to live in all of the conditions of rural life are being driven out of it. No farmer in his right mind today—or at least nine out of 10 of them in their right mind today—are not going to say to their sons: "Son, stay on the farm."

An hon. member: Sure!

Mr. MacDonald: The only way the government is going to alter that is by a planned economic development that says to agriculture, "You are entitled to fair returns in accordance with the principles underlying 'Challenge of Abundance' and we shall make damn sure you get it."

If that means subsidies, let us not run in panic from subsidies. This government is handing out subsidies on EIO loans—the whole public is handing out \$2 billion in subsidies to manufacturing all the time through tariffs.

The minister is confusing the issue by bolstering the farmers' prejudice against assistance from the government. This is part of the prejudice and this is part of his whole outlook. In fact, I go back to this chapter:

The blame cannot be levelled at any one organization or institution. It has been the result of the attitudes and the philosophy of the majority of people associated with the industry.

The attitude and the philosophy of the government and of the Liberal Party and of all those in the agricultural community who seek to perpetuate the proposition that it is somehow demeaning that agriculture should demand and get what they are entitled to for a fair contribution to the economy of this country. The government is perpetuating the attitudes which created the problem and it will always live on.

I do not know whether one can make any headway in trying to cope with the massive misconceptions on this point in rural Ontario. I know it is easy for the minister to get up on his podium—and, indeed, for the Liberal Party to get up and say essentially the same thing, because the hon. member for Huron-Bruce, for whom I have not only a great respect—I was almost going to say an affection, but that might be misinterpreted—has said exactly the same thing.

Mr. Gaunt: Please, please!

Mr. MacDonald: The farmer must get it in the marketplace, he said. Well, the John R. Stewarts of the agricultural community think that the farmers can get it in the marketplace, but the great majority of farmers, I hope, have reached the point that they cannot. Quit kidding them, quit confusing the issue.

Let me sum it up and go back to a question I want to put to the minister. What is the government going to do about the basic problem of agricultural income across the board? We are interested in getting the minister's explanations as to why the hog situation is deplorable at the moment, but that is irrelevant really. What is the government ready and willing to do to cope with the basic problem in agriculture—for hogs, for anything.

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): Supply and demand.

Mr. MacDonald: We have heard nothing about that because the minister did not get it from "Challenge of Abundance." What we got was too sharply focused in the GFO and that blew up. So now have drifted back into a policy vacuum or the basic problem of agriculture. Has the minister any alternative?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the question demands an answer and certainly an answer that cannot be provided easily. There is no question of that at all because he hit the nail right on the head when he said that one of the basic problems in the whole issue is the fact that the farmers themselves refuse to accept any type of regimentation within their own organization. Witness the "Challenge of Abundance" report.

If my hon. friend had gone on, he would have seen the price incentive programme, which was really developed by one of the members of the committee. The reason I appointed him to the committee was because he had developed that programme within the federation of agriculture and I thought this was the place to put him—right on the committee. And he went on to that committee.

Mr. MacDonald: It is essentially the same programme as the farm union had in the late Fifties. That is why there was hope. But the minister does not seem to agree.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They went on with that programme, but my hon. friend did not go any further. If he had read through that report, they recommended that there be one farm organization and that there be a food supply agency established. That I think was the thing, more than perhaps anything else, that created the problem as far as the GFO vote was concerned. It is only a personal expression of opinion, but I think this was one of the reasons why the farm people of Ontario voted down GFO in June of 1969.

Mr. MacDonald: If I can say it unprovocatively, there was nothing more important than their suspicions of how you had manipulated farm organization for years.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, if that suspicion was abroad, it was generated by none other than the then leader of the New Democratic Party in this province. That is where it came from.

Mr. Villeneuve: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: You flatter me if you think I could do this on such a scale across the province.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I can tell you that. Because this man, who is the former leader of the New Democratic Party—

An hon. member: He put on a campaign.

Hon. Mr. Stewart—this hon. member, the member for York South now, has been out abroad preaching dissatisfaction, crisis in Ontario, doing everything he could to destroy the problems of agriculture in this province. This has been his stock in trade.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: He does not have to preach it.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not have to preach it—rather to report. I am asking the minister to recognize it.

Mr. Martel: That is nonsense. He created—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Of course. How can we do anything about it when there is somebody running around the province, as he has been, trying to destroy the very things we are trying to do?

Mr. MacDonald: On one day the minister says I have no influence in rural Ontario. The next time he says I persuaded them all to a certain attitude. How ludicrous can he get?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Certainly the member contributed to it. There is no question of that whatever.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): They are treating the minister mean.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not get too alarmed about that. Let me suggest this, Mr. Chair-

man, that as far as correcting the incredibly low income that farm people sustain throughout this province and this nation—there is no one knows it better than I. I operate a farm—

Mr. MacDonald: The minister has no answer. He is bankrupt.

Mr. Innes: The most sophisticated.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I operate a farm, but I point out to you that those particular commodity groups within the agricultural community who have, by their own initiative, attempted to gear the supply of their product to what the market will require, are in reasonably comfortable economic condition. And I point to the tobacco growers of this province as the best illustration of any that I can find.

I point as well to the fluid milk producers of this country, for there is a group of people who, by their own initiative, have developed a plan for quota production geared to what the market will absorb. They have the best programme of product promotion there is going in this country today, to increase the use of their product so that they themselves are in a better position and I think we would have to agree that they are in reasonably good condition.

Mr. Martel: They got 10 cents a quart, did they not?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There are two commodities that are not in bad shape. The other commodity is beef, which is reasonably good today.

Mr. Chairman: Order please, it being 6 of the clock I do now leave the chair and we will resume at eight. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. minister. I am sure he has many more remarks.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 27, 1971

Tabling Capital Support Programme for universities, and Operating Support for Provincially-assisted Universities, Mr. White	887
Reduction of voting age, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Singer	887
Agency stores to dispense alcoholic beverages, questions to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. B. Newman	887
Procedure of granting bail to inmates of institutions, questions to Mr. Apps, Mr. J. Renwick	888
Advertising and programmes re sport fishing to attract U.S. sportsmen, questions to Mr. Guindon, Mr. Paterson, Mr. Deacon	888
Proposed reorganization of Jockey Club re non-profit organization, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Sopha	889
Jobs created with five per cent rebate on purchase of machinery and equipment, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. J. Renwick, Mr. Deacon, Mr. T. Reid	889
Reduction in civil servants and facilities to administer Succession Duty affairs, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Singer	895
Revenue production through equalization of beer prices, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Singer	895
Revenue expended re fishing licences exceeding money coming in, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Singer, Mr. Good	896
Land bank money assisting North York to purchase York Downs golf club, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Singer	896
Taxing provincial public buildings serviced by municipalities, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. W. Newman, Mr. Paterson	897
Procedure of granting bail to inmates of institutions, question to Mr. Apps Mr. J. Renwick	897
Windsor University equipment used by Ontario contractor, question to Mr. White, Mr. Spence	898
Sudbury Labour Council request for meeting re hospital crisis, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Martel	898
Purpose of study of tourism in northwestern Ontario, question to Mr. Guindon, Mr. T. P. Reid	898
Granting liquor licences in resort areas, question to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Sargent	898
Replacing corporation tax with personal income tax, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Deans	898
Employment in mining industry created by five per cent incentive grant, question to Mr. McKeough, Mr. T. Reid	899

Freeze on moving Ontario Hospital patients into homes for special care, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Ferrier	899
Equalizing gasoline and fuel costs throughout Ontario, question to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Knight	899
Tabling law reform commission report on coroner system in Ontario, Mr. A. F. Lawrence	900
Tabling report containing requested information on licence issuing, Mr. MacNaughton	902
City of Hamilton, bill respecting, Mrs. Pritchard, first reading	902
Provincial Parks Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, first reading	902
Forestry Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, first reading	902
Gananoque Lands Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, first reading	902
Fish Inspections Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle first reading	902
Election Act, 1968-1969, bill to amend, Mr. Young, first reading	902
Speaker's ruling on participation of ministers in committees	902
Planning Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading	905
Planning Act, bill to amend, reported	912
Planning Act, bill to amend, third reading	914
Estimates, Department of Agriculture and Food, Mr. Stewart	914
Recess, 6 o'clock	934



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, April 27, 1971
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

**(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 1971

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned the House at 6 o'clock I was discussing matters pertaining to the pricing of farm products within Canada. My hon. friend from York South (Mr. MacDonald) had suggested, I took from his remarks, that we in the Province of Ontario should be doing something about more satisfactory price levels for farm products, even though they are produced on a national basis.

This, I am sure, is a noble objective but one that is not that easy to obtain nor to reach. He referred to the tractor parades of 1966. Certainly they came about because of a most unsatisfactory price level for industrial milk at that time. The real row that developed at that time among the farmers of Ontario was that they believed we had the right to get into the field of commodity subsidization. I took the position that the Province of Ontario should not become involved in commodity pricing in competition with other provinces because, if members will recall, the Province of Quebec at that time was very much involved in commodity subsidization of industrial milk.

We felt that if we were going to have uniformity of milk pricing across Canada the subsidy—and we agreed that there should be a subsidy—should be paid at the national level so that there would not be the incredible competition that was obviously developing between provinces as regards commodity pricing.

I was not in opposition to the farmers' position for increased prices. There were those who thought that I was. I certainly did not take that position but I did believe that the federal government should assume, through a national dairy commission, the establishment of a uniform price for industrial milk products across Canada, which

could not be achieved unless the Province of Quebec withdrew from the field of milk subsidization.

Our discussions went on with the minister of Quebec and the federal minister of the day to the place where we mutually agreed on Ontario getting into the field of subsidization for an interim period, I believe, of something like six months. We then agreed with the Province of Quebec that we would both withdraw from the field of commodity subsidization and the federal government would assume that responsibility on a national basis, and this was achieved.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that is the place where it should be achieved. One could not hope to generate within the province, where a commodity is produced on a national basis, a price that is higher within that province than it is within other provinces unless one realizes it is but an invitation to the other provinces to ship to the province where the higher price establishment has been made. It just follows like night follows day that that is what will happen. Certainly that is what happened as far as our recent commodity problems are concerned. Our broiler producers in Ontario established a reasonable price for broilers based on a marketing quota, but there were other provinces that did not see fit to establish that type of quota restriction and they simply produced and shipped in here under the umbrella of the price structure that had been established within Ontario. This applied certainly in other provinces such as British Columbia where the same thing was taking place.

This is the difficulty that one runs into. I fully support and sympathize with what my hon. friend from York South has suggested, that certainly we recognize the price of many commodities is far from satisfactory. But, as I pointed out before the dinner hour adjournment, those producers that have agreed among themselves to gear their supply to what the market will absorb have been able to accomplish something as far as a better economic position is concerned. I pointed out that tobacco growers and the fluid milk industry, for example—both of these commodity groups have been pretty

well able to assist themselves to a much more satisfactory income level.

If we recognize these basic principles and if those commodities which can be produced in abundance virtually overnight, such as poultry and poultry products, come under some type of a national bill where there can be some type of supply management provided, it seems to me that we can accomplish a great deal more in reaching the objective described by my friend, the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt), when he says that the marketplace should produce more of a satisfactory price level.

I think that this can be accomplished to a much greater degree when there is bargaining power placed in the hands of the producers themselves, but on a national basis—and that is really what we are talking about. On a provincial basis certainly they have been able to accomplish a very great deal, but because of this movement of products back and forth throughout Canada on an unrestricted basis, as far as supply and price are concerned, then it simply destroys the effectiveness of the commodity marketing plan within the province.

To me it may not be the whole answer, and I am inclined to think that it is not. But I think it is one way of reaching a more desirable level of farm prices than we have had in the past. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if we work toward this objective on a national level I think a good deal can be accomplished. But I must confess that it is a most frustrating and difficult experience to try to reach that objective when we have many farmers, even within in this province, who seek on every occasion to destroy any desire of others to collectively strengthen their bargaining position by working together. This is one of the great frustrations that I have been faced with, and I am afraid it has characterized us as farm people for all too long.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I am not going to prolong this debate, but the minister has made some very interesting comments which perhaps, if I had had the opportunity to be more fully in contact with the agricultural community 24 hours a day, I would have been aware of them.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): You mean if you were an agriculturalist of any kind you would know the difference between a chicken and a broiler.

Mr. MacDonald: You have obviously had too much to drink over supper.

Mr. W. Hodgson: No, I did not have too much to drink.

Mr. MacDonald: If you have got nothing more to say than that, I would suggest to the hon. member that he just lapse into silence. We were having a relatively intelligent debate until he dragged it down to that level. What was I going to say—

Mr. W. Hodgson: Well, the member is a national president; he is a big man.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): If the member has nothing worthwhile to say, do not say it.

Mr. MacDonald: The principle that if you have higher prices in any given province the products are going to flow in from other provinces surely is a very obvious one—so obvious that I would have thought that when Tom Robson came up with the idea in the OFA and presented it to the Vineland conference, he would have recognized that was the case. Indeed anybody would have recognized that when they initially offered the proposition of incentive prices.

If it is so obvious now that this would not work, why did you kid the troops for three years?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I did not kid the troops.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, okay. The minister put his deputy as chairman of a committee that went into three years of study, and therefore the farmers were led to believe that there was some serious consideration of this proposition on the basis of how you would implement the principle of incentive prices.

It is so obvious now that it simply would not work within the provincial framework, it must have been obvious before. Or else you were doing some pretty shallow thinking. I agree, obviously I agree, that one province cannot move on its own, but if the minister is really committed to coming up with a fundamental solution to the problem of farm income, I would have been persuaded that this was still in his mind if I had heard his voice raised rather frequently and vigorously vis-à-vis Ottawa in trying to get Ottawa to do the same thing, to join with provinces to get some sort of basic assurance of adequate farm income through incentive prices or anything else.

But now the minister insists there is another answer to it, and this is what I found to be rather new. The other answer to it is that we get national marketing, and in other words we will make it possible for the farmers to get out of the marketplace through national marketing plans what they have never been able to get out of the marketplace before.

Well, forgive me for being a bit doubtful and saying you are pursuing another will of the wisp. Because there is an awful lot of experience, for reasons that I stated before the supper break, that the farmers simply have not got the strength to get out of the marketplace what they are entitled to in terms of a fair return. It is rather interesting—the Liberals and Tories come together in saying to the farmers, "Get into the marketplace and get what you are entitled to," which simply means—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Why do you not grow up? It is the same old malarkey.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Is this part of the Waffle policy?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the Liberals and Tories are saying that food prices are going to be driven even higher, and I suggest to you that the farmers are not going to be able to get what they are entitled to, through extracting it—

An hon. member: That is not true and the member knows it.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. MacDonald: —through higher food prices, because any government, including this government, is not going to tolerate that for very long. So once again you are kidding the farmers. That is the problem: The Liberal and Tory parties have kidded the farmers for years.

Mr. W. Hodgson: You are kidding the farmers.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Both sides now.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, it may be a long process to enlighten them, but we will engage in it; we will pursue it—

Mr. T. Reid: By nationalizing the farms.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Sargent: He is out of order. He is the one who is out of order.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The hon. member for York South has the floor.

Mr. MacDonald: I not only have the floor but I am finished. I know I am finished and they do not; that is the problem.

Mr. Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): I want to follow up on this point because I do have some comments concerning the remarks of the hon. member for York South, and in addition I want to pursue one other point with the minister.

The member for York South has seized on a point that I made, and the minister mentioned it as well, when I suggested that there was an income problem on the farm. Of course, there is; everybody knows there is. And I suggested that part of that extra income would have to come from the marketplace, and I reiterate that, it will have to come from the marketplace, and that is precisely what I meant.

Let me elaborate on that. If the egg people across this province and across this country had had supply management operating, they would have been getting 35 to 40 cents a dozen for their eggs now; they are getting 26 cents. If that is not getting more money out of the marketplace, I do not know what is. Of course it is.

The same with the hog man. If there had been a programme of supply management across this country operating in the hog industry, the hog farmers in this province, as well as in other provinces, would have been getting \$35, \$36, \$37 a hundredweight for their hogs instead of \$22. That is what I mean by getting more money out of the marketplace.

I recognize that it is only part of the problem and I certainly underline that and I agree with my friend from York South on one thing. I agree that the governments have not done enough in the past to redress the imbalance. They have not done enough in the past and I think they are going to have to accept that proposition that they are going to have to move in partnership with the marketplace, if you like, in order to give the farmers of this country a decent standard of living.

But having said that, I have to remind my hon. friend from York South that whether we like it or not, we operate in a competitive

market society. If we are talking about changing that system, then that is an entirely different argument and we have to set that aside.

But, whether we like it or not, those are the rules of the ballgame. We have to operate within those rules and those rules are set down by the system—the competitive market system.

As far as I am concerned, I think this government could have done a lot more and, indeed, should be doing a lot more in pouring money into research to actually encourage farmers to produce more of the products that we import into this province. I really believe this.

I think that, when one takes a look at the import figures, we import more into this province, Ontario—and it is supposed to be an agricultural producing province—than we export.

Mr. Stokes: Tomato paste.

Mr. Gaunt: Tomato paste, lettuce, frozen foods. I think we could produce these things in our province. We should not have to import them. I think if we poured a lot more money into research and into encouraging farm people to go into this type of production, to put more money in the farmers' pockets in this province, then I think we would be doing them a real service. Now there are, of course, some imports that we just cannot produce here in the province. We cannot produce bananas. We cannot produce oranges. We have to import them into the province.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Can you produce lettuce in January?

Mr. Gaunt: Those things we have to accept, but I think there are certain products that we are importing into this country that our farmers here could grow and grow very well. I would like to see The Department of Agriculture pursue that course.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of the minister? I attended an agricultural meeting in Guelph in January of this year. There were speakers there who informed us that in Canada we imported last year \$39 million more worth of agricultural products than we exported. This is unusual for a country that can produce practically all but citrus fruits.

What is taking place, or does the minister know? It is a very hard question to answer.

Why is that occurring? Are our products of a good enough quality, or what is taking place, or are individuals bringing products into this country to lower our markets here in Canada or Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Spence) asked a question that is extremely difficult to answer off the top of my head, because I do not have the statistics at hand, but if memory serves me correctly, in the figures that he used was included the amount of beef that was brought in here as one of the commodities from Oceania. Now this beef came in—

Mr. Sargent: From where?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: From Australia and New Zealand. Much of it was processed here and shipped on to the United States in great quantities. This, of course, appeared as an import figure for this country. Now, a lot of it appeared as an export figure as well, but by the same token this is where a lot of the import figures come from.

I would also point out to my hon. friend that because of the climate of this country, and the fact that our people have the second highest standard of living in the world today, that our consumers have available, 12 months of the year, the type of fruit and vegetables that we have become accustomed to and take for granted every day. Other than hothouse tomatoes and cucumbers, such as my friend from Essex South the other day, presented us with in this House, all that produce has to be imported. It comes in from the United States, from California, Arizona, and under irrigation from Mexico. Our greenhouse industry finds itself in extreme competition with comparatively cheap labour, because of the climate where one can grow these crops on a successive basis under irrigation, almost on a continual production basis.

I suppose that if we were to deny our consumers the opportunity to enjoy a 12-month diet of that kind of consumer food item, we could cut down greatly on the imports that come into this country. There are certain other commodities that do come in, for example, certain pork cuts that come in here from outside, but by the same token we ship certain pork cuts out of this country. As I said earlier, we have increased our exports in pork last year by 68 per cent. It is extremely difficult to say just how we can increase the growing of some of these products.

My hon. friend from Huron-Bruce mentioned tomato paste. I was greatly interested in that commodity. I felt that here was an opportunity that we could really expand production of a commodity that is obviously being shipped in here as a highly acceptable commodity in this country because it has been used to manufacture so many tomato products.

The truth of the matter was that the farmers themselves determined that they could not grow tomatoes in competition with that kind of a price level. They themselves turned down the idea. It was not turned down by the government. They turned it down themselves as a Tomato Marketing Board. If they make that decision, who are we to say to them: "You are going to grow those tomatoes anyway, whether you want to or not"? I think we have to be reasonable about these kind of things.

I suggest to you that one of the major efforts of our food council is to place emphasis on trying to grow as much as possible of the commodities that we use in Ontario, and in Canada, in our own province. I must say that consumer tastes and preferences, and our standard of living, just seem to keep going ahead of us that much more, and so it is not as easy to catch up as we might like to think.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if I might just take a moment before we proceed. We have some special guests with us this evening. In Mr. Speaker's gallery there is a group of 35 boys from Trinity College School in Port Hope. I am sure we would want to extend a special welcome to them.

The hon. member for Downsview has the floor.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, along the same line that my colleague from Huron-Bruce has been discussing with the minister, and to some extent touched on by the member for Youth South, as an urban consumer I have watched with very substantial interest the recent price war between our supermarkets. While the urban consumer certainly has benefited—he has been able to get his supplies at a cheaper price—the spreading effect, the wave effect of this price war seems to me to be something that the minister should be concerning himself about at very great length and in substantial depth.

Let us start on the supermarket level. As I read in the financial pages of the papers the quarterly returns or the annual returns of

these various supermarket chains, it seems reasonably apparent, to me at least, that their profits have not gone up. They have gone down. As I have watched the changes in top management in those things, it seems that quite ruthlessly, the people who arrange for changes in top management have been chopping off officials who seem to have had substantial experience, probably in direct relationship to the profit ratio in their balance sheet.

Then, as I talked to people who have been with these chains, or have left the chains, and the entrepreneurs—sort of the middleman who gets in—it is admitted quite freely in private conversation that as these price wars started, and as they waxed enthusiastically, the muscle was applied to the producers, to the farmers, and that the farmer was told in no uncertain terms, "We, X Supermarket Chain Limited, are in the price war and this is all we are going to pay you, Mr. Farmer, for your goods."

The farmer produces them and there they are; he has got them in supply and he is in trouble. It is often the case. I cannot give you chapter and verse of the specific commodities, but often he has to sell at a lower price than it is costing him to produce because there it is, he has got it and there is nobody to protect him.

What has bothered me very much, Mr. Chairman, is that this minister, who now calls himself the Minister of Agriculture and Food, has not made his voice heard in connection with this kind of a price war, which seems to have had very limited benefit for anyone in our society. I share the opinion of my colleague from Huron-Bruce that somewhere along the line, if the urban consumer is going to purchase in the marketplace, he has got to pay a reasonable price so that the producer is going to get a reasonable return for his investment and for his time and his effort.

As far as I have been able to watch in this price war that has taken place here in Metropolitan Toronto, no one except, very narrowly, the urban consumer, seems to have benefited. The deleterious effect all the way down the line from top management through the shareholders, through the entrepreneurs, and particularly the producers, has been just a tragedy. I have watched very carefully, and lord knows I am no authority on farm economy, but I have watched very carefully for the words to come from the Minister of Agriculture and Food saying, "I am concerned. I am the responsible minister in government and I am concerned about what is

happening to our producers in the rural areas and I am going to do something about it.”

As carefully as I have watched and as carefully as I have listened, there has been no word. I ask the minister in all sincerity—and I am not trying to bait him yet; that will come on the next vote—I ask him in all sincerity what is his view in relation to this sort of thing, this unusual product of our present economy that is doing no one any good, least of all the farmers and their ability to produce and their ability to make an honest living?

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, on this same point that was raised by the member for Huron-Bruce, there are a couple of factors I might point out to the minister and this House in relation to this particular matter.

I am sure he is aware that I have a resolution on the order paper dealing with this very topic about the province moving into this technology to improve our agricultural situation.

There are possibly two points I would like to make in this regard.

At the present time I am drafting a letter that I hope will get to the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman) within the next couple of days. This deals with the onion business in our provinces and this has been an agricultural product that certainly has had its ups and downs, and trials and tribulations.

I know one of the people in my area has made approaches to officials of your department and, I believe, to The Department of Trade and Development as he has procured verbal contracts in England for the distribution or the shipping of dehydrated onions and onion salt. If he can get into this business it will mean the removal from the Ontario or Canadian market of approximately 500 acres of onions to go into this one particular product. Of course, the shipping is going to be much cheaper and the dollar return is going to be much better.

Here is one instance where, if we get the co-operation of your department—and I am sure we will—and that of the Minister of Trade and Development, we can help bolster the onion business in our particular province.

I have been dealing with a food processor who was attempting to get into the fast frozen food business. I believe most of the cauliflower, broccoli, brussels sprouts and other commodities of this type are being imported into our province and sold 12 months

of the year at our frozen food counters. I think they are receiving a very good acceptance by the housewife if they are competitively priced. I would think if we in Ontario could grow these particular products—take acreage that may be in products that are in superfluous amounts—it would enhance our fresh markets during our growing season, and at the same time provide a source of supply in Canada of produce grown in Canada and thus reduce the imports.

I do happen to have some of the statistics with me. Our acreage, I believe, in fresh beans has dropped from 728 acres back in 1960 down to 470 acres in 1966. Beets—I believe we grew 1,120 acres, which is about half the Canadian production—have dropped down to 820 acres. We are losing acreage in these valuable market garden products.

Also related to this matter, of course, is the outlook of the Ontario Development Corporation. I do not want to go too far into this. I have a letter before me in relation to the EIO loan that was granted to the Campbell Soup Company where they entered into what they called the “first phase of production.”

A performance loan was granted to this company to develop a mushroom-growing operation in eastern Ontario. This is great. But the loan was made on the basis that this particular company was importing approximately \$500,000 worth of mushrooms from the United States and it was estimated that in due course this would go up to \$1 million. The establishment of this plant to grow them in Canada was intended to eliminate these imports.

How did the Ontario Development Corporation arrange this loan, where they have refused others in the food business? They state that this was the first step in an integrated food processing operation.

This is the reason, Mr. Chairman, that I have put this resolution on paper. To see if we can encourage the government—not only The Department of Agriculture, but The Ontario Department of Trade and Development—to try to give an assist; to encourage the development of new processing techniques and get the specialized agricultural products grown in greater quantities, and hopefully at better prices, and under contracts whereby the individual farmers can be assured of dollar income.

I do hope that we get a chance to debate this particular principle in the weeks to come and at that time I will certainly express myself more fully on this point.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this department has to do with the operation of the supply of food in this province. In my area we have the 51st and 53rd lowest on the income wage scale in the Province of Ontario. We have real farm poverty. We have farmers having incomes as low as \$1,700 per year, so we have a disaster area in the area of agriculture.

I am not too knowledgeable about the mechanics and the operations of farm marketing boards and all the intricate things the minister is so knowledgeable about, but I am concerned about the fact that we have an alarming disappearance of the family farm. There must be some solution for the problems of agriculture in that, for instance, every day in the paper we see eight or nine auction sales of farm properties for sale in my area in the daily Sun-Times.

It is a matter of great concern in that these people are suffering hardships. With all the technology and all the advice the hon. minister has to offer, there must be some way to do something for this industry. I know a bit about the operation of the food industry. My colleague from Downsview was talking about the food price wars. They are a matter of concern to everyone in this province.

When Dominion Stores opened the price war, the hon. minister should have been on that firing line from the start. I do not know whether or not the minister will agree with what I have to say, but, for instance, they said, "We will not knowingly be undersold by anyone."

So a group in Winnipeg—five supermarket chains—got together and they said, "We will fix Dominion Stores." They each took 20 loss leaders and they published 100 loss leaders in the Winnipeg market and defied Dominion Stores to match these prices and Dominion Stores took a hell of a shellacking in trying to match these prices.

Somewhere along the line, these people in the food industry, they are—The most important thing in our lives is the supply of food. I am trying to say in a round-about way that the minister, representing the people of Ontario in this area, should be on top of this. First of all, how far has vertical integration gone? How much control of our lives have these big food chains in integration of the different commodity groups? I do not know the story on that, but the minister should be on top of it. How far have they

integrated? Is it too late to block them some way?

It would seem to me that in every area the unions can get together and in the marketplace they can get a fair price for what they can sell. They sell their hands, their labour. They get a fair price, because they can collectively get together and go on strike.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Just a minimum.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, but I would like to have the minister tell me or tell the House how far would he go in helping agriculture go on strike against the people of this province, against the food chains of this province?

Mr. Pilkey: Just enough—

Mr. Sargent: I think the farmers have the most powerful tool in the world. They say a man will—I forget the progression here—but in the first day he is hungry, he will steal; the second day he will be violent, and the third day when he is hungry he will kill for food. The farmers have the most powerful weapon in the whole world in their hands to solve their problem. If the farmer goes on strike, all hell is going to break loose. They are going to get their just price on the marketplace, as the hon. member for Huron-Bruce says, if they have the co-ordination of government to help them get their just rights.

I think it behooves the minister—I say this respectfully—that if he is going to do a complete job in there, he should know how far they have integrated, how much power these big chains have in controlling the food supply, ruining the agricultural industry. Then you must ask yourself if you would help them go on strike. Could the farmers of this province say, "We will not take our supplies to the marketplace. We will hold everything off the market and see how long this is allowed to continue"? You would be in a hell of a mess representing the people of this province if you did not try to break that strike.

Somewhere along the line there must be something. We are putting a man on the moon—with all the technology we have, all the brainpower you have here, there must be some way. I know there are no pat answers for this, but there must be some way that you would say, "Okay, we will go to work and try to solve this thing because we have the power to break this monopoly control these food chains have on the food of our people." I would like to have your thoughts on this.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Mr. Sargent: Can you please tell me if there is any sense in what I am saying?

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister have any comments? The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few remarks in regard to this vote.

Many members and the public at large are perhaps not aware that in northwestern Ontario we have a sizable farming community. Generally, I would imagine the populace, particularly in southern Ontario, looks upon northwestern and northern Ontario as an area more of bush and trees and lakes and forests rather than one of agricultural areas.

Mr. Yakabuski: We are aware.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I would like to point out to my friend who is holding down the back row over there that we have a sizable farming community in the Rainy River district. It is one of the very good areas in the province for growing hay particularly. The minister himself, I believe, was at the opening of the new cattle auction ring at Stratton last fall in which a fair number of buyers from the west and from southern Ontario come up to Stratton in the Rainy River district to purchase cattle and feeders for their feedlots down in this area of the country. It is a large cattle auction, as the hon. minister is aware, and it draws a good crowd.

But my friend who just spoke mentioned the fact that the farm income in his area was some \$1,700 per head. In the Rainy River district among many of my farmers, the average income is much lower than that. I wonder if I might put a question to the minister; perhaps it might come up under a later vote. I wonder if, in concluding these remarks, I might ask him if there is any particular thrust within his department to do something about farm income in the northern regions of the province? If he has any programme to rationalize the farming in the northern parts, any programme which might lead to an increase in the average income for the farmer.

Before the minister rises to answer that question, I would like to extend an invitation to him once again to take part in the cattle auction at Stratton in the Rainy River district, and to all hon. members, next fall.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there are two or three things I would like to say in reply to the various statements that have been made.

First of all, the member for Downsview raised the matter of the supermarket war. I can only suggest that there are not very many business enterprises that will continue to flourish when their profit statements, as indicated in the press, appear to be losing money as fast as they were. I think they will soon change their tactics.

With regard to the reported lack of action, which he noted, as far as I am concerned I am afraid he was not watching television because I was on at least three television shows and was quoted in several newspapers as being very much and very vitally concerned with the possible reaction that the supermarket war could have on primary producers. I do not know of any particular reaction that it has had as yet, and I doubt very much if it will now.

At the time there were certainly pressures put on processors. There were pressures being put on food brokers of one kind or another, to meet certain commitments of advertising and shelf-space and what have you in supermarket stores. We were concerned that that would in turn be passed on to the primary producers. I do not think it happened, but I do want to say that even at the time that the chain store war was going on, as I have mentioned earlier today, the supermarkets were all featuring pork in tremendous quantity.

They succeeded in moving enormous quantities of fresh pork which I think really saved the situation last fall. You will notice that the price did not drop much below, what, \$28, \$29 level. It was even around the \$30 level until the fowl hit the market before Christmas. Then the prices started to slip when the chain stores stopped featuring pork in supermarkets and featured fowl instead.

This is a fact of life. It is there for all to see. My hon. friend from Downsview refers to the fact that we did not take as much action as we should have. Perhaps he did not see, but certainly we were in there pitching, and I wonder just what really is the counterpart—

Mr. Sargent: May I ask a question of the minister?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will come to the member's in a moment.

Mr. Sargent: I mean, how was the minister in there pitching? What was he doing?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If the member had been here instead of out there, he would have heard me say that I appeared on three television shows and was quoted in several newspapers across this province, as giving interviews with the press and with others concerning the possible effect that the supermarket price war would have eventually on the primary producers.

Mr. Sargent: Does the minister call that in there pitching?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think so, yes, I do.

Mr. Sargent: Come on!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will tell the member it is a lot more than his friend Mr. Basford at Ottawa said he would do, and he said he would take no action at all. When his friend Mr. Basford at Ottawa determines—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have the floor.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend made statements about what I did not do, now I am going to tell him what I did.

A few years ago when we were talking about high beef prices, what did his friend Mr. Weinstein do—who is likely to be one of his party's candidates—the chairman for the federal Prime Minister's dinner downtown here a while ago? What did he and the federal minister, Mr. Basford, do when they talked about high beef prices? They said: "Go on strike; tell the consumers of Canada and Ontario to go on strike against high beef prices"—that is what the member's federal counterparts did.

The first time in the history of this country, since 1951, that the beef producers of this country ever got anything like a decent price, and Mr. Basford said at Ottawa, "Go on strike against beef prices."

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, it is what we are talking about. Now then, the member talks to me about what I did as far as the supermarket war is concerned. I said that I took the position that, unless the supermarket war could get levelled out, there would be an adverse effect on processors, which there then was appearing to be, and that the adverse effect would likely be passed on down the line to primary producers. In my opinion, this would be a very serious thing to have happen, be-

cause there are some commodity groups which can bargain in strength—bean producers for one group. They have got an agency plan; they control all the produce that is grown in Canada—virtually right there, in their own hands.

The Ontario Milk Marketing Board controls the price of whole milk; the chain stores could not cut it. They were just simply told, "That is the price that you are going to pay," and there it is. This is where you have organized people who can control their destiny within the marketplace. And, as my friend from Huron-Bruce says, they can get all they can out of the marketplace, and I think this is true. But there are other groups that are not so well organized—

Mr. Sargent: That is good. Why did he not tell us that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, of course, I told my hon. friend, but he does not want to believe it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, of course, I will.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South: The irresponsible attitude of the federal government has caused more problems than—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): On a question of privilege, I had hoped that someone from the Liberal Party would have spoken on this matter that was just raised by the minister in connection with Leon Weinstein, but since they have not, I will. I have had the pleasure of knowing and working with this man for many years. Everything that he did in the beef prices and everything else that had to do with food was an effort to bring food at lower cost to the consumers of this city. The consumers are important as well as the producers, and I think it comes very ill from the minister to criticize him for taking that action.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I make no apologies, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member for High Park or anybody else for defending the farmers' position—let that be clearly known. And if the hon. member for High Park represents the thinking of the New Democratic Party when he criticizes me for suggesting that prices—that I am criticizing Leon Weinstein for advising consumers to go on strike—then he has another think coming, believe me.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that—

Mr. Sargent: What did the minister do?

Mr. Chairman: Order. The hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend from Grey-Bruce, Mr. Chairman, has referred to vertical integration. There is a certain amount of vertical integration going on in the growing of a few cash crops, such as green beans, peas, some corn—

Mr. Sargent: Do they control the market?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They control some of it—not the chain stores, but the processing companies. They have a certain amount of it. I have the figures all here in the file somewhere. I can tell the member almost exactly to the acreage and the percentage what is controlled through vertical integration, but it is virtually nil as far as cattle are concerned. It is nil as far as the dairy industry is concerned, or virtually so.

Mr. Sargent: Cash crops?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Cash crops—a few. As I mentioned, green beans, canning corn, green peas—those are the three most common to vertical integration. These crops lend themselves to mechanical harvesting and that is the reason there have been some inroads made by the processing companies in vertical integration.

But let me suggest to my hon. friend that while I abhor vertical integration and the inroads that it can make, by the same token I must confess that those people who rent the land to the processing companies have told me that they have never made as much clear money in their lives as they are now making out of farming by renting the land. They have never made as much clear money out of farming in their lives as they are now by renting the land to those processing companies. Now there it is. So there they are.

There is no vertical integration that I know of in the beef industry. There may be in some others and I would think that—yes, here it is, four crops—sweet corn, green peas, green and wax beans and potatoes at varying degrees of vertical integration. It is estimated that six to seven per cent of the potatoes, 42.6 per cent of the sweet corn, 32.9 per cent of the green peas and 73.5 per cent of green and wax beans—these are the canning

beans—were produced by vertically-integrated firms in Ontario. Those are the figures that our department's branch of economics and statistics have compiled.

Mr. Sargent: They are past the point of no return.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They are integrated to that degree, but let me point out to my friend that I do not know how he says that there shall be no more integration. Because that means that those farmers—and many of them are widows, and many of them are farmers who have physical ailments—who are not able to operate their farms, but who have been able to rent their farms to the companies to grow these crops. Are we to say to them that they cannot gain that kind of a livelihood? There are two sides to the coin and I think we have to recognize both sides.

My hon. friend is quite right as far as the chain-store influence is concerned. There is no greater influence in the food market today than the chain stores. Certainly I am telling no one any news in that statement. Everybody knows this to be a fact of life. But to say that we are going to be able to do something to control the power of the chain store is, I would think, completely opposite and negative of what my hon. friend, who is a complete free enterpriser, believes in doing.

I just do not know how one does those kinds of things. Is it not wise then, to put bargaining power in the hands of organized people, who can say, "This is the price you are going to pay for milk, because this is what our milk board has been able to do"? Sure it is the processors who are selling the milk to the chain stores, but we know that the farmer is getting a basic price for milk. The same thing applies, as I mentioned, to beans.

My hon. friend from Essex South mentioned onions. Well, we have had an onion board in and out at least two or three times that I know of. Right now we are in the "out" stage; there is no onion board. Now, if there were, perhaps there could be a more uniform price.

So these are the things that I think farmers have to decide for themselves. The hon. member mentioned a strike. Well, if the farmers decide to go on strike, I suppose they have as much right to do that as any other segment of our society. I do not think there is anything to be said against that. If they feel that that is the way to do it, then that is the way to do it.

I would point out that it is very difficult to get the number of farmers across Canada to do the job that the hon. member suggests should be done. One group goes on strike and another group does not. It seems to me that the effect of that kind of strike would be diluted to a very great degree. This is only a personal opinion. Perhaps a strike has a great deal more merit than I am inclined to believe it might have in the long run.

Now with regard to Rainy River—my hon. friend from Rainy River said there is a very great deal done in Rainy River. We will come to that in the votes on northern affairs as time goes on. I know of no district in northern Ontario that has received greater assistance from this government and nobody has put it to better use than have the farm people of Rainy River. That cattleman's co-operative up there has done a fantastic job. There is a delightful story to be told about how this government over the years has aided a group of people who wanted to help themselves and they have accomplished that objective.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Great people up there.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They are indeed, and they know and appreciate how a good government works for them.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, following up my question to the minister, it would seem to me that the minister's performance in the food price war was badly lacking, I would say.

He said he was in there pitching; he made two or three television appearances. It would seem to me that if he is going to do a meaningful job under the food head, which he is supposed to be doing, he should have been doing a bit more than a television show. In fact, it would seem to me that he should take the power that he has as minister of this large department to get tough with these people, because they do control the lives of a lot of other people.

The minister says he doubts very much whether their strike power would have any effect, because it would be watered down by various segments of the province.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In Canada, not the province.

Mr. Sargent: I suggest to the minister we are talking Ontario now.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Is the member at a loss for words?

Mr. Sargent: The minister says, "Oh." That is a very meaningful "oh," but if we had a farm vote here and we had almost 80 or 90 per cent participation across this province, the farmers—the minister knows how, if he backed that thing up—

An hon. member: You belong to the old school.

Mr. Sargent:—and his whole department was behind it and he made it a meaningful thing. The participation was very desirable—

An hon. member: The old excuse.

Mr. Sargent:—and if you would show the same amount of concern about this industry that is dying and if you are going to be the head in this province, I think you would do something more than appear on a television show and give them your words of wisdom when you should be doing something important.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): He does something important. What are you talking about?

An hon. member: He is a professional pallbearer.

Mr. Sargent: Insofar as protecting the—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Send the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) after him—he understands.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, there is no segment in all our economy that has as much plant value assets tied up as the agricultural industry and it is going down the pipe, and you are sitting there grinning and saying you pitched in and made two television appearances.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: When millions of dollars were being spent in advertising the price war, you were doing nothing.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Grow up.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Go back—

Mr. Sargent: I think the minister has a lot of nerve in having the food section tacked on to his department, because he is doing nothing in food other than drawing the minister's salary.

On Vote 101 item 1.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr Chairman, just a bit more explanation from the minister. I think the minister has been very frank and very explanatory today in his efforts to prove to the House that he has the interest of the farmers of the province at heart, and I have heard him say that for many years now.

I am interested in his apparent disdain for the discount stores and the remarks that caused my colleague to rise on a point of personal privilege. He has also said that the farmers, in leasing or selling lands to the processors, are making better money than they can make in any other manner. Will he not agree, and will he elaborate as much on his feelings, as to the part the processors and the packers are playing in this whole price structure, from the producer to the consumer?

We have to believe some of the facts we read about in financial institutions. The grocery stores, the large stores, had been operating before the discount programme at from three to one per cent markup. We must know that the processors and the packers have a much higher markup between the producer and themselves, and of course if the farmer can make more money in leasing, renting or selling land to the processors for their integration and operations, they must be passing it on to somebody—and the only person they can pass it on to is the producer, the farmer.

Will the minister give us his opinion as to the processors' part in this whole price structure—not just the discount stores that have reacted to the public consumers' concern about high food prices and the problem of the farmers in keeping a fair level of income through their produce?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to answer that question because I am not privy to the financial statements of the processing companies. All I can do is say that the percentage of profit on volume—that is, on the turnover—in the processing industry, particularly the meat packing industry, is the lowest of any industry in Canada today. But I believe the high volume of turnover is where they make it; on volume, and in using every item in the process. Virtually nothing goes to waste. So therein is why many believe they have been able to stay in business.

There is no question that they are under very severe pressure from the chain stores—no doubt of that whatever. For instance, in the private poultry processing industry there are 18 independents in the Province of On-

tario alone, to say nothing of those larger processing plants that are integrated with feed companies and other outlets. But when you consider that, I think, there is something like some 40 pork-processing plants in Ontario—or at least there were—you get some idea of the very competitive field in which these companies operate.

They are bidding against one another on the hog market, not knowing which one is buying what hogs or whose hogs they are buying. It is a very, very competitive business. They then get the product into the plant; they have it processed; and then they have to sell it to five, six, seven at the outside; very large outlets. Herein is the place where the pressure is applied. There is no question about that in my mind.

It would seem to me that this puts the processor in a position that, I think, is in some regards—and I have heard many farmers say the same thing—an even more invidious position than the farmer himself and Heaven only knows he is in a bad enough position. But the processors cannot join up to try to establish a strong uniform price to the outlets because of The Combines Act in this country. He is in the position that he has to meet competition within the industry itself and believe you me that is one of the most competitive businesses there is that I know of today in Canada.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, this is an interesting point. We have now gone the full cycle in trying to arrive at a solution to the farmers' problem of low income. Are they suffering from low income or are they not? If we ascertain that fact, we have gone the full cycle. They have not enough income. The stores which are selling to the consumer have lost money through their discount programmes. They had a very small markup prior to that. The processor is facing problems. What is the solution to the farmers' income? Do we have then to raise it to the consumer? Is that the final outcome? To say that we are going to—

Mr. B. Newman: The member for Hamilton East wants it both ways, does he not?

Mr. Gisborn:—provide the farmers with a decent income in this province? Or is it the undeniable programme of vertical integration and a business farming community in this province, as well as across the country? Is that the only solution? If it is, then the

minister should be forthright and honest about it and let us start to head in that direction because we cannot keep fooling ourselves and the public about who is responsible.

Mr. B. Newman: But the member wants to go both ways in his party, that is his problem.

Mr. Gisborn: The minister cannot answer the problems that are facing his own department.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! The member for Essex South.

Mr. B. Newman: The member wants to go both ways in his party. They want it both ways.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): And the member's leader has to ask daddy.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, on this particular topic, I wonder—in the terms of reference when the Minister of Agriculture became the Minister of Agriculture and Food—if within that realm he has the power to investigate the nature of the operation of the supermarkets or the food industry in toto? I do not mean to inquire into the private books of any one company, but it seems to me that the farmer is getting squeezed. We want to protect the—

Mr. Sargent: That is a good question.

Mr. Paterson: —consumer in the province as much as possible with reasonable food prices, but there is too much going on in between. Certainly, the profit picture of these companies is almost nil. It is 1.5 per cent.

I wonder if it is not somehow related to the distribution system itself, between the transportation of these commodities to the marketplace, or the way it is transported, and the collective agreements with those people involved in the transportation. Certainly, in the collective agreements among the workers in the supermarkets—I think they are the only ones in the whole food industry who are really making a buck, the people working in the supermarkets—they have got it made, according to the collective contracts that I have seen. They have very good incomes.

It has been told to me, and I have had it proved, that the lowest food prices in the Dominion of Canada can be found in the Kitchener area where there is one of the most successful open-air farm markets.

If this is the case, it could probably be holding true in other areas such as Niagara and my own, where there are a lot of farm stands where people can go out and buy directly from the producer and bypass the middle men. I do not want to go back to the old-fashioned way of merchandising, but there must be something in the method of merchandising in these giant supermarkets with all the frills, the chrome, steel and so forth, as well as their interest in merchandising products other than food items, that is adding so tremendously to the cost of food. The housewife is being forced to pay, and at the same time our primary producers and canners are suffering.

I just wonder if the minister has any authority at all to investigate this realm to see whether merchandising methods in these giant chains are being misdirected at tremendous cost to all of us?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We do not have any power in that regard.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 101, item 1. The hon. member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): A couple of questions of the minister. If I am off the proper vote, I am sure you will correct me, Mr. Chairman.

My colleague from Kent (Mr. Spence) quite some time ago brought up the problem of the fishermen, and the prices they have to contend with. They were selling the fish to the stores for something like three cents a pound—and the stores in turn filleted the fish and sold them for \$1.35. Now there was quite an issue made of that at the time. Does that come under your department?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, because I believe there is a federal marketing board.

Mr. Bukator: I realize that, but my colleague brought it up in the House and immediately the matter was looked into by the minister of that day, the Minister of Lands and Forests, and something was done about it. I was wondering whether there was some control that came from your department?

Let me ask another question. When the department stores were trying to outdo each other in cutting prices, many of the small stores in the province were badly hurt because the people who did the business in the community store, the little family store, shopped elsewhere. The private individual was very badly hit at that time; some of them were on the verge of going out of business.

Does your department have any record of how many small stores were hurt to the point where they went out of business, or do you have any records of that at all? I might repeat what I was saying about the small stores that were affected during the price war of the big chains. Does your department have any figures on the stores that were put out of business because of the action of the big department stores, or do you not have anything on that issue either?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, Mr. Chairman, I have not heard of one that was put out of business specifically because of that. There certainly have been stores that have sold out for a variety of reasons. I have not heard of any bankruptcies. That is not to say they did not take place, but I did not hear of any.

Mr. Bukator: There is another question I want to ask before we get on to other items. Quite some time ago in this House I made quite an issue of the big stores, the canning factories, that packaged dog food and cat food and the minister was quite sympathetic to my argument of that day—that was three or four years ago. I made the argument in this House that if they are going to sell canned foods for animal consumption, why would they not put the ingredients and the amount of meat or whatever is in that can on the label so that people know what they are buying. Has anything been done in that area or is it still the same as it was?

I understand in many cases they contain a lot of cereals. Lord knows what goes into these canned foods, and yet they get a good price for them. It is my opinion that whatever they sell should be not only put in that can but, whatever the ingredient is, it should be spelled out on the label so the people know what they are paying a good price for because that is not a cheap commodity. Did you do anything in that department?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think that this is done already. I am almost certain it is.

Mr. Bukator: The minister thinks, he is almost certain. Is it a fact?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am not sure. As I say, I do not know if it is a fact or not. I do remember the hon. member making it a point. While it does not come under our department at all—it is federal; it comes under The Department of Consumer Affairs of the federal government—as far as I know it is already on them.

Vote 101, item 1, agreed to.

On vote 101, item 2, information services.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): I would like to ask the minister, in respect to information services: The minister mentioned previously—

Mr. Chairman: On information services?

Mr. Innes: I beg your pardon? That is right, information services. The minister mentioned that he was quite certain, by reason of the high buildup of grain in western Canada, that the hog industry would be in real difficulty before too long.

My question to him is what prospectus, so to speak, was passed on to the farmers of Ontario in respect to this knowledge? He, of course, knew but apparently it did not get through to him because there was a continual buildup of sow population. We have the greatest number of hogs being marketed at the present time in the history of Ontario at almost sacrificial prices.

I just wonder—with the individual areas throughout the province, the agricultural representatives and the area supervisors, so to speak—is this information funnelled out to the hog producers and in what regard?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, it certainly is, Mr. Chairman. There is wide publicity given to those positions that we have taken. I am sure that my hon. friend would recognize with his long experience in the agricultural community, that a series of high-priced hog years inevitably leads to a cycle of lower prices. It has always been that way and I assume it will ever be thus until some time, somewhere the farmers decide that there will be some type of active supply management geared to what the market will absorb.

I do not think there is any way that you can tell people not to do things. You can say that these are the things that are likely to happen, but you cannot tell them they cannot go ahead and breed more sows when little pigs—I had a letter the other day from a farmer who said he was selling little pigs at \$28 and \$30 apiece. He thought the well would never run dry. But it did and he is selling them today at \$7 or \$8 apiece. He is very bitter and I do not blame him. I would be bitter, too.

But whose fault is it really? Perhaps it is not his fault, but a combination of circumstances that has always been associated with the hog-feed ratio; and it runs in cycles. I do not think that there is anything very much

that can be done about it short of supply management.

Our extension branch farm management specialists try to advise farmers through our agricultural representative service as much as we can on what the future of the market holds. There is an outlook conference every year held in Ottawa and we are holding similar conferences, throughout the Province of Ontario. Special days are held in each year indicating the outlook for the year and what the prospects are. Farmers base their decisions themselves on the knowledge that is available to them. All we can do is try to provide it to them and sometimes we are accused of providing too much information.

Mr. Innes: I thank the minister. Could he tell me at the moment if there are any segments of the industry that the information branch could look favourably at and tell the farmers that here is an area whereby they have an opportunity to raise their income—where it does look a little bit better than the hog situation?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, it is being done all the time.

Mr. Innes: Which ones are they?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I cannot tell you exactly which ones they are. We talked about the cow-calf operation today. That holds a lot of promise. Today you cannot go out and say, "Produce more milk," because it is all under quota; you cannot go out and say, "Produce more tobacco," because that is all under quota; you cannot go out and say, "Produce more broilers," because that is all under quota. If you go out and talk about egg prices today at the depressed prices they are in, what can you talk about?

Mr. Innes: Are there any new products?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Not that I know of.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, under this same vote, we see poultry houses and piggeries being built right at the present time across this province or in different parts of this province. Is the minister aware, or is he familiar with, or are his officials contacted when these poultry houses and piggeries and farrowing barns are built or have his extension officers anything to do with the building of them?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We provide advice in structural engineering wherever we are asked to do so.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about this particular vote—101—they are asking for a quarter of a million dollars more this year—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We are on vote 101, item 2—information.

Mr. Chairman: We are on vote 101, item 2—information services.

Mr. Sargent: The thing is, the total votes are up a quarter of a million dollars this year. We have a declining farm population. Is there ever any point at which you have a saturation in your department? Do you never get less or is it always growing? I am talking seriously of the fact that we have a declining farm population—we probably have half the farmers we had 20 years ago—yet you are continually asking for more money to run this department.

The minister has all these different marketing groups that are doing all his jobs for him now, but he is continually coming back, whacking us for more money. For instance, we have here—you are taking this item number 2 of vote 101, information services?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, on information services in the estimates.

Mr. Singer: It is a quarter of a million over 1969-1970 actual.

Mr. Sargent: What kind of information is going to cost us a quarter of a million dollars more this year? What is the department going to do that is going to need that much more money?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think my hon. friend is referring to the 1970-1971 estimates on information services; \$904,000. Right? And the 1970-1971 estimates; \$1,001,000. Right? Which is a difference of about \$97,000 or something like that.

We are expanding the information services of our department to provide market service to the farm community through the phone-in service that we have been preparing and which we have just embarked on now. You can dial in—or at least the radio stations can dial in—which will activate a record and it will play back to you the market price on the various markets. It may be if you want beef, you dial in at a certain time for that; if you want commodity prices, that is fruit and vegetables, potatoes, apples, this kind of thing, you dial at another time. The same thing is true on hog prices and this kind of thing.

Mr. Sargent: For the consumer?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, for the producer. This is available to the producer and this service is provided for the various radio stations throughout the Province of Ontario. It is a hookup with them.

Mr. Sargent: What does that cost?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What does it cost us?

The member asked what the difference was, the \$110,000. The salary award and merit increases were \$69,000 over last year. The salary provisions for staff transfers, about \$19,000. The employee benefits, \$6,300. The work load increase is \$15,900. So all told the information services in this market information service, this dialing service, would be about \$35,000 in total.

Mr. Sargent: But it is amazing that the minister spends \$1 million in this department for propaganda.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh I would not say it was propaganda, I would say it was information.

Mr. Sargent: But \$1 million for information in this one department?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is right.

Mr. Sargent: Then the department is going to provide \$100,000 more information this year than last year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Not necessarily. The staff salary increases were \$69,000.

Mr. Sargent: This is information we are talking about?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes of course it is information, but there have to be people. That is, I would say, the hardest working branch of our whole department. Those people work hours and hours and hours trying to get information out to producers across this province and their salary increase, according to the civil service schedule of those people, is an increase of \$69,000 over last year.

Mr. Sargent: As a taxpayer, would the minister say he could get by with a half a million in this job? Could he give us half a million dollars worth of information instead of a million dollars worth?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well of course, Mr. Chairman, I recall those days when my eloquent friend, the then member for Grey

South, Farquhar Oliver, stood in his place as Leader of the Opposition and berated us for not providing enough information to the farm people of the Province of Ontario, and we stepped up our programme.

We have done a lot of things. We have built up an information branch that is second to none in this whole country of ours in providing the findings of research. We spend over \$10 million in actual agricultural research. Our educational agricultural research programme is well over \$16 million. What are we to do with these reports? Put them on a shelf and file them and not let the farmers see them?

Mr. Sargent: They should burn half of them.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: How does one get this information out to the people? This is what the information branch is all about.

Mr. Sargent: This is Parkinson's law. It is working great here. You know that \$1 million will buy a full page ad in the Toronto Daily Star for almost a year—\$3,000 a day. It is completely ridiculous. You take \$1 million of information for this one department. It is ridiculous.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Yes, I might inquire as to how the new system of market information is working. Is the department on that system going to the radio stations, giving reports on the carload movement of various commodities, both within our own jurisdiction, and say within the Dominion of Canada and the United States, as well as the price and the other pertinent information?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The service will begin on Monday, May 3, which is not very far away. We have had a few trial runs, a few dry runs, but it begins then. It will begin with a livestock report, and thereafter at regular intervals we will initiate other commodity reports as we are able to develop adequate reporting systems. I can tell members that it has been a very difficult programme to set up, because it is so highly automated. It is operated by only one operator and a technician, so it is a pretty highly automated affair and very technical.

Simultaneously with the opening of the service to the radio stations, the same information will be available to farm people on a regular basis. They will be able to call

a designated number, but they must pay the cost of that call—that is the long distance phone call—and the service will be there. I think it will provide an up-to-the-minute information service on the trends of the market—not just the prices that are paid that day but the trends of the market, the availability of supply.

Mr. Paterson: Is this a continuous programme through the day, updating?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, updating all the time.

Mr. Paterson: Is this particular service working closely with the food terminal or where does the department get information in relation to fruit and vegetables?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It will be working not only with the food terminal but it will be working with every source that we can work in.

Vote 101, item 2, agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the committee of supply rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Lieutenant Governor is standing by for royal assent.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the throne.

Hon. W. Ross Macdonald (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed a bill to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant: The following is the title of the bill to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 28, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to this bill.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Clerk of the House: The 17th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD

(continued)

On vote 101, item 3:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 101, we are on item 3 now.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): On item 3, Mr. Chairman, if I can get the minister—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Saved by the bell!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister first of all, in this estimate which asks for \$81,700, the extent of the legal staff he now has in his department?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): We have three lawyers attached to the main office.

Mr. Singer: Has he added one, or does he plan to add one? Because his estimate has gone up some \$15,000 over last year.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Salary increases, same complement.

Mr. Singer: Same complement. Mr. Chairman, over several years we tried to establish, and I thought we had established with the former Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), that he or the occupant of that office was to be all of the law of the Province of Ontario. I wonder whether or not the three lawyers in the legal services branch of The Department of Agriculture and Food take instruction or discuss with the law officers of the Crown—those in the Attorney General's office—such questions as the drafting of legislation and that sort of thing?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, of course, there are relationships as far as The Regulations Act is concerned, and bills. There is that connection.

Mr. Singer: Could the Minister of Agriculture and Food tell us the extent of the discussions that took place between the members

of his legal branch and the members of the Attorney General's office when Bill 10 was drafted?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It was drafted in consultation with the legislative counsel's office.

Mr. Singer: I see. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could tell us whether, as this bill was being drafted in consultation with whoever was being consulted, it occurred to anyone that the question of constitutionality should be determined by some authoritative opinion?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend quite thoughtfully advised me a while ago that he was going to try to bait me when we came to this particular vote.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I am indeed—and well he deserves it.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): The member would not bait anybody, would he?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not know what he means by baiting. But I have nothing to hide whatever, and if my hon. friend were as much aware of the legal rights of The Marketing Act as he seems to think he is, he would know that The Farm Products Marketing Act was submitted in 1957 to the Supreme Court of Canada, which upheld The Farm Products Marketing Act in Ontario as it is presently constituted. Therefore when we draft amendments to The Farm Products Marketing Act we do not necessarily have to take them to the law officers of the Crown to discuss with them items that pertain in our Act the same as they pertain in many other Acts across this country of ours today.

Mr. Singer: Is the minister in fact advising us, Mr. Chairman, that notwithstanding the fact that he knew there was a decision by the Court of Appeal in the Province of Quebec, notwithstanding the fact that he knew there was another decision, a contrary one, unambiguously made by the Court of Appeal in Manitoba where similar legislation had been ruled unconstitutional, he did not have the intelligence to seek an authoritative opinion as to the constitutionality of Bill 10?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There was no constitutionality issue at all as far as Bill 10 is concerned; absolutely none.

Mr. Singer: None. I see.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My friend is trying to confuse the power of seizure which is in most Acts that we have. Certainly it is in The Department of Lands and Forests Act. It certainly is in The Oleomargarine Act, The Edible Oil Products Act—it is in many other Acts; there is nothing unconstitutional about it at all.

The constitutionality issue, if there was one, should have been discussed last September if that is the problem, because that had to do with the issuance of the marketing permits. Now my friend is making a great fuss, Mr. Chairman, and—

Mr. Singer: And I intend to make more fuss too!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well that is fine. He can go right ahead and make that fuss, but he wants to make the fuss knowing full well that we have not said to any broiler shipper outside the Province of Ontario: "You cannot ship your broilers in here." We have not said that at all. We have said that when you have them in, you must comply with the marketing regulations that pertain in the Province of Ontario. That is entirely different than the plan that is in either Quebec or the hypothetical plan that was drafted in the Province of Manitoba.

Now if my hon. friend understands that difference he can base his argument on that, because we do not believe that we are in any way unconstitutional, either in Bill 10 or the marketing permit rights that have been granted to the broiler board under The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Mr. Singer: I am very pleased that the Minister of Agriculture and Food now believes that he can give an authoritative legal position, and that he has switched his ground to the extent that he said, "we do not believe." It would seem to me that since, in his various remarks that he made to this House, he was so familiar with what was going on in Quebec and Manitoba, the path of most obvious discretion would have been to have a supporting opinion in his hand from the law officers of the Crown of Ontario.

Be that as it may—this Minister of Agriculture and Food knows more than anybody else about everything—be that as it may, he did not. Then he subsequently refused—and he denied it in the House, he misled us. I had to quote Hansard to him. He said specifically: "There is no reason to intervene in the case going before the Supreme Court of Canada."

However, now he has changed his mind and he made the illuminating revelation to the House yesterday that, "Yes, we are going to intervene."

So, Mr. Chairman, the next question I want to ask him is this: Is his change of mind the result of certain remarks made over the weekend by the Premier (Mr. Davis) saying he, the Premier, was most concerned about the constitutionality?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I made those remarks the other night while my hon. friend was enjoying the hockey game—right here in this House—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, it seems to be a matter of great delight to the Minister of Agriculture and Food that I went to the hockey game. I was there, certainly I was, and I am in the House much more often and much more frequently, and participate much more intelligently in most of the debates of the House than does the Minister of Agriculture and Food. I do not know where he goes and I do not really care where he goes, because he adds very little of benefit to the people of Ontario by his participation in the legislative process.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It gets my friend nowhere.

Mr. Singer: Be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, be that as it may, I want to know the effect of the Premier's statement over the weekend saying that he was concerned when the minister previously told us that he, the Minister of Agriculture and Food, was not concerned.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have no comment on that.

Mr. Singer: The minister has no comment on that. Well it speaks for itself!

I think what in fact happened, Mr. Chairman—and it is patently obvious now—the Minister of Agriculture and Food in another one of his piques of temper flew off the handle and then he was overhauled by the leader. It is high time his leader took him in hand and started to tell him what these things are all about.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend is leading the House astray, as he usually does. I was never spoken to by the Prime Minister in any way, shape or form. He never mentioned that particular subject.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): That took the wind out of the member for Downsview's sails.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the minister—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The intervention was decided on Wednesday last when we received word that the submission had been made to the Supreme Court, when the word came, as I explained the other night, to Ontario asking us if we wanted to take a position there. I said we would then deal with it. The request did come back asking us if we wished to take a position and I advised the Attorney General's office, through my deputy minister, that our department wished to be represented and our government wished to be represented at the Supreme Court hearing.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, that sounds as illogical as most things that this minister says.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, nothing illogical about it.

Mr. Singer: The minister at long last—and because of what his leader said—had to reverse his position. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No.

Mr. Singer: —the final question is will the minister have the courtesy to tell the members of this House on what side of the dispute he is intervening?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I have no information at this time.

Mr. Singer: No, he has no information! Well, Mr. Chairman, having said in such decisive language that in his opinion Bill 10 is within the constitutional powers of this province, is the minister now going to instruct his lawyers to go to Ottawa and go before the Supreme Court of Canada and argue against what the minister has said?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am not taking any position in this. I am not a lawyer and we have not discussed it at all. We will talk this over with the law officers of the Crown and my own lawyers in this department and then we will take a position.

But I will say this, that as far as I am concerned my recommendation to the Attorney General is that we simply support the position that we have taken under The Farm Products Marketing Act of this province, which is quite different to the appeal which has gone to the Supreme Court by the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Singer: I see, I see.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend nods in great understanding and depth of knowledge and I assume that he has it all. All I am doing is telling exactly the position that I think we should be taking.

Mr. Singer: Then is the minister saying that it is his opinion, and he is so going to instruct whatever solicitors appear on behalf of the government of Ontario, that they should oppose the decision of the majority of the Court of Appeal, the unanimous opinion of the Court of Appeal in Manitoba? Is that what he is saying?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Would the member rather say that we instruct our officers of the court of Ontario, who go to the Supreme Court in Ottawa, to uphold the unanimous decision of the Court of Appeal of the Province of Quebec, which was opposite on the same point?

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Yes.

Mr. Singer: I am trying to find out what the minister is going to do. Is that what he is going to do? If that is what he is going to do, Mr. Chairman, then I think he should have the courtesy to advise this House what the opinion is of the law officers of the Crown in Ontario, because obviously the minister sets himself above any legal opinion.

He has attempted to argue that this is a valid Act by reason of the way it is going to be enforced. He has not even touched for one second on what the Act contains, because that is the test the courts are eventually going to apply to Bill 10 here in Ontario. No matter what is in his mind, it is what he has written in the Act.

And I say, Mr. Chairman, that the minister has abrogated his responsibility when he brings a controversial Act like this before us without any supporting opinion from the law officers of the Crown in Ontario as to its validity. He can explain until he is blue in the face, unless he is prepared to do that he is not doing his job as a responsible minister of the Crown.

I say this is just absolutely inexcusable. Now I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the minister is prepared to tell us what kind of discussions, if any, have ever gone on between him and, say, Mr. Gerald Baldwin, the Tory House leader in the House of Commons, who had a few very choice words to say about the approach of this minister to this kind of marketing legislation.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, none whatever.

Mr. Singer: None whatever! And since the minister and his government are so concerned about what is happening in Ottawa—and constantly on their lips are the words of blame attached to those guys in Ottawa—would it not seem somewhat logical that this minister would consult with his Conservative friends in Ottawa, or perhaps listen to the House leader of his party in Ottawa? Would it not seem that the Conservatives throughout Canada have some kind of common view?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, we do not apologize for what happens in Ottawa, we are Ontario.

Mr. Singer: You see this minister, Mr. Chairman, is a most puzzling person.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are Ontario. Those fellows keep apologizing for Ottawa. They get on the phone to their Ottawa friends for instructions.

Mr. Singer: Yes, we are Ontario; yes after the chauvinistic speech—the budget speech—wherein they were attempting to isolate this province, wherein they seem to abrogate their responsibility to the other sections of Canada. They do not care what is going on in the Maritimes or in Quebec or anywhere else.

They just want to carve a single empire out of the Province of Ontario, with tariff walls on the east and tariff walls on the west and send their inspectors in to seize and destroy; in abrogation again, Mr. Chairman, of everything that Mr. McRuer said in his report dealing with The Farm Products Marketing Act. Then I say, Mr. Chairman, the minister is a disgrace to the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Yes Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with two aspects of the McRuer report that came down last Thursday. I realize the minister and his officials probably have not had time to study the section in relation to The Farm Products Marketing Act as much as they would wish, nor have I—I forgot my glasses this week and I cannot read all the fine print.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Does this come under this vote?

Mr. Paterson: Yes, it is a legal opinion.

Mr. Singer: Which is more than the government ever had!

Mr. Paterson: It states the provisions giving the board the power to define farm products

should be repealed. I wonder, at the outset, if the minister has any reaction to this, in particular the bit where the paragraph goes on to say that the definition is quite wide, and so on.

I notice in the definition that it does not include the growing of flowers as an agricultural production effort. The minister no doubt will recall the question in the House the other day when he, in his own opinion, thought the growing of flowers was an agricultural endeavour.

I just wonder. I possibly take a different opinion to Mr. McRuer on this section initially, and I would like to see the term "flower producer" or "flower grower" included in the terms of reference under the board. It seems to be excluded.

Would the minister care to comment?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Only to this extent, Mr. Chairman, that I undertook the other day that we would review The Farm Products Marketing Act in the light of the report. We intend to do that. I must confess that it is a very onerous responsibility and job which I think will take a very great deal of time, and we simply have not been at it yet.

Mr. Paterson: Would the minister give any consideration to including the growing of flowers as an agricultural endeavour?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will take that under advisement.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3. The hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Yes, item 3 in respect to legal services. I imagine the new legislation would come under this particular vote.

Could the minister indicate whether the animal research bill, the controversial one that has been before the House for some time, will be coming forward this session?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, any reference to The Animals for Research Act should come up under the veterinary services branch.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else under item 3?

Vote 101, item 3, agreed to.

On item 4, personnel services:

The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: What personnel are involved here?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: These are the people who look after the hiring and the salary classifications of the entire department. There are 12 in all.

Mr. Sargent: Is any temporary help involved here?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, there is no temporary help.

Mr. Sargent: Why do we have a billing of \$13,000 under this for communication, and another \$45,000 for information; a duplication of services there? Is there any relation there?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, this is an explanation of the transportation and communication services provided in the personnel section of the main office.

Vote 101, items 4 and 5, agreed to.

On item 6, systems and procedures:

Mr. Sargent: What does that mean—systems and procedures \$21,000?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is office methods and the organization having to do with records management, electronic data processing; in other words the computer service provided to the department.

Mr. Sargent: Does the minister rent the computer service?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, through the government computer services. Our branch uses government computer services but it is charged up against our department; that is, the pro rata is against our department.

Mr. Sargent: As a matter of interest, how many computers are there in the government's operation?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I could not tell the hon. member. I really do not know how many there are.

Vote 101 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 102 is on page 16, agricultural production programme.

On vote 102, item 1, administration:

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I want to make some comments with respect to the farm tax reduction programme. This particular programme comes under the administration section of the second vote.

There are really two items here with which I would like to deal. The first has to do with a specific problem which was rather unique to Huron county. The minister will no doubt recall that back in 1969 an over-zealous assessor got the idea that he would assess as commercial all of the farm properties in Huron county that had hog or poultry operations located on the premises.

All of those farmers involved decided that they would appeal that particular assessment. It was taken to the court of revision, and the court of revision came down with the decision that any agricultural intensified operation such as a hog barn, a poultry barn or what have you, if there was not 10 acres associated with it, was certainly a commercial assessment.

As far as the farm tax rebate programme is concerned, of course, the payments are made on the basis of the coding which is set out by the assessment department; if that assessment coding happens to be commercial, then of course those farmers do not get their tax rebate.

I have talked with the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) about this. We have mentioned it here in the House before, and I am wondering what the Minister of Agriculture and Food is doing in concert with his colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, to have this situation corrected. Presumably it will have to be corrected by way of legislative action.

It seems to me this is going to have to be done very quickly because the programme has been underway, the payments are being made and have been sent out for the most part. There are still some to come where there have been errors in coding other than this commercial coding business to which I make reference—they have been dealt with—and I presume The Department of Municipal Affairs is going to meet with the assessment department in each county to clarify some of the mistakes that have been made.

As I pointed out earlier, I think the problem in Huron county is rather unique in that I think it was one of two counties where this particular thing happened across the Province of Ontario at that time. So these farmers—I can think of two or three cases where they are big farmers in actual total production, but they do not have the 10-acre stipulation. They are under the 10 acres. Their total holdings are under 10 acres, therefore they are assessed as commercial and they are not eligible for the farm tax reduction payment.

I am wondering if the minister is going to really push that forward with his colleague or just what is going to happen. I understood that it was going to be corrected before now.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Certainly there is concern here, and we have expressed the concern to the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough). As the member will appreciate, there is a new Minister of Municipal Affairs and we are going through the motions again; I assume that this matter will be taken care of.

There was an order-in-council drafted and passed which would deal with the incorrect coding to which my hon. friend refers. This will pick up a number of those who have been missed in the tax rebate programme. That will be dealt with. But the matter of business assessment is something that in my opinion should be spelled out clearly in legislation; there should be no business assessment levied against agricultural production of any kind.

I am not sure what the status of this is with The Department of Municipal Affairs. There certainly have been many discussions on it and they are very well aware of what my opinion is. I can only hope that in the fullness of time we will have legislation presented which will include what the former minister expressed and what I have expressed on this matter.

Mr. Gaunt: I appreciate the minister's comments in this regard. I think he feels as I do in this respect. These units are food production units and they are just as much an agricultural production unit as a farm of 100 acres; only it is more intense, the production is concentrated. Certainly as far as I am concerned I think there should be a change made and this correction should be set out by way of legislation for all to see so that The Assessment Act is clarified in that regard.

There is one other point I want to make with respect to the education tax as it applies to farm property. I believe the minister made a statement a while back that as far as he was personally concerned he felt that all education taxes should be removed from farm land and that they should be applied exclusively against the farm buildings. This would agree with the—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Not quite, not quite!

I think we are talking about the same thing, but the way the member has expressed it is the tax off lands should be

transferred exclusively against buildings, and that was not what I said. I said the education tax should be taken off the farm lands, but that buildings should continue to bear their share of the cost of education tax—the same as a greenhouse or the same as a gas station or a feed mill or a manufacturing plant—but that the education tax on farm lands per se should be taken up by the provincial government, which is what we have attempted to do in that tax rebate programme.

Mr. Gaunt: This would basically agree with the taxation report which was brought in by the then Minister of Municipal Affairs back—what, 16, 18 months ago now?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Gaunt: I am wondering: Is the government going to make any move toward adopting the other recommendations in that report?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I think we will have to wait for the Minister of Municipal Affairs to make his opinions on that known to the Legislature. That falls within his jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. Innes: Yes, I would like to speak on a couple of problems in respect to the 25 per cent reduction. I have a peculiar situation in my riding and it may be common in the odd section of the province.

We have what is termed a chemical valley outside Woodstock and it is composed of a Cyanamid plant, the Canada Cement plant and Domtar. These people own the land and lease it back to the farmers at a nominal fee of so much a year. The Department of Municipal Affairs has seen fit to give them a tax reduction of 25 per cent on their land, which of course is not farmed by them. The intent of the Act was to return the money to the farmers who are working the land.

Like so many of these ad hoc situations in which the government pieces things together in a hurry, this is another example. To this day there are some of these farmers who have not received the tax rebate that has been passed on to companies. I would like the minister to comment on what he feels would be the just and proper way to cope with this particular situation. I have had farmers come to me and ask me what they were going to do.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I would have no comment to make on that until I saw the terms of the agreement. What did the terms of the agreement say? It seems to me that it would be quite improper for me to pass an opinion on a legal matter unless we knew what the terms of the agreement were.

Mr. Innes: Of course the agreement was made previous to the tax reduction formula coming into effect and any agreement that was made previously to that certainly would not have any bearing on one that was made later, I would think.

Another problem that has been brought to my attention by the clerks of many of the municipalities is that certain properties have been in arrears of taxes for many years, and some of them of course have been up for land sale. The tax rebate went to the owner of the land at that particular time, even though the municipality did not receive their taxes for many years. Here is a landowner who cashes a cheque from the department for taxes that he has never paid and no doubt some of the land will be sold and he is away scot-free.

Does the minister feel that this is fair to the municipality?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well of course it depends on why the farmer withheld his taxes. There was a tax withholding programme—

Mr. Innes: No, no!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —supported by many last year. How are we to know why a man withheld his taxes? We paid the money to the farmer. The arrangement between the municipality and the farmers to collect the taxes is a well-known statute; it is set out clearly as to how they can do that. It has been done in many cases in the past as my hon. friend so well knows.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister how many farmers have not received their farm tax rebate yet?

Mr. Innes: Eight thousand.

Mr. Spence: Eight thousand? In the township in which I live a number of farms have been classed as residential instead of as farms. This has caused great concern to many of the farmers. One farm is 400 acres, which certainly is not a residential property. I wonder if the minister—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Reassessment!

Mr. Spence: —is trying to get this corrected?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I just answered that question a moment ago—

Mr. Spence: I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —in reply to my friend from Huron-Bruce, that the new order-in-council passed a week or so ago attempts to pick up those who were improperly assessed in the coding on the computerized programme covering the assessment roll so that they will be taken care of. The applications, I believe, have been extended to September 15 rather than March, so it—

Mr. Ruston: September 30.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —will allow us to clean up some of those mistakes that have been made inadvertently in the past.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this may not be the place, but this vote seems to be kind of an omnibus operation.

I would like to ask the minister if he has ever considered the feasibility or practicality of rental-purchase agreements for farm equipment? I understand this is now in effect in the United States in some areas. Does the minister's research tell him that this is a practical thing to do? Is it feasible for the farmers of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh yes Mr. Chairman, there are many farmers in Ontario who practice that, but that is done through the private companies. There are many farmers who have rental agreements on equipment and they seem to like it pretty well because it avoids tying up capital.

Mr. Sargent: Has the minister ever considered offering forgivable loans to farmers?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, if my hon. friend would observe the capital grants programme there is \$6 million in this programme. We have been doing this for a number of years. A substantial capital grant is now available—40 per cent up to \$3,000 for capital purchases to any one farmer in Ontario.

Mr. Sargent: Has the minister ever considered the possibility of beef crop insurance?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Of what, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Sargent: Beef crop insurance.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Beef crop insurance?

Mr. Sargent: Right!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: This is a good one. The minister does not even understand this one.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The hon. minister is not the only one.

Mr. Sargent: We have crop insurance.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: The minister has heard of beef? That is cattle?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, I have a few myself.

Mr. Sargent: Beef crop insurance.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Would the hon. member go over that again, please?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: I have not been drinking. I think the member should erase that remark from Hansard. It was not very nice.

In fact, there is too much of that going on in the House—insinuations about a fellow having a drink. We all take a drink once in a while.

An hon. member: Not all!

Mr. Sargent: Okay, not all do, but the fact that the hon. member would say that tonight was not very nice.

Mr. MacDonald: Are we debating this?

Mr. Sargent: I would like to get the hon. member outside and talk to him about it some time.

Mr. MacDonald: Anytime anybody gets up here and rudely interrupts and frustrates the debate he will be spotted.

Mr. Sargent: Not like that.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The member should get off that self-righteous kick!

Mr. Sargent: That is not like the member. That does not become him at all.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): The member for York South can hand it out but he cannot take it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ruston: Holier than thou!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I think there are a lot of beef operators who think that this is a logical thing to ask. What does the minister think about it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that I have not heard the proposal broached before. It was a new terminology to me but I confess I am always willing to learn and always willing to listen. I will look forward to the proposal being made.

Mr. Sargent: Does the minister not think that these people are the biggest gamblers in the world?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is a comment my hon. friend from Grey-Bruce might ascribe to us. I am a beef man myself, but I never figured that I was that big a gambler. I cannot afford to gamble.

Mr. Sargent: That is all the more reason why the hon. minister should be protected.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, I guess it is.

Mr. Sargent: So the hon. minister is learning something new from the opposition.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Indeed I am.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. minister admits that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Indeed I do.

Mr. Paterson: Make it a guarantee for tender steaks!

Mr. Sargent: This will probably come up now in the minister's election platform. When is the election?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is hard to say.

An hon. member: Does that guarantee tender steaks?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South. The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister. I take it there is no conflict with the grants for capital purposes and farm development and the loans in accordance with The Co-operative Loans Act, except that the one is for farm expansion and merger of smaller farms into a larger one for economic purposes?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, Mr. Chairman. May I explain to my hon. friend from Hamilton East that the loans in accordance with The Co-operative Loans Act are for co-operatives

that are already established, or for co-operatives that want to establish. By this I mean feed co-operatives, marketing co-operatives, this kind of thing. But the capital grants are available only to farmers per se.

Mr. Gisborn: Yes. That is the explanation that I expected. In browsing through the minister's report I came across a small paragraph relating to co-operative loan boards, and reading it, it instantaneously came to my mind—the government's Equalization of Industrial Opportunity programme. With that also came to my mind a clipping that I saved and had in my files from the fall of 1968 where the farmers were quite disturbed about the fact that the Schneider meat-packing firm was one of the first groups in the first \$1 million that was lent through that programme. It received some \$250,000. It is quite an interesting analogy.

I wonder, in his concern over this, why the minister has not insisted, on behalf of the farmers, that the co-operatives could enjoy the EIO programme rather than The Co-operative Loans Act provisions. It seems to me quite discriminatory when industry can get loans on a less restrictive basis—

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gisborn:—than the co-operatives in this province. We all agree that co-operatives perform a very useful service.

I happened to take an interest in this and I went to the Act and read the provisions or regulations which applied to the co-operatives getting loans, and they are quite a restrictive set of regulations. They have to open their books. They have to send financial reports. They have to hire a manager approved by the minister. They have to continue to use a manager approved by the minister until the loan is paid off.

They are quite extensive. They have to pay it back at an interest rate set by the board; and if we read the qualifications for a loan under the EIO programme, there is no such thing. They have to perform for five years and to hire a certain number of men.

It is beyond me to understand why this minister, on behalf of the farmers in this province, who I believe are the people that developed the co-operatives for their own benefit, why he has not insisted that the EIO programme be available to them on a forgivable loan basis for expansion of increased facilities such as the grain elevators, cold storage and so forth—anything that expands their business.

Has the minister given that some thought on behalf of the farmers, because it was quite a discouraging thing to find out how and why the Schneider's packing-house firm got the \$250,000; if the article out of the farm paper is correct, and I have no reason to believe it is not, it was just a handout to them, and almost admitted.

I suppose the minister has read the article. It ends up saying that Stuart Hicks, the development supervisor, who will be in charge of the Ayr plant, says the forgivable loan was one of the factors which influenced the company to choose the Ayr site, but not the only one.

If you remember, that was the location where FAME—I think it was the Farmers Allied Meat Enterprise group—wanted to build their packing plant, and of course they were given short shrift by this government. They were demolished and just told: "You have had it, boys. There is nothing for you."

But he goes on to say there were other reasons. Accessibility to market was another reason why Ayr was chosen instead of a number of other locations. "Our major markets are in the Metro Toronto area and Ayr is right on Highway 401." Mr. Hicks said his company could have partially financed this Ayr plant in other ways; but since many of its major competitors—Kraft Foods, Campbell Soup Company Limited, Canada Packers—had taken advantage of the forgivable loan why should not Schneider's?

After this kind of situation took place, surely this minister in charge of the department that regulates the loans for the co-operatives should have gone to the cabinet and said: "Look, what is going on here? Let us make these forgivable loans available to the co-operatives in this province on the same basis and on the same terms as to the industries in this province."

I wonder if the minister would give any good reason why he has not taken this position two years prior to this point and if he will consider taking this up to the cabinet to see that these people in this province get equal treatment to the industrial groups?

Mr. MacDonald: Stand up and fight for the farmers for a change!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, I think the point is well taken, Mr. Chairman. We will certainly look into it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. Ruston: I want to ask the minister if the Soy Bean Marketing Board has ever approached the government with regard to whether it would be eligible for loans. I know it says "co-operative", but what about a marketing board that wished to put in storage for soy beans or a crushing plant? Would it have to go to the Ontario Development Corporation, or would there be any chance of it getting money through The Department of Agriculture and Food?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Not under The Co-operative Loans Act. They are not a co-operative.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Yes Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister something concerning the Ontario Farm Safety Council.

Recently there has been a lot of concern with vehicle safety. As we read in the press daily, especially during the warm weather months, there are more and more farm accidents involving the use of the various implements and the vehicle itself.

Has the minister ever considered approaching the manufacturers with recommendations that they improve the safety features of the various types of vehicles used in the agricultural industry and also add additional safety features to the various types of equipment that are put to use in the agricultural industry?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Ontario Farm Safety Council has from time to time had these discussions with the manufacturers but unfortunately all of these safety features add to the price, the cost factor, of equipment. As a matter of fact, there have been from time to time equipment safety features, safety equipment—I think of roll bars for instance—made available on an optional basis on machinery. I can think of one company which had a supply of these that they simply could not sell. They ended up by simply getting rid of them at fire-sale prices because nobody would buy them. I do not know why but they just do not buy these things.

While we maintain a close record and have at hand reports supplied to us by the Farm Safety Council on all serious accidents—in fact in every county and district, as I understand it, through the ag rep's office there is a very accurate record kept of farm accidents or accidents involving rural people—and this is very enlightening but is hard to say how much effect the Farm Safety Council has

had on reducing the number of accidents. That is an unknown factor, but they keep working at it with, I think, very effective results; and of course working through the Workmen's Compensation Board as well in all publicity that they can direct toward this particular programme. I think it is having some effect, but it is still far greater than anyone would like to believe.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask of the minister, through you, if the incidence of agricultural injuries as a result of the use of the vehicle and the implement is decreasing or is it still on an increase?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If memory serves me right it is decreasing.

I do not have the report right at hand but I believe it is decreasing, because for one reason the Workmen's Compensation Board rate has been reduced from \$3.50 per 100 to \$3.35. This is based, of course, on the accident history or record of the industry and so there is a reduction. We hope that it can be further reduced.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, there are two other avenues that concern me in this same respect, and one is the effect of the noise of the vehicle and the damage it can do to the hearing senses of the farmer himself. The other is the fact that the farmer working on the tractor for long periods of time is subjected to the fumes of the burning gases. As a result it may have a harmful effect on him which will not be detected early enough so that he would be eligible for workmen's compensation, but may adversely affect him in his later years. Is there not something that can be done to protect the farmer against both the aspect of deafness and with regard to pollution?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This matter of noise pollution certainly is of concern—as a matter of fact that was the theme of the Ontario Farm Safety Council this year. One of the demonstrations was of the type of earmuffs that can be provided now for farmers to wear who are riding tractors on a constant basis.

Another thought that has been aired and is certainly being stressed is that farmers should take that coffee break, as it were. We farmers have always thought we never had time to do that, but those farmers who are taking that coffee break in the afternoon or in the morning—getting off their tractor, shutting it down and getting a little exercise, having a coffee—can get back on much refreshed and go on with the job. I think this is an important safety feature.

Quite frankly I think we should be doing a lot more of that, and this is one of the things our farm safety specialists are stressing through the various county and district farm safety organizations.

With regard to the pollution factor, it is of concern, but most tractors are equipped to move the exhaust above the level at which the person is sitting or standing on the tractor. I have ridden a tractor a very great deal and I must confess I have never found it to be a very great problem myself.

Mr. B. Newman: Finally, one other question of the minister, Mr. Chairman: are farmers who are subjected to this excess of noise as a result of the vehicle itself eligible for workmen's compensation as far as their deafness is concerned?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I suppose they would be if it could be proved that is what happened, if they were insured as self-employed farmers under workmen's compensation. I have not heard of any case of deafness in farm labour which has been associated with this.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oxford.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, on the same particular subject, I notice in the United States that a recommendation has been made over there that all individuals up to 16 years be prohibited from driving tractors unless they have had some type of a course in the 4-H movement.

I hate to think of the compulsory aspect of it, but I would think that it might be well to have our 4-H programme include some type of educational course along this particular line at each of the particular areas in the 4-H categories—whether it be in the dairy or the horse clubs and so on.

Maybe it would be a good idea. Maybe it is being carried out now, I do not know.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, we have 4-H tractor clubs, Mr. Chairman, but I think the hon. member is suggesting that in the calf clubs there be a sort of a sub-course to go along with it. That is a pretty good idea. I would like to give some thought to that, quite frankly.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Might I ask a couple of questions in relation to the agricultural manpower service? What efforts are the minister's department making to attract seasonal

workers into, say, Essex and Kent counties or the Niagara Peninsula this year, other than the workers from the Caribbean areas?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Essex and Kent county?

Mr. Paterson: Yes, I used my own area, but is the department trying to attract them into the areas where we require extra work or extra manpower during their growing season?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is controlled, or at least it is under the jurisdiction of the joint federal-provincial manpower committee that has to do with seasonal help. I think they have done a pretty good job in trying to determine, first of all the needs of the farmers in their respective areas and then trying to fulfil those needs.

As far as the member's own particular area is concerned, I have not got the details on that, but I assume that it is being looked after by that particular committee. There will be representatives on that federal-provincial manpower committee from your area, who I am sure will be correlating their needs with the available sources of manpower, and I understand it is through advertising and transportation assistance and housing. These are the things that we have had before, but relating it to the specific requirements for this year, that will be determined by the people representing the member's area.

Mr. Paterson: Might I ask, is the emphasis being put on individuals to come in, or families, students or non-students? Is there any guideline set out by the department as to what we wish in our particular area?

One of the things I was hoping that the department might be trying to do is to discourage some of the types that we have had drifting in in the past, because they are causing a great many problems to the communities in these areas. Is this manpower service actively encouraging this type of person to come in, or are we seeking to help those who really want to help themselves?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would think that would be our first objective; certainly the committee, I am assured, will be reflecting the requirements as enunciated by the people who represent the member's area on the federal-provincial manpower seasonal labour committee.

Mr. Chairman: Item number one.

Mr. Innes: I would like to speak on it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oxford.

Mr. Innes: Many of the schools, Mr. Chairman, throughout the secondary schools of the province, have set up their own little manpower depots, so to speak. I wonder if it would be possible for the department to sort of relay through the ag-rep service the availability of certain farm oriented people in the various areas throughout the province to be on call for certain work such as tomato picking, and down in my—

Mr. Paterson: Corn detasseling.

Mr. Innes: —corn detasseling, and these particular things. I know that in our particular area last year I thought the students did an excellent job in setting this up on their own. They worked through manpower to some degree, but on the other hand they set up their own system and used their own phones and had a real good programme. Maybe the minister could co-operate with them through the department in funnelling them to areas where there is a need for an extra force at a particular time of the year.

Mr. Chairman: Item 1 carried?

Vote 102, item 1, agreed to.

On item 2:

Mr. Chairman: Item 2, agricultural and horticultural societies. The member for Oxford.

Mr. Innes: I would like to ask the minister in respect to this particular vote—I have had complaints directed to me in some of the new areas of regional government throughout the province where there seems to be an apparent majority of urban people on the regional commissions. As such they have seen fit to do away with the grants to certain societies, agricultural societies, in their particular jurisdiction that previously were getting it through the county. And they have also expressed concern that they are going to be overhauled by the urban people who are on the particular regional government.

I just ask the minister if he has had any comments or complaints along this particular line?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have not had a complaint, and I am assured by the director of the branch that he has not heard of it any place.

Mr. Paterson: Might I ask, in the same regard, in relation to the grants for community centres and such in the legislation

that we passed a couple of years ago whereby more than one municipality could qualify, have there been any implications with the development of regional government where this has interfered, say, with the maximum grant being obtainable by a group of municipalities for these particular purposes?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This comes under vote 103, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else under this item?

Vote 102, item 2, agreed to.

On item 3, crop insurance:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Essex Kent.

Mr. Ruston: Yes, it is time to rise and report.

Mr. Chairman: There have been no instructions yet.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the committee rise and report it has come to a certain resolution, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, before the motion for adjournment is put, could the House leader advise us what he thinks will be the order of business on Thursday?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I thought I had indicated earlier today that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon)—perhaps the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. De Monte) was not here?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): The member for Downsview was at the hockey game.

Hon. Mr. Wishart:—the Leader of the Opposition would lead off on the budget debate on Thursday, and I think we went further to indicate that the leader of the New Democratic Party would take part in that debate commencing Monday. If those addresses will not occupy the whole time we will go to continuation of these estimates, with possibly some second readings.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, can I ask another question of the House leader? Does he know whether the great television debate has been resolved?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member has brought that up also.

We discussed that earlier today. I had to indicate at that time that I had no part in the making of the arrangements and no knowledge of how they were made, how long they were to endure, or who they were to cover. Since then I have made inquiries. I learned that the CBC makes those arrangements at its own discretion. It did wish to cover the presentation of the budget address. I understand that it afforded publicity—interviews—yesterday evening to leaders of the opposition group—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Shame!

Hon. Mr. Wishart:—to some extent, and at the moment they have not rendered a decision as to whether they are going to cover the opposition speeches or not.

Mr. Singer: That is what I wanted to know.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This may or may not come about, I do not know.

Mr. Singer: Could I ask the House leader one more question? I picked up a rumour over the supper hour that somehow we are going to get on to Public Works estimates. Could the House leader confirm that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I have in mind that Public Works—the present arrangements are moving to definite stage—will probably move into committee early next week.

Mr. Singer: Does the House leader mean Monday, Tuesday, or Thursday?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It will be Monday or Tuesday. I have got a couple of days yet.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): When are those fellows going to get organized over there?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): I wonder if I could just—

An hon. member: The member will have a chance at committee.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that you yourself were in charge of the negotiations in regard to the CBC

televising the proceedings of this House. I am wondering exactly what was in your mind in relation to whether the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the New Democratic Party should also be televised when the budget came down. Was it in your mind that all three parties should be represented on the television debate?

Mr. Speaker: The matter was raised this afternoon and the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) made certain remarks in the House which I think were quite correct. That was that some time ago—one or two sessions ago—there were meetings and there were arrangements made at that time in Mr. Speaker's office that television would be in the House for the opening ceremonies on the opening day of the session, and on budget day for the budget presentation and each of the leaders of the opposition parties.

The next year, as I recall it, all that happened was that Mr. Speaker was advised that these arrangements would continue and this was quite satisfactory and it had been agreed.

This year, all Mr. Speaker knows about it is that he was advised that television would be in the House on the budget presentation. As I said this afternoon, I have no further information on the matter. Personally I had presumed that the same custom was being followed, but the arrangements were not made

by Mr. Speaker, they were made with his approval and after he had been consulted and he sat in on the meeting.

I said this afternoon I would endeavour to find out myself what the situation was. I have not yet been able to do that. I know now as much as the other members from what the House leader has said, and I hope to be able to find out in the morning. One can find these things out—

Mr. Sargent: You hope!

Mr. Speaker: I hope, yes—provided the people involved are available, and at the moment they are not available to me.

So that as far as Mr. Speaker is concerned the understanding was that the CBC was coming in as before, but he has nothing to show that. There have been no arrangements and no meetings with Mr. Speaker about that this year. That is all I can add at this moment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The NDP would not want any more television coverage like it had last weekend.

Mr. Speaker: Anything further in the order of business?

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at 10:35 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 27, 1971

Estimates, Department of Agriculture and Food, Mr. Stewart, continued	939
Royal assent to Bill 28, An Act to amend The Planning Act, the honourable the Lieutenant Governor	955
Estimates, Department of Agriculture and Food, Mr. Stewart, continued	955
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to	968



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, April 29, 1971
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

**(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon our guests in the east gallery are students from Thornlea Secondary School in Thornhill; in the west gallery, from Athens High School, Athens, LaSalle Concert Tour Band and St. Ignace City schools from St. Ignace, Mich., and the Newfane Central High School from Newfane, N.Y. We will have in both galleries students from Rockcliff Senior Public School in Toronto, and later today, from Grant Sine Public School, Cobourg, Mount Carmel School, Leamington, and Ecole Secondaire Theriault, Timmins. This evening the Eglinton Progressive Conservative Association in Toronto will be with us.

I think this might be the appropriate time for Mr. Speaker to report with respect to television coverage. The hon. members will recall that Mr. Speaker was asked to look into this matter along with the House leader the other day. The hon. members will note the lights are back again, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) will go on TV at 3 o'clock today for an hour's coverage. Next week the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) will also be on TV on Tuesday.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of the hon. members the publication which has been placed on their desks. The new publication, "Northern Ontario Canoe Routes," has been produced in recognition of the increasing interest in this recreational activity and to provide basic information to the many persons seeking for new and more challenging canoe areas.

The development of the system of canoe routes across Ontario is one of the programmes designed to meet the goals and objectives of The Department of Lands and Forests in providing opportunities for a wide variety of healthful outdoor recreational experiences for the people of Ontario.

This free booklet contains information on 125 separate routes, totalling approximately 11,000 miles.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The minister has not got Highway 10 in there.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Members will note from the contents and fold-out map that these routes are well distributed across northern Ontario and offer the canoeist a wide variety of landscape, challenge and degree of remoteness from civilization. Portage improvements and documenting of the routes is being completed by our field staff and detailed route descriptions are available from the district foresters in the areas concerned.

The increasing public use of these routes will be of direct benefit to the economy of a number of our northern communities in the provision of guides, goods and services.

The second publication, Mr. Speaker, is a newly revised edition of the "Ontario Provincial Parks" brochure which includes a colour code to allow the visitor to quickly select the kind of park which will best meet his particular interests.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to announce today the release of the publication "Ontario Mining—The Early Years," copies of which have been placed on the desks of all the members. This particular booklet was produced by the information section of The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I thought McClelland and Stewart published it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It is very good. It is a good publication. I hope the hon. members will read it right through.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): I already have.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This profusely illustrated 48-page booklet outlines the people, the places and the events that were part of Ontario's colourful mining industry. Within its pages are stories and actual photographs—

Mr. Nixon: There are pictures in it!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): That is the ex-minister on the front cover.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —of the areas, the great camps and the pioneers responsible for the discovery and the development of this province's mineral industry, and also, in considerable part, of her northland.

Mr. Nixon: Is that a picture of the former Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs on the front?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes it is.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This publication is available, free of charge, from the publications office of the department in the Whitney Block. I think—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Which minister? The former minister or the present minister?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think the book will speak for itself, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a point of personal privilege. I want to make Hansard aware—I refer to last Thursday, April 22, in the Speech from the Throne—that Mr. R. F. Ruston is the member for Essex-Kent and not Essex South. I am sure that I would not want to replace our good member for Essex South, just so that the record will be straight.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

PUBLIC ORDER (TEMPORARY MEASURES) ACT

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Justice: Does the government intend to make a statement on Ontario's position with regard to possible changes in the federal Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act whose jurisdiction will run out tomorrow?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I had the occasion two weeks ago to make a public address, generally giving the overall view of the government. It is my understanding that there will be a statement made very, very shortly, perhaps even within a matter of minutes, on this general subject.

Mr. Nixon: Oh?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: But not by me.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY RIOTS

Mr. Nixon: Another question, Mr. Speaker, of the same minister then, if the government is going to make a statement on that matter: Can the minister explain and describe to the House the role played by the Ontario Provincial Police in the investigation of the Kingston Penitentiary riots and the aftermath—particularly the charges associated with some of the prisoners?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, the Kingston Penitentiary, as I think my hon. friend is aware, is located within the geographical police administration boundary—if I can put it in that awkward way—of the Kingston municipal police forces. Obviously, two murders have taken place within Kingston Penitentiary.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): It is a little late.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: We are assisting the Kingston municipal police forces in the best way that we can. We have an inspector taking part in the investigation relating to those two crimes, or alleged crimes. In respect of certain ancillary matters arising from the riot at Kingston, regarding alleged beatings at Millhaven, this is completely within the jurisdiction of the Ontario Provincial Police.

It is not within the jurisdiction of any municipal police forces, and I was rather concerned initially when some of these allegations were brought to my attention that there might be some conflict of jurisdiction respecting the federal service and our own Ontario Provincial Police. I am now informed that it does not matter whether these alleged crimes took place in a federal institution or not, this—

Mr. Nixon: Does that include the murders as well as the beatings?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No. As far as the murders are concerned, and as far as we are concerned, the proper police force is carrying out an investigation there, that is the Kingston police. We have a homicide inspector helping them to take the proper course of action.

As far as the Millhaven beatings are concerned, we are investigating this in the same manner that we would in respect of any other alleged crime. We have a team of investigators right now who are on the spot. We have interviewed some of our own force in respect of this matter and a very full investigation is taking place.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: There is more than one murder charge that could be laid? There is more than one murder that took place?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: My understanding is that there have been two deaths, I had better put it that way. Whether these are murders or not, I do not know, but there are certainly two deaths.

Mr. Speaker: If the Leader of the Opposition and the members would allow us to revert to statements by the ministry, the Prime Minister has one which might perhaps be the subject of question. I do not know what it is. Then we will resume the question period.

PUBLIC ORDER (TEMPORARY MEASURES) ACT

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is really in reply, as well, to a question by the Leader of the Opposition, on Monday I believe.

Mr. Speaker, as you and the members of this House are aware, The Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act of the Parliament of Canada expires at midnight tomorrow. This Act was passed by Parliament last October in response to a very difficult situation which erupted in the Province of Quebec and was given a limited span of life. In the judgement of the government of Canada and Parliament, it will either be extended beyond the end of April or allowed to expire.

While the government of Ontario has not been directly consulted on the advisability of continuing The Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act, I should like to express to this House our views on this matter inasmuch as it was raised with me in a question posed by the Leader of the Opposition on Monday of this week.

First of all, I want to emphasize that this government fully supports, and is prepared to take necessary action to preserve to the fullest possible extent the freedom of all individuals. This government is most emphatically opposed to the institution of authoritarian control. Yet, at the same time it is the responsibility of this government—as it is for other provincial governments and the government of Canada—to take whatever action is necessary to preserve law, order and security within our areas of responsibility.

Last October, when Jasper Cross and the hon. Pierre Laporte were kidnapped by the

FLQ, the governments of Quebec and Canada concluded that circumstances were such that the use of special powers was necessary to preserve the integrity of our country, the safety of individuals and their families, and to control the illegal operations of the FLQ. On the basis of the somewhat fragmentary information available to the government of Ontario, it was considered at that time that The Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act was both useful and necessary.

It must be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that this Act is a federal statute. The primary responsibility for enforcement is vested in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The police agencies in Ontario have co-operated fully with the federal authorities, although the Act's application to conditions prevailing in Ontario appeared to be restricted and of limited need.

Now, as the date of expiry approaches, I want to inform the House that, in the view of this government, The Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act has probably fulfilled its function insofar as Ontario is concerned. I would not wish, however, to imply that Ontario would object to either an extension of the period of applicability of The Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act, or its modification to provide specific application to other provinces. This is a matter I leave entirely to the wisdom and judgement of the federal government, to be dealt with in whatever form it deems most appropriate in the circumstances. But as far as our province is concerned, Mr. Speaker, we do not believe it is any longer necessary.

Mr. J. Renwick: Did it ever have any application in Ontario?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Yes, what did it ever have?

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period is now resumed. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): I wonder, before my leader gets on to a new question, if I could ask a supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: No, there are no questions in the—

Mr. Singer: No, no, supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: On the original question?

Mr. Singer: Yes, on the original question.

Mr. Speaker: Before the statements?

Mr. Singer: Before the statements, yes, that is the one. Insofar as the two deaths that the Attorney General referred to, my reading of the newspapers led me to conclude there had been only one. Has there been a second one that has not been given any publicity and if so, when did that take place?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am sorry; the only information I have in respect of that—because as I indicated, the investigation is directly under the control of the Kingston municipal police force—was that there has been a subsequent death. I believe there was one prisoner who was claimed to be critically injured and I thought I had read in the press over the weekend—and only that is the basis of my knowledge—that that particular prisoner had died. I had thought there were two deaths, but I may be wrong.

PUBLIC ORDER (TEMPORARY MEASURES) ACT

Mr. Nixon: A question of the Premier in connection with his statement.

Can he say that The Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act ever had any application in this province and if so, what was it? Secondly, does he feel that the running out of the jurisdiction of this Act should lead the government of Canada in with consultation among the provinces, to consider some other statute less rigorous than The War Measures Act that could be available in case of need under the circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for the federal government or say what their intentions may be.

With respect to the first question—and I will seek out further information—I believe there may have been only two persons picked up as it related to the actual application of this Act by the RCMP.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mistaken identity.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker does the Prime Minister think the Act really had any relevant application to Ontario at any point?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if memory serves me correctly, the then Attorney General made several statements wherein he stated that in his view it did not have application here in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Therefore, the Premier's statement several months later is a reaffirmation of the position several months ago—

which leads me to the supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the Premier of Ontario not feel that he has the right to put his government's view for Canada as well as for Ontario as to the appropriateness of the extension of this kind of legislation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think we can all have personal points of view. I speak as the head of this government as it relates to this province and I have expressed that point of view.

Mr. Lewis: By way of one last supplementary, does the Premier think, either in his personal point of view or as head of the government, that this Act should be extended beyond tomorrow midnight?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I thought the statement was quite clear, that as it relates to this province we do not believe it should be.

Mr. J. Renwick: By way of a supplementary question, on what basis does the Prime Minister make the statement that the primary responsibility within the Province of Ontario for the enforcement of that Act rested with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think, Mr. Speaker, if the member for Riverdale were to check section 2 of The Criminal Code he would find that this in fact is the case.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): That is why he asked the former Attorney General to sit down beside him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I used to know The Criminal Code too.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

CIVIL SERVICE ARBITRATION

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: Can he state the policy of the government with respect to arbitrations handed down on behalf of the negotiations between the government and the Civil Service Association or any group within the Civil Service Association? Is it the policy since the budgetary statement on Monday of this week to reject all arbitrations that would exceed five per cent?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there has been no set policy as it relates to that. I think the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) made this abundantly clear in his answer to certain questions yesterday and I really do not think they need repeating here again this afternoon.

Mr. Nixon: As a supplementary, would the Premier make it clear how in fact we can accept an average of five per cent unless we hold in abeyance all of the negotiations and arbitrations until the very end of the year before settlement is brought forward?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think this too was explained yesterday. It is quite obvious—and the Treasurer, I think, pointed this out—that this was an average, a guideline which the government was hoping to attain, and of course there would be certain situations with exceptions to that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oshawa.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, of the settlements that were made in 1970 which extend to the end of 1972, and which exceed the five per cent wage guideline, will those agreements still be honoured?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, any agreement this government makes will be honoured.

Mr. Pilkey: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, the former Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton)—I will get to the question in one second—the former Treasurer in enunciating a statement on May 6, 1970, concluded by saying: "This is an encouraging confirmation that true collective bargaining can and does take place in the public service of Ontario." My question, Mr. Speaker, is, has the government policy changed in view of the five per cent wage ceiling announced in the recent budget?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker: (a) it is not a ceiling; (b) the policy has not changed.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Not a ceiling?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River has a supplementary.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Nixon: Is that not awfully confused?

Mr. Singer: That is worse than the Minister of Trade and Development on housing.

An hon. member: The Premier is baffling again—"Baffling Bill Davis."

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Lewis: Another section of the budget hits the canvas.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary of the Premier.

Mr. Singer: With the help of McKeough and Grossman you really have nothing.

Mr. Speaker: Order! An hon. member of the opposition is endeavouring to place a supplementary question.

Mr. T. P. Reid: May I ask the Premier, by way of supplementary, if there is any thought of extending this supposed guideline or ceiling—whichever word the Premier prefers—to other sections of the Ontario economy, or is he going to restrict it only to civil servants?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I could be very facetious and say that certainly it will extend to no contemplated raise to members of this Legislature, but I will not. But of course we do not have the capacity to do this as it relates to areas where we do not have direct control.

Mr. T. P. Reid: By way of further supplementary, does the Premier not feel that it is discriminatory to one part of the economy—and that is the public service—to restrict them to five per cent guidelines and let the rest of the economy supposedly go as high as it wants, or can get?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it was made abundantly clear both in the statement and the questions answered by the Treasurer yesterday, that we are talking about averages; nor is it inconsistent.

An hon. member: We did not sit yesterday.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, I take it that the Premier has therefore rejected the categorical statement in the press release accompanying the budget that the budget calls for a five per cent ceiling on average salary increases?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have read the budget two or three times since it was introduced to this House—

Mr. Stokes: It is a pity he did not read it before.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I recommend to the hon. member for Scarborough West that he do the same, and I think he will find that it includes the statement that this is a guideline, a ceiling, an average.

Mr. Lewis: Guidelines?

By way of supplementary, I take it then that the Premier is not at all concerned that Judge Anderson has said he will pay no attention whatsoever to the so-called guideline or ceiling?

Mr. Singer: Off with his head.

Mr. Lewis: Or will he survive to sit?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to comment on what the judge of the court has said. He has every right to say what he wants to say. I am not going to stop him.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

LOCATION OF NEW AIRPORT IN SOUTHERN ONTARIO

Mr. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier if he is preparing any statement having to do with the location, or the provincial decision on the location, of the international airport which is to be built in this area of southern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think the position of the government is such at this moment that we are seeking further information from Ottawa as it relates to the subject. I have communicated with the Prime Minister of Canada—I believe the letter is going out today; and I believe the Minister of Transportation and Communications either has or is in the process—to get some determination as to what extent the federal government will be involved in the payments of any infrastructure transportation facilities, or what have you, to any possible airport site.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Are news reports correct that indicate that a variety of possible locations have been put before the government of Ontario for their consideration, if not their decision?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that one could phrase it that it was put before the government for its consideration. The government of this province has had discussions with federal officials relating to certain areas where we have concern and interest. We have provided a great deal of information, and I think it is fair to state there has been a substantial degree of communication in this area.

As I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, one of the very real concerns we have as a government relates to the economics and the financing of the new airport site as it relates to the means of access to and from, the questions of servicing and what have you, which we feel should be answered prior to any further discussions as to geographic location.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Can the Prime Minister indicate when a decision might be arrived at in this important matter?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot.

Mr. J. Renwick: By way of supplementary question of the Prime Minister, did the government make any recommendation to the government of Canada as to the order of priority of suggested sites within the Province of Ontario, bearing in mind its concern for the economic impact of the location of that site?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we really established any priorities. We made the information available to the extent we could—our own plans as related to the Toronto-centred region and other considerations. But as I stated, in my view at least a basic concern at this moment relates to the economic influences as they in turn relate to the geographic location.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a further supplementary question, does the Prime Minister not consider it important that the government of the Province of Ontario, having regard to the studies in the field of economics of the Province of Ontario, should make available to the government of Canada its precise recommendation as to the order of priorities with respect to the location of that airport?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, of course our priority will relate, to a certain extent at least, to the federal policy with respect to compensation or contribution in connection with services.

Mr. J. Renwick: A final supplementary question: Does the Prime Minister not think that the government is likely to find itself in the position where it is faced with the fait accompli without these matters having been worked out, if the government does not take a more effective stand in making known to the government of Canada the order of priorities as to the suggested location of the airport?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker. I am optimistic that the federal government will recognize that what we are now asking is very relevant, very necessary, and that we will be consulted before it comes to some final determination.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce has a supplementary?

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the Prime Minister mean to say that despite the millions of dollars we have spent in studies at MTARTS, that all these transportation studies do not come into play now? Does the government not know the answer to these questions now?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, with great respect to the member for Grey-Bruce, this is just what I said. We have made these studies available.

It gets down now to a question if it is to go to site "A", this means a four-lane highway to site "A." Does it mean water and sewage? What is the cost of this? Who pays for it? How does it compare with site "B" or "C"?

I think it is a very logical position for this government to take. This is the information we are now seeking.

Mr. Sargent: The government is seeking a new study now?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I am seeking to determine who is going to pay for it, which I thought would be of interest to the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Oshawa has a supplementary.

Mr. Pilkey: A supplementary to the Prime Minister: The federal government has been alleged to have submitted four sites to the Ontario government. Has the government selected any one of the four sites in responding to the federal government?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do apologize if I have not made myself clear.

We have not selected a site. The site is selected by the federal government, quite obviously. The federal government has asked us for certain points of view.

As I have explained, I hope, to the members of the House, before we can express these points of view we must find out from the federal government what the economics of any such decision will be. I think there were some 76 proposed sites in the initial

stages. It is now very substantially reduced from that.

Mr. Pilkey: Yes, as I understand it the Ontario government—

Mr. Speaker: Does the member wish to place a supplementary question?

Mr. Pilkey: Yes. As I understand it the—

Mr. Speaker: No; the member may place a supplementary question, not his understanding of.

Mr. Pilkey: A supplementary question: If, as I understand it, the federal government is attempting to get an agreement on one of the four proposed sites, has the Ontario government agreed to any one of these sites on the basis of the federal government's request to the Ontario government?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, obviously if we had agreed to a proposed site we would not even be discussing this now.

The answer is that we have not agreed to a proposed site.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Etobicoke, a supplementary.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question of the Prime Minister: Does the Prime Minister anticipate a thawing of relations and then arrival at an agreement prior to the next provincial election or is it possible that there may be some holding-back on the part of this government until after an election has been held?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think we have made it very obvious in the past few days that there is no holding-back as far as this government in this province is concerned.

We do not, as the member's own leader has observed, relate matters of Throne Speech, budget and policy decision to elections. We want to do business in the ordinary sense of the word and we think we are doing it very logically at this precise moment.

Mr. Singer: That is a sharp one!

Mr. Braithwaite: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Does the Prime Minister then indicate that there is no holding-back as to the possibility of the next election being held in the immediate future?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the member is very anxious to find out when it is to be. I am really not in a position to tell him today.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

CONFERENCE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: A considerable time having elapsed since the Throne Speech, can he inform the House of his plans for the major conference on foreign control which he hopes to convene—when and under what circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if memory serves me correctly, we are talking about foreign investment, not foreign control.

The plans are moving along very well and I would hope by the early part of the week I shall have a statement to make so the member for Scarborough West will be fully informed as to how much progress we have made.

Mr. Lewis: That is fine. Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member will not be the opening speaker. No offence.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary question—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: I will be glad to wind up.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): The hon. member will.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question: Will the leader of the New Democratic Party be invited to participate in that conference?

Mr. T. P. Reid: No, Laxer will be teaching then.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is my thought, at this moment at least, to have observers from all political parties there to see what goes on. A definition of participation at this moment I really cannot determine.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, does not the Prime Minister recognize that the leader of the New Democratic Party is one of the best-informed persons in the Province of Ontario, if not in Canada, on the question which is the subject matter of that conference? Would he not believe that the success of the conference would be determined to a large extent by whether or not the leader of the New Democratic Party participated, other than as an observer in that conference?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Riverdale wishes to go to the hon. member of Scarborough West's nominating convention to make a speech endorsing his leader in that capacity, he may do so. I would only say to him I am quite aware of the member for Scarborough West's capacity in many directions—a capacity I will not define in this House. I think I will leave it there.

Mr. Stokes: I think the Prime Minister had better.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Can we submit a list of speakers?

ODC DIRECTOR'S INTERESTS

Mr. Lewis: Somewhat apprehensively, Mr. Speaker, I will move to my next question.

Could I put a question to the Minister of Economics and Development? When will the Minister of Economics and Development have for the House a statement on the Ontario Development Corporation and the question of possible conflict of interest on the board of the ODC?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I presume—

Mr. Lewis: I am sorry—Trade and Development.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well I did not know. I did not want to take over any of the duties of my colleague.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): I do not want any of his either!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well of course standing here watching the fellows over there is like seeing a Punch and Judy show. The statement will be forthcoming shortly, Mr. Speaker.

TORONTO-CENTRED REGION

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the provincial Treasurer: What has happened to all the various briefs and proposals put forward which may not, in fact, coincide with the principles of the Toronto-centred region that the government has now endorsed in advance of hearing all the submissions or appraising all the submissions?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They are in the process of being sorted out and studied. There are a number of conflicts, large and small, with the original concept, on some the resolution is relatively easy, on others the resolution is not so easy. I would hope that within perhaps the next two months we would be in a position to detail the changes which have been made, which would give answers to a number of those briefs.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary: On at least one specific, I take it from the categorical assertion in the budget statement that Century City is now ruled out as a development within the Toronto-centred region.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would not draw that conclusion.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, how is it that Century City, in the middle of land otherwise designated within the Toronto-centred region, can be permitted when the budget statement says:

We intend to apply the main elements of the Toronto-centred region concept in deciding on proposals submitted. This reaffirmation of provincial intent should help to resolve a number of outstanding conflicts.

How are the two possibly compatible?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well I think if the hon. member goes back a little bit further than that he will find we have accepted the principle of it. In accepting the principle, there will be deviations from the original concept. I am not indicating to the member at this moment in time whether Century City should be such a deviation or not. As I have said, there are conflicts, some of which can be resolved easily and some of which are more difficult to resolve—but the resolution of them in my view will not change the overall conceptual nature of the plan that we have accepted.

Mr. Pitman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I wonder if I could ask the provincial Treasurer how he relates the pledges that were made both by himself and by the Prime Minister and by the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) that no final decision would be made until there was a long period of discussion with local municipalities, and his statement in the budget indicating that this is now virtually finalized?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is a long way from being virtually finalized.

Mr. Pitman: May I ask a further supplementary? Will there be opportunities for open meetings with municipalities and a full opportunity of discussing any modifications of this plan?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The former Treasurer and myself and our officials are meeting daily with people in an attempt to sort out some of these problems.

Mr. Lewis: With right-wing deviations or left?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Down the middle!

Mr. Pitman: A further supplementary: Will there be an opportunity for open discussions—

Mr. Speaker: This is becoming repetitious.

Mr. Pitman:—between the officials of his department and these local officials?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: A number of meetings have already been held under the auspices of the department and the regional development councils and I anticipate there may well be more. Those meetings were fully open to the public.

An hon. member: There had better be more!

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the provincial Treasurer: Do I take it from his budget that he is going to the federal-provincial conference in June to ask, on behalf of this government, for fiscal equivalence in cost-sharing programmes; that that will be the request of the government?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, not necessarily at this conference. This conference is called to discuss certain matters in relation to the constitution, I think it is important however—and this was the point we attempted to make, and in my view did make, in the budget—that where these matters—the pensions, if I can put it that way, between Canada and some of the provinces which began some four or five years ago—where they concern matters of money related to responsibilities, those questions have not yet been settled.

We have come to the conclusion that depending on what ultimately may result from the white paper proposals in terms of legislation, this government at this time feels that it would have been better, and presumably on the basis of our present knowledge will

be better, to opt out of certain shared-cost programmes, as has, for example, the Province of Quebec. I have indicated this to both the Minister of Finance for Canada and the Secretary of State. I would gather from the press clippings arising from certain remarks of the Prime Minister of Canada that neither of those gentlemen conveyed my remarks to the Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. Singer: I have a question of the Minister of Transport (Mr. MacNaughton):

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Supplementary to the—

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question from the hon. member for Windsor West?

Mr. Singer: My question is a new one.

Mr. Peacock: A supplementary question of the Treasurer, Mr. Speaker: Has the Treasurer, since his budget, accepted the position of the government of Canada that Ontario cannot opt out until the expiration of the tax sharing agreement?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think that is correct with most of the agreements, the tax sharing agreements. We cannot opt out of anything tomorrow. They are matters of agreement, some of them for five years; some of them can be terminated with a period of notice given in advance by both parties and agreed to by both parties. We have simply indicated, as I have said, to the Minister of Finance and to the Secretary of State—and indicated formally in our budget on Monday—that as these matters come up for renegotiation, at this moment in time it would appear that we would be better to opt out of these agreements as they are renegotiated.

Mr. Peacock: What is the earliest opportunity?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The dates vary. For example, the post-secondary agreement has about another year and a half to run. On the other hand, we already have to talk about renegotiations; there have been meetings already. There are meetings going on in both health fields—hospitalization and medical care. Even though that agreement has another three years to run, the federal government initiated certain discussion.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: does the Treasurer then have an opting out formula which he has submitted, to which this House might have referral? Can he indicate to us what he expects—

Mr. Sargent: He would not tell the member anyway.

Mr. Lewis:—the fiscal equivalents in these medical plans to be? Does he know the dollar sum we are talking about?

Mr. Sargent: What a dreamer!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I cannot indicate those. There are existing opting out fiscal equivalents—

Mr. Lewis: They elapsed in 1968.

Hon. Mr. McKeough:—but they are being paid presently to another province; if we start from that base, yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia, with a supplementary.

Mr. Bullbrook: The leader of the New Democratic Party has somewhat asked the question. May I ask, by a supplementary question to the Treasurer, can the people of Ontario properly presume, since he wishes to change the policy and opt out of these agreements, that the government perpetrated a disservice to them in entering the agreements in the first place?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I do not think so. The wisdom of the moment is that we will be better to opt out. The wisdom of four or five years ago perhaps was something different.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview has a new question?

INCOME TAX ASSISTANCE

Mr. Singer: Yes, I have a new question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Transport.

Does the Minister of Transport think it is reasonable and fair that a lady named Bea Clark, who was apparently the issuer of licences in the town of Georgetown, should run a display advertisement in the Georgetown Herald on April 15, saying "Let me do your income tax return" and sign it Bea Clark, motor vehicles office?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Mr. Speaker, I really do not know that I can see anything terribly wrong with that. I suppose she wanted to direct the attention of possible income tax clients to her place of business.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, does the minister not share my concern that one who apparently acts for the government and who wants

to be helpful in preparing income tax returns is conveying the implication that a government employee preparing income tax returns can be of greater help than other people?

An hon. member: Is the member suggesting she has an in with the Liberals at Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is applicable in these circumstances. She is not, in fact, an employee of the government; she is an agent of the government.

Mr. Singer: Is this one of the ladies for whom patronage is part of our way of life?

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Take the halo off.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

HAMILTON BOARD OF EDUCATION PROSECUTION OF FATHER

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education.

Does the minister think it proper and fair that the Hamilton Board of Education should have pursued the father of a child who is not in attendance at school and who is almost 16 years of age, to the point where he has been placed in jail, taking into consideration the statement of the principal of the school that there was no purpose in his returning to school?

Hon. R. Welch (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, this is asking the minister to comment on the action taken by a board. The board has the authority under The Schools Administration Act to take the action that it did. I have no opinion one way or the other with respect to it. That is the law.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary? The hon. member for Waterloo North. I am sorry, did the hon. member for Wentworth have a supplementary?

Mr. Deans: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask the minister if he does not feel, as the administrator of the Act, that he has the right to at least counsel with the Hamilton Board of Education to determine whether they should take into consideration the views of their employees who have the ultimate responsibilities for the education of those children before they follow a parent into court and have him committed to jail for 10 days?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may want to get the facts a bit straight. I do not know that it was the Hamilton Board of Education that brought the application for the man to be incarcerated.

The law is quite clear that there is a compulsory school attending age of 16 in this province. The way to change the law is through legislation, not by breaking it.

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Has the member ever made an amendment in the House to it?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North had a supplementary.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): By way of supplementary, would the minister consider—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Does the member want to reduce the age?

Mr. Good:—amending the Act so that it would revert to where it was in 1968, so that the juvenile court officers across the province, who are very reluctant to enforce this Act, and the attendance officers, who also find it impossible to enforce, would not find themselves in such a precarious position where they have an Act which cannot and should not be enforced?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, aside from all the editorial comment in that question and the opinions there expressed, this government has no intention of lowering the compulsory school attending age in this province.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary? The hon. member for Peterborough has a supplementary.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if the Minister of Education would consider seeking methods within that Act for allowing counselling to be done by various people within a board—a principal, guidance counsellor or directors of education—to decide whether alternatives to being in a school might not be more appropriate for persons between the ages of 14 and 16, particularly when they are failing and school means humiliation rather than victory, whether there might not be something that the minister could do in that regard?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very positive contribution. I think the hon. member will know that at one time there was a provision in The Schools Administration Act—

Mr. Pitman: Just a work permit.

Hon. Mr. Welch:—there were three different reasons for which a student between the ages of 14 and 16 could be excused from the provisions of this Act. They were removed by this Legislature and the compulsory age of 16 was re-enforced without the exceptions.

On the point that the member raised as to the alternative that should be found in lieu of actual attendance at school, I would be glad to take the hon. member's question under advisement.

It is interesting to note that the father in question comes from another jurisdiction where the compulsory age is only 15, and it may be that he was under some mistaken idea that that was sufficient.

Mr. Deans: No, he was not.

Hon. Mr. Welch: It is interesting to note that in Great Britain, from which country he comes, there is a great deal of agitation to change their legislation and raise it to 16 or 17, if not 18. So that in many jurisdictions this whole question of the compulsory aspect of school attendance is a very interesting one.

There are some other countries which have no compulsory age at all and feel that this, in itself, has some built-in incentives. We have had a very interesting dialogue on this question and I find the proposition of the hon. member a very interesting one in that light.

Mr. Pitman: If I might ask one further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the minister would ask the school boards if, before any further efforts to bring parents into court under this Act take place, they would refer it to the minister in every case for consideration by his department and by his officials?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I would say no. I do not want to interfere with the local operation of boards. Each situation must have some special circumstances.

Mr. Pitman: That is the very reason.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would suggest that prosecutions under this section are so rare that there must be exceptional circumstances in this case and that each case would have to be treated that way. I do not wish to interfere with the local operation of the board and the enforcement of the law.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): What is that?

Hon. Mr. Welch: But on the other hand, I am quite prepared, as we all should be, to always consider the import of the law and any changes that should be made in the law. This is where it should be done and not by the wilful breaking of it by someone who feels that he can take the law into his own hands.

Mr. Pitman: Well, bring in an amendment.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member should bring in an amendment.

Mr. Pitman: Okay we will. In a few months we will.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wellington South.

PETS IN ONTARIO HOUSING

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Trade and Development.

Would the minister clarify the position of the tenants of Ontario Housing in Guelph in relation to a letter they have received from Ontario Housing Corporation to rid their properties of pets by June 30 or take this as notice to vacate?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for giving me notice of this question or else I would not have been able to deal with it at all, because I had not read this morning's paper. I was able to get a copy of the clipping and a copy of the letter that was sent out.

I should advise the hon. member that the letter itself was sent out by I guess one would call it the housing corporation—the housing authority at Guelph that manages the housing development in question for the Ontario Housing Corporation. However, I have seen the letter and I am not too happy with the manner in which it was written. There no doubt are some instances in which pets that are in OHC premises are destroying premises, and I think in those instances of course the housing authority of Guelph or any other housing authority is duty bound to make sure this does not happen. However, it appears to me there is a policy which is applied generally across all of OHC developments, and it is with respect to this particular policy that I am going to have the whole matter reviewed to come up with something that appears to me not quite as all-embracing as to cover everyone regardless of whether pets are a nuisance or not.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

REGIONAL AIR CARRIER SERVICE

Mr. Stokes: Thank you. I have a question of the Minister of Highways and Transport. Will the minister assure the people of Geraldton and Chapleau that he has not completely—

Mr. Singer: Forgotten.

Mr. Stokes: —put a moratorium on the airstrips in that area? And can the minister assure the House he will institute a regional carrier to operate in areas that are under-serviced at the present time in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I think I can safely say there has been no decision that has been made that would injure the prospects of Geraldton and the other one—Chapleau—from being provided with services with respect to their requirements in the areas that the hon. member mentioned.

With respect to regional air carrier services, I would have to say that decision is not as clear-cut as it might be at this point in time. It is well understood, I believe, or should be, that Air Canada proposes to pull out of its regional air carrier services by 1973.

Certainly every effort is being made presently to ensure that the communities that will not be serviced by Air Canada will be serviced by regional carriers. There is going to be a good deal of consultation and deliberation in this field. I can safely say that we are very anxious that by that point in time there will be Ontario-based regional carriers to service these communities.

Some of them are now being serviced by out-of-province carriers. We would like to hope that by that time we can have an Ontario-based carrier or carriers to service these communities.

Mr. Stokes: A supplementary: Can I assume from the minister's answer that he will be going forward with the "highways in the sky" programme instituted by his predecessor?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that programme will not stop. It is not altogether related to the other matters which he proposed—that is in terms of regional air carrier services—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): It is just like a song from Johnny Cash.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I would say that becomes what you might characterize as a third level service. We are not talking about the same thing. When we say regional services we are talking about those areas that are about to be abandoned by Air Canada. We should distinguish between that level and the third carrier level that is already in the process of being studied, in demonstration terms if you wish.

Mr. Speaker: Any further supplementaries? If not, the member for York Centre—

Mr. Pitman: I would like to ask a further supplementary on that.

I wonder if the minister could indicate whether by the time Air Canada gets out of the regional carrier business, he will have a total grid for air services for eastern Ontario and northern Ontario and southern Ontario, due to the fact that it is not only those communities served by Air Canada that are involved in the erosion of air service in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I think in my previous answer the hon. member could have assumed that was correct because, as I mentioned before, there is a distinct difference between what is termed as regional carriers, which service is now being provided by Air Canada, and a third level of service that will, if you like, pick up those areas that are not presently being served. That is all in the mill now. It is all being pursued. As a matter of fact—

Mr. Pitman: When does the hon. minister expect to have that available? When will we know?

Mr. Sargent: Nineteen hundred and ninety on the path the government is going on now—1990.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any great reason for pessimism, but we are starting from scratch at the point in time when Air Canada said they were pulling out of the regional services—

Mr. Pitman: We are scratching pretty hard.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We had to start from that premise. The third-level carrier system that we are working on now, and which will be made manifest at least in study terms by a demonstration project to start in September—

Mr. Pitman: This September?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton:—this September. We have asked several Ontario-based carriers to respond to a request for evaluation of certain criteria at this level. Some of these reports are in, some of them will follow—and when that information is in and studied it is our intention to set up an actual demonstration project. Rather than employ consultants and take time and read a lot of paper we are going to undertake an actual demonstration project. That is as far as I can convey any information to the hon. member at this time, but it is being very vigorously pursued.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Yes, may I ask a supplementary? May I ask the minister when that demonstration project will get under way?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I thought, Mr. Speaker, that I mentioned we are trying to get it under way by September, hopefully by September.

Mr. Gaunt: That is a fairly firm date.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is our projected date, anyway.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

USE OF STUDDERED TIRES

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): a question of the Minister of Transport: Would the minister consider changing the basis of the ban on studded tires to that of vehicles licensed in Ontario, to avoid any possible embarrassment to drivers of vehicles coming from other jurisdictions? At the same time this would alleviate the burden of studs in the province without embarrassing people.

Mr. Stokes: No.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, that question was asked of me a few days ago and I made the observation then—and I think it is as valid today—that I do not know why we should place the automobile drivers of Ontario in one position and offer a different position to out-of-jurisdiction automobile drivers. I do not think it would be acceptable and I do not think it would be fair.

Mr. Sargent: What a stupid answer that is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is not nice.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has now expired.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might very briefly correct a statement I made earlier? I find I made an error in relying on the news media report over the weekend that there had been the death of a second prisoner resulting from the Kingston riot. Apparently there is just the one death.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. J. Yaremko presented the 1969 annual report of the Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, the 1969 annual report of the Ontario Telephone Commission, the 1969-1970 annual report of the Ontario Mental Health Foundation, the annual report of the Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario 1969-1970, the 1970 annual report of the St. Lawrence Parks Commission.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson, from the standing private bills committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee recommends the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr17, An Act respecting Kedar Mines Limited.

Bill Pr22, An Act respecting Timothy Investments Limited.

Your committee recommends the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill Pr3, An Act respecting The Thunder Bay Foundation.

Your committee recommends that fees, less the actual cost of training, be remitted on Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the Thunder Bay Foundation.

Mr. Speaker: In order that we may carry on the work of the House in accordance with previous agreements, I think the House would agree with me that we should now move to orders of the day, and at a later time we can come back to unfinished business in the previous orders.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the budget statement of the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) on Monday of this week confirms the rapid escalation in the costs of operating this provincial government and its programmes. Setting 1967, Centennial Year, just four years ago, as a base, when our net general expenditure was \$1.79 billion, it is predicted that this year Ontario will spend \$4.26 billion. This is an increase of 133 per cent in our general expenditures in four years, averaging 33 per cent each year.

This uncontrolled rate of growth can be compared with the growth rate of the gross provincial product, that is the ability of this province to develop goods and services, estimated for this year at 8.9 per cent—a rate which, I bring to your attention, has never exceeded 10 per cent during these last four years.

This is the real delineation of the fiscal nightmare that has become a reality in this most prosperous province. We face the largest deficit in our history—\$415 million—without adequate justification that provincial policy or initiative can control the spending machine set in motion or that the government has even identified the control mechanisms.

Even this year, when a special effort to control costs has been announced, government spending is increasing at the rate of 10.7 per cent. The government's efforts at cost-cutting have been pathetic and ineffectual.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to your attention eight specific items that bear out that contention.

First, centralized purchasing, announced two years ago, degenerated into a fiasco six months ago with the termination of the services of the senior administrative staff. Predicted savings of \$10 million were never realized.

Second, the amalgamation of hospital insurance and medical insurance, announced September, 1970, was postponed at the time of that announcement until July, 1972. We are continuing with the duplication, the expensive efforts in sending out these premium notices four times a year for both of these programmes.

Third, efforts to reorganize the cabinet by the new Premier (Mr. Davis) are ludicrous as he unloads four of the old ministers and replaces them with seven new ones, balloon-

ing the cabinet to 24 members, by far the largest in our history.

Next, the province has proceeded with a building programme exerting high inflationary pressure, which has included in the last three years the \$64-million Queen's Park office complex, new buildings for The Departments of Agriculture, Financial and Commercial Affairs, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, and others.

I have been criticized for calling the Ontario Institute a \$60-million expenditure. I have been told by the former Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), and others, that it will in fact cost only \$17 million but that we are purchasing it under an elaborate lease-back programme. In fact, we pay only \$2 million a year for 30 years, and it appears that before our responsibilities are discharged it will in fact be a \$60 million commitment, but as the former Minister of Education has said this includes the cost of janitorial services.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about attempts by the government to cut costs and I am talking about the elaborate building programme that has been going on for the last three or four years.

Ontario Place, which with moneys estimated in this budget will require a total of \$26,483,000, is simply the cherry on the top.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): How much?

Mr. Nixon: The hon. minister says "How much?" I repeat for him, \$26,483,000. This is the total of the sums that have been voted by the Legislature and which we are asked to vote this year to set Ontario Place in operation during these few months this summer. We know that it will be opening in a few weeks.

I think it is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the tender for the construction of this beautiful building—and it certainly is a beautiful building on stilts, built out on Lake Ontario in front of the exhibition—that the tender was let in August 1969, the peak of the inflationary period.

I am talking about the approach the government has toward cost-cutting—toward the responsible use of the more than \$4 billion they extract from the community in taxes. They undertook just a few months ago an elaborate advertising programme on the theme "Is there any place you'd rather be?", designed to politically brainwash the people of Ontario while using their own money.

Hon. A. Crossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Is there any place the hon. member would rather be?

Mr. Nixon: We remember those ads, the colour television commercials, the full-page ads in all the dailies and weeklies, talking about Ontario: "Is there any place you'd rather be?" Very similar to the same programme under the responsibility of the then Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) that was inaugurated before the last election.

Now fortunately the former Premier (Mr. Robarts), who does not happen to be in his place this afternoon, realized that this was political dynamite. The programme failed. We now find the minister responsible has taken a new position in the back row of the Legislature and it is well known that he has a new position with a well known Toronto firm of hamburger stands.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): I can get 'em for you wholesale!

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the sixth item: The government persists in its expensive patronage commitments to its friends and its supporters, the most recent example being the automobile licence issuing offices used for the advantage of local Conservative supporters and costing an extra \$3 million this year.

A case in point: The drivers' licence office in Kitchener is located at 701 Belmont Avenue West. The Department of Transport driver examination centre is at 449 Belmont Avenue West. Here is efficiency on the Tory style. These two offices are within half a mile of each other and still they cannot combine this licence issuing responsibility, which must be retained by the minister to dispense as only he sees fit.

There may be some excuse for part-time licence agents in isolated areas, but frankly I do not really accept even those excuses. After all there are OPP offices, highway garages, highways offices, and surely some other type of government office in every centre in Ontario. The only exception perhaps would be the county of Brant where I regret to inform you, Mr. Speaker, there are very few government offices of any description. However, if there are no offices of this type, the licences can be and should be mailed to those very few who would otherwise be inconvenienced.

This is patronage and it has no place of value where the work can be better and more

practically done elsewhere. The former Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) explains that such patronage is part of our way of life. Now it costs an extra \$3 million to finance only that programme. We as Liberals reject such a philosophy and we know that the people do to.

I want to continue with my review of the government's attempt to cut costs. The next one was the review of education costs announced by the Premier on two separate occasions.

I think you know, Mr. Speaker, that on the examination of this year's budget the amount we are asked to vote as members of the Legislature in support of our education programmes this year alone is \$1.78 billion. We should understand that this does not include any of the funds which will be raised on the basis of local assessment and which it is the responsibility of local school boards to expend. This year alone, \$200 million extra is being allocated under the direction of the new Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) as he puts his estimates before us.

My point is this, that the review of education costs by the standing committee on human resources has been emasculated by the Premier's refusal to provide support for independent research. Instead he gives the same responsibility for review to another inquiry, not responsible to the Legislature, conducted largely under the direction of Dr. J. R. McCarthy, Deputy Minister of Education until, I guess tomorrow night at midnight when he ends his term of office as deputy minister. He is well known as the author and director in the implementation of the county school board system.

Knowing Dr. McCarthy's ability and personal integrity as I do, the Premier may get more than he expects, but he expects a white-wash justification of his own years as Minister of Education, at the same time refusing an impartial investigation to be conducted in the public interests by the standing committee on human resources made up of members of this Legislature.

My next point: A review of hydro development and costs has also been announced by the new Premier. It will be directed by J. R. Dillon, formerly of the engineering faculty of University of Western Ontario. But he, in addition to his professional qualifications, is a former president of the London North Progressive Conservative Association. Now this does not disqualify him, but the Premier cannot expect a believably objective review of these two areas from the men he has

selected to direct them. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that he will receive at best recommendations tainted with the subjectivity of the reviewing authority, and at worst another political whitewash of the two great spending engines in our provincial system—education and Hydro.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): With no representation from the north.

Mr. Nixon: Obviously, we in the opposition support the establishment of any kind of a review because it has been put off for far too long. As a matter of fact, it was not—I believe about 1957 was the last time that a review of this type was established. Surely it is time that we had an objective understanding by those from the community to look at these costs. I am pointing out, Mr. Speaker, the flaw, not in the concept but in the implementation, the administration of the review under the direction of the new Premier.

The other regret I have is that there has not been a substantial review or an undertaking to review the cost of our medical and hospital insurance projects in this province. We believe that much more can be done with the scarce funds that we are asked to apply to the training of more doctors in the province and the funds that should go toward the establishment and strengthening of group practices in this province, particularly in those areas that are not well served by nearby urban centres.

These specific items—eight of them, Mr. Speaker—that I have drawn to your attention, head an endless list of facts proving that the present government will not undertake cost-cutting programmes that will contribute to the overall control of our runaway government expenditures.

I could, of course, go on and talk about the appointment of former ministers to positions on a variety of government boards and commissions, to their additional emolument. We are aware of this. We are simply here to say, Mr. Speaker, that after 28 years in office the government obviously cannot root itself out of these commitments to policies and people—commitments entered into over this period of time, more than a quarter of a century; commitments that are not authored by the new Premier so much as his predecessors, going right back to George Drew and probably beyond.

There is, of course, a remedy. It is the remedy that is available to anyone who believes in democracy; and that is to turf the administration out and replace them with

men and women with new ideas, new policies; and that is the responsibility that is upon us, as Liberals, when we face an election this very year.

Now Mr. Speaker, there are several specific announcements in the budget that I want to deal with.

The first is the five per cent tax credit given to corporations installing new machinery. This money has been a political football for three years and more. The government imposed a sales tax of precisely five per cent on production machinery in the first place. The following year—that would be two years ago—the tax was removed and then reimposed the year after.

The recently announced tax credit is designed, I suppose, to trickle down to the working man in better employment prospects. The \$125 million assigned for this item will help industry, will help the corporations and thus, I suppose, to that extent improve the provincial economy. But it will not put much meat on the table of the working man, whether he is in the factory or on the farm. I simply want to quote, from today's Toronto Daily Star, an item headed, "Tax Credits Will Mean Few Jobs." I quote as follows:

Two leading bank economists said yesterday they expect the \$125-million investment credit programme provided for Ontario business in the latest provincial budget will have only "minor effect" in creating new jobs.

One described the move as "mainly political." Forest Rogers, chief economist of the Bank of Nova Scotia, said:

"It is hard to view it as anything but part of a game of politics in taking a different line than the federal government by encouraging business and making as much political mileage as possible out of it."

It has already been stated and admitted by the Treasurer himself that he cannot account for any new jobs that can be directly related to this programme; that in fact 90 per cent of the installation of new equipment would have taken place whether or not this programme was brought in.

It sounds a lot like the methods Herbert Hoover used back in 1931 to bring the United States out of the Depression: Give money to corporations and after they have had their say with it, enough will trickle down to end depression. Well it did not work for Herbert Hoover and I would predict to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is going

to be equally ineffectual in solving the problems that beset the Province of Ontario.

We feel that the money would better have been used to remove at least a part of the sales tax on building materials, and in this way direct employment would be fostered as well as an improvement in the continually unfortunate housing situation in this province.

The only budgetary impact on the working man from the budget is the higher price of beer which we are told by the Treasurer will net about \$8 million extra for governments and the brewers at the expense of the beer drinker.

We approve of the equalization of beer costs, but surely the imagination of the Treasurer might very well have reduced the northern cost to the level that is enjoyed, I suppose, by the beer drinkers across southern Ontario without simply escalating it as a further \$8 million income source.

If he wanted to undertake some further improvement for those people who make their living and raise their families in northern Ontario, then surely he should do something about the equalization of the price of gasoline in the northern communities. I do not believe there is any reason for a continuation of this inequality.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party supports the inclusion of nursing home care under hospital insurance. We regret, of course, the postponement of the programme until April, 1972. As a matter of fact, it will not be a charge on this budget of any significance whatsoever, if at all, and therefore it is clearly brought forward merely as an election promise—which is all right; they are promising that they will do this a year from now if they are returned to office.

Well the \$3.50-per-day deterrent for nursing home care will confiscate \$105 out of the \$135 per month that is received by the old-age pensioners in nursing homes, even though their hospital insurance premiums are fully paid up.

I want to be fair. The Treasurer had not made it clear whether or not these people will be left with a larger amount of those pension funds in their own hands and for their personal expenditure. But failing a further clarification, which must obviously come from the government, this \$3.50 a day, while it might readily be payable by many people using the nursing home services, would be a very severe detriment to the usable parts of the programme under the federal and provincial combination in the provision

of these pensions. I believe that this particular aspect must be set right before it is implemented a year from now.

Another matter: the Treasurer's announcement of a five per cent wage ceiling on civil servants asking for dislocations and strife in dealing with the public service. He knows it. It was substantially ill-advised.

I have referred to it as a ceiling in my remarks, even though the Premier in answer to questions a few moments ago said it is not a ceiling, that it is simply going to be an average and a guideline at that. But, Mr. Speaker, we should be aware of what kind of an imposition this will be on large numbers of people presently employed in the public service of the province.

As a part of the budget, we were informed that 69,000 people presently work for the government of Ontario. While a limit in growth has been set, still it indicates that working for the government, or the business of government, is growing more rapidly than any other enterprise in this province.

I was interested also to note that the largest downgrading in staff was going to be in The Department of Revenue. This department was supposed to be the example par excellence of how an administration could be run economically and in the best interests of the public. We felt that there should be no separate Department of Revenue. It was not necessary to have a separate minister with that responsibility, with the pay and perquisites that go with him—the car and all the rest.

At one time the minister said that he was going to use only a Chev as his ministerial automobile. I think he lived up to that, but oh boy what a Chev!

But it is interesting, you know, that now that the member for London South (Mr. White), has been relieved of his responsibility as Minister for Revenue, already 26 members of that department are slated to move out. So obviously even in the short few months that he was running what was supposed to be the best administered department in the government there was a lot of padding as far as personnel was concerned.

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): That is the result of my work.

An hon. member: Empire-building!

Mr. Nixon: But I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should be aware—

Hon. Mr. White: The member had better read that again.

Mr. Nixon: —that there are 70,000 people working for the government. Some are well paid indeed but at the other end of the scale —there are the janitors who are presently paid \$4,350 per year. They are paid on an hourly basis, but if they work the hours prescribed by the regulations of The Department of Labour and The Department of Public Works, they get \$4,350 a year.

These janitors are presently having their wage scale arbitrated before the arbitration board established by Act of this Legislature and administered by the government opposite. If the five per cent ceiling dictated by the Treasurer on Monday of this week is imposed, they will be granted a raise of \$217 per year, giving them an elevation to a yearly salary of \$4,577 per year.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, there is ample evidence in this case? I am prepared to say that there are others in the public service well paid indeed, and I see a number of them sitting under the galleries here this afternoon, I see them over there; but we are thinking of these large numbers of people who certainly will not be well served by the ceilings that have been imposed by the government opposite.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: With compulsory arbitration being the law of the province for these particular government employees, surely the government must abide by that arbitration without interference? The arbitrators agreed to by both sides must consider all factors in wage negotiations. Surely an arbitrary limit set by the government will make a farce of that particular system?

Mr. Singer: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: If we are going to continue with compulsory arbitration with no right to a legal strike, it must be clear that the government must and will abide by the arbitration awards without trying to influence the arbitrators in such a way as attempted by the Treasurer earlier this week.

Mr. Singer: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, we have become accustomed since 1968 to veiled threats and some not so veiled by the present Treasurer and his predecessor. Threats to establish a separate provincial income tax in Ontario. On March 4, 1969, the then Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), stated in the budget papers as follows:

The Ontario government intends to establish its own personal income tax system within the next two years. This move to independent income tax is necessary to preserve the province's fiscal integrity and to achieve meaningful tax reform in Ontario.

Since that time we have had a series of proposals from the present government all aimed at establishing the principles upon which the tax base for a separate provincial income tax might be established, including a renewed threat in the current budget. You will find it on page 8, second paragraph, Mr. Speaker, where the Treasurer in his pronouncements said:

If we are thwarted by the new federal tax legislation, the Ontario government is prepared to proceed independently.

Now this has been a course of substantial concern to politicians, admittedly because it would be a huge political issue. But the taxpayers feel that our levels of taxation are at the breaking point now and that we should not be considering this additional levy.

Such a course of action, the introduction of a second income tax in Ontario, double taxation, at least on that base, would be disastrous. Ontario taxpayers would have two different returns to fill out and would have to send them to two different governments. Administration of the scheme would be costly, perhaps as much as \$5 million. Yet another group of tax experts will have to be hired to administer the tax.

The Treasurer has said, when I criticized him on this point previously, that of course it could be worked out in conjunction with the government of Canada. But I simply draw to your attention again what his predecessor said in the budget of March, 1969:

Ontario intends to establish its own personal income tax system. The move to independent income tax is necessary.

It sounds like a completely independent programme that is in the minds of the government and the Treasurer. We recall that in 1962 the then Premier, Mr. Robarts, parallel with the then Prime Minister of Canada, John Diefenbaker, established elaborate researches into the tax system of Canada and of Ontario.

The Carter report, which came down federally in 1967, has been translated into the white paper which has been discussed so much across Canada and probably no place more than in this Legislature in the last few weeks since we have had a new Treasurer, who is prepared to thrash through all that straw again.

We should not forget that during that same period researches into the tax system of Ontario were being undertaken by the Smith committee, which also reported in 1967. That committee on taxation studied the Ontario tax system exhaustively and in 1967 recommended against a separate provincial income tax in Ontario on the grounds that it would be needlessly costly and complex.

It recommended a continuation of the existing tax collection agreement with the federal government. What we do urgently require is closer consultation between the federal and provincial governments on tax reform and to this end I have proposed that the federal government include, along with its forthcoming proposals on tax reform—and they are expected within the next few weeks according to press reports—legislation setting out specific requirements and machinery for meaningful consultation with the provincial governments in detail on any proposed changes to the income tax or corporation income tax base.

It is difficult to have the kind of consultation which will mean anything when the attitude of the government of Ontario is the attitude of political confrontation, as it has been for the last few months, reaching new heights in the Speech from the Throne. We as Liberals believe that rather than creating a second tax bureaucracy at Queen's Park we ought to be thinking of doing away with part of the one we now have.

It is important to recall that the Smith committee recommended that we negotiate a collection agreement with the federal government for the corporate income tax, along the lines of the one we now have for the personal income tax. We should and must retain a general tax policy unit at the provincial level, but surely we need only one corporate tax collection and administration staff. Maintaining staffs both in Ottawa and in Ontario for this purpose is a waste of taxpayers' money. We should have one income tax system, both personal and corporate in Canada, with close and continuous consultation between the federal and provincial governments to determine its base and rate structure.

The budget continues in this particular vein—it continues the provincial programme of succession duties. This too is a costly, confusing duplication with federal estate tax machinery. We already share the federal estate tax to the extent of 20 per cent; provincial succession duties should be abolished and replaced with a federal-provincial

agreement negotiated to raise the same amount of revenue.

Now that phrase should surely appeal to the Treasurer and to his predecessor, because we agree that tax reforms in themselves should not inflate the revenues from the tax base. If a government, either federal or provincial, does require additional revenues, it should be prepared to take the tough political decision to raise these rates if it considers this necessary. And by way of reform alone, we should simply be striving for equity and fairness for all, rather than increasing the take from the tax base.

The Treasurer has reiterated that position on many occasions, and from my reading I know that the Minister of Finance for Canada agrees with him. Since the opposition agrees—and we will hear from the NDP next week on some of these proposals—I would think that there is total agreement and that we could undertake this negotiation so that our share of the federal estate tax, if we get out of provincial succession duties entirely—which we recommend—would be accomplished without any loss of revenue as far as we are concerned.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): No, no, no! We will take a different position on that.

Mr. Nixon: Now Mr. Speaker, one of the most powerful checks on those who would subvert our democratic system is the need to raise the funds through taxes to pay for programmes to meet the needs of the community. This valuable requirement is weakened when governments use funds collected at other levels to pay for their own programmes.

I am simply stating the other side of the position put forward a moment ago when I say that our future, in the efficiency and equity of a national and provincial tax base, has to be one of co-operation. Modern government is not so simple that we can build walls between administrations and raise all of the taxes needed for our own purposes within our own taxing ambit. Fiscal transfers from federal to provincial governments, and from the province to the municipal governments, will always be with us, and if anything become more complex and sophisticated than they have in the past. But this government always emphasizes its contributions to assist municipalities even though these payments are made with so many strings attached that the decisive power is transferred from the municipalities to the province.

As a matter of fact, when I look at the tax bill that is rendered to me by the corporation of the township of South Dumfries, there is by law a section right on the tax bill which indicates quite clearly the provisions made by the government of Ontario to assist in keeping local taxes down.

I have no objection to that, because I think it is important in the democratic process that the people who receive the assistance from public funds know which level of government collects the taxes in the first place, because of course it is easy to introduce programmes, expensive and otherwise, if in fact the money to pay for them does not have to be levied by the same level of government. What this government does not recognize adequately, and what is therefore often ignored by the taxpayer, is the importance of federal payments in support of our own provincial programmes.

Our tax sharing agreement with Ottawa will net Ontario \$1,078,000,000 from income and estate tax collections sent to Ottawa by the taxpayers and then sent back to the Ontario government. There is no objection to this. Our position, as Liberals, is that we must cooperate more and more on shared responsibilities in levying these taxes. But it must be understood by those people who see the deductions month by month, and who write out a sometimes substantial cheque just about this time of year and then send it away to Ottawa, that in fact the Premier has evidently been writing out some substantial cheques.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Not substantial, but cheques.

Mr. Nixon: I see, yes. From this collection we have our largest individual source of provincial revenue, this year estimated to be more than a billion dollars, which comes from Ottawa as is our right, by agreement to pay our provincial costs.

In addition to that we have a long list of shared-cost programmes which have been mentioned, in education, health, welfare, and other areas which are payable to the province, and these amount in this budgetary year to \$450 million. I think the interesting thing to note is that while the Treasurer has announced that we are going to opt out of many of these shared cost programmes—and I am going to have something specific to say about that in a moment—these programmes are open-ended.

For example, the government of Canada, by agreement, pays half the cost of post-

secondary education, which as you know includes half the cost of grade 13, but they have no control over the size of that programme at all. This is completely controlled by the government of Ontario, and specifically by the Minister of University Affairs, and so there is no federal control at all. It is an open-ended programme in which the government of Canada simply agrees to pay half, but all of the control and the administration is here.

Frankly, that has got to be a good deal. To opt out of that programme surely does not seem to be in the best interest of Ontario, because we have full control and we get to spend 50-cent dollars.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is Ottawa that—

Mr. Nixon: All right. Well, Mr. Speaker, the same is true of their commitment to health insurance, to welfare under the Canada Assistance Plan—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not quite now, not quite!

Mr. Nixon: All right, but in education it is wholly "quite."

Hon. Mr. McKeough: All right, but let us not include health insurance in that, which is half of the national average.

Mr. Nixon: All right, that is fine, but there is no control at the federal level other than to pay half the costs, and this has been a good deal for us, particularly in meeting education costs.

Mr. Speaker, in assessing what is transferred from Ottawa to us by tax collection agreement and by shared-cost programmes, the grand total is more than \$1.77 billion. It is collected by the federal government but spent directly by the government of Ontario for provincial programmes. Now this means that 41 per cent of our 1971 budget of \$4.26 billion is met either from fiscal transfers or by the provincial share available under the tax collection agreement.

This is the sort of thing that is never brought forward by the government, even though they are prepared to insist by law that their assistance to the municipality appears on the tax bills.

Now tax reform in Ontario is of substantial concern to us all. I was interested in what the Treasurer had to say about tax reform at the national level, because obviously we are all taxpayers in Canada as well as in

Ontario, but surely our responsibility is to deal with provincial reforms as well, not simply to discuss the matter exclusively affecting Ottawa?

Our reform has consisted to date of irresponsible threats and a series of ad hoc, politically motivated handouts which have been called tax reform. The Treasurer a few days ago put a bill on this. He has now got it up to about \$413 million—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Four hundred and sixty-one million dollars.

Mr. Nixon:—Four hundred and sixty-one million dollars, in tax reform, and in that he includes the takeover of the cost of the administration of justice back in 1967 as one of the cornerstones of tax reform. But surely tax reform has been ignored by this government opposite, and particularly in this budget there is nothing on it. There is nothing in it that deals with reform on the tax base of the province.

I want to tell you my personal case. Last September, in a move which was not a part of the budget a year ago, the former government decided to make payments to farmers to assist them in meeting their tax commitments and responsibilities. I am a farmer; I have 260 acres in Brant county which has been in the family for a long, long time. My assistance for tax payment amounted to \$238. I am grateful, I suppose, as I should be. It was not quite enough to change my political stance, but let me say something more about it because—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member would have done himself a great service if he had.

Mr. Nixon: Let me just tell you a little bit about it, because I am concerned as a taxpayer that these cheques arrived in four separate envelopes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Has it got his picture on it?

Mr. Nixon: All right, each cheque had a picture of the Parliament Buildings in Toronto; each one was signed by Charles MacNaughton, Treasurer of Ontario; each had an enclosure from the hon. Darcy McKeough—who now sits almost directly across from me, and who was then minister of Municipal Affairs—explaining that this provincial programme was to assist farmers. Another note was included from the hon. Mr. Stewart, the estimable Minister of Agriculture and Food, explaining that it was designed to assist the farm economy.

I received it just after Christmas. There was a little bit of a foul-up there, because the government's other tax reform programme was made up of cheques for \$50—no variation, they were all the same. That went to all of the pensioners in the province in receipt of guaranteed income supplement. Very popular, a nice Christmas present indeed; and believe me farmers and pensioners and others have not been dealt with fairly by this province or even the government of Canada because this is where real reforms are needed. It is not handouts that are looked for. The government degraded these people by this sort of so-called tax reform.

It is typical of this government that instead of attacking the root of the problem by relieving the property tax of the impossible burden of financing, now 45 per cent of the cost of education in the province, and by doing something as well about the highest combined Medicare and hospitalization premiums in the country, it has simply hired more civil servants to administer this complex programme of grants and rebates, a costly and inefficient excuse for genuine tax reform.

What they might have done was to do something in this budget for the low income people of this province. If the government was going to be consistent and say, "Here is some money for farmers. Here is some money for old age pensioners," they might very well have made out another few hundred thousand cheques for low income people in this province to give them a tax credit and assist them.

This would have been the consistent approach if, in fact, the government opposite had any consistency. Instead of that they took the \$125 million, gave it to the corporations and said, "Now you fellows let this trickle down to where it will do the most good." You know where they think it will do the most good? It is not going to be in the pockets of the working people of this province.

Our second priority for reform must recognize that municipalities are under increasingly severe fiscal pressure. The property tax is simply not an adequate base to finance the many onerous expenditures for which municipal governments are now responsible. The minister opposite can say that he has undertaken to increase certain grants payable to regional governments. He is going to increase certain unconditional grants while recognizing that this is a very advantageous way to get the strings of control to lead directly to his former office in 801 Bay Street, the ministry of Municipal Affairs; to get the strings of control out of the municipalities.

But he has moved only a tiny bit in this direction. Instead of that, under his leadership—that is, the Treasurer's leadership when he was Minister of Municipal Affairs—there had been a series of regional governments imposed around this province which have been nothing but trouble.

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. Nixon: The costs in the Niagara region have escalated. St. Catharines feels that it has not been fairly nor properly dealt with in its petitioning to get out of regional government. The Premier has refused to see those people from St. Catharines saying—

Hon. Mr. Davis: On a point of order. I have not refused to see them.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier has not refused to see them?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I have not.

Mr. Nixon: Has the Premier seen them?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, but I have not refused.

An hon. member: The Prime Minister is not available.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): It takes a long time, does it not?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the Premier has not refused to see them but he has not seen them even though they have requested what they choose to call an audience.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): When the Stanley Cup playoffs are over, the Premier will see them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have not seen any of the games for the last week.

Mr. Nixon: Certainly, there will be other occasions, if the Premier will permit me, to discuss the problems of regional government because this is a substantial issue—particularly the funding of local government—an issue which must concern taxpayers at all levels or the provincial government must take over 80 per cent of the costs of education from the municipalities—

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. Nixon: —and finance it through the broader tax base of the province on a phased four-year programme.

This has been our position consistently since I became leader of the party in 1967. Believe me, it is eminently defensible now as it was then. As we approach the increasing tax problems and try to find the solutions for these tax problems, this appears to be the substantial cornerstone of the kind of reform that is needed. But there is one catch to it.

In order that the province does not lose to the federal government the amounts of property tax which, under present legislation, are deductible by farmers and corporations from the personal and corporate income taxes respectively, we require an agreement with the federal government to transfer the windfall increase in tax revenues back to the province.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: Now maybe the Treasurer sitting over there could not negotiate that agreement, but I will tell him, we could.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Davis: What agreement is that?

Mr. Nixon: I think it is interesting that the Premier turned to the Treasurer and said, "What agreement is that?"

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Premier wanted to know who the hon. member was.

Mr. Nixon: I see. The Premier knows who I am. I am the leader of the Liberal Party in the province and I am about to be Premier of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, specifically, when I talked about municipal reform I said that was our second priority. Our first priority must be to renounce the mindless political confrontation adopted by the government of Ontario in their dealings with the government of Canada.

Hon. Mr. Grossmon: That is a good phrase.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: Page 9 of the budget statement makes a clear statement containing a clear threat that Ontario will block substantial advances in the constitutional review unless tax arrangements are changed. I have it here and I can read it.

Until there is substantial progress in tax sharing, and unless the province achieves better financial arrangements, I can see major obstacles in the way of any substantial advance in the other aspects of the constitutional review.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Shame, shame!

Mr. Nixon: I think that is a substantially serious statement of a blackmail threat that is the most ugly and divisive move in a federal-provincial war that was escalated since 1968 and now assumes irresponsible proportions.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: The government has gradually moved into a policy—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That new speech writer is not bad.

Mr. Nixon: This is very serious. The government has moved into a policy attitude which seriously undermines national unity. The vendetta against the federal government began in the Robarts-MacNaughton days, but the former Premier's recognition of Ontario's role as a national leader kept the attitude in check. Now this moderate approach has disappeared. It has gone. The new Premier has not the personal status to control the natural tendencies of his Treasurer to go to irresponsible extremes.

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear!

An hon. member: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member just wishes that he had somebody as talented.

Mr. Nixon: The same lack of control was demonstrated by the Minister of Agriculture and Food earlier this session. He insisted on the fast passage of a law giving Ontario the power to seize and destroy farm products entering Ontario from other parts of Canada. Mind you, not coming in from Italy or coming from a banana republic in South America—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Which ones?

Mr. Nixon: —but from the other provinces of Canada, such as Quebec and Manitoba.

Aside from the fact that the Minister of Agriculture and Food knew that federal control legislation is before Parliament and that similar provincial legislation is presently being contested before the Supreme Court of Canada, he also knew that other provinces will be forced to retaliate to the ill-advised moves taken under the leadership of the Minister of Agriculture and Food and agreed to by the Premier, who seems to agree with all of his ministers without any direction from him.

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: And important in this connection, Mr. Speaker, is that both the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture and Food forget that Ontario has a \$2.6 billion trade surplus. Not with the world but simply with the other provinces of Canada. In the long run this protectionist attitude will not be in the best interests of our farmers or any other part of our economy.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: What I suppose is even worse, the policy balkanizes Canadian provinces with the old Conservative approach to tariff protection. Not to defend the boundaries of Canada but to defend the boundaries of Ontario.

I had an interesting evening last night. I was up in Victoria-Haliburton at a nomination convention.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nixon: I see the member over there looking at me.

Mr. Sopha: That is one we get.

Mr. Nixon: I could not help but think of the days when Mr. Frost, the former Premier, had to deal with the governments of Canada. He dealt with Mr. St. Laurent and which was probably much more difficult, former Prime Minister Diefenbaker. I always felt that while he had the ability to deal rigorously and in a businesslike fashion with the government of Canada, he did it as a government to a government. While under certain circumstances he might have been able to put his arm around John Diefenbaker and say, "Listen, John, maybe we can work something out," essentially Ontario's tradition has been to deal as government to government, not as political party to political party.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: Even the former Premier, who is absent this afternoon but would occupy seat No. 1 if he was here, was quite prepared to make speeches in which he was substantially critical of federal policy, but there was never an occasion at a federal-provincial conference—and I attended them as an observer, almost all of them that were open—in which he could not, almost palpably, exert the special responsibility that Ontario must exert as the keel, the balance wheel of Canada, in dealing with this government—

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: —of Canada and the sister provinces. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is what we have lost in the change of administration. The new Premier may be able to exert that influence when he goes to the federal-provincial conference in Victoria in June—

An hon. member: Leave that up to us.

Mr. Nixon: —but not if he is undercut by the Treasurer and the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Singer: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: There was a time when, I suppose I would have some compunction about praising the former Premier. There were many things that he did that we felt were not in the best interests of this province. But what he could do was deal, from a position of strength and leadership and not from a position of political confrontation with his sister government.

We know that Ontario has one-third of Canada's population and one-half of Canada's wealth. The Conservatives are now prepared to reject the responsibility that this wealth and power must carry with it. They retreat to the discredited political confrontations of the 1930s which will be as politically disastrous for them as it was for the administration of Mr. Hepburn and the Liberals back in those days.

I adjure the premier officer to think about that, because I know he is a politician—if not par excellence, at least learning. This is a matter that must much concern him in his capacity as leader of the government before it concerns him in his capacity as leader of the Progressive Conservative Party.

In referring again specifically to the budget, it contained more than one diatribe against Ottawa. The budget speech descended to the picayune in comparing, for example, the number of summer students hired by the federal government with the number hired by Queen's Park. This foolishness I submit must come to an end.

We must get down to serious discussion with the federal government on vitally important questions—the continuation and the improvement of the tax sharing agreements, and particularly the kind of agreement that we must extract from the government of Canada on our share of the capital gains tax revenue.

The NDP, sitting to my left, have been talking about a separate capital gains tax. I am sure we will hear their views in more particular from the leader when he speaks next week. But this is another area where one capital gains tax is needed across Canada, but we as a province must bargain for our share, and these bargaining sessions should be undertaken. If they have not already been undertaken, they should be undertaken immediately.

We have got to stop indulging in this area of mutual recrimination, which has characterized the last three years but never more so than the attitude of the government during the last few weeks. The central theme of the budget speech is that the federal government has centralized power over the last few years.

I am not prepared to argue that. It may be so or it may not, but I think we have got to remember that the people of this Province of Ontario are residents here but they are citizens of Canada, and as citizens of Canada they have the right under our constitutions to vote for or vote against, to accept or reject, the policies of our federal party—the Liberals, the Conservatives and the NDP.

In the last election, they happened to have accepted the policies of the federal Liberal Party. And it is through that means that remedy can be found. The Parliament of Canada is quite established with responsibilities to support government policies or reject them. It seems strange that this government here has established itself as the main opposition to the policies of the government of Canada. It may be the feeling that the opposition is not being conducted appropriately in the House of Commons but, of course, that is their problem.

My position, obviously, is that we are not worrying about the centralizing aspects of the government of Canada when we are talking about the provincial budget. It is true that this government, however, is guilty of centralizing policies, if any government ever was. It has systematically centralized decision-making powers to Queen's Park in the last 28 years. We need only take the example of assessment, which was the responsibility of the present Treasurer in his former capacity.

For no demonstrative reason, and in the face of a recommendation of the Smith committee to the contrary, the provincial government took over the responsibility of assessment, a responsibility which should be, and will be, returned to the regional and county level within provincial guidelines.

The costs of centralized assessment are estimated in the present budget at \$22 million for this year alone—far above the former county assessment costs. Further centralizing and planning, imposition of regional government and county school boards, have added to government complexity and costs and a true indication of who is the centralizing administration. It is the administration here in the province at Queen's Park.

I have made some reference to shared-cost programmes. I believe that we will always have shared-cost programmes. I would support the government, if it wanted to extract itself from these commitments with proper fiscal equivalents in those programmes which are essentially not open-ended. We can discuss this on other occasions, I know, but surely it is irresponsible, as the Treasurer did on Monday, to reject further shared-cost programmes. If national unity means anything, if Confederation means anything, then it is the responsibility of the government of Canada to give leadership in this, always with the kind of consultation that is needed, if these programmes can be accepted in a realistic base by the provinces taking part.

Mr. Speaker, there have been election rumours. We know that the life of this House ends automatically in November 1972—still a long time from now. If the government, the Conservative Party, wants to make a confrontation with the government of Canada the issue, then so be it.

But our position, of course, is that we must deal with provincial issues, the issues associated with the quality of education, the environment, economical development and jobs, local autonomy and a new partnership with the municipalities, the strengthening control of our business, our labour and our cultural endeavours.

I feel that it is time for new people and new ideas controlling the government of this province. It is, obviously, time for a change and we are going to the people to accomplish that change.

I was interested, just in the moment or two at my disposal, to see that at least the government has one strong supporter in the editors of the *Globe and Mail*—"Canada's national newspaper," it says at the top. I will read an excerpt from an editorial, dated Wednesday, April 28.

Ottawa's drive, both to fight inflation and end regional economic disparities, hits at the three most productive provinces, Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia. It

appears intended to produce economic equity across the country, not by helping all the provinces to become rich, but by punishing Ontario . . . into poverty.

I think of that poverty when I think of \$27 million spent for Ontario Place, when I think of a \$33 million Centennial Centre, a \$60 million new building for the Institute for Studies in Education; and even the caviar that was served at the pollution conference just a few months ago. Bad poverty! Poverty in the eyes of the *Globe and Mail* and in the eyes of the government!

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) that the Treasurer's motion be amended by adding the following words:

This House regrets the failure of the government:

To eliminate wasteful expenditures of taxpayers' resources in lavish government structures, in excessive and uncontrolled provincial departmental bureaucracies and by having created and by continuing to encourage unnecessary and costly aspects of regional government and county school board hierarchies.

We regret the failure of the government to implement meaningful tax reform, which would relieve the burden on lower and middle-income groups, including farmers;

Their failure to establish realistic programmes to improve the environment, to increase housing and to stimulate northern development;

Their failure to develop a simple method of stimulating employment by reform of the Ontario Development Corporation and reduction of sales tax on production machinery and building materials, rather than the proposed costly cumbersome procedure, which fails to encourage Canadian manufacturers and for which there is no evidence that future net gains in employment will result;

Their failure to propose a programme of co-operation with the government of Canada and other provinces to achieve the goal of strengthening national unity, national tax reform and the modernizing of our constitution, rather than embarking upon a course of fiscal separation from the other provinces and the federal government.

Finally, we regret their failure to be bound by arbitration in connection with civil service salary negotiation and the arbitrary fixing of a maximum rate of increase in advance of any such negotiation.

Mr. Sopha: What we are going to put on that door is "Premier Nixon."

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Nixon moves, seconded by Mr. Singer, the Treasurer's motion be amended by adding the following words:

That this House regrets the failure of the government:

To eliminate wasteful expenditures of taxpayers' resources in lavish government structures, in excessive and uncontrolled provincial departmental bureaucracies, and by having created and by continuing to encourage unnecessary and costly aspects of regional government and county school board hierarchies;

To implement meaningful tax reform which would relieve the burden on lower and middle-class income groups including farmers;

To establish realistic programmes to improve the environment;

To increase housing and to stimulate northern development;

To develop a simple method of stimulating employment by reform of the Ontario Development Corporation and reduction of sales tax on production machinery and building materials, rather than the proposed costly, cumbersome procedure which fails to encourage Canadian manufacturers, and for which there is no evidence that future net gains in employment will result;

To propose a programme of co-operation with the governments of Canada and other provinces to achieve the goal of strengthening national unity, national tax reform and modernizing of our constitution, rather than embarking upon a source of fiscal separation from the other provinces and the federal government;

To be bound by arbitration in connection with civil service salary negotiations and the arbitrary fixing of a maximum rate of increase in advance of any such negotiations.

An hon. member: The government would vote for that itself.

Mr. Lewis moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before calling the next order of business, I am sure the House would be interested in two rather significant events that have taken place.

Mr. Turner has apparently announced that The Public Order Act will be allowed to expire at midnight tomorrow.

I am sure the next statement will be greeted with the same enthusiasm across the House. I understand that Mr. Eric Kierans has resigned from the cabinet of the Prime Minister of Canada with one of the significant reasons being a disagreement with respect to economic policy including full employment.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Why did the Premier bring that up?

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): That is what he will be like.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I really think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) should rise in his place and thank me for restraining myself and not announcing it on CBC when he was performing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Before we left the orders of the day which we are following to allow the budget debate to continue, we were at the order of business of presenting reports and I think perhaps we should go back and continue from there and finish the business of the House today in the normal ordinary manner.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Meen, from the standing procedural affairs committee, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following applications for private Acts and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient:

The Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake;
The City of London;
The City of Sault Ste. Marie;
Triangle Swine Enterprises Limited;
The City of Guelph;
The City of Barrie;
The Borough of Etobicoke;
The City of Windsor;

To incorporate the Association of Natural Resources Technicians of Ontario.

Mr. Sargent: Why do they not fix the PA system?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in response to numerous requests from all sides of the House, I am pleased to table this report on the disposition of public land for cottage purposes.

In it you will find interesting information for Ontario, other Canadian provinces and the United States. For example, there is an analysis of sales of Crown cottage lots in Ontario over a 20-year period. It shows that sales to non-residents have been fairly constant annually at about 16 per cent of total across the province. In certain parts, however, such as Algoma, Rainy River and Kenora, the proportion has been much higher. Methods of land disposition for other Canadian and American governmental agencies are also presented.

Public lands in Ontario were first sold for cottages about 1880. Cottages are important centres of recreation for many citizens. It is our belief, Mr. Speaker, that some of our vast area of recreational land should continue to be committed to this use. And it will be our resolve to devise a fair and equitable system of disposition to accommodate this use.

Mr. Sargent: It is a good job they bought the printing plant.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

BROCK UNIVERSITY

Mr. G. E. Smith, in the absence of **Mr. Morningstar**, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Brock University.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): I protest, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): He is so small you cannot see him.

Mr. Speaker: The motion which Mr. Speaker received reads:

Mr. Morningstar moves, seconded by **Mr. Hodgson** (Victoria-Haliburton) that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, An Act respecting Brock University, and the same be read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF SUDBURY

Mr. Sopha moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Sudbury.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BOROUGH OF ETOBICOKE

Mr. Rowntree moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Borough of Etobicoke.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF GUELPH

Mr. Worton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Guelph.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE

Mr. Gilbertson moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF WINDSOR

Mr. B. Newman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF LONDON

Mr. Bolton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of London.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE EXTENSION ACT

Mr. Kennedy moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Municipal Franchise Extension Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The member wishes to make an explanation of his bill.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of this bill is to permit

persons on the resident voters' list, for example persons residing in mobile homes who have been formerly denied this vote, to vote at elections for members of local boards and utilities.

TRIANGLE SWINE ENTERPRISES LIMITED

Mr. Breithaupt moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Triangle Swine Enterprises Limited.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

ASSOCIATIONS OF NATURAL RESOURCES TECHNICIANS OF ONTARIO

Mr. Jessiman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to incorporate Associations of Natural Resources Technicians of Ontario.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF WOODSTOCK

Mr. Innes moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Woodstock.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BOROUGH OF SCARBOROUGH

Mr. Meen moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Borough of Scarborough.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF CORNWALL

Mr. Villeneuve moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Cornwall.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF BARRIE

Mr. Evans moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Barrie.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF TORONTO

Mr. Price moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Gilbertson, in the absence of Mr. Morin, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF NIAGARA-ON-THE-LAKE

Mr. R. M. Johnston moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to draw the attention of the members of the House to significant days within the lives of countries with whom many of our people have close ties.

Today, celebrating their National Day are Israel and Japan. Tomorrow, the Netherlands observes its national day by celebrating the birthday of Her Majesty Queen Juliana, of great affection to the people of Canada in a personal way.

On Sunday, those of Polish descent in Canada and the western world will be celebrating one of the very significant days in the history of the Polish people, Constitution Day, May 3.

It is appropriate at this time that I remind the hon. members of the House of the press conference and reception which is being held at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning to which they will all have received invitations giving the details of a new reception service being inaugurated by our department at Toronto International Airport.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Is the minister serving coffee?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview) Caviar?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We are not only serving coffee, we are serving Capuccino, which is Italian, with French croissants and Ukrainian babka.

Mr. Nixon: Ukrainian vodka?

Mr. Singer: At 9 o'clock in the morning?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Ukrainian babka. Whether a Calgary eye-opener will be served has yet to be decided.

There will be multilingual reception counsellors, some rather striking multilingual information kits and, of course, the multilingual breakfast to which I referred.

Mr. Singer: Multilingual breakfast?

Mr. Nixon: Sounds delightful.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Multi-ethnic breakfast.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Would you revert to introduction of bills, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Speaker has an important engagement; the member was not here—no one was here with the bill, the bill can wait until tomorrow morning.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, in the absence of the Prime Minister, I wish to table the answers to the following questions standing on the order paper—questions 4, 5 and 10 (see appendix).

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 20th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: The Department of Agriculture and Food; vote 102, item 3, crop insurance. The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

On vote 102, item 3:

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks with regard to crop insurance. It is a little discouraging to look over the crop insurance commission report for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1970. We are disappointed in that it has not gained more momentum in the Province of Ontario in the agricultural arts than it has to date, and probably one reason that it has not is the failure of the Province of Ontario to assume an equal share with the government of Canada in assisting it.

The acreage that corn covers in the Province of Ontario is very minor. I have some figures showing that 14,000 acres were covered in 1969 for corn and in 1970 went up to 33,000 acres, which is a sizable increase on the previous year—over 100 per cent—but I think the corn acreage in Ontario, if I recall correctly, figures out at about four per cent of the total acreage; it may even be less than that.

I noticed that in the county of Kent alone the corn acreage is 200,000 and we insured 33,000 acres; so there is some reluctance on the part of the farmers to accept this. One reason, I assume, is that farmers, being rather an independent group, can probably gamble provided they are growing more than one type of crop.

Soybean acreage was 19,000 in 1969, and that was the year, of course, when we had the heavy rainfalls in southwestern Ontario, especially Essex and Kent counties, where most of the soybeans are grown in the province. Insurance was taken out on that year, of course; the main reasons were that they could not get them planted and the late date for getting your contract in. So there were 19,000 acres insured. Of course, the loss ratio is very high for that year, and yet in 1970 we only had 13,000 acres insured; so in fact there were 6,000 fewer acres in soybeans insured in 1970 than there were in 1969. This again shows the reluctance of the agriculture people in Ontario to accept it and we are wondering just why they are not accepting it.

It would appear to me that the government of Ontario should share the responsibility of part of the premiums. Looking over the premiums, I noticed the annual premiums collected from insured persons were \$373,000 and the government of Canada paid in \$133,000. If the government of Ontario had paid an equal amount of \$133,000, we could have lowered the premiums by about 30 per cent.

I think that we are going to have to take a real look at crop insurance to see if we cannot make it more palatable to people in the farming industry if we are going to continue with it. I do not think it seems too logical to continue with something that is only insuring three or four per cent of the total acreage; so it would appear to me that steps are going to have to be taken to make it look a little better.

The cost of the administration of this is very high, and here again I say that if we are going to pay the administration costs of this, as we have in this last report that I have, which shows that administration expenses shared equally by the government of Canada and the Province of Ontario were \$424,000, our total income from premiums with unearned premium reserves came to \$507,000, and in the same year we paid out \$878,000 in claims and the cost of administration was 50 per cent of that, \$424,000. It would seem to me that probably we could have three times as many acres insured and

still probably operate for about the same rate—maybe a considerably higher acreage than that. There must be some steps taken by the government to encourage people to take this, I would think. If, in fact, after a period or four or five years it does not pick up any more than it does now, one would almost think that we will have to find a different method of crop insurance or crop catastrophe.

Maybe we will have to go into a crop catastrophe fund—that would be an alternative—but the crop insurance principle is good. We would think that it should be continued but it must have more participation by this government to get it rolling. The cost of administration is really serious, I think, considering the amount of acreage we insure. I was noticing one or two items on advertising and publicity.

Apparently, there is a lot of money spent on that—\$46,000; rental of office space \$34,000. That seems rather high, although I do not know how many employees they have. I see salaries are \$179,000. There are some areas there that look very high and one wonders, as a layman looking over this report and having had some experience in claims and other types of insurance, I know that we could never have operated that way. We would have been bankrupt so I guess governments never go bankrupt, they just raise taxes.

I would think a minor influx of money into this programme may be the stimulus to get it off the ground. I would hope that—we mentioned this, I think, last year and maybe two years ago—the province should accept this responsibility and we still feel very strongly that it should. Then we will have another look at it after it makes up its mind to that.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I just want to underscore one point that my colleague has made. It seems to me that we are now coming to the crunch in crop insurance. As far as I am concerned, there are a number of items which can be dealt with and can be improved by way of some adjustment in the crop insurance plan.

It seems to me, however, that the main problem at the moment is enrolment. If we could get more farmers to enrol in the plan and to participate in the plan by way of insuring some form of their crop production, I think we are on the road to some improvement in the plan. But when we have such a

small percentage of the farmers in the Province of Ontario taking part in the crop insurance plan, I think we have got some real problems.

Of course, it is an insurance principle that the more people you have enrolled, the lower your costs. It seems to me that we have now reached the point where we are going to have an infusion of provincial money into the fund, specifically by way of matching the federal government's contributions on premiums costs, to get the farmers into the plan. Then, I feel, once we get them in, they will see the benefit of the crop insurance programme generally and will continue to enroll year after year. But until we get them in, farmers will remain by and large outside the plan because they are, for some reason or other, suspicious of it or they do not think it offers them any real benefits. It seems to me that that is a clear cut priority insofar as The Department of Agriculture is concerned in its relationship to the crop insurance programme in this province.

I think we just have to do it. We have been talking about it for a number of years. I can recall talking about it the past several years, as my other colleagues have done. I think we have got to the point now where we are going to have to do it, for no other reason than just a simple experimental programme to see if we can get more farmers into the programme.

I am very interested in hearing what the minister has to say. I know he will say "That is an expenditure of public money that I am not prepared to spend at this time, because I am not sure what the benefits will be." But I am saying to the minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that I think it is worth a try because nothing else seems to work. I think that if we were to try that, at least we would know if the farmers would indeed enroll.

Mr. Chairman: Anyone else on crop insurance? The hon. minister.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks that have been made by my hon. friends. Naturally, we are all disappointed that there are not more people participating in the programme. However, I would like to point out to my hon. friend from Essex-Kent, he quoted from, I believe, the 1968-1969 report. Is that not the one he quoted from?

Mr. Ruston: The fourth annual report ending March 31—that would be the 1969 crop year.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That year we had about 3,100 people participating in the programme. Last year we had 4,200 people participating in the programme, which is about a 33½ per cent increase, is it not?

Mr. Ruston: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is a substantial increase anyway—well over 30 per cent—and it looks, with the interest that is coming along this year, as though there will be an increase of another 30 per cent this year so that is moving along. I think we would be satisfied with a 30 per cent advance in most programmes on an annual basis. There is broader coverage this year, certainly the bare ground coverage has been made available—many changes have been made in the plan, some as a result of matters that have been brought to our attention in a debate that was held on crop insurance when we were in committee stage downstairs—I think we had a half-day debate on that.

It was a good debate. There were many things brought to light there and we have had, through the crop insurance commission, a good many meetings with various production groups, such as commodity production boards. I think the crop insurance commission has attempted to integrate into its plans and amendments to its plans some of those ideas that I think are more in keeping with what those producers want. Certainly, this will be reflected in greater participation. We have well over 40 per cent of some crops—tomatoes for instance; well over 40 per cent I believe of, what is it, peas and what else? Sweet corn, is it? Yes, it will be well over 40 per cent as well this year, so these are rather high-risk crops and they are moving along.

The inclusion of forage corn, or at least a plan for forage corn, will attract and has attracted more interest than when we just had straight forage coverage. For some reason or other, farmers have never been interested and apparently are still not interested in applying for crop insurance on a forage crop such as hay or pasture and this kind of thing, even though we had those disastrous years, like 1965, throughout eastern Ontario.

The bare ground coverage is a fact and it is being offered this year. We have finally got the amendment through the federal government and we have amended our plan as well. It is now a fact and being offered across the province, I believe, at 30 cents an acre on all of the crop land insured for bare

ground coverage. That is a major step forward and I look for better things to come as it comes along.

Vote 102, item 3, agreed to.

On item 4, extension:

Mr. Chairman: Anything on that activity? The hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): This is one of the big areas, of course, in the department, the extension branch. It has over \$4 million and a lot of it, of course, is taken up in salaries and each year we seem to continue—we add to the already large force of civil servants in this particular department.

I am concerned that there is not a greater effort being made for the younger person in the agricultural fields. I have thought that from time to time a programme initiated by the extension department through the various agricultural offices, somewhat comparable to the junior ranger programme, and carried out for a period during the summer months would be one of the ways by which we could do something for the younger people, not only in the farm communities but also in our urban areas close to the builtup areas.

As you possibly know, Pollution Probe has done a fair amount of work in organizing people in various cities to do work throughout that particular area. In the city of Woodstock, I know of a group of people—it was initiated by one of the schools—a group of students, and they went out on Saturdays and have cleaned up a lot of streams around that particular area. It is really amazing what these children come back and tell you. In fact, one of my daughters happens to be the secretary of it and they tell me about what they have picked up out of the streams and around them. They tell us that they could be engaged in this type of work almost endlessly to try to help in this particular area.

I really think that we could do something along this particular line, initiated by the department and by the particular agriculture office. In this way they would be teaching the youth of the area something to do. I feel that they would be doing a service to the area whereby the youth feel that they would be part of the community, part of Ontario and part of Canada.

At the moment we seem to be getting money to build institutions to put the children in at 16 and 17 to try to get them off drugs. I feel if we had some type of programme like that we could get a little more money out of some of these other programmes

and not build these great big institutions with walls around them, and get them out in the country, we would be much further ahead.

Only this last weekend I had it brought to my attention that a 13-year-old girl had to be sent to one of the institutions and they just could not contain her. These are the type of people that we could help in a programme like this.

Maybe there should also be an initiative from the department to restore what we used to term the old Arbour Day. I would think that maybe we could have an Arbour Week so to speak, so we could do a tree planting job throughout every county in the province, and initiate a programme for the younger people that would not be just a one-year effort. I would like to see it on a permanent basis.

You would not need expensive buildings, because these youngsters would like to camp out or they would like to have some type of community effort. I can tell you, I think it would be something that would be a step in the right direction.

I have often thought that the extension branch—while they do a very good job in 4-H work and they have extended it out into other areas, other than the livestock fields—are not quite as competitive as they should be. I noticed, in the United States—and I do not want to be using them as an example—that they do have what they term regional shows for these 4-H children. They seem to take great pride in competing with outside areas and they seem to mingle better. They have one of their great rallies in Chicago every year where they have many thousands. I think this is a wonderful effort, that these people are recognized in this respect.

I think too often we in Ontario fail to give the 4-H movement the proper recognition after they have completed their course. I think too often we present them with some type of a little award and they go back into obscurity and they do not seem to carry out that particular intent that we had hoped they would. Maybe the minister might comment on those two areas.

Mr. K. C. Bolton (Middlesex South): Mr. Chairman, I should like to offer a few comments too in this section on extension. I think there is hardly any aspect of this department's work that is more important. We are constantly reminded that farmers are leaving the farm at a very rapid rate—I am told 3,000 a year. Whatever can be done

to encourage the farmer to feel that he is a useful member of the community is of great value.

I commend the department on the work of the extension branch. I am very impressed with the personnel whom I have met in Middlesex county and the quality of the programme that is offered. I find that the 4-H clubs present the young people of the community with a great chance to develop their native skills and also to develop a better understanding of the rural community and have a greater sense of relationship with it. I hope that whatever else is done, nothing will ever be done to reduce the impact of the extension work that is being done.

I would like to make reference to one or two of the financial items. I am a little concerned about the amount set aside for farm safety, which appears to be only \$10,000. Any of us who have ever worked around a farm know the great hazards that exist around the machinery, around the barns, and so on. I wonder if the farm safety campaign is a vigorous one? I speak out of ignorance. I do not know enough of the programme. It seems to me that if \$10,000 represents the total investment in this very important area then it needs to be looked into. That is all I want to say in this particular area at the moment.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): I would like to comment very briefly on this particular item, Mr. Chairman. I think that I too would join with the other members on this side of the House in the suggestion that this aspect of the work of The Department of Agriculture and Food is perhaps the most important.

I have had a number of occasions to have dinner and to meet with young people and with those who are representing the extension department of The Department of Agriculture and Food in the Peterborough area. I have also been invited to and have had an opportunity to participate in some of the summer courses that have been given and in the conferences that have been held.

What I would like to know is if the minister could give me any statistics on the number of young people who are involved in the 4-H programme, or a related programme, as related to the number of young people that there are on farms? What is the proportion of young people that he thinks he is reaching through the extension programme?

The second thing I would like to ask him is this: We know that many of these young people will not work on the farms for the rest of their lives; we know that they will work in a very different kind of farming for the rest of their lives, and what I am wondering is to what extent is his department engaged in some kind of research to provide a kind of a bridge between the rural and the urban environment?

Nearly all of these young people, of course, are going into large schools, usually in urban centres, if they are brought in from the country. To some extent this is, I suppose, a degree of influence in terms of urbanization. I realize that many of them are taking courses—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Is the hon. member the farm critic here?

Mr. Pitman:—I have a good many farmers in my area and I am very proud of them, and if the hon. member does not mind I would like to speak just for a moment on this—

Mr. Sargent: I am very touched.

Mr. Pitman: The hon. member may be very touched, but I think that it is one of the more important aspects of activity in the Peterborough area, if I might say so. I would like to ask one or two questions about this. To what extent are the minister's courses related to developing, in a sense, the bridge between the rural and the urban society, helping these young people to condition themselves—

Mr. Sargent: Prima donnas here.

Mr. Pitman:—to a different society in the future?

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on extension?

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister if he could briefly outline this \$211,000 that we are spending on developing agriculture in the north. When he is answering back he could answer that question.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister, before he replies in regard to this extension branch, if I understand it the minister has a specialist from this branch go out and speak to groups of farmers and individual farmers. I understand there were about 150 meetings last year. I must say in regard to farm manage-

ment, do these specialists—I regret to say I have never attended one of these meetings—inform the farmers about the outlook for different crops, advise them what to grow, and advise what livestock to go into? Is that the kind of management programme they discuss with the farmer?

Because we find today overproduction in so many lines, I did often wonder if these specialists in this extension branch give advice, or advise them to the best of their knowledge about what livestock and what is the outlook and what is the future with regard to agriculture.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of questions that have been asked of me.

First of all, I think the member for Oxford mentioned youth participation in conservation projects. Certainly, that is reinforcing and indeed endorsing the position that our government has already taken this year in what is known as the SWEEP programme, where under the Minister of Energy and Resources Management over 1,000 students will be engaged to do just what he is suggesting—working with the local conservation authorities across the province of Ontario.

As well, there will be about 4,000 urban young people—I think my hon. friend from Peterborough will be interested in this—in the ages from 13 to 15 years of age, coming out from the cities across Ontario, spending time with rural farm families, getting to know what happens on the farm, getting acquainted with farm life and having a break away from the urban community.

Mr. Pitman: Good.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It can only lead to a better understanding and relationship.

Mr. Pitman: May I ask a question? Is this part of a government programme, that is, are these young people going out for an educational purpose, or are they going out actually to participate in the work of the farm?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, no, it is purely an educational programme. A rural-urban relationship programme will be carried out through a joint effort of our extension branch working with a special youth committee of The Department of Education.

Mr. Pitman: I do not want to interrupt the minister, but I wonder if I could ask just another question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Pitman: I have always been very impressed by the efforts the department has been using to develop the idea of the farm as being a vacationland. Some very good pamphlets were put out to encourage the use of farming, relating farming to the tourist industry.

I was wondering if there had been any thought, particularly in some areas where agriculture is not very productive, of using the farm unit as a place where one might well take young people from inner city areas, where it might become, in a sense, a part of our whole development of trying to get kids out of the cities into the country and developing some kind of essential recreation; whether anyone thought of using agriculture, and the base of agriculture, with the air and soil and, in many cases, near rivers and lakes, whether there had been any thought of actually tying that in as one of the ways we might make the agricultural industry related to a very different kind of development in our society?

Mr. Innes: Exactly what I asked.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think the hon. member has a point there, but I have to remind him that somebody has to be in charge of that kind of a farm. They just cannot be taken out there and given nothing to do. Now I think it is better to spread those 4,000 young people who will be coming out at any one time across the various farm families, where they can live with families and enjoy themselves with relationships with their rural counterparts.

Mr. Pitman: I could not agree more.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have, as well, a good deal of interest being displayed by the corn companies in southwestern Ontario. We understand that between 4,500 and 6,000 students will be employed and there will be a corn detasseling programme in that part of the province. I would think that that would provide a good deal of employment and, I think, a certain amount of enjoyment to a good many otherwise unemployed rural youths this year.

With regard to farm safety, I am pleased to hear by hon. friend from Middlesex South's voice has recovered a wee bit and he is able to ask some questions today regarding farm safety. While our programme here accounts for \$10,000, this \$10,000 is available to the county branches of the farm safety council.

Our total grant to the farm safety council is something like \$25,000, of which \$10,000 is going to the local branches and the rest of it going to the council itself.

Then I believe there is also a contribution made to the farm safety council by the Ontario Workmen's Compensation Board, having to do with its safety conscious programme as it applies to farm accidents.

With regard to the rural-urban relationships, my hon. friend from Peterborough raised this point, and I think we discussed this. I think he understands that we are very much interested in it. The member for York North has referred to the northern Ontario grants, and I have those grants here. I think it might be interesting if I were to send him a copy of that, because I can tell you it would take up a few pages of Hansard if I were to enunciate all of the grants that are available to northern Ontario.

They include special grants for lime subsidy to northern Ontario. These are special grants that are administered by the local county agricultural committees—I should say district agricultural committees in the north—where a group of farmers appointed from among themselves, with the local agricultural representative acting as secretary, determine how the grants that we make available to northern Ontario are to be spent in their particular district. For instance, you might have a district in Manitoulin, or we might have a district in Rainy River that would want to spend its money in a different manner than the district in Cochrane East or Cochrane north, or whatever it may be. So there are some differences. But we feel that that is the local decision of the local farmers. Now that amounts—

Mr. W. Hodgson: Administrated—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I beg your pardon?

Mr. W. Hodgson: Administered by the local people?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is right. The local people make the decisions as to how they want to spend the money. If they want to spend it on fencing or on lime or on land clearing or on wells or something like that, that is their business. But we simply say that you cannot spend it on new land clearing, but if you own a farm on which you need to clear some more land, then if you want to spend the money, that is your local committee's determination so to do.

We think it has worked out extremely well, because it is really taking the straitjacket approach away from it, and giving them some flexibility that perhaps they did not have in previous years.

My hon. friend from Kent asked for information advice to farm meetings. This, I think, is one of the great advantages and the strengths of our extension branch. I would like to read to you the attendance at group meetings:

Farm business management, 19,850 people; livestock management, 44,000 people; soils and crops management, 23,000 people; other extension branch meetings attendance, 87,000 people. Those are phenomenal figures across this province of ours.

Individual consultations on the farm or in the office—

Mr. Sargent: You are sounding like the former Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall).

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —livestock management, 14,000 consultations; individuals, soils and crops management, 15,000; financial management, 13,000; press releases from county offices on farm management, 2,700; radio broadcasts, 1,500; television programmes 87.

Then we have that continuing programme of our extension branch people on radio and television, putting these shows on almost on a weekly basis. This to me is the real strength of—

Mr. Sargent: Does the minister listen?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Sargent: Does the minister listen in there too.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes I do; I must confess I do. I listen to that advice. I listen to that because I can use that advice on my own farm. No one knows how valuable that is any more than I do. So really our farm management programme, to me, is simply an outstanding programme.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Right!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think we have to recognize these men are reinforced in what they are doing; that is, they are guided in what they have to say on a year-to-year basis by interpreting the federal-provincial outlook conferences that are held. Now here is the opportunity for us to learn what they are saying.

Mr. Spence: We have surpluses in different segments of agricultural society.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have what?

Mr. Spence: We have surpluses—such as overproduction in pork.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Sure, that is right.

Mr. Spence: Has this extension branch advised the farmer not to overproduce pork or not to overproduce eggs?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, indeed. They interpret those things, you see from—

Mr. Sargent: Control production.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —the federal-provincial outlook conference—we had been told, and we could see that there was going to be a surplus of pork. Now we have interpreted that too to the local farmer, whether he wants to believe it or not.

But what is a farmer to do? If he has pork production facilities, if he has got high silos for high moisture corn—this kind of thing—if he has geared his whole production to that, is he going to stop overnight because somebody in the west has got the idea he is going to jump into hogs when he cannot sell grain? He will jump out again just as fast next year if he can sell the grain. I think you have to recognize that some of our farmers are going to continue production.

That really is the job that the extension branch is trying to do and I think it is doing a right good job at it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The minister has dealt with the overall participation of large groups of people of the farming community across Ontario over the year in mass meetings. That is good. I think misery loves company.

But the point that I am concerned with, along with the member for Peterborough, is that I have a lot of farmers in my area. I am not too smart on the farm operation—in fact, I am not too smart period—but the thing is that we have a lot of farms going out of production, progressively, week after week. The manufacturing capacity of these plants in gone forever unless Mr. Crown gets into the act, through the ARDA programme, to make these mass operations. I think it is coming to that.

But I am wondering if we could not, somewhere along the line, in the terms of reference of the extension branch—for which we are paying \$2 million in the first section of the vote here—if there are not across Ontario hundreds or thousands of successful retired farmers who know a lot of the answers, who have made all the mistakes there are to make in agriculture.

Could they not be retained by the minister's department to take a group of farmers and supervise them insofar—as my friend from Kent says—insofar as the many hundreds of decisions they must make in the operation of a farm and getting into things like controlled production?

I do not know the many facets in that, but today we met with the federal people. We had Gordon Hill and Jim Jacklin and the boys. We have in the federation people who are dedicated and concerned, but they can only do certain things in the overall picture. Then we have the pros in the minister's group who are knowledgeable people, and we are lucky to have them.

But I would like to ask, going along with what my friend from Kent says, if we could not take this mass meeting programme the minister is talking about and break it down into individual operations to make these farms viable operations that can be successful. Because no matter what the minister does, unless we have these people making money at the local level, then farming, the small family farm, is going to be a thing of the past.

So in extension, has any thought ever been given to retaining 1,000 successful men and giving them areas to supervise, to do a concentrated job on these people?

Mr. Innes: Do not give them any more men. They have too many now.

Mr. Sargent: Maybe they would do it. Not for pay but for the love of agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend from Oxford county says: "Do not do that. It is costing too much to run the extension branch now."

Mr. Innes: I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have got too many men now; that is what he said, so perhaps we should take his advice into consideration.

Mr. Sargent: If he said that, I will buy it. It is right.

Mr. Innes: I do not say it. The people out in the country say it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: But my hon. friend from Grey South has introduced—

Mr. Sargent: Bruce! That is a dirty word, Grey South.

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): It is not. It is a darn good riding.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Grey-Bruce, sorry—an idea that may have a good deal of merit. I would suggest however—

Mr. Sargent: The minister must not con me. Come on. You see when a minister gets the best from us he is nice, he suggests that it is a good idea. The minister wants to get off the hook as fast as he can. Everybody has a good idea, but will the minister do something about it though?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There is not a reason in the world why not, but I am talking about this year's estimates and it is not in this year's estimates. I cannot say whether I can put it into next year's estimates until I get some approval for the budget.

Mr. Sargent: The Treasurer will put it in.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: But the Treasurer is not here, Mr. Chairman, and I do not want to speak for him.

Let me say that we will take that idea under consideration. There is really nothing in the world to hinder a group of farmers employing the services of some of those highly regarded retired farmers around the country—

Mr. Sargent: Oh! There the minister goes, passing the buck again.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —to do the job themselves. I think they might appreciate it better if they were to initiate the idea than if we were to do it.

Mr. Sargent: Would the minister loan them \$1 million to do it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend from Peterborough asked me a question a moment ago about the relationship between 4-H members and the total rural youth of our community. I cannot give him that exact breakdown, but, if I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention this in this debate because I think it is very important.

As far as the 4-H participation in agricultural clubs is concerned, we have just under 9,000 rural young people participating in agricultural clubs. We have something like

just under 17,000 participating in homemaking clubs in this province. That is a pretty sizable number of young people.

Mr. Pitman: Is that up or down over the last 10 years?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, it is holding about even. The girls' homemaking clubs are increasing, I believe. I think the agricultural clubs are about even, are they not?

Mr. Pitman: In spite of the drop in farm population?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, that is right. Now, there are some clubs, particularly the girls' homemaking clubs, that are involving girls from the smaller towns and cities and villages of Ontario. They are involved in these clubs as well, so that there is that on-going relationship. Of course, those clubs take girls in a certain age bracket; they take part for about three years. It is just a revolving number of young people.

So, the impact of the 4-H club movement on rural Ontario is simply phenomenal. There is no other way to describe it.

While the member is quite right—a number of these young people will never stay on the farms—the idea of the acceptance of responsibility in 4-H club work is something that will stay with them wherever they go. To me that is the crux of the whole thing and that is why we think it is a very important programme.

Mr. Chairman: Will item 4 carry?

The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: While the minister and I are in agreement on that point, I just want to follow up on this business of the farm management meetings and what the minister's management specialists are doing.

Specifically, I want to refer to a speech given by Dick Heard at the soil and crop meeting this past February, I believe it was, here in Toronto. It was at the time that we had the terrific snowstorm in any case. I think that was February. He said that a farmer could make an extra 30 cents a hog if he got his credit through the bank, rather than through the feed company.

That type of thing makes good sense to me. I think this is the kind of thing that these farm management specialists should be doing. I congratulate both Mr. Heard and the department, because many farmers just do not take time to sit down with a pencil

and figure these things out. They read a farm paper once in a while. They do not even do that when they are busy in the summertime.

It seems to me that this is good stuff. It is practical. It can be put to immediate use by the farmer involved. He went on to say that many of the feed mills charge 1.5 per cent per month for outstanding accounts, which amounts to, I think, some 60 cents on \$20 worth of feed. Or, to put it another way, he said that a farmer could be in pocket something in the neighbourhood of \$300 per year if he were shipping 1,000 hogs a year.

I want to ask the minister, in view of what I have said about it, and it is of very real value to a farmer, what the department does by way of followup. Is this the kind of information that is given out at the management schools and in his broadcasts and so on? And specifically, did this information get out over the air waves and at these various meetings?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, indeed it is. It is discussed at those meetings and it is also published through our information service. There is a booklet just off the press now updating these figures, which is available to anyone who wants it.

It is difficult though, and I am not sure why, to persuade farmers to go to the bank and work out a credit arrangement with the local bank. A feed company salesman comes in and says: "Look, you do not have to do that. We will provide this for you. You know, all you have to do is sign here and you do not need to worry about it at all. We will provide the feed and when you sell the hogs, it is all taken care of."

And this is the incredible part. How do you stop that kind of thing? How do you save people from themselves? This is a question that I do not know how to answer. The member is perfectly right and Dick Heard is perfectly right. The extension branch staff is doing everything it can to assist farmers to make those management decisions.

Credit to me is just like another tractor. It is just another vehicle or another implement that you use on the farm. No one thinks of going out and buying a tractor—he should not think of it, anyway—that is too big for his needs, thus losing money on the value of the tractor. Why would he go out and spend money for credit that he should not be spending? These are the things that I wish I knew—

Mr. Innes: Lower depreciation.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —the answer to, but I really do not know. But the point is well taken and all we can do is keep hammering away at that point every place we can.

Mr. Gaunt: I think bank managers overawe farmers, Mr. Chairman. I think the bank manager is successful in trying to convince the farmer that he knows more about farming than the farmer himself, and I think in that respect—

Interjection by an hon. member

Mr. Gaunt: —he overawes him. Perhaps some of these farmers will get up on their hind legs and start making their views felt.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on extension?

Vote 102, item 4 agreed to.

On item 5, home economics:

Mr. Gaunt: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: I notice that in the vote for agricultural production there is a reduction in the total amount of the estimates this year for 1971-1972, as compared to the 1970-1971 estimates. I hope that reduction of some \$4 million did not involve the home economics branch in view of the personnel who happened to head up that department?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, no; no such thing as that.

Mr. Gaunt: Just as a matter of interest, where does the cut come or where do—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There are not as many automobiles being purchased for that particular branch this year.

Mr. Gaunt: Oh, so they do not need more automobiles?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, sure they do, but rather than deal them as regularly, as we have been doing, we are trying to get a little more mileage out of them so we have decreased the purchasing for this year. I think it amounts to about \$4,000.

Mr. Gaunt: I see. They are not going to trade them in?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Perhaps not as often.

Vote 102, item 5 agreed to.

On item 6, livestock service:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a little bit about this. Throughout the Province of Ontario we have quite a sizable number of institutions that have quite large herds on them, and for some years I have complained that we have not got the proper mileage in our research efforts in these particular herds.

I would like to ask the minister how many head of livestock are currently on the research institutions throughout the province? This would include the farms of Correctional Services too, which I hope are being utilized, and if they are not I would be very disappointed because I have heard rumours that they are not being utilized to the extent that they should be.

Another problem which concerns me is that in this particular research programme we do have in the province three large artificial insemination units, which by reason of their interest in their particular area have accumulated around them very fine animals which have gone through test procedures and are very creditable to their particular area. But we do have another faction, so to speak, at the university carrying on a programme almost similar to what we in our particular organization are trying to do.

At the moment they have a few sires that they feel we should have in our units throughout the province and they would like to dispose of them. But we, in our three large artificial insemination units—which are the backbone of the livestock industry in the Province of Ontario and you have to believe it, in the dairy and beef operations—have in the neighbourhood, I suppose, of maybe 500 or 600 bulls on a type of test programme.

We would like to ask the department to co-operate with us and help utilize these bulls and to prove them. We feel we have personnel who are capable of picking out these bulls as such, and we feel if they have 500 to pick from surely the scientists at Guelph can pick out a number out of that 500 which would suit them? But they apparently feel the breeders who have been successful in their own operations are not capable of doing this.

This is of concern to every AI organization in the Province of Ontario and they, directly or indirectly, represent every livestock breeder. They are either directly or indirectly a member of one of the three co-operatives. This is one of the problems which concerns

me, and it concerns me very much, because at the moment it is most essential that we have more animals proved that we can recommend to our breeders.

Each year we are told by the University of Guelph and the research institute that we should be stepping up our potential numbers—and I agree 100 per cent—yet they are the people who in some respects are hampering us when they could be helping us. I say this is not right and we would like to co-operate with them. I hope the minister will comment on this.

Now I want to mention a little bit about the—pardon me, Mr. Chairman. Does DHIA come under this too?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Innes: Well, of course, along the same line it gets into the sire programme and I want to talk a little bit about DHIA and the ROP. ROP, of course, is the federal programme and DHIA is the provincial programme.

I want to compliment the minister for incorporating some central testing labs for milk in the Province of Ontario and to tell him I think they are doing an excellent job. But the operators do tell me they have ample room to test almost double or triple their capacity, and I would like to hope that his extension people and the people who are—we go back to the specialists again, because I think they could be doing a little bit more along this particular line to encourage farmers and agriculturalists to be on a programme whereby they can make more money by utilizing the proper techniques that are currently available to them.

I am of the opinion that while this programme has been reasonably successful, the percentages now currently on test are not very much different from last year in spite of all the extra enthusiasm that we have put into it—not only the department but the various organizations. This is what I would like to ask him, because I do feel in all fairness that this is one of the areas where the farmer could increase his revenue as an individual farmer if he would take more interest in these particular programmes.

Britain, of course, has a compulsory system—it is carried out by their marketing board and has proved quite successful—but we in the Province of Ontario at the moment are a little dubious about the compulsory aspect of it. On the long run I really think this would be the best thing, but it would be very hard to incorporate into a pro-

gramme, I agree. If there is some other method the extension people could utilize and try to incorporate this, I think they would be well advised to do so.

I wanted to speak a little bit about the bull index system. This relates again to the need for an overall programme in the Beef Improvement Association. It is estimated that this year in the Province of Ontario 250 bulls will be tested and that in the province more than 4,000 new breeding bulls are needed each year. Dr. Jim Wilton of the department of animal science at the University of Guelph has asked specifically that this one resource the department could help should be stepped up in a progressive nature, if at all possible. Some other programmes are being carried out in various other provinces, but I do feel that we need a standard programme in this province and that we should continually try to upgrade this not only in the beef but in the dairy.

So I would invite the minister to comment on these two particular aspects of something I feel is very important to the average livestock man particularly throughout the province, because if he is keeping livestock when they should be keeping him, he is going to lose money—and I kid you not.

Mr. Chairman: Does anyone wish to discuss the matter further? The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister about a different subject—to do with the promotion of breeding cattle exports. Maybe he would like to answer the hon. member first.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The points raised by the hon. member for Oxford are of great interest. The research facilities involving livestock will, I think more appropriately come under the vote for research and agricultural education when that comes along. We do not have those figures here as to the total number of livestock involved. I assume we can get them; they are maybe in the book later on. I am not sure, but we will have a look at it.

With regard to artificial insemination, my deputy advises me that he has just received a letter requesting a meeting with representatives of the artificial insemination units and with myself and with him, so I assume that the points that the hon. member for Oxford has raised will likely be the basis for discussion, at least part of it anyway, since I know he is very much involved in those AI units.

We will certainly take a look at these things. I was not aware that there was any real problem.

With regard to some of the other institutions, particularly reform institutions, there was an extensive beef breeding programme that went on I believe at the Burwash farm, and I think I have heard—has it been closed out? No? But some of the beef bulls that were on that farm were offered to the artificial insemination units, and some dairy bulls as well. I know that our department took some of those bulls from the Burwash farm and are using them on our farm at the New Liskeard agricultural college. However, we will take a look at that.

With regard to DHIA, it is interesting to note that during 1970 there were 1,312 herds with over 46,000 cows enrolled in the supervised plan, and 1,885 herds with 51,735 cows in the owner-sampler plan. During 1970 we were happy to be able to accommodate practically every farmer who wanted to get on to the cow testing programme.

I think it is interesting as well, Mr. Chairman, to look back over the records of DHIA participation, or at least milk recording, in the Province of Ontario. In 1968, 18.2 per cent of the cows in Ontario were on test. In 1969 it was 21.1 per cent, and then in 1970, even with the decrease in the total number of cows in Ontario, we still have 20.7 per cent on test.

When you relate this testing programme to the number of herds on test, we have 29 per cent of the dairy herds of Ontario on test. This to me is a fairly significant figure—the highest of any province in Canada except British Columbia where, of course, most of the dairy herd are producers of fluid milk and I think it is fair to say that they have been in the vanguard of milk recording programmes throughout.

We intend—and I would like to make this announcement, Mr. Chairman—to appoint a DHIA advisory committee which will be comprised of producer representatives, as well as perhaps a few from the civil service in an advisory capacity. We feel that we want to do everything to bring about some of the desirable objectives to which my hon. friend from Oxford referred. We all seek those objectives.

We would like to see greater participation in milk recording programmes and we think one way to bring it about is to perhaps have a co-ordination of thought among producers who would be members of this advisory com-

mittee. We then want as well to nominate a few ourselves.

I think that committee can be of immeasurable help to our livestock commissioner and to the department in trying to strengthen the work of milk recording in this province.

Mr. Innes: Could I ask the minister a question? Could he tell me the number of owner-samplers that are included? What is the percentage of owner-samplers?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The owner samplers: 1,885 herds—

Mr. Innes: What percentage?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —with 51,735 cows. That is larger than the number of cows on the supervised plan—5.7 per cent in comparison with the 5.1 per cent under the supervised plan and 9.8 per cent under ROP.

Mr. Innes: One of the areas that concerns me very much is that we do not use the owner sampler plan, we do not recognize it as an official testing programme. And one of the problems that has been brought to my attention is that in the inspection of these particular herds, where we have the inspectors going out and collecting the samples at the various farms, they invariably get a route that they like and they get some of these friendly people and they seem to keep them on the owner sampler almost indefinitely.

Mr. Ruston: They ask him to dinner?

Mr. Innes: Maybe they ask him to a dinner or two, I don't know. But anyway, this has been brought to my attention. If we are going to grade this up, they should try to encourage the owner sampler people to get up to the DHI status so that we can utilize their figures in our computations of our indexing of bulls. This is one of our real problems. I suppose, maybe indirectly, I am sort of responsible for that owner sampler because I brought it up here many, many years ago. It was sort of a stopgap to get them into the DHI end of it, but really it has not—

Mr. Gaunt: All the good ideas come from over here.

Mr. Innes: —stepped up the way I had hoped it would.

An hon. member: Because the member was away for a while.

Mr. Innes: I think that this could be looked into to try and encourage these people. I

really think a lot of people are losing a lot of money in the resale value of their cattle by not just going that extra mile, so to speak, and not knowing the value of their cattle.

I want to ask the minister one more question, and this is in regard to the Correctional Services department and where the cattle are at the moment. I understand that they are not being utilized to the capacity that they really should be and I would hope that if this does happen to be the case the department would set up a programme for Correctional Services, whereby the two departments could operate in an area that would give us proper research of beef cattle that they do have on those particular farms.

I understand that some of the farms are not even recording the bulls that are being used, and this is rather disgraceful if this is true, and I am not going to say that it is—it is just what is told to me. If this is the case, I think it is rather disgraceful.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I appreciate the hon. member's advice, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Item 6. The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, there are two points I wanted to ask. First of all, does this programme on livestock services this year change the emphasis and assistance given breeders in the Timiskaming area, New Liskeard? I have had complaints in the past that the programme in that area was overly directed toward the beef, whereas there is a very large and increasing dairy production in that area. The dairy farmers in that area have indicated to me that they have been endeavouring for some time to get a lot more assistance from the department with regard to the dairy herds in that area. I would appreciate the minister's comments on what the programme forecast for the coming year includes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Is this for the Timiskaming district?

Mr. Deacon: Yes, for the Timiskaming district. The fact is that within the New Liskeard area particularly there is quite an increase in dairy production. They feel that the department should be increasing its services to the dairy farmers in that area.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I must confess that this is all news to me. If they have relayed it to you, they certainly have not relayed it to us. I must confess, too, that as far as I am con-

cerned, we have nothing to say about how they spend the local grant in the area. That is the determination of the local people involved.

I attended a Holstein-Friesian twilight meeting in the New Liskeard district last summer. I met a host of Holstein breeders there and I was greatly impressed with the quality of the livestock I saw on that particular farm and the interest and enthusiasm of the breeders who were at that meeting. I never heard a person say that we were not doing enough to help them in whatever project they wanted. If they wanted to spend more of their local grant, as I advised my friend from York North, they can make that determination themselves.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the minister could indicate if there is any dairy programme going on at the New Liskeard farm?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, there is not. It is entirely beef on that farm.

Mr. Deacon: Would there be any consideration to introducing a dairy programme there in the light of the increasing dairy production in the area?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, Mr. Chairman. I will have to say no because I think we have to recognize that we already have dairy programmes going on at other agricultural institutions, particularly Kemptville College. We have a dairy research programme going on at the Ridgetown College as well, and a very extensive dairy research programme going on at Elora.

I do not think that you can fragment these programmes and provide duplication in the New Liskeard area. It is purely and simply a matter of production of milk there, to supply a local market. It seems to me that with the increasing demand there is for beef feeder cattle in this country, and with the facilities of pasture and relatively inexpensive land in northern Ontario, we should be concentrating on beef cattle production up there. That is why we have so directed our programme, and I really do not intend to change it right at the moment.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that there are different climatic conditions in northern Ontario—drastically different—and the fact that the market increase is apparently sufficient to warrant increasing production, would this not be a good reason?

I would think this would be a good reason for the minister to consider maybe shifting a dairy programme from one of the southern stations to the station at New Liskeard so that we would have better evidence, perhaps of what we would need in the future development of fluid milk production in a northern climate. I would think that New Liskeard would be an excellent place to test such a programme.

The next point I want to find out from the minister is the extent to which the livestock services include encouragement of export markets. We have witnessed in the past strong export sales in the Holstein breed particularly. Has any of this been due to support of this programme toward export sales? I would appreciate knowing to what extent we have co-operated in encouraging the export sales of cattle.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am sure my hon. friend would realize, if he would speak to his friend from Oxford county, that the Holstein people run their own show, and they run a good show. I know of no group of breeders of any kind of livestock in the world today, certainly in Ontario and Canada, that can compare with the Holstein-Friesian Association of Canada—

Mr. Innes: They are always there to collect a grant, though.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —in running their own business and developing export markets. I pay great tribute to what they have been able to do over the past.

The beef people have been involved to some degree in expanding export markets. We have helped along that line with food council efforts, working through the livestock commissioner as well. We have made a grant to the Ontario Beef Breeds Association for the expansion of export sales and trade missions to countries where we hope they may be able to expand sales.

We were pleased, as well, to have the opportunity of showing some Ontario cattle to a delegation from Russia this past winter. They came here, looked at our herds and, I believe, were favourably impressed, and I hope will end up purchasing some cattle. I understand that some offers have been made. I do not know whether or not they have been accepted, but it is encouraging to know that this is a breakthrough as far as we are concerned in being able to sell some cattle to Russia. Previously, they seemed to rush off to western Canada.

We have some extremely good beef herds here in Ontario, and we are delighted to know that they are exhibiting some interest here as well. We want to work with the OBBA and our livestock commissioner is attempting to be of service through the food council grants to that group of livestock breeders.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear about that encouragement of beef exports. The particular market I would bring to the minister's attention is the Japanese market as an export possibility for our beef breeds.

The rapid increase in incomes of the Japanese people is increasing the demand for beef there substantially. They have made tremendous progress in the last decade in the improvement of their dairy herds. Their dairy herds are coming well up to some of our North American herds in their productivity, but the beef herds are well behind. In view of the fact that they forecast a substantial increase in beef consumption, it is a market we should carefully study.

The Americans have looked at this market and they have done a rather unique and rather interesting job of developing an interest on the part of the Japanese beef farmers in American beef animals. They have sent a man over to Japan. They have not had Japanese delegations coming to the States, but they have sent a practical beef farmer over to Japan and helped him to establish an experimental farm, so to speak.

There the Japanese can see American animals on test. They can see the improvement of crossbreeding with the Japanese breeds. The Japanese farmers are far more impressed by the practical farm operation that has been developed there than by any visits which delegations from Japan have made over here. I therefore suggest to the minister that perhaps he encourage the development of a programme by the beef breeders whereby they establish, in co-operation with the province, a sample operation in Japan. If they have it operated by a man with practical experience and background, and I think we will find that through that outlet a tremendous market for our beef animals can be developed.

I suggest that in any country where the per capita income is rising very quickly we will have a natural outlet for our best beef animals. In view of the fact we have a good beef improvement programme hereon which to base such a programme, I would ask the minister to look into this possibility.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I appreciate that suggestion, Mr. Chairman. We have already been in touch with the federal government who have made some trial shipments of chilled beef to Japan already. We have a trade mission planned for beef breeders to Japan, or at least through the OBBA and our food council, for later this summer to explore the possibilities of introducing some of Ontario's beef breeding cattle to the Japanese people.

I do not know what the possibilities are. I think they are perhaps more limited as far as beef breeding animals are concerned than they have been for dairy animals.

I recall my predecessor as the member of the Legislature for Middlesex North, the late Tom Patrick. Many, many years ago, long before he was in this Legislature, he took the first shipment of Holstein cattle over to Japan. If memory serves me right, that was the case.

That was a long time ago and we know that the Japanese have bought a great many high quality Holstein cattle here in Canada in the last few years particularly. But here again, it is for the production of milk.

We hear rumours—and I do not know how sound or valid they are—that there may be an opportunity to send feeder cattle to Japan, that is feeder calves for feeder cattle purposes. That to me looks a little peculiar. I would think it would be easier to transport the beef than it would be to transport the live cattle and then feed them out after they get there because the Japanese do not have a surplus of grain. But these are areas which we are exploring, and we hope to be able to capitalize on every opportunity we can to develop trade with our Japanese friends.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the Japanese beef breeders that one of my sons visited last year—when he judged a couple of shows over there—expressed a very keen interest in this American project where an actual farm operation was set up. It was not just somebody coming over to try to interest them in buying something, but showing them what could be done, particularly crossing with their native Japanese breeds. I think that in view of the tremendous population of 100 million people and that when they start to increase their beef consumption at the rate that is projected—it is actually increasing very rapidly now—we should think in terms of not just shipping beef to them but actually helping them improve their own production. That is certainly a good way to help our own purebred breeders over here.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would be delighted to add a word of comment here. I understand the Japanese have been here and already have purchased some high-quality purebred beef cattle to take back to Japan. As the hon. member knows, there is an on-going project of Japanese farm people coming to Ontario every year to spend a year on our farms and then going back to Japan. All of these things will add to the importance of what my hon. friend has suggested.

Mr. Deacon: I think the minister will find that the number of cattle being exported from the United States to Japan is many times greater than here.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further in livestock services?

Mr. Innes: Yes, I would like to ask the minister about his reply to the bull-testing programme. Is it going to be stepped up, or what is the possibility?

Mr. Sargent: Mark this down in case he gives the expected date.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: During 1970, 400 breeders tested 1,676 bulls and this was an increase of nearly 400 over the previous year.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce on livestock services.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, if my hon. friend will permit me—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon:—one brief comment and question. Is the minister aware of the practice in some of the finer restaurants in Ontario of importing their beef products, steaks and roasts from the United States? Is he aware of some special processes of butchering, cutting and ageing and preparing for restaurant services that is not available in Canada?

I have felt that we should be able to produce the best there is and I have been surprised to be told by chefs at some of our best restaurants—some of the good ones not too far from the Parliament Buildings—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I cannot afford to get to those.

Mr. Nixon: Of course, the hon. minister would never get to them. He would just go to Murray's.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I never get to them. I cannot afford to go to them.

Mr. Nixon: —that the best beef cuts are imported. It seems ridiculous to me, but I must admit they have some great steaks.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, it is a possibility. I must confess that I do not know. I do know that there is a process in the United States being employed by some of the packing houses of pre-packaging beef and ageing it in a particular way to send cuts out to the restaurant and hotel trade. It may be that some of these have found their way into the Canadian market. I do not know.

There is a movement both ways across the international border of various types of commodities, and it is possible that some of those beef cuts are coming in. I do not know.

Mr. Sargent: The best beef cuts in are Grey and Bruce.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to make a few comments with respect to a research project that was carried out at the Lacombe research station in Alberta having to do with the testing of bulls as a finished product and comparing them with the steer on the rails.

The information that I have has indicated that this has been a very successful experiment. Interestingly enough, the research station there found that bulls were superior to steers in a number of ways. First of all, in the lean content—

Mr. Nixon: The hon. member said “a number of ways,” I can think of one.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gaunt: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, if you want any clarification on that last part of the statement I would be prepared to give it, but I am talking exclusively about “on the rail”—and the lean content averaged approximately—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Did my hon. friend say clarification or demonstration?

Mr. Gaunt: I said “clarification.”

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Thank you.

Mr. Gaunt: There was 30 per cent more lean on the bulls than there was on the steers; there was 10 per cent more rib eye area in the bulls as compared to the steers; and there was three per cent greater in the per cent deboned, defatted product—whatever that means—and I am not sure what it means.

In any case I was not aware of this until I was talking to a farmer in my particular part of the country, and he was telling me that as far as he was concerned he was not going to put in any more steers, he was going to put in bulls because they seem to be superior.

There are some obvious problems with that type of operation, but obviously he felt that he could make more money by doing this type of thing. The research station found out, according to their studies that in economic terms the chance of 0.2 inches in the average rib fat is worth approximately \$1.50 per hundredweight—cold carcass weight—at the current beef prices.

When that is translated into 100 bulls as compared to 100 steers that is a substantial increase in one's income.

An hon. member: That is a lot of bull.

Mr. Gaunt: It certainly means quite a lot to a farmer if he were operating on that sort of scale. I am wondering, in view of this, if the department has undertaken similar studies at any of its research stations? Has the minister got anything of a comparable nature in the bull-steer fight to indicate that this would be a good course to pursue for our commercial farmers across the province?

Of course, if everyone wants to buy bulls instead of steers perhaps the advantage will be somewhat limited, but I am just wondering if in fact the department has been doing anything along this line.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the department has not been doing anything in this respect as far as research is concerned, but the theory which my hon. friend has advanced has been confirmed by studies that have been conducted under—well I should not say under supervision but certainly with the full knowledge of the meat section of the Ontario Agricultural College, University of Guelph.

There are a good many people who substantiate what the member has related about projects going on in his own area. I visited a farm in my own township the other day where there were 1,200 steers. There are 250 bulls in one feed lot and the steers from the same ranch are in another feed lot, and believe me they are doing pretty well. I think the farmer is more than pleased with the feed conversion. If he is just as happy when they are on the rail as he is now he is going to be interested in buying more bull calves next fall.

Mr. Gaunt: According to my friend he has indicated that the processing plants are very interested in this. They are working with him and they are prepared to give him a premium based on their knowledge and experience in this regard.

It seems to me it might be a good project to undertake either at the University of Guelph or one of the other research stations across the province. I think it would be advantageous for us to have some first-hand experience by way of feed consumption and feed conversion when one compares the one against the other. I would like the minister to consider that. I think this would be a good approach.

One other thing I wanted to talk about—here again I am using my own experience of farmers in my own area. In this case it is only one farmer. There is one farmer in my area who is importing Limousin cattle from France. This breed of cattle is quite exclusive. I believe he told me concerning the latest heifer that he got over from France, that he considers that if he were to resell that animal in this country, he could demand at least \$20,000 for it.

That is a pretty fee, but apparently these cattle have a number of desirable features, one of which is their very rapid rate of gain for meat purposes. Is the department keeping up to date with this type of thing and does it have precise figures as to what these animals will do—the performance of them in tests and this kind of information?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: As you know, the research institute of our department works very closely with the cattlemen's services in agricultural research work as well, and this research is being done on the various imported breeds. Now, there are many others, Simmental—Charolais is one of the first and the CDA has worked very extensively in this field of determining the crossbreeding possibilities and potential of using these similar lines of cattle.

There is no doubt that they do offer some possibilities which I think are very much worth exploring. However, I do not think that we should just throw out all of the advantages that we have gained through the English breeds that have been developed to such a high quality in this country. Perhaps there is a place for cross-breeding here. But there are two sides to the story of using these imported breeds.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on livestock services?

Vote 102, item 6, agreed to.

On item 7, junior farmer loans:

Hon. G. Carton (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: Oh, oh!

An hon. member: We are talking about livestock services.

Mr. Gaunt: We want to talk on livestock services—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): A challenge.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. Chairman: Will the motion carry?

All right, let us clarify this. Did the hon. Minister of Labour wish to speak on livestock services?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I was going to make the same motion.

Mr. Singer: The minister has been demoted.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I would ask for unanimous consent to revert to statements, the purpose being that a similar statement to the one that I have is being made in the legislative assembly in Quebec at this time.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the House would agree to a reversion to oral statements by the ministry.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): How long is it going to take the minister to speak?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Be patient. This is in regard to security tax regulations and amendments thereto.

For some time, The Department of Revenue in the Province of Ontario has been aware that the security transfer tax was being applied on certain short-term money transactions, which was resulting in an abnormally high ratio of transfer tax to the profit of such transactions, especially if the transaction was for a relatively short period of time.

This matter has been discussed with our counterparts in the Province of Quebec and it has been agreed that, effective May 1, 1971, by regulation, our respective jurisdictions will not apply the security transfer tax on the sale of short-term money transactions having an original term of repayment of one year or less, in the case of Ontario, or less than one year, in the case of Quebec.

In addition, our two jurisdictions have been concerned about the duplication of security transfer tax which prevailed, when an order was placed by an Ontario resident to sell a security which would be sold through a stock exchange or broker in the Province of Quebec. Both jurisdictions were claiming the tax, and I am happy to announce that effective May 1, 1971, in accordance with the reciprocal provision of our Acts, our respective jurisdictions will arrange for the security transfer tax to be paid when the

transaction is placed through the stock exchange or the office of a broker located in our province. If the seller is located in the Province of Quebec, no tax will be levied by that province. Similar tax treatment would prevail in the event of a reversal of conditions.

Personally, I am very pleased that we have been able to work out these arrangements mutually with The Department of Revenue of the Province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 20th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: Estimates of The Department of Agriculture and Food.

It being 6 o'clock, I do now leave the chair and we will resume at 8 o'clock.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

APPENDIX

(see page 1000)

Answers to questions were tabled as follows:

4. *Mr. Peacock*—Inquiry of the ministry:

1. In each of fiscal 1968, 1969, 1970 what was the amount budgeted by the Ontario Department of Health for bursaries for mental health professional training, and what was the amount expended?

2. If between any of the years given above there was a reduction in the amount budgeted, what was the reason for such reduction?

Answer by the minister of Health:

For each of the fiscal years shown, the amounts budgeted and expended by the Ontario Department of Health for bursaries for mental health professional training were as follows:

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Amt. Budgeted</i>	<i>Amt. Expended</i>
1968-1969	\$1,535,101	\$1,507,601
1969-1970	1,540,724	1,520,724
1970-1971	1,709,320	1,675,320

5. *Mr. Peacock*—Inquiry of the Ministry:

1. Under the expanded diseased elm tree removal project by The Department of Highways, how many persons were placed in jobs in the Chatham district?

2. How many of these were referred by the Windsor office of the Canada Manpower Centre?

3. What quantity of wood in cords or the appropriate measurement, have been removed in the district?

4. What was the value of the total payroll for the number of jobs provided within the district?

5. What was the value of the wood removed and who received payment for the removal and sale of the wood?

Answer by the Minister of Highways:

1. 317.

2. 60.

3. 12,207 trees.

4. \$198,750.

5. No value placed since, by agreement, wood belongs to the property owner and was not removed from the premises.

10. *Mr. Reid* (Scarborough East)—Inquiry of the ministry:

1. Did Mr. M. Kwinter serve as chairman of the presidential search committee of the governing council of the Ontario College of Art?

2. Did this search committee recommend the appointment of Mr. R. Ascott for president of the college?

3. Has M. Kwinter now been appointed vice-president of the college under the new president, Mr. Ascott?

Answer by the Minister of University Affairs:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. No.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 29, 1971

Introducing "Northern Ontario Canoe Routes" and "Ontario Provincial Parks" Lands and Forests Department publications, Mr. Brunelle	971
Introducing "Ontario Mining—The Early Years", Department of Mines publication, Mr. Bernier	971
Ontario's position re federal Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon	972
OPP investigation of Kingston Penitentiary riots, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon	972
Ontario's position on federal Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act, statement by Mr. Davis	973
OPP investigation of Kingston Penitentiary riots, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Singer	973
Ontario's position on federal Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis	974
Government policy re arbitrations on negotiations with Civil Service Association, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Pilkey, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Lewis	974
Ontario decision on location of international airport, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. J. Renwick, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Pilkey, Mr. Braithwaite	976
Conference on foreign investment, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis, Mr. J. Renwick	978
Statement re possible conflict of interests on board of ODC, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Lewis	978
Briefs and proposals re Design for Development: Toronto-centred region, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Pitman	978
Federal-provincial conference—request for fiscal equivalent in cost-sharing programmes, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Peacock, Mr. Bullbrook	979
Licence issuer advertising to give income tax assistance, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Singer	980
Hamilton board of education and father of child not in attendance at school, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Deans, Mr. Good, Mr. Pitman	981
OHC tenants in Guelph receiving letter to rid properties of pets, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Worton	982
Airstrips and air carrier service for underserved regions, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Gaunt	983
Limiting studded tire ban to vehicles licensed in Ontario, question to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Deacon	984
Presenting annual reports, Mr. Yaremko	984
Report, standing private bills committee, Mr. R. G. Hodgson	984

Resumption of the debate on the budget, Mr. Nixon	985
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Lewis, agreed to	997
Report, standing procedural affairs committee, Mr. Meen	997
Tabling report, disposition of public land for cottage purposes, Mr. Brunelle	998
Brock University, bill respecting, Mr. Morningstar, first reading	998
City of Sudbury, bill respecting, Mr. Sopha, first reading	998
Borough of Etobicoke, bill respecting, Mr. Rowntree, first reading	998
City of Guelph, bill respecting, Mr. Worton, first reading	998
City of Sault Ste. Marie, bill respecting, Mr. Gilbertson, first reading	998
City of Windsor, bill respecting, Mr. B. Newman, first reading	998
City of London, bill respecting, Mr. Bolton, first reading	998
Municipal Franchise Extension Act, bill respecting, Mr. Kennedy, first reading	998
Triangle Swinc Enterprises Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Breithaupt, first reading	999
Associations of Natural Resources Technicians of Ontario, bill to incorporate, Mr. Jessiman, first reading	999
City of Woodstock, bill respecting, Mr. Innes, first reading	999
Borough of Scarborough, bill respecting, Mr. Meen, first reading	999
City of Cornwall, bill respecting, Mr. Villeneuve, first reading	999
City of Barrie, bill respecting, Mr. Evans, first reading	999
City of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Price, first reading	999
City of Ottawa, bill respecting, Mr. Morin, first reading	999
Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake, bill respecting, Mr. R. M. Johnston, first reading	999
Celebration of national days by ethnic groups, statement by Mr. Yaremko	999
Tabling answers to questions on the order paper, Mr. Wishart (see appendix)	1000
Estimates, Department of Agriculture and Food, Mr. Stewart, continued	1000
Security tax regulations and amendments thereto, statement by Mr. Winkler	1016
Recess, 6 o'clock	1017
Appendix, answers to questions 4, 5, and 10 on the order paper	1018



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, April 29, 1971
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

**(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 1971

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD

(continued)

On vote 102, item 7:

Mr. Chairman: When we recessed at the supper hour the hon. member for Grey-Bruce was—

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): On a point of order, might I ask the House Leader whether the announcement made by the Minister of Tourism and Information, the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Guindon) about a fall election was accurate or not? On the CBC news at 6:30 the hon. member for Stormont was quoted in French as saying there is a fall election coming up. I wonder whether it is accurate or not?

Mr. Chairman: It is hardly a point of order.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): I think it is hardly a point of order, Mr. Chairman, and I do not follow the CBC in the dinner hour. I did not hear it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Before the hon. member for Grey-Bruce starts I wonder if he would permit an intervention. There are some friends and members and officers from the Progressive Conservative Association from Eglinton riding that I would like you, along with the members of the House, to welcome.

Mr. Young: There are that many Tories in Eglinton?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Most of them look like Liberals.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Yes, I think there are a lot of Liberals there.

Mr. Chairman: Now the hon. member for Grey-Bruce on item 7 of vote 102.

Mr. Sargent: On vote 102, Mr. Chairman. Before I ask the minister a few questions,

I would like to repeat the question put by the hon. member for Yorkview. If that was a matter of record, I think we have a right to know as a matter of personal privilege.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member is out of order. We are dealing with item 7 of vote 102.

Mr. B. Newman: But it is an important question.

Mr. Sargent: The chairman would like to know himself.

Mr. Chairman: It is the incorrect time to ask such a question. When the member finds out, let me know.

Mr. Sargent: I will. But do not get too rough here now.

Mr. Chairman, the auditor's report probably has been mentioned by my colleague, our agricultural critic, in reference to the situation of junior farmer loans. The amount that the minister is asking for in this vote is \$1.76 million, and the Provincial Auditor is concerned about the fact that net advances of \$3.9 million are necessary to retire the outstanding amounts. I understand the loans were cut off in 1969. The junior farmer loans were set up in 1952 and for 17 years we had a total—well there are 5,667 loans still outstanding, as I understand it.

Could the minister first of all advise, Mr. Chairman, the amount of moneys in accumulated loans still outstanding—the amount of the moneys outstanding?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): The total amount as of January 31, 1971, was \$98,727,257.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you. We then have \$98 million recoverable. What is the experience? The revenues fall far short of the moneys needed to clear this amount. Is that not right?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes. The interest rate, the hon. member will understand, is four per cent on some of the loans and five per cent on the remainder of the loans—that is, when they were made. There were 3,828 loans made at four per cent and 1,228 loans are

still out at four per cent with a value of almost \$4 million. The remainder out are at five per cent—\$94,785,000 at five per cent—that is, 4,288 at five per cent are still out. We pay the going rate of interest; so that what we get in, we have to make up the difference. That is where that money comes from.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you. The auditor says that no confirmation of the mortgage principle was obtained from the debtors concerned. Is the minister concerned about the ability to pay off these mortgages?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well I am concerned about the ability of anyone to pay off a mortgage. But the history of the repayment has been very good.

Mr. Sargent: These loans were cut off in 1969. Why were they cut off?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is somewhat redundant.

Mr. Sargent: Why?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have been into this before—we have gone into it on every occasion. Our estimates have been up since that time.

We withdrew the junior farmer loan programme and concentrated the money we were putting out in that in expanding our extension service and farm management programme. We were in direct competition with the Farm Credit Corporation loan which was at a standard rate of interest. We were offering a very slight subsidized interest at that time and still would be if we were in the field at that rate of interest. We simply withdrew from the junior farmer loan field and the federal government has been carrying it all since then.

Mr. Sargent: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the minister that nothing is redundant in this Legislature. I would not ask him if I knew the answer to it and I have the right, for my people, to know the answers. The fact is, there are farm credit loans available in the Province of Quebec—is that right?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No.

Mr. Sargent: They are not?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, they are available. They pay a subsidy on the interest supplied by the Farm Credit Corporation.

Mr. Sargent: Are the junior farmer loans available to the Quebec farmers?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Not to my knowledge. They pay a subsidy on the interest rate on Farm Credit Corporation loans.

Mr. Sargent: My information is that the junior farmer loan programme in the Province of Quebec is subsidized by the government to an amount of five per cent. The net cost is 2.5 per cent of the money there.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is quite right, but it is not a provincial government loan. It is a federal loan subsidized by the Province of Quebec.

Mr. Sargent: Does the minister not think that this puts the farmers in Ontario at a disadvantage then, when they can borrow money five per cent cheaper than we can here?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Certainly, in that respect it does.

Mr. Sargent: So what gives the minister the right to think that our farmers do not deserve the same treatment they do? They are competing in the same market.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Not necessarily.

Mr. Sargent: The minister says my questions are redundant. Has he explained to the rest of the House why our farmers do not have the same treatment then?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, many times.

Mr. Sargent: Would he please tell me why they should not have the same treatment?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: For the information of the hon. member, we feel there are so many advantages that our farmers do have regarding climate, soil and quality, generally speaking, in comparison with farmers in—

Mr. Sargent: That is a lot of nonsense. We are talking money, we are not talking soil.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We simply do not think that the subsidized interest rate which was provided under the junior farmer loan programme was really a great advantage to the farmers involved.

My hon. friend was a business man and he knows the intricacies of the business world far better even than I attempt to know. He knows full well that you can pay a great deal more per acre for a farm if you are buying that farm at five per cent or four per cent

than if you are buying it, at say, eight or nine per cent. The farm organizations in this province made no secret of the fact that there was no real benefit being provided to the farmers of Ontario through a highly subsidized interest loan paid out of the pocket of the taxpayers of this province because the real problem was that the land values escalated to such an extent that the farmer was paying far more in total per acre for land than he is today at a much less subsidized interest rate for farm loans.

I do not think that there has been anything that has taken the heat off the land market quite the same as the fact that there is not a subsidized loan available for farm purchase purposes. There is nothing else that I know of that has had that effect.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That is the justification.

Mr. Sargent: Nothing has taken the heat off.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is one of the reasons, my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition says.

Mr. Nixon: That is a very thin justification for revoking the junior farmer loan programme.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is one of the reasons. My hon. friends can argue about it, it is a good political talking point.

Mr. Sargent: You bet your boots it is.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, that is fine and I gather that is why you are stressing the point. Of course, it is. There is no other reason for your suggesting it, because it has been debated in this House every time since we withdrew the loan.

Mr. Sargent: And it always will be.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, that is fine. You can carry right on doing it, but I am taking the advice of farm advisers that we have across this province through the farm organizations, and that is what they have told us.

Mr. Sargent: It all depends who is wearing—

Mr. Nixon: The minister has a different justification every year.

Mr. Sargent: It all depends who is wearing the hat and looking after the farmer. We have justifications by everyone of your caucus to

give forgiveness loans to industry right across the board. There are hundreds of millions of dollars to industry, to foreign industry.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Foreigners, Americans!

Mr. Sargent: But he says to us that the farmers are not justified in getting forgiveness loans. They do not get forgiveness loans—never. You cannot even subsidize their loans.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, let me bring to my hon. friend's attention the capital grants programme that we have out today—over \$6 million a year in total absolute grants.

Mr. Nixon: To help cut down elm trees.

Mr. Sargent: Six million dollars.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Not repayable but total grants payable out—that is what we have been paying; it is available to farmers.

Mr. Sargent: I do not see it in there.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We dealt with it the other night. If the member had been here, he would have heard about it. Is it right there in the estimates.

Mr. Sargent: I was here.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is right there in the estimates. Now there it is. Forty per cent up to a maximum of \$3,000 per farmer in this province is available in capital grants.

Mr. Sargent: Is that not a big deal? The government loans millions to Americans, though—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: To each farmer.

Mr. Sargent: Three thousand dollars. Is the minister not a big spender?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Total that up against the number of farm people there are in the Province of Ontario and you run into several millions of dollars a year. That is what has been paid out and what we will continue to pay out if the farmers want it. It is a 12-year programme and we are in the fifth year of it now.

My hon. friend did not even know that.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, we have pretty well established the fact that this minister feels it is okay to give loans to industry and every other part of the economy, but the farmer is not important in this regard. But the

Quebec farmer has a five per cent premium over the Ontario farmer in this regard. Here we have in this budget an amount of \$1,750,000 the minister is asking us for on this vote.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): The member is way out of line.

Mr Sargent: Mr. Chairman, it is costing us \$131,000 to administer a defunct corporation. It is costing \$131,000 in salaries and wages to administer a corporation that is broke; it is non-operative. In other words, the minister is paying out 10 per cent of the money he is asking to operate it. What the hell do they do to earn \$131,000 a year for an operation that is dead?

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Did.

Mr. Sargent: How can the minister justify those kinds of salaries?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The junior farmer loan branch continues in operation for the simple reason that we have 5,500 loans out and they have to be serviced. We have to have someone there to collect the money, to look after the servicing of those loans. That is part of the reason. The lawyers who are in the junior farmer loan branch service all the loans that are brought through ARDA. The land evaluators work through the ARDA branch as well. It is charged up to this junior farmer loan board vote that we have here, but it is a joint effort.

Mr. Sargent: How many employees does the minister have?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There are 15. Two less than there were last year.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): What do the lawyers do?

Mr. Sargent: Fifteen employees? What do they do?

Mr. Bullbrook: What do those lawyers do? Write discharges?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Not necessarily; some do, yes. But they also do all of the legal work for ARDA, or the land purchases under ARDA.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this may not sound like a lot of money but it goes to show further the complete inefficiency. Here we have a loan setup that is already broke; they are defunct; they are not operative any more. They are not giving any more loans,

but we are paying out \$131,000 to operate an operation that is not operating any more.

Mr. Nixon: It is \$160,000.

Mr. Sargent: Of course, that is to pick up the lack of recording of interest, that \$160,000.

Mr. Nixon: No, \$160,000 in costs in addition to that.

Mr. Sargent: My leader is right—\$160,000 to supervise an operation that is dead.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): That is right, straighten him out.

Mr. Sargent: The logical conclusion, I would say as far as a businessmen is concerned, is that it should be part of the Treasury to collect receivables; no other way.

An hon. member: That is an idea.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, under this vote the minister has \$100,000 set aside for rabies indemnities in the province. Has rabies increases or decreased or is rabies under control in this province?

Mr. Chairman: What item is that under?

Mr. Spence: I thought it was \$100,000 here.

Mr. Chairman: It is not under this. We are dealing with item 7 which is the Ontario junior farmer loan.

Mr. Spence: I am sorry.

Mr. Sargent: It is on page 21.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on item 7?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Yes, I wanted to ask—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Oxford was on his feet first.

Mr. Singer: I will gladly give way to the hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, the minister mentions there are 5,500 loans still in existence: How many of these are transferred? Suppose a young farmer under the age of 35 bought a farm today—one that is currently carrying a junior farmer loan, can he carry on that loan? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, it is transferable.

Mr. Innes: The hon. minister says he can do that if he happens to pick the right farm and finds that there is a junior farmer loan on currently?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Innes: Has the public the availability of finding the list of farmers in the province who are currently carrying a junior farmer loan?

An hon. member: That is in the registry office, is it not?

Mr. Innes: If I were a junior farmer and said I would like to get a list of the farms in the Province of Ontario that have loans that are currently being carried under The Junior Farmer Loan Act—if I were a young farmer I think I might want to go out and buy one. Could I get a list of them?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That list is not available to the public.

Mr. Innes: Would it be available to me as a member of Parliament?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is not available to the public.

Mr. Bullbrook: It is public knowledge.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: No it is not. It is private business.

Mr. Bullbrook: Are the mortgages not registered?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Bullbrook: Then it is public knowledge.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Sure it is.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well why does the hon. minister hide it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If the hon. member wants to go to the registry office and look it up that is fine.

Mr. Bullbrook: Why put the onus on the individual?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not think my hon. friend from Sarnia would really want the Province of Ontario to publish a list of all those who held a mortgage from the junior farmer loan.

Mr. Sargent: Do not publish it, make it available.

Mr. Bullbrook: It is public knowledge. He is not asking the hon. minister to make a list. He is not asking the hon. minister to do that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, it may be. But surely that is not the prerogative of the junior farmer. I am amazed at my hon. friend suggesting that.

Mr. Nixon: Oh come on!

Mr. Innes: Just on the weekend I had a farmer ask if he could get them. I said, "As far as I know, yes."

Mr. Evans: When did the hon. member pay his off?

Mr. Innes: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on this item?

Mr. Sargent: He can buy and sell all of you!

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, of the 15 staff that the minister has in this branch, how many of them are lawyers?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Too many.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Two.

Mr. Singer: Two? And those are in addition to the three lawyers that he has in the legal branch?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is right.

Mr. Singer: What are the salaries of those two lawyers?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Sixteen or \$17,000.

Mr. Singer: Each? And what do they do?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: As my hon. friend would have heard me explain, had he been here earlier—

Mr. Singer: I was at the hockey game. I am sorry. I just came in.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I explained that they not only do the legal work on these mortgages—

Mr. Nixon: All the legal work in a fund that has not issued a loan in three years?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —they also do the work that is done for ARDA—the purchase of land

under ARDA. These same two lawyers do that.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, what legal work is there to do? It is my understanding that this fund has not loaned out any money in three years. He has a legal staff in his head office—three lawyers—and an expenditure of—

Mr. Sargent: One hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. Singer: No, no—of \$81,700 for the legal branch. Has it ever occurred to the minister that he could amalgamate these two things? It really does not take a great deal of time for a number of lawyers to draw up discharges. Why could he not put this branch into his head office, in the legal branch?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I suppose we could transfer those legal offices to the legal branch of the main office. I suppose there is no reason why we could not. They have got to be paid whether they are in that branch or in the other one, and as far as we are concerned—

Mr. Singer: But since they are not issuing any new loans what work is there to do? There are no titles to search anymore.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There are discharges. We have over 5,500 loans to service and there are those to discharge.

Mr. Singer: Yes, but surely lawyers are not needed to service loans. The minister needs bookkeepers—maybe an adding machine—perhaps an accountant. What does a lawyer do in servicing a mortgage loan?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have explained—

Mr. Singer: What does he do?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He works on the discharge of the mortgages that are—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: All right—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Now just let me tell my hon. friend that as far as ARDA properties are concerned there were 650 individual properties purchased last year under ARDA—

Mr. Sargent: That is 12 a week—two a day.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —and our lawyers do those kind of things as well and all the legal work—the searching of titles and that kind of

work. Now if there are too many lawyers the hon. member can take a look at it. I have no desire to keep a group of lawyers around—

Mr. Sargent: One and one-half a day.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —at public expense. If we have too many we will get rid of them. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Singer: Are they busy in administering mortgage loans? Is that first part of the minister's answer correct or has he withdrawn that now?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, it is not. They have to look after the work that is done in the junior farmer loan branch. It is the legal work of the junior farmer loan branch. They also have to look after the clearing of titles with 650—

Mr. Sargent: It is not the loan branch; it is the recovery programme you are on.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, that is true, but there are mortgages to discharge.

Mr. Sargent: There is no more loan branch then?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Maybe we have a misnomer on the title. We call it the junior farmer loans branch. Six hundred and fifty properties were purchased last year under ARDA and now we have those matters—

Mr. Singer: All right. Let us deal with the administering of the mortgages. I suggest to the minister that to look after a mortgage loan he does not need lawyers; he needs bookkeepers. So far as preparing discharges, I do not know if the minister is familiar with what the discharge of a mortgage is, but it is a simple one-page document that can be prepared by any legal clerk. The tariff of fees in the county of York for preparing one of these is \$20. Now how much of their time is spent in preparing discharges of mortgages on the advice of the bookkeepers?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I cannot really answer that question, I have not got it at my fingertips.

Mr. Singer: Well I think you should. I think you should come prepared to discuss your estimates.

Now the second thing you talk about is the purchase of 650 properties under the ARDA scheme. All right: Who certifies the title, your lawyers or other lawyers; or do you hire outside lawyers?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am told that the certification of the titles is done by the legal agents, not only in our office, but in the county offices.

Mr. Singer: Oh I see. So you hire, I presume, 650 legal agents.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would not think that.

Mr. Singer: Well, yes, I would think one for each title. Maybe you add a number together, so that one lawyer may certify a flock of them. So it may not be 650, but you pay 650 fees for the certification of those 650 ARDA titles, not through your legal branch but through outside lawyers. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It could be that a certain amount would be paid. I cannot tell you the exact figures.

Mr. Singer: All right. Well then, let me come back to your lawyers in this branch. What do they do?

An hon. member: Not enough to play bridge.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend does not think they do enough. We will have to get rid of them. Maybe there will be two extra lawyers on the market. Who knows?

Mr. Singer: Well, do I gather then that the minister has finally recognized that he has got far too much professional staff in here that really is not doing anything? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, it is not, I can assure you.

Mr. Singer: All right; that is fine.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, one further question: I would ask the minister to comment on the statement of the auditors. It says, in summary, no confirmation of mortgage loans principal was obtained from the debtors concerned. Is that not the function of the lawyers, the legal staff?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would not imagine they would be confirming that many loans. I would think that the mortgage itself would be confirmation of the debt.

Mr. Sargent: But the Auditor General says it is not.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, that is his opinion and I am sure I am not disputing it at all.

Mr. Sargent: Oh! He is right then?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, he is obviously right that they have not been confirmed by personal contact.

Mr. Sargent: Then why do you not as minister get on top of these boys and say, "Get cracking and get this cleaned up here"?

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, while we are on this same subject—and it is something that the hon. member for Huron-Bruce was speaking about—the credit situation as it applies to farmers and where to go to get the proper deal, so to speak, or the best interest rate possible: I think it was in the farm income report where they did mention about incorporating the junior farmer loans with the federal system in an overall system of new financing; is there any segment of your department that has given some study to ways and means whereby they could set up some type of an agricultural bank of some description that could, in all fairness, give this type of advice, without going to the loan sharks so to speak? Is the minister giving any study to this?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is the whole purpose of the farm management programme of which I spoke this afternoon. Our emphasis is entirely on farm management counselling and advice in helping farmers to make decisions on credit, sources of credit and all the rest of it. The government does not have a central credit bank, but we certainly do help to provide that information to farmers.

Mr. Innes: There must be one person who looks after this. Who is in charge of this particular area?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Of farm management?

Mr. Innes: Yes. Who is in charge of looking into the equitable way of financing a farm?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is an extension branch responsibility.

Mr. Innes: Who is in charge of it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Art Bennett is the director.

Mr. Innes: I beg the minister's pardon?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Arthur Bennett, A. G. Bennett is the director of extensions for the province on all of the—

Mr. Innes: He is trained in financial matters or accounting?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, not he necessarily, but there are people throughout the province who are. They are strategically located in regional offices right throughout the province. Each of our agricultural representatives has received special in-service training in farm management and credit management.

Mr. Innes: Okay. Who would be the man the farmers in my area would go to see? Who would be the contact man, other than the agriculture representative if, in fact, there is a special man?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. R. E. Heard in London. He is stationed in the Department of Agriculture's London office and he covers those counties in which the member's Oxford riding is located.

Mr. Chairman: Item 7?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, as I think about what the minister has told me in response to the questions I posed earlier, the money paid for the searching of these 650 titles really is not disclosed in this vote, is it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I do not think so.

Mr. Singer: It would be disclosed in the vote under 103? Under ARDA?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is right.

Mr. Singer: The next one. So that in this vote of \$1,760,800 there is really nothing for the searching of the 650 titles the minister was talking about?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I was led to believe that was the reason they were engaged. I questioned this vote when my estimates were being prepared and I was advised—

Mr. Singer: Oh, yes?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —that this was the case. Now if this is not the case I can assure my hon. friend that there is going to be a thorough look taken at the administration of the junior farmer loan branch.

Mr. Singer: That is fair enough.

Could the minister advise me, or could he by the time we come to the next vote, of the amount of money that was paid to outside lawyers for searching these 650 titles? Perhaps the minister has not got the information now but by the time we get to the next vote, he may.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not know.

Mr. Singer: Secondly, could the minister advise me of the number of lawyers who were retained to provide these services and how much each lawyer was paid for providing these services? I would not expect the minister would necessarily have that information now, but I think it is most important because if he hired outside services for 650 separate jobs, I think the members should have a very careful look at how much was paid and who was retained and the reason for the retention of each one of these individual lawyers.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on item 7?

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes. I want to make a comment, if I might.

I have sat back, Mr. Chairman, and listened to the examination of the perspective of the utilization, the continued utilization, of legal staff in connection with the junior farmer and the ARDA programme. I want to make comment in this respect.

Our party accepts what the minister has said, that he is going to make an investigation. But the fact comes to our attention, as lawyers sitting in this House, as follows: If there is a programme that is not instituting new loans, the minister does not really have any responsibility in connection with legal work, under the junior farmer programme, except eventually with the discharge of the mortgage. All the remainder of the dealing in connection with those mortgages is purely financial or administrative. A lawyer is not required.

In connection with the ARDA programme, as my colleague from Downsview has amply pointed out, the great bulk of the work is done on retention of individual solicitors in the location of the loan. The concern that we express is not an attempt to embarrass unduly this particular minister. We want to convey, Mr. Chairman, in this vote the fact that this is purely exemplary of things that go on in almost every department of government.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, no.

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister advises—let me tell the minister by way of example if you will permit. There are eight solicitors involved in the Ontario Housing Corporation and one of them search a title, none of them.

Mr. Singer: Or even know how to draft leases, as the minister well knows.

Mr. Bullbrook: The fact of the matter is that every time there is an involvement in connection with a senior citizens' housing project in the Province of Ontario, the proximate decisions have to be made here in Toronto; then they hire solicitors out in Sarnia, Sault Ste. Marie, here in Toronto, and elsewhere. One has to ask in good conscience why we are retaining these solicitors.

It gets back to the philosophy that we have expounded on this side of the House time and time again. It has been put forward by my colleague from Downsview, my colleague from Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) and others that the time has come when we have got to stop this wastefulness in connection with the retention of legal talent. There has to be a simple authority in this province responsible to the people of Ontario for retaining professional assistants.

That is the only reason I rise for a moment to take part in this debate. Because in the three and a half years that we have been in this Parliament, we have talked about it time and time again—in the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General, in the estimates of The Department of Education, in the estimates of The Department of Health, in the estimates of The Department of Municipal Affairs, in the estimates of The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, and now in the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

Now because The Department of Energy and Resources Management has hired lawyers, that is why I say now, in connection with that department, we are going to be involved with that again, which we were not before.

An hon. member: The Department of Agriculture and Food.

Another hon. member: It is The Department of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Bullbrook: All right, presently we discuss it in connection with The Department of Agriculture and Food. But we want to convey again, Mr. Chairman—and it is our obligation to convey during the course of every session of this Parliament—our concern in connection with the wastefulness relative to the hiring of legal talent. We know we who are lawyers here—and we do not hold ourselves out as having any more knowledge than anybody else, but we do have approximate involvement in connection with this—

we happen to know what these men must be doing, as they know themselves, those who sit in the House and listen to us; they know the work that they must be doing from day to day. The work is basically nothing and it can be nothing and the—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh nonsense!

Mr. Bullbrook: Well now the former Attorney General interjects, and I invite him to join the debate right now and tell me exactly what those lawyers are doing in connection with the junior farmer programme.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: I say this to the former Attorney General, now the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs: This is the only legal responsibility they have, the only one—and that is, eventually there has to be a discharge of the mortgage clause.

I am going to sit down and let us get it on the record; right now, without reservation or equivocation, what they do that cannot be done by an administrative clerk. I resume my seat for the minister to tell me what they do.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not—

Mr. Nixon: Like a trout!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It was very good bait, you know!

I do not speak, of course, for the Minister of Agriculture and Food but I have interjected and I am prepared to interject further.

It is only a couple of days ago that the hon. member for Downsview was questioning at great length what effort had gone into a study of legislation which the Minister of Agriculture and Food had presented.

Mr. Singer: They have lots of lawyers over there.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think he got a reply that the matter had been studied, had been considered from its legal point of view. It was very important legislation: there was case law in the Province of Manitoba; there was case law in the Province of Quebec; and there was a case that had gone to the Supreme Court of Canada, and I am—

Mr. Nixon: They have not looked at it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They asked me to reply, now they are going to get it.

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): Yes, just listen.

Mr. B. Newman: The minister was ahead before he started.

Mr. Singer: Now comes the red herring technique.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am quite certain, in fact I know from my discussions with the minister in connection with that legislation, that the lawyers in his department were consulted on that matter. For instance, I am sure that from day to day in The Department of Agriculture and Food, which deals with land all across this province, there are many questions arising from time to time that need legal examination, legal advice and legal consideration, as I will account for the lawyers in my department, from day to day when I come to my estimates.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, can I reply to my friend?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: This is an invitation that I cannot resist, much as I would like to hear my colleague from Downsview.

Mr. Chairman, it is less than passing strange that in connection with this particular vote I invited the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs to tell us one thing that the lawyers did in connection with the junior farmer programme, other than perhaps drawing a discharge—which they do not do anyway.

He did not touch on that at all. He decided in the alternative that he would show the extreme responsibility of a legal department in connection with the analysis of the legislation involved in the department. This, of course, gets right back to the fundamental question that you beg every year, year in and year out, and the question that you beg is—whether you need an array of talent of eight lawyers with the housing corporation to analyse what is done by your Minister of Trade and Development.

The fact of the matter is you do not need them. And the fact of the matter is that this minister knows that the people of this province would be better served by the development of an elite corps of counsel in this province, knowledgeable in connection with provincial constitutional responsibility and the

legislation concurrent therewith. And the minister knows further, Mr. Chairman, that every time there is a problem of significant technique, your own lawyers do not decide it anyway. You go downtown to Bay Street and pay \$1,000 a day for somebody else.

And that is the fact of the matter. This type of subterfuge, this type of murky, does not fool the people of Ontario—and it will not continue to fool the people of Ontario.

Mr. Sargent: You know it is true.

Mr. Bullbrook: I hate to quote the great conservative, Barry Goldwater, but: "In your heart you know it's right."

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, you know what the reply to Mr. Goldwater was: "In your guts you know he is nuts."

How many times do we have to reiterate these things in this House over a period of four years? It has been said over and over again: The shambles of central purchasing, which was brought to light the other day in the Legislature; the inability to cohere your own programmes; and your admitted great talents with respect to lip service to the very things that are brought forward by this government itself. We have repeated, following McRuer, who is the chief thorn in the cloven hoof of the Minister of Agriculture—

Mr. Nixon: Thorn in the cloven hoof?

Mr. Lawlor: Thorn in the cloven hoof of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. McRuer lives with him; thrown up in his teeth daily; he has to batten down in the evening with McRuer, but he does not have much compatibility.

And the point there is that he has advised and said over again, and the Attorney General last session said that the allocation into a central unit of the legal talent of this province was a mandatory prerequisite. Nevertheless, in face of those recommendations—which I say you yourself accepted to all intents and purposes—you go on perpetuating the present system.

Take the two lawyers inside the branch who apparently are preoccupied in discharging mortgages—

Mr. Singer: What do they do?

Mr. Lawlor: —which, in the normal legal office a girl does. It is a simple routine to do that. When these 650 titles come back into your hands do you review them? Do these lawyers, preoccupied in a review of the titles, make their own determination as to the validity or do they simply accept the certificate of title that is coming from the outside solicitor, bow their heads and leave it at that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is their job. Part of their job is to look after those 650 titles that I mentioned, and it is their job to finalize them here in our office.

Mr. Lawlor: Do outside lawyers send you a certificate of guarantee to those titles?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I could not answer that. I do not know. I am not a lawyer and I am not working in the branch every day.

Mr. Lawlor: Well you are in charge of the branch. Do your advisers not give you some indication of what they do?

Mr. Singer: When we have a look at the fees we will be able to tell him.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: I cannot resist exchanging a remark or two with the former Attorney General. The old smoothy was at his best tonight. He talked all around the subject and never came to deal with the issues. He neglected to note the debate that we had earlier about the legal branch of The Department of Agriculture and Food separate and apart.

The Minister of Agriculture and Food was justifying the other day what they had to do, particularly in relation to Bill 10. I would have thought the former Attorney General would have been very concerned that no opinion was ever sought from the law officers of the Crown. That was admitted by his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

But we left that apart and what we were talking about tonight before the sweeping whitewash was another legal branch. Did you know, for instance, I say to the former Attorney General, that there were two legal branches in The Department of Agriculture and Food?

Mr. Nixon: At least two!

Mr. Singer: Yes, at least two; and maybe when we get on to further votes we will find a few more.

Mr. Nixon: ARDA has two or three lawyers.

Mr. Singer: Yes. I would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that the former Attorney General should have located at least by number and position and duty all of the lawyers in government service. Obviously he has not.

Does the former Attorney General know of his own knowledge, other than in this grandiose language that he hurled at us a few minutes ago, what these two fellows do in the junior farmer loans branch?

Mr. Nixon: They play bridge.

Mr. Singer: Do they do anything more than the Minister of Agriculture and Food has told us? They look at discharges and maybe prepare a few, and they hire people to search 650 titles. I will bet you the people who search the 650 titles charge full tariff fee of their local county loan association, and provide the certificates of title. What then does a lawyer in the junior farmer loans branch do with those? Does he search the title that has already been searched or does he certify the certification that has already been made? I am surprised, really, because the former Attorney General knows better, and had he looked at The Department of Agriculture and Food—and I suspect looked closely at other departments—he would have found much more went on in the name of the legal profession than he ever imagined in his wildest dreams. My advice to the former Attorney General, now that he has left the responsibility of that office, is that he should just be quiet and perhaps we will not notice the fact that he was not all the law to all the people of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will not take that advice.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 7 carried?

Mr. Innes: Just one more comment, please. I mentioned about the number of junior farmer loans. How many junior farmer loans were transferred to another junior farmer last year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There were 49.

Mr. Innes: Forty-nine?

Vote 102, item 7 agreed to.

On item 8, soils and crops:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): I would like to ask the minister a few questions on weed control. I see it is \$72,000. Just what does this cover? Just along the roadsides in municipalities?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, it is the subsidy we pay to each municipal weed inspector.

Mr. Haggerty: This goes to county weed inspectors?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Haggerty: Local municipality weed inspectors?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Haggerty: What do they do? Do they go on large vacant areas of farmland and control the weeds in this particular area?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes. That is the job of the municipal weed inspectors, to enforce The Weed Control Act in the municipalities. We pay half their salary plus half their expenses.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, do they do the job? The point I raise is that I know a municipality where under local bylaws they can go in and control a small lot. They can go in and cut it down and charge the property owner. But what happens when you get 30, 40, 50, 100 acres of land that lie idle, with weeds this high? I am sure the minister has had a number of requests from municipalities asking for some form or type of legislation to control this.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is the local municipal weed inspectors' job in the municipality, and he simply enforces The Weed Control Act of that municipality. There is a variance, I believe, from one municipality to another. But that is the job of the local weed inspector. He is not directed from Toronto, he is directed by the local municipality and we pay half his salary.

Mr. Haggerty: That might be quite right, Mr. Chairman, but the point I raise is that I think he does control it on small lots. I am talking about lots, say, 60 by 100 or something like that. What happens when you get 100 acres that lie idle year after year with brush, grass and thistles and everything else that high? He has no control over that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Of course he has—the same control over that as he has over small lots if he wants to enforce The Weed Control Act in that municipality. That is his job and

if he is not enforcing it, then somebody should speak to the council about it because he is employed by the local council and the job is to enforce The Weed Control Act.

I certainly know of municipalities where weed inspectors have enforced the Act and large areas have had to be cleaned up. Now if it happens to be otherwise in your municipality, then it must be something to do with the relationship between the local council and the inspector. I cannot understand any of the reasons. There is no reason they should not enforce the Act.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Middlesex South was attempting to gain the floor previously.

Mr. K. C. Bolton (Middlesex South): I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): I want to ask the minister, under organization and special projects, about the Ontario Soil and Crop Improvement Association. Exactly what is happening at this point in this field? I am not sure if this is the exact organization, but I know that there was an investigation conducted a number of years ago in terms of soil testing in the peninsula and other parts of the province. I wonder if the minister might be able to tell us what is happening in this particular instance with the \$57,000?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well I will try. These are local county soil and crop improvement projects within each particular county or district. They make their decisions as to what they want to demonstrate in that particular county and we pay a grant toward it from the department.

Mr. Deans: I see. Is there some particular reason why the two sums are not incorporated into one vote? One is shown as a demonstration project vote and one as a general subsidy.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Is the member referring to the \$57,500?

Mr. Deans: I am talking about the \$57,500, but I notice that there also is an additional \$5,000 shown here that goes to the same association and I am curious to know why.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The \$5,000 is to the parent organization, the Ontario executive, to carry on their particular function. The \$57,500 is for the special projects of the

Ontario Soil and Crop Improvement Association as related to their various county and district organizations.

Mr. Deans: Fine. I wonder if the minister could tell me what is being done at the present moment to determine suitable replacement areas for the growth of soft fruit and the like in the Province of Ontario, in terms of the soil content? Are there projects under way at the moment in the province that will enable us to determine in which areas of the province we might expect to see a soft fruit development take place in the next 10 or 15 years to replace that which is being slowly eliminated in other parts of the province?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: As a matter of fact, there has not been that great a drop in the Niagara fruit acreage.

Mr. Deans: I want to talk about that later.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The Vineland station does a considerable amount of research work, but the Simcoe station also does a good deal of work along this line as well, and of course there are also soft fruits grown in the Essex county area. So I do not think there is any great danger of running out of land where peaches can be grown for that matter—grapes might be a different story.

Mr. Deans: Well, this is really what I was after. I was curious to know whether the Ontario Soil and Crop Improvement Association was conducting tests in other areas in regard not only to soil, which is one factor, but in terms of the possibility of expanding the soft fruit industry in other parts of southern Ontario to replace those areas that are presently going out of business for reasons which we will discuss on the next vote I hope.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am told that grapes are being grown on research plots at Harrow, down in Essex county; we are trying to find out what the story is down there as well. But through the Ontario branch of the Canadian Horticultural Council and the Vineland research station—which is a separate entity to this, having to do with fruits and vegetables—and through the Ontario Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, there are relationships and work going on along the line that the member suggests.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 8 carry?

Mr. Innes: In the soils and crop department, I was wondering how many soil testing stations are in the province, other than

Guelph? Are there individual soil testing areas in areas other than Guelph?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Just the one at Guelph.

Mr. Innes: As the minister knows there has been quite a bit of concern, and a pamphlet came out recently on fertilizer use and environmental control. Some of the farmers, of course, always want to make sure they have got enough fertilizer on, and there are others who do not even use soil tests. But the conclusions in the summary that has been published in the fertilizer use and environmental quality control publication coming out of Guelph indicate certain conclusions, such as:

The contribution of nitrogen to underground waters increases rapidly when fertilizer in excess of that required for most typical crop yields is added. It is therefore important that precise methods of establishing the nitrogen requirements in specific fields be developed.

And it goes on along the same line. I think the minister's people should be concerned about the extra amounts that are going on in some areas and the fact that it is contributing to the so-called pollution of our waterways. They indicate that if the proper amounts are put on there is little or no concern. What do the minister's individual ag rep offices and soil specialists indicate to the farmers in the various areas in respect to this? Has there been any concentration of effort to try to get them to use proper amounts rather than, as in most cases, using too much?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have, I believe, 60,000 or something like that individual soil samples taken or at least tested at the University of Guelph, the Ontario Agriculture College, on an annual basis. The results of those soil tests are submitted back to the agricultural office in the counties and the agricultural representative with his professional training interprets those results related to the field or the farm, with the soil or the crop conditions all being taken into consideration.

It is certainly their purpose and intent not to recommend the overuse of fertilizers, including nitrogens. We take the viewpoint—and I make no apologies for this—that it is quite unwise for any farmer to use more than the necessary amount of fertilizer. He is not only contributing to a needless expense, but he could be contributing to a pollution factor. I think it is imperative that we took a good look at all of this. There are schools on fertilizers and plant—

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Hon. Mr. Stewart:—nutrients being held in many areas, to have farmers schooled to fertilize on the basis of soil tests, not only from the standpoint of economics but also from the standpoint of protecting the environment.

Mr. Innes: There are 60,000 samples, the minister tells me here. What proportion of the farmers does he feel that this covers? I know it is very small. And what capacity could the research department handle? What is their capacity? Currently the minister says it is 60,000 samples. How many more could they handle?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am told that that represents roughly one-third of the farms of Ontario and that we could handle double that amount if it were available.

Vote 102, item 8, agreed to.

Vote 102 agreed to.

On vote 103, item 1, agricultural rehabilitation and development:

Mr. Sargent: The member for Kent was first, I guess.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. Spence: On the rural development programme, I see by the minister's estimates that he is going to spend about \$14,560,000 this coming year; about the same amount of money he spent in 1970-1971.

You might say that rural development is a big field in the Province of Ontario. I might say, Mr. Chairman, on the ARDA programme, for community pastures, farm enlargements, maple syrup, man-training programme, we have not heard too many complaints. They seem to be working very well.

But, Mr. Chairman, we were very disappointed, and it was a great loss to southwestern Ontario, when the minister signed this new agreement with Ottawa for \$60 million to be spent on ARDA projects in Ontario over the next five years. When we lost that one-third grant for the construction of municipal drains it was brought to my attention many times that the farmers did miss this one-third grant.

However, on the agreement—maybe Ottawa would not agree with the minister. I do not know what great effort he put into it, but it was, I will say, a loss.

I might say on rural development in Ontario that we find many of our towns and

villages deteriorating in and across the province. If we look back over the past, we find that rural areas produced the food and the fibre and, Mr. Chairman, we supplied a great number of our educated young people to the cities. I have nothing against the cities, but we see the cities across the Province of Ontario thriving at a great pace while in rural Ontario many of our towns and villages are standing still, if not going backwards.

I would like to say that our towns and villages have been depending on our agricultural industry, but the net return from agriculture is going down; it is at a very low ebb. The purchasing power of the farmer is going down; he cannot purchase and this is affecting both our rural areas and our villages and our towns.

And today, when pollution is of great concern to rural Ontario, we find our towns and villages have to put in sewerage—their taxes are going to be raised \$120 for sewerage. Many of our towns have to bring in water from our lakes, which is another \$100, so about \$230 more in taxes will be required of the less well-off of our towns and villages.

Of course when the budget was brought down here by the hon. provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), he said that the Province of Ontario was going to pay 55 per cent of the cost of education. I must say that it was a great disappointment to those in rural Ontario that the government was not going to pick up more of the tab of education, because sewerage, water and education cause great worry and great concern that rural towns and villages are going to deteriorate even more. I might say, Mr. Chairman, something has to be done.

In the past the young people, in rural Ontario, as I said before, have been migrating to the cities. And, of course, in rural Ontario we have to ship out all our products. Today, transportation is one of the biggest factors. We have reached a great production. A great credit is due to the agricultural colleges across this province. We have reached a very high production. But today the farmers have to compete in the markets. I think that transportation is the next part of our economy in which we have to make a study.

A few weeks ago I wrote a letter to the minister asking him to make a study of port facilities in southwestern Ontario, so that we could put our products in the markets where other countries are putting the same products and could compete on an even keel. As a layman, I feel that we could transport

many of our products that we have to export out of southwestern Ontario by ship. We could put them into the markets by water cheaper than by rail.

I would like to ask the minister if he could give consideration to making a study of transportation of our agricultural products. I think the time has come when we have become very efficient in production. We are increasing our production each and every year, but nothing is done about transportation. I am telling the minister that the agricultural industry is facing serious problems at the present time and have to look at all facets in connection with agriculture.

I hope the minister will give this consideration because it has been discussed back and forth and we must be able to compete if we are going to sell our products.

I brought to the attention of the minister the other day that we in Canada bought \$39 million worth of agricultural products more than we exported. The minister said to me: "This is an affluent society in which we live. Of course, a lot of Australian beef has come in here and then was re-exported to the United States."

This is a quandary to me. It looks to me that other countries can put their products in here cheaper than we can put them in markets, for example like Montreal. I would like to ask the minister to make a study of this to see if there can be a saving, or if we can compete. Because if we do not compete, the agricultural industry will certainly have to have supply management.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the ARDA programme was a programme, I would suspect, inherited from the federal government. I do not think that it was the brain-child of this government, of this minister—

Mr. Nixon: It was Dief.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It was developed by the hon. Alvin Hamilton when he was Minister of Agriculture in the Diefenbaker government.

Mr. Sargent: God bless him!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: God bless him!

Mr. Sargent: The thing is, I understand that \$6 million came from the federal government and that this government put \$6 million into the pot, so we have a budget

of probably \$12 million or \$14 million at this point.

How much of this budget was left over from last year? Did the Minister of Agriculture and Food spend it all last year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There is about \$2 million unspent. It is carried over into this year because there are projects going on that are uncompleted and we have to pick them up.

Mr. Sargent: That is how the minister is arriving at the figure of \$14 million?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, but not entirely. Any moneys that come back in from the ARDA agreement are added each year—that is revenue from the ARDA agreement.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, I see.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is added to the amount and reinvested.

Mr. Sargent: But the minister did spend all the money that he had available?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, that is right, except it has not been paid out yet. It is budgeted for but not paid out.

Mr. Sargent: But it is within the minister's ambit to spend all the moneys in the pot? Receivables and—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The government tries to do that.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): The minister does not have any problem there now, does he?

Mr. Sargent: My only point is that—and this must become boring to the minister—we go through this every year but things are not getting any better in farming. I feel that, progressively, the \$12 million is not doing the job.

It seems to me I have a figure some place along the line that the hon. minister has, in total, about 1,200 or 1,300 farm units to date as part of the operation in Ontario. Would that be a correct figure?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Under ARDA?

Mr. Sargent: Under ARDA.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Fourteen hundred and eighty farms have been enlarged. The acquisition of 225,000 acres.

Mr. Sargent: How many acres?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Two hundred and twenty five thousand acres. The farms that have been retired out of agriculture to forestry or recreation involve about 45,000 acres.

Mr. Sargent: We have in total 1,400 economic units in operation in possibly four years of operation and we are talking possibly of a total budget of possibly \$30 million to acquire or to produce 1,400 plants in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Not entirely, that is just that section of the programme, the farm enlargement section.

Mr. Sargent: To better agriculture—that is the end motivation of the ARDA deal.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, not entirely.

Mr. Sargent: Not entirely? But that is—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is just one of the projects.

Mr. Sargent: That is the minister's target.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The objectives of the recent ARDA agreement are much broader than that. First of all, the research for the development of new programmes and to determine the impact of the existing programmes—that is a research project. It is not very important.

Second, the farm consolidation and enlargement; third, the retaining and rehabilitation assistance; fourth, provision of a well-trained field counselling service—this is to help farmers make decisions.

These are not really the commercial farmers that are involved in the extension branch programme, these are the farmers that are living on land where they just simply cannot make a living, and they are probably working at some off-the-farm job just to make ends meet.

Fifth, the development and reallocation of land and water resources. This is what we are talking about as well.

Sixth, the development of alternative opportunities of employment. That to me is quite significant, because here we are trying to establish industries in areas where we can assist the local economy by not only providing job opportunities but by providing industry that will assist the viable farm units in the area.

That really is what the ARDA programme is all about.

Mr. Sargent: I do thank the minister for that, but I would suggest to him that the only thing we can measure very much as a physical or concrete thing is the 1,400 economic units.

Insofar as the minister is talking about creating job opportunities could he tell us how many jobs he has created through ARDA?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: About 1,525 jobs have been created by the alternative opportunities programme to date.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you. That is important. I appreciate that. But out of eight million people we have 1,500 people employed and we have got down to 1,400 plants that have been put into operation through ARDA.

In other words I think the minister is just going through the motions of taking moneys available to the minister from Ottawa, and the minister is not being very objective when we see the papers full every day with farms for sale.

It would seem to me that if we are going to do a meaningful job in this area that he should go after more money to acquire these lands and make them productive units. Is there any plan of farms that are on the market on the minister's across-Ontario board with all his pinpoints. Has he any projection of what farms are coming up for sale? Has he any way he can put these into meaningful 400-acre units?

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Is the member looking for a farm?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, this year we have the ARDA counsellors and the ARDA fieldmen working throughout the various counties and districts of Ontario where the ARDA programme is applicable. They are working with local people all the time. We have 600 farms now that are in the process of being turned over to ARDA and another 200 that are exploring the possibilities.

Mr. Sargent: And the \$40,000?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is for this coming year.

Mr. Sargent: For the 400-acre unit?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Pardon?

Mr. Sargent: For the 400-acre deal. Is that still the package?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, not the 400-acre deal. I do not know what the member is

talking about. The 400-acre deal? What does he mean by the 400-acre deal?

Mr. Sargent: Buying four 100-acre farms together for a package.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, it could have been used as an illustration, but it does not really apply in this particular instance, though it might apply in some situations.

Mr. Sargent: All right. Would the minister define what he means by economic units.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: An economic unit is a unit which provides a viable standard of living for the farmer and his family. Now there can be a difference between one area of Ontario and another, believe me. But based on the investment in the land—and ARDA owns the land—they provide a five-year lease to the farmer who leases the land—

Mr. Sargent: A leaseback?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: A leaseback!

Mr. Sargent: Agreement!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He takes the land on by lease for five years with the option to renew the lease at the end of five years or to purchase the land at what ARDA, that is the federal and provincial government, has in the land. I do not think there is a better kind of a lease. But you see it allows the farmer to use his working capital to develop his farm operation. He does not put that capital in land.

Mr. Sargent: Can he buy it back?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He can buy the land within the terms of the lease. He has the first right of refusal; that is what the programme is.

The size of those farms vary. Maybe a farmer wants one farm, maybe he wants two or three or whatever is available to him in that area. Some of them get much more than that.

Mr. Sargent: Then would the minister say that a figure of 76 per cent of the farms in Ontario gross less than \$2,000 a year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Those would not be considered commercial farms at all. I have no idea where the member got that figure, but they would not be considered commercial farms. Many of those people might have gotten that much out of farming, but I am sure they were likely getting a good deal more out of jobs that they had off the farm.

So their net income might have been much greater than the gross income as related to the figure the member has. I have no idea where that figure came from.

Mr. Sargent: Would the minister suggest to me what is going to happen to those 76 per cent making less than \$2,000 a year.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not know what 76 per cent the member is talking about, because I have no idea where the figure came from. I do not know whether it is a valid figure or whether it is an estimate from somebody else.

Mr. Sargent: All right. Supposing the figure is not correct, supposing it is 66 per cent, what is going to happen to that 66 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Supposing it is 26 per cent.

Mr. Sargent: I got the figure out of Hansard.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I see.

Mr. Nixon: It ought to be right then.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to know what does the minister think is going to happen to those people?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: A good many of them are working through ARDA in the consolidation programme.

Mr. Sargent: No, we only had 1,400 to date who have got a contract with ARDA—1,400 in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We purchased 225,000 acres.

Mr. Sargent: The minister could buy a million acres. I am talking about 1,400 economic units.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: As well as the 45,000 acres that have gone into forestry work.

Mr. Sargent: Or pastures or whatever you want.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is right. You cannot force these people off the land, but you can talk to them about the opportunities that are provided in ARDA to purchase their land—to relieve them being locked into a situation in which they simply cannot make a living. But they can through this programme get rid of their land, and we will help to train them for some other type of job and try to find them another type of job.

Many of these people want to stay on in the farmhouse where they have been living. Maybe they get a job some place else and they augment their income. Some of them may be on pension or welfare or something like this. We help them somehow to improve their standard of living. I think we have to look at it from the standpoint of a people-oriented programme. That is really what ARDA is all about.

It may not be moving as fast as my hon. friend would like to see it move. But I think if he would refer to the article that is printed in this week's *Farm and Country*—"ARDA Programme Consolidates Farms Into Paying Units"—that is an excellent item. I direct his attention to it. It explains the ARDA programme, its history and what it has been able to do and the fact that it is accomplishing something for many people throughout rural Ontario.

Now it is not any grandiose scheme to shout about from the roof tops, but go and talk to the people that are involved, as I have talked to them, and the member will find they are getting a very great deal out of the ARDA programme. But it is a programme that you just simply cannot force on people. You cannot go out and say: "We are going to buy your farm; move on." You just cannot do those kinds of things. You have to work quietly with those people and persuade them, if they want to be persuaded—

Mr. Sargent: I agree.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —here is the thing to do. Offer them those alternate opportunities. This is what we are trying to do through what I think is a very excellent group of field counsellors.

My hon. friend made a suggestion today—I think it was this afternoon—talking about farmers, some of whom are retired and for a variety of reasons may not be farming. We are using these people in many instances as ARDA counsellors because they talk the farmers' language. They have been through the mill. They understand the situation and they make excellent ARDA counsellors. I maintain we will never get anywhere by calling public meetings about ARDA. You have to go to a person's home, sit down with him around the kitchen table and talk to him about these things. That is where these counsellors really shine.

Mr. Sargent: I will not flog this any further. I just want to find out about what must be many, many thousands of people who are prime prospects for ARDA education. I

would like to suggest that there are many, many thousands who have never been exposed to what ARDA can do for them. I would like to ask the minister, in finality, how many people does he have actually in the field selling his bill of goods?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have six rural development officers, 23 rural development counsellors and five professionals working. Now that is in addition, of course, to our extension branch staff in the various counties where ARDA has application. They themselves, in many instances, discuss these things with the farmer and advise him to get in touch with the ARDA office, and in many cases they set up the appointment. They do the negotiating.

Mr. Sargent: So these people are empowered to make deals for ARDA?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh yes. These are the people who do the negotiating and the field work. The ag reps and our extension branch do a very great deal of that counselling themselves and they direct them into the ARDA channel. If they can be helped in another way in farm management, well that is where they help them. But it is a screening process.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Middlesex South.

Mr. Bolton: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister some questions about the transfer payments.

They seem to be grouped in rather odd ways. On page 21 the transfer payments are separated and the different amounts are indicated.

Here we have agricultural drainage, rural water supply, rehabilitation; and it is all lumped together. Could he separate for me the amount that is spent on the alternative employment opportunities out of this \$7,570,000?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I can, Mr. Chairman. The transfer payments are as follows: Farm enlargement consolidation and adjustment, \$650,000; rural water and resources development, \$1,980,000; rehabilitation and retraining, \$500,000; alternate employment opportunities, \$2,390,000; special ARDA projects—now these are for Indian bands and this is recoverable from the federal government—\$200,000; municipal drainage, eastern Ontario—this is what my friend from Kent was talking about, it does not apply any longer

other than in the ARDA area—\$700,000; special drainage and systems, \$1,500,000—and this is carryover for western Ontario of drains that qualified prior to the cutoff and were not completed, but they are now in the process of development so that is the figure for them.

Mr. Bolton: Mr. Chairman, the minister has told us that we have spent \$2,390,000 in providing alternative employment. Does this indicate—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is the budget for this year.

Mr. Bolton: That will be the budget?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes. That is right.

Mr. Bolton: How does it compare with last year's? Roughly!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh golly! Last year we spent \$1,100,000 on alternative employment opportunities; so it has doubled.

Mr. Bolton: Am I to assume then that the minister is expecting more and more people to look for alternative employment? Is this telling us that more and more people are going to leave the farm? And what is going to happen if this is so?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Not necessarily. Alternative employment opportunities are to provide industry or assistance to industry to locate in areas of low employment. My hon. friend from Grey-Bruce mentioned a while ago figures regarding low income for rural people; this provides, we hope, opportunities, of employment in those areas where they can continue to live on the farm if they wish but work at these job opportunities that we hope to entice into those kind of areas. And we have been fairly successful in many instances.

Mr. Bolton: So they will be partially workers at local industries?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is a people-oriented programme.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Timiskaming.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, just to go a little farther on this, is the minister telling us that the money is being used to entice industry into these areas?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Into certain areas where the ARDA programme is applicable.

Mr. Jackson: Is this not an overlapping of the programme under EIO and the Ontario Development Corporation?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not suppose you could call it an overlapping programme, but it certainly is a programme where we can go into certain areas and do things that perhaps the ODC programme is not doing.

Mr. Jackson: Can the minister give us some indication of how many jobs have been created in the last year by the one-million-so-many-thousand dollars that have been spent; and how many are expected to be created by the \$2,390,000 in the next year; and how this actually compares with the programme under EIO and under the Ontario Development Corporation?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well our programme last year resulted in an increase of 1,525 jobs.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Jackson: Just one more question before I sit down: Would the minister table in this House at some later date the jobs that have been created, where they are and in what type of industry?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We will take that under consideration. I do not know whether all the lists are available or not. For industries that are started up it is hard to know who is working there now—the programme has been in effect for several years.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, the minister says it is very difficult to tell and yet one minute ago he said there were 1,525 jobs created.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: For one year. That was last year.

Mr. Jackson: It is very difficult to tell us what industry has been created by this plan, how can he tell us now that there are 1,525 jobs? Surely he can tell us one way or the other.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, we can certainly give the member a list of the industries, where they are and what they got. I do not have it here, but we can get that. But I cannot tell him how many men are working in an industry that may have been given a grant four or five years ago. I think it would be very difficult to do that today.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, all I ask is whether he would table the industries that received grants last year and the number of jobs that came out of the grants last year.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, we will be glad to.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Over the last three years the minister and I have discussed a number of times the problems that are facing the farmers in the Niagara Peninsula, particularly in regard to the need for rehabilitation and the need for particular recognition of their problem, as opposed to recognition of general farm problems. I want to try once again, and perhaps in a more friendly way, to talk to the minister.

I did last year engage the minister in a rather lengthy discussion and I must confess to him that perhaps I overstated the case somewhat. I do not often make these confessions but I make it this time. I went over what I said, and I am prepared to concede that in the situation as it then prevailed I may have overstated the problem to some extent. Because of that perhaps the minister took umbrage at what I said and we did not get down to the matter of dealing with what was going to be the ultimate problem.

The minister and I would both recognize, I am sure, that about four-fifths of the present soft fruit growing in Ontario is done in the Niagara Peninsula. Four-fifths of the total acreage is presently in the peninsula and, whether recognized today or not, much of that land is either under option to or is in the ownership of other than the people who are presently farming it.

The farmers in the peninsula are facing a very difficult situation, because what we are going to have happen over the next few years is that because of the rather exorbitant prices that are being paid to farmers in the speculative land market for properties which they presently own—properties which they may well have either optioned or sold to other individuals who are speculators during the process of reassessment—the effect on all of the adjoining farms will be that many of those farms will be assessed considerably higher, because of the market value assessment, than they are presently assessed. I hope we can agree on that. I think we can.

What is worrying me—it has worried me for some time—is that I view the peninsula as a special situation as opposed to a great

proportion of the other farming that takes place in the province. I happen to think that not only has the peninsula contributed, and does still contribute, considerably to the economy of the Province of Ontario and in fact to the economy of the country, but that if we are going to maintain any semblance of a soft fruit industry, much of it will flow from that particular area of the province for a number of years to come. I think this is borne out by the fact that not too much of the growing has taken place anywhere outside of that particular section.

What we are faced with is this: When we talk about farmers in general and their needs and the problems that they are facing in regard to taxation—it is a problem, and no doubt a problem that can be resolved by a change in the tax structure—but when we talk of the peninsula, we are talking about farming taking place within an urban context and in many sections, in fact in practically all of the peninsula, when you talk about fruit farming you are talking of farming that is taking place almost within an urban setting. The farmers are facing, on a day to day basis, a very difficult situation in trying to raise sufficient moneys from the crops which they are able to raise to meet the ever-increasing burden of cost which is placed upon them by the planning functions that have taken place in the municipalities.

We have any number of farmers who are deriving very little more for their product today than they were deriving ten or 15 years ago. The minister agreed with me last year on that point—that in many instances the produce that is put on the market is not bringing back in constant dollars any more than it was ten years ago, and yet the burden of cost to the farmer in those areas is considerably higher. I think if I recall the quotation correctly—it may not be exactly word for word—but the minister indicated last year when I spoke that it sounded very much like a speech that he had made back when he first got elected to the Legislature.

Well maybe in those days he was wiser, I do not know. But it seems to me that we are going to have to recognize the unusual situation of the peninsula, its worth and the fact that the farmers of the peninsula are facing very grave problems, both by urban sprawl and by increased taxation. If you believe, as I believe, that the people of the peninsula and the farmers of the peninsula who have worked pretty dammed hard over the last umpteen years to produce a crop that has contributed significantly to the economy of

this province; if you believe, as I believe, that it is necessary for them to have an opportunity to maintain their operation, then as a government you are going to have to pay particular attention to their difficulties.

Last year I quoted a gentleman who made some statements which may or may not have been true. I am not going to argue them, but his name was Jerry Utter and the minister said he knew him. He pointed out a number of problems that were occurring in the peninsula. Since that time I have taken the trouble to check them out, because at that point the minister indicated to me that he was not satisfied that what Gerry Utter had said and what I was then saying was true.

I want to talk with the minister rationally, hopefully, about what is really happening. Throughout the area that I represent farms are being taken away by the acre on a day to day basis. If they are not going out of production immediately they are certainly going to go out of production in the foreseeable future. The chance of maintaining the farm industry in the peninsula as it is presently set up is not very good unless we are prepared to recognize the problems that they face.

Throughout the peninsula, from Hamilton to Niagara Falls, there have been any number of purchases made of farm properties by speculators, and in a number of instances those farmers have been permitted to continue to operate—but over a short period. The minister knows as well as I do that as the re-evaluation of property takes place, the reassessment takes place, the market value of the properties surrounding the properties which have been purchased by the speculators will be drastically affected by the changes that have occurred because of the excessive prices that have been paid.

I do not want to deprive the farmer of a chance to make enough money off his property in order that he can live a reasonable existence. But I think it is important for the overall economy of the province that we maintain and sustain a viable fruit marketing and a viable fruit-growing farming situation in the Niagara Peninsula. I do not think it is going to happen. I have a notion that in 20 years—and I pick that figure arbitrarily; it may not be that long, it may be longer—but my guess is if we permit what is now occurring to continue we will have no farm community to speak of.

The reason I asked the minister in the previous vote what was being done in the way of soil testing to determine suitable areas

to replace the farms which were going to go out of existence, was because I was concerned that some day in the not too distant future we are going to be faced in this country and in this province with the undesirable situation that in order to acquire fresh fruit we are going to have to import it.

I see no evidence, and the minister said there was evidence, but I see no evidence in the numbers of acres that are being utilized in the province—other than those acres in the peninsula—I see no evidence at all that there is a sufficient emphasis being placed on the production of soft fruit in other parts of the province to take up the slack which will ultimately occur because of the urban encroachment.

The minister might say there is nothing we can do about it. I do not agree with that. I conducted a poll among the people in my riding and my guess is they are probably 30 per cent of the total peninsula. Eighty-seven per cent of the people who returned the questionnaire said to me that it was their desire, their wish, that the peninsula be maintained (a) as a green belt; (b) for fruit farming purposes if possible.

They said in that questionnaire that they were prepared to see taken whatever steps had to be taken in order to ensure the viability of the future growth of fruit in the Niagara Peninsula.

It is world famous. Other parts of the world are working to preserve the things that we have there. We appear to be prepared to allow those kinds of things to be taken over by urban and industrial and speculative encroachment, without any consideration for the value that particular area has to the overall province.

I will concede to the minister that it is possible to grow the fruit that we need somewhere else in the province—that may well be so. I have no proof that it is not so, and therefore I will concede it may well be. But I happen to believe, as I look throughout the world, that there are many other countries and many other sectors of the world which would give their right arms to have an area so suited to the growth of fruit as is the Niagara Peninsula and that they would take the necessary steps to protect it. Unfortunately, we are not doing that.

I say this. One of the major growers in my own riding—not in terms of production—who is a prominent citizen, sold out and closed down. They built a warehouse, or they are about to build a warehouse, to store Dofasco products on land which previously grew fruit

and which even at that point was still capable of growing fruit.

All the way down the peninsula this is happening. Now it is the gateway to Ontario for much of the eastern United States. It is an area that provides for Ontario—not only in terms of farming, but in terms of recreation and green belt potential—perhaps the single, greatest potential of any area in the province.

Aside from the parochialism involved, I speak of it only because I live there, we will regret, when we look back in years to come, the fact that we did not take the necessary steps today or five years ago to protect that area for future generations. It is unfortunate we seem to be motivated by the profit factor in everything that we do.

I recognize the farmer in the area owns the land. I recognize his right to receive fair compensation, but I think as a government we have an obligation not only to the generations here to protect them against the kinds of impositions that will occur by virtue of not having any homegrown fruit, I think we have an obligation to ensure that future generations will have access to that area, because it is without question one of the finest areas in Ontario in terms of producing recreation, agriculture—just simply playtime, if nothing else.

Now we are in the process of trying to safeguard the Niagara Escarpment. We are talking every day of protecting the escarpment and it would seem to me that when you discuss the protection of the escarpment you must surely discuss the protection of the entire peninsula to ensure that at some point when your children, my children, or perhaps our grandchildren, grow up there—

Mr. Sargent: Time!

Mr. Deans: No time, because I listened to the hon. member and I could speak all night because it happens to be important to me.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): Well, why does the hon. member not say something?

Mr. Deans: I listened to the talk on artificial insemination of cows, I listened to the member for Grey-Bruce talk about things he was groping on, and what I want to say to the minister—

Mr. Sargent: Say something intelligent. The member is making a speech.

Mr. Deans: I am making a speech.

An hon. member: Do not let them get to you.

Mr. Deans: I want to say this to the minister. There will be a time—and I predict it—whether I am here or not there will be a time when in this House all hell will be raised over the fact that protective measures were not taken.

I am saying to the minister now that there are farmers in the peninsula who are working like the devil to try to maintain a prosperous farming community. They are doing it very well. But if we do not take steps now to ensure that the urban and industrial encroachment and the speculation that is now beginning to take hold of the peninsula is stopped, there will not be a peninsula and there will not be any farming community and there will not be any recreational area and we will regret it.

Now the minister can do with it as he pleases. I have said it every year and I will say it every year for as long as I am here.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): That will not be much longer.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, somewhat on the same theme since I am here, the land development people speak, as do those who are knowledgeable in the ways of planning, in the ways of laying out property particularly, they spoke with respect to land-use control of all kinds. I think the minister knows, when he is setting up a scheme of land-use control throughout the province, particularly in southwestern Ontario, that in the area which was just placed under question, there are two phases on which it would be beneficial to designate. One would be prime agricultural lands on one side of the fence and on the other obvious recreational areas.

Starting with that base then, the government can develop its whole picture as to what uses should be made of land and some kind of mandatory safeguard would have to be placed upon that.

This government is not averse to doing that. The Toronto-centred region plan is precisely a plan dedicated to such a proposition.

When I hear these men talk, who are supposed to be experts in the field—by the way I find them very amorphous and very ambiguous people to listen to. They say—and I wonder if the minister agrees with them—“It does not matter.” The market garden, the

small farm, the fruitlands, the vineries. "It does not matter. With the use of fertilizers and phosphates the land may be used for whatever use one wants to put it to"—industrial, factories, residential, high-rise, what you will. To try to preserve land which is alluvial, very fertile by a natural gift, is neither here nor there.

It seems to me, listening to these people, they are very wrong. Lands which, let us say as God's gift, emerged as useful for a particular purpose, produce food of a particular vintage, succulence and what not, ought to be preserved in that very use.

Mr. Deans: Everyone else in the world is doing it.

Mr. Lawlor: If the Okanagan was turned into an asphalt jungle, if the Annapolis Valley was so turned I think we would all be concerned. Not just through romantic aspirations either, nor through some kind of throw-back to a Thoreau life-in-the-woods sort of thing, not because of those sort of things but because we have a kind of a natural sense that certain dispositions of nature are there and ought to be utilized and maintained in that particular line.

When this country finally emerges into some form of independence where we can call our soul our own—that day under the present regime may be somewhat distant—the erosion of our fertile lands and food sources will have been completed because of the government's blind dedication to a particular philosophy or ideology in the free enterprise way that whatever the market sources happen to dictate in a particular context that is the way things must be, instead of intervening for the protection of these soils.

When we finally achieve our independence we may no longer have any fruit to eat in this country.

Mr. Deans: The people will not be able to buy it.

Mr. Lawlor: That would be one of the terrible penalties and sacrifices this people would have to make in order to achieve such an independence. I would like to know the minister's opinion as to whether potash is a substitute for hardpan, and whether he thinks—

Mr. Deans: That is common sense.

Mr. Lawlor: —the cherry orchards, peach orchards and what not of this province could

be placed in some other alternative site such as man disposes in this particular regard.

Mr. Sargent: When does the member's book come out?

Mr. Deans: Listen to the member; this party will take over.

Mr. Sargent: I am listening.

Mr. Lawlor: And so what would the minister think, having all the access to the knowledge in this particular field, in this regard?

So, I suppose, while the minister is in office, shall it be. His decision on that sort of thing will make the final determination as to just what the layout of the province is going to be; partially in terms of regional government because how the agricultural lands and recreational lands are used will be partly disposed by how the government will set up its contour lines for that kind of government.

The minister indicated he did not have any great case for the preservation of fruitlands. I do not think we have to worry very much about the vinelands. They are sufficiently viable, sufficiently economically staple, and therefore the commercial value remains at a high enough level to maintain them against the encroachment of more mercenary forces.

Has the taxation committee driven through that particular portion of the countryside? Even the Conservative members on the bus pointed out the signs along the roadway: "For sale." Everything lying; nothing growing! It is a sort of desecration—and it was admitted to be so by all members of all parties passing through that territory at that time. I shall not forget it and I think the attitude of the minister on these things will be crucial to our future.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Chairman, I do want to ask one or two very quick questions because if we are talking about land acquisition under the ARDA branch, I just want to know where it is in these estimates. If the total \$15 million was used for land acquisition without any of the other programmes it would not go anywhere in terms of the Niagara Escarpment. I do not know what we are talking about.

If there is some possibility of finding an item in here for land acquisition for properties bought to be held in perpetuity, I want

to talk about it and I want to stake out a claim for it right now. But I do not see it here. That is what I want to know—if it is here or if we are talking about something that does not exist in these estimates.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin, I think, has summed it up very neatly. It certainly does not exist in these estimates, because what my hon. friend from Wentworth has said, while it might have wide emotional appeal, and I think to some degree factual appeal, there is certainly no provision made in the ARDA agreement for the acquisition of land at the price of that particular land. The limit is \$150 an acre in the new ARDA agreement.

The matters he raised are of concern to all of us, of course. He referred to something that I said many years ago in this House—and I recall it very well—when I made a similar speech. I am sure it was not nearly as eloquent as his was tonight, but perhaps with less emotion, and I got a series of letters from all over the province indicating that I had better keep my nose out of the affairs of people who owned the land in the Niagara Peninsula. It was their land; they were paying the taxes on it and if they could make more money selling it than they could in growing fruit, they were going to sell it. It was as simple as that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There is no reason in the world why the local municipalities, to which my hon. friend refers, cannot zone the land for agricultural purposes. I live in a municipality where the land is zoned agricultural and the council makes it stick. It is as simple as that—and that is the way it is.

Mr. Deans: May I raise a point?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I listened to the member and I said nothing. I think I was fair to him.

Under The Planning Act the municipalities—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Under The Planning Act the municipalities have the right to zone the land as they see fit, and they have not seen fit to do what my hon. friend suggests should be done—that is to zone the land in perpetuity for agricultural use.

Mr. Lawlor: That is because this government's taxation system forces their hand. Only the province can do that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I agree. That is the next point I want to come to.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The point I want to come to is that, in my opinion, if the land is going to be retained in agricultural use, I as a farmer would be ready to accept the fact that my land was zoned for agricultural use in perpetuity, providing the assessment on that land was based on the productive capacity of that land in the climate zone in which it was located. That to me is the crux of the whole thing!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend from Wentworth suggested, if my—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): That yahoo couple in the back would clap at anything.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): We would clap for the member if we could.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend suggested urban farming. He suggested the land was owned by someone else and I took it for granted that many of these fruit farmers to whom he referred had sold their land and were carrying on under a leaseback basis. Did I understand him correctly?

Mr. Deans: No.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That was what I took down in my notes. I may have been wrong.

Mr. Deans: What I said was that the farmers in the peninsula were being forced to farm within an urban community. That is a different thing.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Have many of them sold their farms?

Mr. Deans: And I said that there were instances where options had been taken or sale had been made of farms that were going to be going out of production within the next few years. That was what I said. If the hon. minister can answer that, then go to it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think that we could resolve the matter through, I suppose, land-use planning, but I think that land-use plan-

ning has to be accompanied by appropriate assessment value based on that land.

Mr. Deans: I agree.

Mr. Lawlor: Why does the minister not do that sometime?

Mr. Deans: I tell the minister that I will support it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is good to know, but when the hon. member supports something I am very suspicious of it; I have to say that.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: The hon. minister is beginning to sound a little rational.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We are greatly concerned about the loss of acreage of fruitland in the Niagara Peninsula. When you drive down the QEW you do see that a lot of land is not growing fruit. It is lying there empty in many areas.

An hon. member: Is the hon. minister concerned?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: When one looks at the number of acres that are in fruit acreage in the peninsula—9,000 acres of peach, 22,000 acres of grapes, 4,500 acres of cherries, 2,000 of pears, 2,000 acres of plums—this is just an illustration of what is there.

I believe that in a survey, if memory serves me correctly, done over the last 10 years, the fruit acreage in the Niagara Peninsula had declined only by five per cent.

Mr. Deans: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: And the total tonnage of fruit produced had increased by much more than that, because of new agricultural practices and what have you.

Mr. Deans: It does not show it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: While the Niagara Peninsula and its climate is more adaptable to the production of soft fruits than any other part of the Province of Ontario, grapes can be grown in other areas.

Mr. Deans: Okay.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is being explored and exploited at the moment.

Frankly, I think this whole matter of land-use planning—and I do not know really, Mr.

Chairman, whether this comes under ARDA, but I suppose it is a factor of rehabilitation—

Mr. Deans: That is right. The minister hit it right on the nose.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It may be that is where it is. I must confess I have to stretch my mind just a bit to see where this debate would fit in—

Mr. Deans: It will do it no harm.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: But I think this matter of land-use planning is something that has to be dealt with. The municipalities have the right to do it. I think that if they want to go ahead they can accomplish just as much as anybody else can, but it is their determination to do it. That local municipal government is made up of elected representatives from the very farm community to which my hon. friend refers.

He referred to a consumer survey—and I assume there were many urban consumers involved in that survey coming from the area which he represents. I have to ask myself whether or not those same consumers, who said to him: "Preserve the Niagara fruitlands. Let us save them to continue to grow fruit for the rest of eternity!"—are those same consumers willing to put their hand in their pocket and pay the price that is necessary for that farmer to maintain the standard of living to which we think he is entitled? Or are those people ready to run and buy Australian fruits at every opportunity when it comes into this country?

This is the question I think we have to ask ourselves, and I am not accusing my hon. friend of misleading anybody. I think he would agree that there is real concern in that regard. I have a feeling that some of these people would be inclined to be price-conscious when they went to the supermarket if there were two price levels established.

There has been an average increase in the price of fruit negotiated by the marketing boards affecting fruit produced in the Niagara Peninsula, and for that matter in other parts of the province, of about five per cent a year over the last several years.

Mr. Peacock: How does the hon. minister expect them to hang on?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is a five per cent increase on top of prices that all along I thought were reasonable prices. Those farmers are getting reasonable prices, but

the problem is their costs are escalating so very fast.

Mr. Deans: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is the problem. One of the great problems of course is the taxation in that particular area. This is something that, as I say, must be dealt with, and I think members will be agreeably surprised with action that will be taken by this government in that regard.

Mr. Peacock: The hon. minister told us that last night.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult, because I was unable to keep notes on everything the minister said.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Do not make too much noise; the hon. member will wake the boys up.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): The hon. member himself has not said anything for a while.

Mr. Deans: I want to point out that he ended up as I began.

I point out to him, as I did previously, that the major problem confronting the farmer is that in spite of the marginal increase in the price of his commodity, the cost of production has outstripped it; and that much of the cost of production is a result of taxation, which is the result of having to farm within an urban community and that we have to treat the farmers of the peninsula in a different way. We have got to recognize that particular problem.

Anyway, I want to ask the minister a question. I want to ask if he is prepared to indicate to the House what recommendations were contained in the second report prepared by Professor Gertler on the fruit industry in the Niagara Peninsula. That was, I understand, prepared and given to the cabinet some months ago, and as I understand it contains some very pertinent and important recommendations that would be to the benefit of most of the farmers in the peninsula and the operations that are going on there. What can the minister tell us about this report?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have nothing to say about it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deans: Can I ask whether or not this report is likely to be made public in the foreseeable future in order that we in the Legislature and the farmers over whom it

has such great jurisdiction, might have an opportunity to understand what is being planned for their future? I mean, it is very much to the point in this rehabilitation; we are losing—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, this is completely out of order.

Mr. Deans: Well, will the minister answer?

Mr. Chairman: I am trying to relate how the debate has to do with the ARDA programme.

Mr. Deans: I am almost finished, so you will not have to worry about —

Mr. Chairman: Whether the hon. member is almost finished or whether he anticipates speaking for an hour, I want to relate it to the ARDA programme if I can.

Mr. Deans: What I am really talking about is the rehabilitation of the Niagara Peninsula, some of which may well be done within the ARDA programme and some may not.

Mr. Chairman: Rehabilitation of the Niagara Peninsula and the ARDA programme, I believe, are two different things.

Mr. Deans: I am not at all sure that is so. It says the rehabilitation and resource development to improve employment opportunities and income. Now if you can tell where anything that I have said is not aimed at improving employment opportunities and income rehabilitation, then of course I will sit down.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister have any comments on the remarks made by the member for Wentworth?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, Mr. Chairman, I thought I dealt with the matter regarding the Niagara fruitlands in reply to the first question. I have no further comments to make.

Mr. Deans: Just one final point then. I want to say to the minister, if he wants to find out if the peninsula farmers are prepared to pay a little more in order to preserve their future, in order to safeguard themselves against the day when they will be forced to live within the price structure established outside of this country, then ask them. Ask them! I am convinced that they are prepared.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What about the other 7.5 million people in Ontario? What about them?

Mr. Deans: Well speak to them, too, because they will suffer—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have, I have!

Mr. Deans: —just as much by the lack of action by the minister as will the people in the peninsula. The problem, my friend, is that the minister is too damned pig-headed to recognize the problem.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. Farquhar: I would just like to see if I cannot find myself talking somewhere on a question that might be related to these estimates. I would like to direct the minister's attention back to the question of land acquisition if I can.

I recognize that the funds for land acquisition come, as far as I know, through The Department of Lands and Forests; and we also know that in connection with some of the things that The Department of Lands and Forests would like to do, the funds are not within their budget. All I want to ask the minister is whether in fact for community pasture purposes or any other purposes, there are funds within his department that could be used to assist The Department of Lands and Forests to acquire certain important pieces of property.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Can I ask the minister why he will not discuss the additional Gertler report on the Niagara area?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am not familiar with the report, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lewis: Well, by way of—I am not in the question period; I do not have to ask a supplementary. I gather that after Professor Gertler submitted his initial report to cabinet in the middle of 1968—it was released in October, 1969, if memory serves me—subsequent to that there was a report following on the heels of the assessment of the Niagara Escarpment which dealt particularly with the problems of fruit growing in the peninsula area. Is the minister aware of that report? Is he familiar with it? Was it brought to his attention?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I must confess I read the report but I am not familiar with it at the moment and I am in no position to discuss it. I cannot remember the details of it at all. It is a long time ago.

Mr. Farquhar: Oh wonderful!

Mr. Lewis: But it is correct that there was a report specifically in this area which at some point in time crossed the minister's desk?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not have any further comment to make, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Farquhar: Can we get back on the estimates? Could I ask the minister if, at some point in the near future, he could discuss with the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) and his director the possibility of finding funds, within his estimates or wherever, for the purpose of assisting a project of land acquisition on Manitoulin Island? I do not have to get into the details of the negotiations that are proceeding and I do not intend to because they do not belong in these estimates at the moment.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: As the hon. member is well aware, discussions are going on now on the particular project to which he refers.

Mr. Farquhar: I have no intention of discussing those negotiations at all of course, and I am aware of them. I only want to try to make an effort to persuade the department that there might be ARDA funds to assist in these negotiations.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I said, yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Will item 1 carry?

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. Spence: I wonder if the minister could answer in regard to the study of transportation for the benefit of agriculture in the province.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes Mr. Chairman, the hon. member mentioned that earlier. I received his letter. We are looking into those possibilities.

There are many ramifications to it. There are some who share his support for this project; there are others who do not. It is a matter that I think we have to take a real good look at. There is no question that water transportation appears to be much less than

rail transportation. If we are going to move grain from southwestern Ontario into export markets it would be very useful to have some type of port facilities.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, the minister mentioned there are about 240,000 acres in the ARDA programme at the moment. What proportion of these are in a trade programme, in reforestation? Also, how large a tract of land does a farmer have to have to apply to reforest a particular area? How large an acreage?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We do not deal with that. That comes under The Department of Lands and Forests. The lands that we have acquired and have been turned over to forestry—I gave a figure of 45,000, I should have read that as 75,000 acres—have been acquired and turned over for forest reclamation purposes, which is under the direction of The Department of Lands and Forests. I believe that there are 225,000 acres that have been leased to farmers under the farm enlargement programme for agricultural purposes.

Mr. Innes: Now the community pastures programme, who owns that land?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: ARDA owns the land.

Mr. Innes: ARDA owns the land and manages it?

Mr. Chairman: Anything further under item 1?

The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Chairman, I had an inquiry of the past-president of the Soya-bean Growers' Marketing Board, and I think I asked a question of the minister the other day with regard to this under co-op loans: Has the Soya-bean Marketing Board made any representation to the department to see if it could obtain any assistance for building a storage area?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is not in this vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: This will be vote 104.

Mr. Ruston: Okay.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further under item 1 of 103?

Mr. Stokes: One brief question.

Mr. Chairman: Item 1, agricultural rehabilitation development.

Mr. Stokes: I do not profess to know anything about farming, but I had occasion to speak on several Indian reserves, and I think I brought one instance to the attention of the minister whereby we were trying to establish a community pasture arrangement on a reserve in my riding.

Apparently the minister investigated the thing and he came back and he said that the soil and climate and many other factors mitigated against the setting up of a community pasture. The chief of that reserve was so infuriated that he went and he planted a bunch of potatoes, and last fall when I visited he made me pose with a bunch of potatoes, about that size, that he grew on the reserve. And he said, "Now take that back to the Minister of Agriculture and tell him he is wrong." Unfortunately I have not got the pictures.

Mr. T. P. Reid: How could one tell the difference?

Mr. W. Hodgson: Sandy ground will grow potatoes, but it will not grow pasture.

Mr. Nixon: You can grow good alfalfa up there.

Mr. Stokes: I am wondering, on what basis did the minister's department make the determination and is there any way in which we—

Mr. Nixon: Roots 20 feet long.

Mr. Stokes:—might set up something that this reserve might qualify for the kind of thing that is covered in this vote?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not know which reserve my hon. friend is talking about.

Mr. Stokes: Heron Bay! Pic Reserve, Heron Bay; north shore of Lake Superior.

An hon. member: I did not think they had a farm up there.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Northwestern Ontario?

Mr. Stokes: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: Let me tell the members that any land that will grow potatoes will grow pasture.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Where is the member for Thunder Bay's number?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Without casting any reflections upon the people who have the reserve at all, when the property was examined it was not determined that it was suitable for a community pasture project. I think my hon. friend will agree that one can grow potatoes on land—

Mr. Stokes: I really do not know; I am asking.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —in areas that would not be quite suitable for a community pasture. There are many Indian reserves that are being used for community pastures. I think there are two on Manitoulin Island as a matter of fact. But this particular one did not seem to have the qualification, and I do not believe there were cattle available to put on the land in the second place.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item one carry?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): No!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: There are two items with which I wanted to deal. The first has to do with the Bruce county community pasture. That is an excellent project; it provides a very real service to the farmers in the county. I am wondering a little bit about the philosophy, if it is the intention of the local committee at the direction of the ARDA branch to ultimately make the pasture farm operate on a break-even basis.

I know, at least I am pretty sure that it is not designed to show any sort of profit and be a profit-making enterprise. I am just wondering if there is any scheme and any plan whereby in the next few years that particular programme will be a break-even project?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the Bruce community pasture is a break-even project now. It is paying all its expenses for the operation of the pasture. It is not intended that it pay back the capital investment in the property, but it is a break-even proposition right now.

Mr. Gaunt: In the calculation of that matter, are any of the buildings—well I guess they have not got any buildings. They have some chutes and some corral areas, but as far as actual buildings are concerned, if I recall correctly—and I have been up there a number of times—they do not have actual buildings on the site.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Only the weigh scale is covered.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, but I am talking about more elaborate buildings. In the computations that are done, it is just the operating cost of that pasture programme for one year as against the revenues that it brings in through the charge to the farmers who pasture cattle on it. That is the sort of balancing done, is it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: And the municipal tax system carries that too.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, right.

Now I am wondering in addition, and I move over to another matter having to do with the municipal taxes on the ARDA-owned properties as it relates to the farm reduction tax programme, I have had one or two cases where the lessee of an ARDA farm called about his tax reduction payment and he said: "I did not get my tax reduction money on the farm which I am leasing from ARDA and I understand that I am entitled to it." In talking with some of the ARDA people I understand that the money is paid to the ARDA branch and they in turn forward the cheque to the farmer. Now then, the catch comes in the business where there is an improper coding, as there has been with so many of these, where the assessment department has made a mistake. Is the onus on the farmer to get the correction made by the assessment department, or will the ARDA branch actually pursue it with the department and the department in turn will take it up with the assessment office in a given area?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the answer to the question is this: Cheques are submitted to the ARDA directorate and they have all been paid out except those where there is a delinquent account and they have retained the cheque in the ARDA branch to offset the delinquency in the account.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, I understand that, but where there is an improper coding, is the minister telling me that those have all been corrected and the moneys all paid out in those cases?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We are not aware of any improper coding in the ARDA accounts. There may have been but we are not aware of it.

Mr. Gaunt: There has been one to my knowledge and I would have to check—there

may have been two, but certainly there is one up in Bruce county. I drew it to the attention—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Great Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: Pardon me?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Great Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: No, no, in Bruce county.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): He did not say Grey-Bruce. He said great Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, of course, the great Bruce, the Treasurer says—

Mr. Nixon: Any delegates from up there?

Mr. Gaunt: —the great Bruce and I would certainly concur with that.

Mr. Nixon: They have one from Waterloo South.

Mr. Gaunt: I am wondering what the procedure will be. I am telling the minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that there was a case where an ARDA farm was not coded as farm property. I am not sure what it was coded as; whether it was coded as residential or whether it was coded as commercial. I am not sure but it was improperly coded and the payment was not made to ARDA.

I am wondering, as a matter of clarification, because when I go home on the weekend my phone is going to be ringing no doubt and the farmer in question is going to be asking me where his cheque is. I want to have it absolutely clear as to the procedure that is involved. If he assumes the responsibility to get the assessing department, the assessment office in Owen Sound, to make that correction, then that is fine. I will inform him accordingly.

If, on the other hand, the ARDA branch will do it on his behalf and then forward the cheque to him, then that is fine, too. I will be able to pass that along to him, but I just want to have it absolutely clear as to what the procedure will be in this situation.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I will relieve my hon. friend's concern for the weekend if he would tell my friend Mr. Crown, who is at the table here, after the House adjourns tonight, the name of the farmer. I do not want him to mention it here. Give him the name of the farmer, the lot and concession, and we will check it out.

We are not aware that this has happened, but as I say it could easily happen and there may be other cases, we do not know. We do know there have been some cases. But as I explained the other day, it has been corrected now so that we will be able to look after those farmers who were improperly coded. We will check it out through ARDA and see that the man is looked after.

Mr. Stokes: The member for Huron-Bruce should ask the minister if he will let him deliver the cheque?

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 1 carry? The hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. Innes: The minister said that delinquent people who owed ARDA had their rebate cheques held. Is that true?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes. Because we paid the taxes to the municipality.

Mr. Innes: And yet in the municipalities across Ontario where there were many land owners who had not paid their tax arrears for three years, the department returned it right to the owners and let the municipalities go look for it, and yet—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I said to my hon. friend the other day we did not know whether those taxes were being withheld purposely or whether—

Mr. Innes: Oh no? Well, the minister could have found out.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We had no way to know, so we paid everybody.

Mr. Innes: Oh yes there is.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on item 1?

Item 1 agreed to.

On item 2:

Mr. Chairman: Grants under The Community Centres Act. Any discussion on item 2?

Item 2 agreed to.

On item 3:

Mr. Chairman: The Ontario Telephone Service. The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the matter of consolidations of small rural telephone service companies across the province is actually continuing at an acceler-

ated rate. For a few years the amalgamations were becoming quite frequent. I know the minister introduced a bill, I believe it was last year, with my full support certainly, allowing these companies to go into various other areas of investment in order to sort of supplement their operation and to put it on a more sound basis.

I know there are still quite a large number of small rural companies and I know they have trouble competing in the market against Bell Telephone with all its capital and its resources and the fact that it can instal new equipment—it is pretty hard for small rural telephone companies to compete, and yet the Ontario Telephone Service requires that they maintain certain standards and meet certain requirements in order to provide a minimum standard of service to the telephoning public which they serve.

Could the minister first of all give me the remaining number of small rural telephone companies in the province and the number of amalgamations that have taken place in the past year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I can tell the hon. member that there are 51 left, and 10 of those are making arrangements over the next three years to phase out. So that it looks as though we will end up with about 40 strong, smaller, independent companies. About nine have amalgamated in the last year, so I am told.

Mr. Gaunt: Have any of those nine been taken over by Bell or have they amalgamated among themselves?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There has been some of both. We do not have the exact breakdown here. Those figures are obtainable but we do not have them exactly. I just cannot answer that.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: In this vote of \$96,100—this is under the rehabilitation to help the outlying parts of the province basically. We have an area up our way where we have a dentist—we had a hell of a time getting him but finally we did get a dentist—and now he cannot get a telephone. We cannot give him telephone service because we have not got the money and the telephone company will not extend it to him because of the fact that it is an economically impossible line for them. Could the minister give us \$2,000 or \$3,000 for that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would like to, but I would be doubtful.

Mr. Sargent: The minister is doubtful?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes. Who has the franchise in the area? Does the member know?

Mr. Sargent: It is up Lion's Head way, near Tobermory. I can get the name of the service.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Maybe the member would be good enough to provide that information to us and we will follow up on that and explore the possibility.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Simcoe East.

Mr. G. E. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a question or two. I am well aware of the counselling that the Ontario Telephone Service Commission gives to some of the smaller independent exchanges or companies—I have at least two in my area who are enterprising, still trying to operate as a viable unit—and I am wondering if this service, in addition to the financial counselling or business administration counselling advice, gives any advice from an engineering standpoint to assist these smaller exchanges?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, we do. We provide expert engineering service to all of them. We cannot do them all at once, but we certainly have that service available. It has helped a great many of these independent telephone companies to make the adjustments that modernization has required.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 3 carry?

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter I want to deal with in this vote. It has to do with the billing procedures of some of the smaller telephone companies.

I think there has been some movement in the Ontario Telephone Service Commission to encourage these companies to adopt a uniform billing system; whether it be every month or every second month, I think the point is that it should be done on a regular basis.

There is one telephone company of which I am aware—maybe there are more—that does its billing by way of an addition to the tax notice. This is done once a year. If the municipality is switching to a twice-yearly system, then of course it will be done twice a year.

But in one particular case, the farmer was not living on the farm and he leased out the house; the person who was living in the house went on using the telephone and he ultimately moved out but he would not pay the bill. So the farmer was stuck with the bill and he really had no legal recourse, as I understand it. It was a case of the farmer having to locate the person who was renting the home and to actually sue him or put a judgement against him or garnishee his wages in some fashion in order to recover that.

Now it seems to me that this type of thing should not happen. I think that all telephone companies—regardless of whether it is Bell or the small rural companies—should do their billing monthly. I see no reason why they could not do that other than the fact that it might be somewhat more costly, not a great deal, but somewhat more costly because they have the mailing and the stamps and so on.

If that had been the case in this instance, this would not have happened. Presumably if the person who was living in the house had run on for two or three months, maybe even two months, his phone would have been cut off and at least the farmer, if he had to ultimately pay the bill, would not have been faced with one so high—I think it was \$162 or something of that nature. It would maybe have been only \$20 or \$30, but it certainly would not have reached the amount at which it ended up.

Now is the service in a position to do this, other than on a suggested basis, other than to go to the company and say: "Look now, we think it is in the best interests of your patrons and users that you do this"? If it is on a suggested basis, I wonder would the commission entertain this idea? If they have perhaps a little more leverage to insist that the telephone companies do this, I am wondering if they will do so. I think that it could prevent this kind of thing happening. I would be interested in hearing the minister's comments.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There are one or two things that—there is a slight distraction here on my right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Gaunt: Is the Minister of Trade and Development giving the minister trouble? Is he giving the minister trouble?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: First of all, the farmer would actually be the subscriber and he would have the equity in that system. Certainly in the case of that phone he had an

arrangement with his tenant that probably left something to be desired. But nevertheless this is an isolated situation that has come to our attention.

I am on one of these independent systems. We are billed every three months and I think it is a reasonably good way to do it. I would hate to see the telephone commission go to our telephone system up there in the great counties of Perth or Huron and say to them: "You bill every month."

I tell you I just would not want to be a part of that kind of a decision. I think these people—

Mr. Nixon: Are they one of the systems that are selling out?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No sir, they are one of the better systems in Ontario.

Mr. Innes: That is not what I heard last night.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well it may not be what the member heard last night, but just give that system time and it will work that situation out over there too. I do not think they would want to be told to bill every month.

I am advised by Mr. Bennett, assistant deputy minister, who is also on the telephone services commission, that where there is a complaint launched—

Mr. Nixon: Is he on the telephone commission too?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —by someone concerning this matter of billing, they will discuss this with the directors of the company, but they have never yet forced anybody to go to a different system of billing. They do explain to them the advantages that can accrue to that type of billing, but by the same token I think we must recognize that these are local rural telephone systems and I would like to see the local rural people run them. They are the people who own them and I think they are the people who should make the decisions themselves.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gaunt: All right, I agree in part with the minister. I think he makes a point. I am wondering about the number of companies that actually bill irregularly or perhaps only bill once or twice a year. Would the minister have any idea of the number of companies which have a billing procedure other than once a month?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No I do not have it.

Mr. Gaunt: Could the minister find out that information?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We could find it out, but I really do not think it is a very important issue, Mr. Chairman, quite frankly. I just do not think so.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on this issue, can the minister tell me whether the telephone commission retains some power to control the service after a small rural telephone company sells out or joins the Bell network? Do they, in fact, have any continuing responsibility to see that the service is at least maintained as well and as extensively as it was before?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, the agreement of sale or transfer has to be considered by the commission and then the commission sees that the terms of that agreement are carried out by the purchasing system. That is the continuing relationship.

Mr. Nixon: Does the commission have any responsibility to deal with complaints after the sale when a company with a federal charter, such as Bell, in fact has the operating responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, if the complaint pertains to the agreement then the commission has some authority. But if it is a complaint unrelated to the terms of the agreement that were enunciated at the time of takeover, the commission does not have any authority. Does the member follow me?

Mr. Nixon: I suppose the agreement that is accepted by the commission basically would maintain at least as good service as before, let us say in the toll-free calling range. Certainly complaints have been sent on to me as a local member from certain areas where, when Bell has taken over, there have been complaints that the toll-free calling range has been inadequate compared with other Bell toll-free ranges, although perhaps not restricted from what it was before.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Was it the same now as it was when it was taken over? Was there any change?

Mr. Nixon: I know it is considered inadequate now.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It may be considered inadequate, but was it the same as it was when it was taken over?

Mr. Nixon: Well, it is inadequate now.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is a different matter.

Mr. Chairman: Does item 3 carry?

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I—

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. member have very much more to say?

Mr. Gaunt: I am not a very fast talker. It may run on for a few minutes.

Mr. Chairman: I am very disappointed. I had it ticked off.

Mr. Nixon: Can you un-initial it?

Mr. Chairman: I can un-initial it!

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come to a certain resolution, and begs for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply reports that it has come to a certain resolution and begs for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I perhaps might indicate to the members something of what the business of the House is expected to be for the next few days. Tomorrow I anticipate we will continue with the estimates of The Department of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): No second readings?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think not tomorrow!

On Monday we will perhaps seek to do some second readings, and whether these estimates presently before the committee are disposed of or not the minister will not be available Monday. We will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests on Monday, and perhaps then some second readings, depending on the exigencies of the situation.

In the committee on estimates on Monday, The Department of Energy and Resources Management. That will be followed in due

course by Public Works; and in the House Lands and Forests and Agriculture and Food probably will be followed by the Provincial Secretary's estimates.

I understand that the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Lewis) will be speaking, I believe, at 4:30 on Tuesday—I believe it is 4:30 to some hour—and we may get some second readings done on that day.

Mr. Speaker: I presume that the private members' hour, in accordance—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There will be private members' hour as usual. I anticipate night sittings as usual on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Before we move adjournment, Mr. Speaker, what committee is going to be hearing the estimates of Energy and Resources? Will it be the standing committee on natural resources or an estimates committee?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: An estimates committee on natural resources.

Mr. Nixon: Well on that point, Mr. Speaker, surely it is the estimates committee where there is the availability of substitution so that a variety of members can take part not only in the debate but in the votes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I did not take time to look at the record.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Come on; somebody must know what is going on.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is on the record. When the committees were set up, the estimates for each department were designated there. I could check it, Mr. Speaker. I will have it for the members in due course.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Do not worry about us.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): I think we should debate Kieran's resignation. That would be more interesting.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, I understand from our whip today that the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management would be referred to the estimates committee.

Mr. Nixon: Oh good!

Mr. T. P. Reid: Who is running the show?

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at 10:35 o'clock p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 29, 1971

Estimates, Department of Agriculture and Food, Mr. Stewart, continued	1023
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to	1056



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, April 30, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 30, 1971

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This morning our guests in the west gallery are students from Queen Elizabeth High School, Sioux Lookout, and in both galleries students from Downsview Secondary School in Downsview and Richard W. Scott School in Toronto.

Later today there will be students with us from King Edward School, Windsor; St. Ambrose Separate School, Toronto; Lewis S. Beattie Secondary School, Willowdale, and Levack District High School in Levack.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, an agreement has been reached between the federal government and the government of Ontario to participate in a rent supplement programme that will provide accommodation for 1,100 Ontario families.

An hon. member: It is about time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is the first time the federal government has agreed to participate in a rent supplement scheme under which Ontario Housing Corporation will lease accommodation from the private market for families on the waiting list. The subsidy involved will be shared 50 per cent by the federal government, 42.5 per cent by the province, and 7.5 per cent by the municipality involved. The reaching of this agreement will greatly facilitate our efforts in this field and reduce the time involved between the offering of units and the time they can be filled. So long as the units offered fall within the general guidelines worked out by the two governments, the corporation can directly enter into the lease without referral of the individual units to Ottawa for specific approval. The time involved in such referral had a serious effect on our pilot rent supplement project in Metropolitan Toronto.

In Metropolitan Toronto, a total of 500 units in two-, three-, four- and five-bedroom sizes will be leased from private housing stock. OHC has already issued a proposal

call for these units and, at the present time, corporation officials are assessing something in excess of 400 units which have been offered to date.

The remaining 600 units will be located in 19 communities, and calls will be issued after necessary discussions are held with participating municipalities. The first such call has already been issued in Kitchener where the resolution passed by city council allows the use of this technique.

Ontario is very pleased that the federal government has joined with the province in this programme. We see it as a useful supplement to our construction programme and, hopefully, a means to obtain larger bedroom units which are in short supply.

Families accommodated under this programme will pay rent based on the geared-to-income rental scale with the three levels of government subsidizing the difference between that and the actual rent of the units.

Mr. Speaker, the programme is similar to the rent certificate programme operated by this government in 1960. Before it was phased out in 1964, the plan at its peak provided rental assistance for 240 families. Lack of financial participation from the federal and Metropolitan Toronto governments, and the fact that landlords demanded higher rents when the short-term leases came up for renewal, resulted in it being dropped. Now, of course, under this new plan we will be able to lease for as long as 10 years.

A decision to proceed with the leasing of further units over and above the 1,100 referred to under this new programme will depend upon OHC's success in leasing suitable accommodation and, ultimately, on market conditions.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAMME

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, further to the minister's statement, I wonder if he could explain why

it is necessary to involve the municipalities directly on a cost-sharing basis when the responsibility for finding the accommodations and the decisions on who gets them will essentially be a provincial decision?

My second question is what information has gone out to the municipalities already which would enable the city of Kitchener to be prepared to take part in this programme at this stage?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in respect to the first question, this is an arrangement made between the officials of the two governments. I cannot advise the hon. member as to what circumstances or what motivation entered into the final decision. Presumably, this was felt to be the only way it was advisable to go into it. I do not know sufficient of the background to be able to give the hon. member any further information. If I do get that information, of course, I will provide him with it.

I cannot recall the second question.

Mr. Nixon: How come Kitchener is ready to go ahead when the minister just made the announcement? I think it is very odd.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because the municipality passed a resolution and this is required. We intend to go ahead and consider other municipalities and they will be so advised. I think they pretty well all know what the circumstances are and how they qualify for this.

Presently those areas being considered outside of Metropolitan Toronto are Kitchener, London, Hamilton, Kingston, Peterborough, Thunder Bay, Brampton, Brantford, Galt, Guelph, Mississauga, Oshawa, Belleville, Sarnia, Windsor, North Bay, Sault Ste. Marie, St. Catharines, and Ottawa, and presumably any other municipality which might qualify.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Surely the minister cannot say that it is officials that decide what levels of financial participation are entered into by the three levels of government. I would say—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has asked his question. Now he is about to make a statement and that is not part of a question.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: Well, I have asked a question. I would like an answer.

Mr. Speaker: That is entirely up to the minister. He may or may not answer as he sees fit.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have not heard the question.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker said there was a question, so there must have been one.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member asked the question. Perhaps he would ask it again.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I may rephrase my question, sir, for the convenience of yourself and the minister—

Mr. Peacock: Statements by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is too experienced a politician and a member of this House to think that when he says, "I will say," he is asking a question, and I would ask him that in the future he would phrase a question as a question.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, thank you for your guidance and assistance.

I have a supplementary question to the minister. Why can he say that officials make the decision as to the financial contribution of the municipality when it is obviously his role as minister to make this policy decision?

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): How fierce!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I merely said that it was left to the officials of the two governments to come to some reasonable arrangement in respect of how this could be carried out. There may very well be considerations other than financial which led them to the conclusion that it would be better to have municipalities involved financially. Now as to what goes on at the moment, I am not in the position to say. The question is a good one. I will get the answer to it, of course.

In the final analysis, Ontario Housing Corporation, as well as the housing authorities representing the federal government, have to go to their respective governments, their respective treasury boards, their respective cabinets for approval of the policy. So, in the final analysis, it is the decision of the government because there are subsidies involved. I will get that information for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Other than the participation of the federal government, how does this programme differ from the two earlier rent supplement programmes announced by the minister's predecessor between 1968 and 1970?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I thought that was explained at least in general terms in the original statement. In the first place, in the rent certificate programme there was no participation on the part of the federal government.

Mr. Peacock: Not the rent certificate programme; not the one that expired in 1964.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right. In the other one I was referring to, the federal government insisted, as I understand it, that every time there was an arrangement made where the landlord was prepared to rent his premises out, each individual case had to go to Ottawa to be processed; by the time that red tape was processed, the landlord got tired of waiting and just did not wait.

Mr. Peacock: That was in 1964.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There was a tremendous amount of red tape involved. Under the present arrangement the federal government leaves it entirely up to OHC to make its own arrangements locally and they will make an arrangement with the landlord, process the applications, and process the paper work.

Mr. Peacock: That was the 1964 programme.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No! The 1964 programme fell down because of the reasons I explained in my statement.

Mr. Peacock: Right, but I am talking about the other two since then.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member wishes to ask a supplementary, he should do so properly.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member is talking about the other two since. I am talking about the other two. Under the temporary arrangement that was made at the time, we had to get this information for the federal government. It just took too long. Further, it was not possible to make the kind of a lease which a landlord was interested in; that is, something more than a very short-term lease.

Under the agreement with the federal government, we are now in a position apparently to make a lease between three and 10 years which, of course, a potential landlord would show a great deal more interest in than a short-term lease which may only last for two or three months.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West has a further supplementary.

Mr. Peacock: In the rent supplement programmes announced since the collapse of the 1964 programme, can the minister tell the House how many units in fact were leased?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Pardon?

Mr. Peacock: Since the collapse of the 1964 rent supplement programme, can the minister tell the House how many units in fact were leased?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not think that I have that information.

Mr. Peacock: None.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It would not take the hon. minister very long to compile it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not say it would.

Mr. Lewis: These rent supplement programmes have not saved housing in Ontario yet.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville was on his feet. Has he a supplementary?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, if I may ask of the minister were consultations under way between both the municipalities and the federal government before this programme was implemented?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should add that the difficulty in making a statement in respect to any arrangements of this nature with the federal government is that the announcements should be made simultaneously. As a matter of fact, because of that, I always make it a practice, as far as is humanly possible, to check every statement before I make it in this House and go over it thoroughly so I am completely familiar with the details. Unfortunately—

Mr. Nixon: What was that? What was that?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It is too early for that kind of put-on.

Mr. Lewis: It is Friday morning; do not put us on.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would not change anything in that statement if I had to do it all over again. There is nothing wrong with it; it is factual. Now I take it, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The minister could inject a little truth into it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members would like to hear the balance of what I have to say in respect of the statement.

There is an arrangement between OHC and their counterparts in Ottawa that the federal minister will make a statement simultaneously with the statement made in the province, whichever province they are making these arrangements with. This was one of the problems—

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Assuming he does not resign in the meantime.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): What was that?

Mr. Makarchuk: Assuming he does not resign in the meantime.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is one of the problems—somewhat like the red tape that was involved previously when we had to go to the federal government and give them all the details of the unit we were going to rent, or something of that nature. That has been cut down.

Apparently we have not been able to find a way to cut down on the red tape as between public statements arranged for simultaneous delivery by the two governments. This was handed to me last night. I got as much information as I could for the hon. members this morning, because the statement was made this morning, I think, at about 9 o'clock in the House of Commons.

So I have given the members all the information I could possibly get together between last night and now. Any questions that the hon. members are asking, or are

prepared to ask, and for which I do not have the information, I have told them I will be very pleased to get it for them.

Mr. Lewis: Just tell us how many flats you intend to rent.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We always co-operate with the federal government.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville has a supplementary?

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister did not reply as to whether the municipalities were consulted before this programme was to be implemented. If they were consulted, would the minister care to reply as to whether he would ask Treasury Board for some type of grant to enable the municipalities to carry on with this programme, because as a result of it—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has asked his question; he is now making a statement.

Mr. B. Newman: Did he consult with the the municipalities?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The question was asked previously and I think I answered it as to whether municipalities had been advised.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister saying to the House that he, as the responsible person in the government, had nothing to do with these negotiations until the officials had an agreement which was then placed in his hands to be read here?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the negotiations have been going on for some time. The OHC comes to the government to ask for an allotment of funds to carry on a certain programme. OHC obviously had to come to the government to say, "We are entering into negotiations—with your permission—with the federal government. This will probably be what the subsidy will be." They ask for approval; obviously if we approve, if Treasury Board and cabinet approve of the subsidy, obviously we must be approving of the plan to go ahead and discuss with federal authorities.

Mr. Nixon: The minister does not know much about it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary, does the minister know how much it is going to cost the municipalities in the current fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, of course not, Mr. Speaker. It would depend upon the sort of an arrangement the municipality enters into in a particular case. If they have decided that they will enter into this programme, that they want to participate for 50 units, 100 units or even 10 units, it will depend upon that as to what amount they are prepared to go for.

Mr. Singer: The minister mentioned 1,100 units as a potential for the current year; if that full 1,100 units is taken up, how much is 7.5 per cent of the cost of subsidizing 1,100 units?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That information I have, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member will wait until a little later, I will have the documents in about—

Mr. Peacock: Who is buried in Grant's tomb?

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, does the minister know how municipalities that have already fixed their budget are going to be able to participate in this without redoing their whole budget scheme?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, no.

Mr. Singer: Another supplementary question: Does the minister know whether or not Ontario Municipal Board approval will be necessary for this kind of municipal expenditure, because apparently it is going to extend for a longer period than one year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is no, although it would be much more helpful if we could see a lot more alacrity by the opposition so that we are able to get more housing units. Everyone over there seems to be unhappy about it.

Mr. Nixon: Not at all.

Mr. Singer: We want to know how the minister is going to do it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Peacock: They have not rented a single unit.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Are members over there happy to see us arranging these units?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will get the members all this information. Why do members opposite not give us their blessings?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): The minister made a better jailer than he did a tradesman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not what the hon. member said when I was Minister of Correctional Services.

Mr. Speaker: Order, the Minister of Municipal Affairs advises me that he has a statement which is of interest and upon which there might be questions. Would the House agree to reverting to statements and then we will come back to the Leader of the Opposition and questions?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the assistance and co-operation of the members. I am pleased to announce the provisions for payments to designated mining municipalities for 1971 and future years, referred to by the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) in his budget statement of Monday, April 26. The formula which is the basis of the new scheme was developed in association with the mining municipalities and is presented as a long-term solution to a somewhat difficult problem. Any change of formula inevitably implies that there will be some change in the distribution pattern of the provincial assistance previously established, and this scheme is no exception.

If we need any reassurance that such a change is overdue, however, we need to look only at the comments of the Ontario committee on taxation and the select committee of the Legislature. Both were unanimous in their criticism of the formula which operated to the end of 1969. It was originally hoped to introduce a new formula in 1970, but this proved impossible due to a lack of information on the assessment of mines processing facilities in sufficient time.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): In time for the election though.

Hon. Mr. Bales: An interim programme was developed for 1970. The new formula draws some of its inspiration from the comments and suggestions of the members of both of the House committees to which I have referred. I considered them, and the representations of the Association of Mining Municipalities have also been carefully considered.

I feel sure that the latter will agree that the new procedures will more adequately reflect the current requirements.

The mining revenue payment will continue to fill the role of a taxation deficiency grant but, in future, the province will measure the deficiency attributable to each designated municipality by comparing the actual per capita assessment to a predetermined standard. In effect, this programme will mark a first step toward a grant system based on the needs and resources of municipalities. Each mining municipality will receive a payment which is related to its assumed fiscal impairment. The predetermined standard assessment—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): That is our tax foundation grant.

Hon. Mr. Bales:—which will remain fixed has been set at \$10,000 of provincially equalized assessment per head of assessed population. The actual per capita equalized assessment for each municipality will be deducted from this standard in order to determine the deficiency. When the scheme becomes fully operable, the province will, in effect, make a payment in lieu of taxes on this assessment deficiency.

For example, we are dealing with a municipality which has a per capita equalized assessment of \$8,000. Since the standard assessment is \$10,000 per capita, the province will contribute the difference. Thus, the basic payment to the municipality would be 20 per cent of the approved municipal expenditures.

The payment to those municipalities which are not deemed to be fully dependent on the mining industry will be modified. Municipalities in which 10 per cent or more of the population is composed of resident miners, will be deemed to be fully dependent on the mining industry.

For those municipalities in which the ratio of resident miners to total population is less than 10 per cent the payment will be reduced in proportion. For example, a municipality with only nine per cent resident miners would receive 90 per cent of the payment under the basic formula.

To facilitate the changeover and to prevent undue fluctuations in tax burdens, the implementation will be phased in over three years so that the new basis will not be fully functional until 1973.

Perhaps inevitably there are still a few unknown quantities and the government will be keeping a close watch over the situation to ensure that the new system operates satisfactorily. We are satisfied that the new system is a substantial improvement, but we are prepared to consider any adjustments that may become necessary as experience is developed.

Mining revenue payments have become a very complex topic and we propose to introduce a number of associated reforms aiming at simplifying the system. I will briefly mention only two of them.

Firstly, in future, mining revenue payments will be made exclusively for the benefit of the municipal general fund. There will be no apportionment of the payment to other purposes or bodies. In 1970, \$2.5 million of the payment was allocated to boards of education and these apportionments operated to reduce the grants to the school boards. In 1971, this will not apply and we anticipate that, as a result, the school board grants will be substantially increased.

We expect that, although the provision for mining revenue payments has been reduced by \$700,000 this year, education grants will increase by approximately \$1,100,000. Thus, the taxpayers in mining areas will benefit to the extent of some \$400,000.

Mr. Nixon: We will have to have the Minister of Trade explain this.

Hon. Mr. Bales: It is our intention to ensure that no taxpayers suffer by reason of any net deficiency in the amount paid to municipalities.

Secondly, in the future, no municipality will be designated as a mining municipality unless it has at least 2.5 per cent of its population represented by resident miners. This will not, however, affect any municipality previously designated. By the time the new scheme is fully implemented in 1973, I estimate the programme will be assisting the mining municipalities to the extent of about \$11 million annually or some \$3 million more than they received in 1970.

The new regulations governing the new payment system will be issued shortly. I shall be advising the designated municipalities of the amount they may expect to receive for 1971 as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker: We now revert to the question period. The Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

MINING REVENUE PAYMENTS

Mr. Nixon: Further to the statement that the minister has just completed and which I think will have to be examined rather carefully—

Mr. Singer: By the Minister of Trade.

Mr. Nixon: Is it to be understood that the mining revenue payments in fact will be reduced this year?

Hon. Mr. Bales: They will not be reduced in the net amount. In the actual amount, yes.

Mr. Nixon: They will be reduced this year?

Mr. Singer: Not in the net amount, but in the actual amount. That is a very clear distinction, that one.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, in previous years part of the mining revenue payment was allocated to school boards. This year none of the mining revenue payment goes to school boards. All of it remains with the municipality for municipal purposes.

Mr. Nixon: Why would it be reduced?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Because last year part of it was paid to the school boards in lieu of grants. This year the grants are paid direct to the school boards.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): Can the hon. Leader of the Opposition not understand that? It is pretty clear I would say.

Hon. Mr. Bales: In the result there is an increase of an estimated \$400,000, but to ensure that no municipal taxpayer receives less than he did last year, we will make up any net deficiency that actually develops.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay has a supplementary?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What does the increase announced in the budget by way of mining revenue payments mean to municipalities which qualify on a per capita basis?

Secondly, will the amount that accrues to mining municipalities be taken into consideration in cost-sharing programmes, such as district homes for the aged and other cost-sharing programmes?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I will take the last one first. This is a direct payment to the municipality and there is no money deducted from it for those other purposes. It is a straight payment, dependent, of course, on the fact

that we have to have their final budgets before we can actually calculate payment.

Mr. Stokes: Would the minister answer the first question on a per capita basis?

Hon. Mr. Bales: We use the per capita data to obtain the assessment basis and that is how we figure out what the deficiency is.

Mr. Stokes: Has the minister calculated what the increase will mean to mining municipalities on a per capita basis for the forthcoming fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No. We will do it on a municipality basis. We do not do it on a per capita basis.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River has a supplementary?

Mr. T. P. Reid: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate what, if any, across-the-board increase there will be in the revenues that each municipality will receive under this new tax system?

Hon. Mr. Bales: For an individual municipality?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot do that. We have to have the actual or final budgets for the individual municipalities before we can actually calculate the amount. But I think the important point is that the municipalities should understand that they will not be receiving less than they received in 1970.

Mr. T. P. Reid: But not necessarily more?

Hon. Mr. Bales: They will be receiving more, we have estimated, by about \$400,000 overall.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Spread over all the municipalities?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West has a supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: When, Mr. Speaker, will the schedule be published to show what each mining municipality receives? When will the hon. minister have that?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, we have to have the actual budget from the municipalities before the final amounts can be calculated. As soon as we receive that information we can then calculate the amounts and they would be advised directly.

In the meantime we give the assurance that they will receive no less than they received in 1970.

Mr. Lewis: I understand that, but the hon. minister has already indicated in the budget that he anticipates an increase of \$400,000 overall. That anticipated increase must already be broken down by his department in order to arrive at the figure. Is there no way of indicating to the House which mining municipalities are affected?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The basis on which it was done was to take their preliminary budgets for last year and then calculate it on that basis and make some allowance for increases.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. minister means it is a ballpark figure.

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, it is not a ballpark figure.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

Mr. Lewis: By way of further supplementary: Has the minister done that on the basis of his new formula or the old formula?

Hon. Mr. Bales: We took the preliminary budget of last year and applied the new formula to it so as to obtain some reasonable estimates of what it would be.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre has a supplementary?

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A supplementary question: Would the town of Goderich, which as I remember, was one of the very highest beneficiaries of the mining tax on a per capita basis, also continue to get the same amount as it has previously, even though it would seem to be far out of line with other mining municipalities in the province? Would there be an adjustment downward over a period of years to bring it in line?

Hon. Mr. Bales: There was an arrangement made in reference to Goderich because of the salt mines there, and there is a special regulation that pertains to that. I think it is scaled down over a period. This I cannot be positive of—the rate—but I know that at the moment they will receive the same benefit as they did last year.

Normally they would receive a lesser payment but they will be protected under this for the phase-in period.

Mr. Deacon: A further supplementary: Is it planned to adjust the \$10,000 assessment base if inflation or other factors cause this level of assessment to lose its relevance as a basis of measurement?

Hon. Mr. Bales: For example, we have used the figure of \$10,000 now, which is higher than the average per capita assessment across the province. If that increases we would certainly want to look at it to make changes in the future.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce has a supplementary?

Mr. Sargent: No, sir, my question is answered.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Timiskaming has a supplementary?

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Would the minister clarify one point for me? He has guaranteed that there will be no drop in payment for 1971? Does that extend into 1972 and 1973?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Right through to 2000.

Hon. Mr. Bales: No. We anticipate that there will be an increase in each year, but when you are introducing a new system and a new type of calculation there are bound to be some municipalities that might receive less. We are guaranteeing against a net loss for this year. Then, when we look at the actual figures at the end of this year, we will be in a position to see whether we need to make that kind of adjustment in future. If we do, I will certainly give it careful consideration.

Mr. Jackson: One further question, Mr. Speaker: On the basis of a town that is now dependent—10 per cent or greater—on this mine revenue payment, if in the future the mining population declines—

Hon. Mr. Bales: Could the hon. member repeat the first part of his question? I did not quite hear it.

Mr. Jackson: Taking the example of a town that is dependent on mining at this moment, where the mining population declines, would the mine revenue payment decline at the same rate?

Hon. Mr. Bales: If the number of miners in the municipality decreased below 10 per cent, then there would be an adjustment because they are not as dependent upon the mining industry as they were previously. But that has to be worked out carefully.

Now, on one point I think I may have misled the House. I said 1971 budgets—those will not come until next year. What we will have to use is the budget of 1970 and those final figures or expenditures are not available until well on in the summer of 1971.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

PROVINCIAL ELECTION DATE

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Tourism: Can he provide the House with a translation of his comments on the French network yesterday in which he, as a minister of the Crown, indicated that the election date would be somewhat postponed?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, it is quite—

Mr. Lewis: Try saying it in French.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well, I do not want to embarrass the hon. member.

I was asked to comment on the budget by the French network of the CBC the day before yesterday, I believe. I wish to assure the Leader of the Opposition that my comments were very favourable about the budget and then I was asked—

Mr. MacDonald: Then the minister violated cabinet secrecy.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: There is not any secret there—but I think I was asked whether this would be the last budget before the election and I said, "Well, I would think so." That is all I said and my guess is just as good as the hon. member's. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It might even be better.

OLD FORT WILLIAM EXPENDITURES

Mr. Nixon: I have another question of the Minister of Tourism. Can he tell the House what the decision is in the expenditure of \$5 million in the establishment of Old Fort William in the Thunder Bay city area as a major tourist attraction, which was announced some weeks ago by the former Premier and is supposed to go forward immediately?

Mr. Lewis: And has just lost the seat for the member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman) over there.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, I think you will find in the budget that we have an item for \$1 million for 1971.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question of the minister: Can he explain why it was decided that the original site of the fort could not be usable and in fact it had to be located some five miles from that original site?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: No, Mr. Speaker. This factor is still not quite definite. We are meeting with the vice-president of CPR on Monday next, and as you know there have been disputes in Thunder Bay about the original site and the site which the department had possibly preferred.

The Minister of Public Works and myself spent two days listening to groups of people, the historical societies, who were opposed to the new site, the Point de Meuron. Following this we said that we would approach the president of the CPR and even the federal government, we might need their help, to see if the original site was available because we did get a letter from the CPR telling us that it was not. This matter should be resolved by Monday.

Mr. Nixon: By way of supplementary, is it possible that the original location—that is, the one announced by the former Premier—will not be where the actual construction takes place?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, the big problem is that the original site is not available now. It is owned by the CPR—I mean the tracks—and that is what we have to resolve shortly.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, the minister was in Thunder Bay not very long ago making a categorical announcement that the old fort will be built on the new site despite the evidence of widespread public opposition. Why has the policy been changed?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, there has been no change of policy at all. I spent two days in Thunder Bay to hear groups of people who were against the Point de Meuron and we said from there that we would discuss it with CPR. We have tried time and again to get the president of CPR on the phone in the last two weeks. We are finally getting his assistant on Tuesday next.

Mr. Lewis: The minister got him on the phone?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: On the phone. We have been trying to get appointments to see him, and we are seeing his vice-president on Monday.

Mr. Lewis: You should tell him you are a cabinet minister in Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management—

Mr. Lewis: Have you ever phoned the CN?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Oh, shut up.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Scarborough West will have his turn in due course.

JAMES BAY HYDRO PROJECTS

Mr. Nixon: There will not be any time left. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister can tell us if there have been any negotiations with Hydro-Quebec on the development of the substantial James Bay hydro projects which have been announced, or are to be announced, that might include Ontario development in the same location?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, there have been the usual discussions with Hydro-Quebec about their power capacity. This would include Churchill Falls in Labrador, for example, as well as a potential at James Bay.

Mr. Sargent: What about Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There is always the possibility of course that we may purchase power from a source such as Hydro-Quebec in that area.

Mr. Nixon: There is a substantial possibility!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: If our needs develop in that way, depending of course when that

development would take place and when power would be available. But there has been no definite contractual arrangement regarding the development of James Bay between Ontario Hydro and Hydro-Quebec.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Is there potential for a similar development on our side of the provincial border?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that we do not have the falls or the water power within our boundaries that is available in Quebec. Our streams do not have the falls, for example, and therefore do not have the potential to develop hydro power on our side as exists in Quebec.

MANPOWER RETRAINING

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the hon. Minister of Education: Is he aware that the Premier has undertaken to investigate the reasons why the teaching capacity at some of the community colleges in regard to manpower retraining has been downgraded because of federal fund deficiency? Is the Minister of Education interesting himself in this substantial problem, particularly at Mohawk College where some of the finest teachers have been laid off and the classes are assuming very large and inefficient proportions?

Hon. R. Welch (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the answer to both questions is yes.

Mr. Nixon: Well, a supplementary question: I wonder if a statement could be made in the near future about this. The students themselves are suffering substantially—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. Nixon: —and will the statement be forthcoming in the next day or two because I have put it to the Premier for the last two or three weeks?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I hope to have it soon.

Mr. Speaker: Any further supplementaries?

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, in relation to that problem, when the community colleges will be going on formula financing, does the minister realize that some of the staff in these community colleges do not know whether they will be teaching next year because of the lack of a decision in this area?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I think the government policy in this matter will become quite clear. You will recall that the Speech from the Throne said the government would announce its intentions to transfer the community colleges to The Department of University Affairs under a new departmental name. No doubt at that time we would be in a position to provide further information with respect to the question which the hon. member has raised.

Mr. Pitman: By way of a further supplementary, will the individual colleges be given some indication of exactly what their revenues will be next year for staff and for operation?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the estimates have been tabled now—

Mr. Sargent: There is lack of efficiency in the whole operation.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —so that as far as the current fiscal year is concerned, they would know on that basis.

Mr. Pitman: Estimates do not divide into colleges.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): A supplementary question of the hon. Minister of Education. Would the minister also include in his report the conditions at the Saltfleet campus of Mohawk College as well as the Braneida campus in Brantford as they affect the cutbacks in the manpower retraining programme?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Brantford.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, does the minister realize that besides the manpower retraining students who are being hurt, other students who have paid their tuition to attend these colleges are only getting between eight and 12 minutes of education per hour because of the cutbacks, and because of that it is an urgent matter?

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition has completed? The member for Scarborough West.

NIAGARA PENINSULA REPORTS

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Lands and Forests, Mr. Speaker: Was there a second report dealing with any aspect of the Niagara Escarpment or Niagara Peninsula which came from Professor Gertler or via Professor Gertler after the original Gertler report?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of another report. The only one I am familiar with is the Gertler report.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: Is the Premier aware of any further substantive document on the Niagara Escarpment or Niagara Peninsula that came by way of Professor Gertler beyond the original document?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not aware of it in the last couple of months. I shall see if there has been any further material supplied by Professor Gertler. I do not know of it, but I will certainly have a look.

Mr. Nixon: Somebody phoned the NDP.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Obviously the member for Scarborough West knows there is, or feels there is.

Mr. Lewis: I am not certain but I would like to know.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No?

LAW SCHOOL ADMISSIONS TEST

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a question of the Minister of University Affairs, Mr. Speaker— if you will forgive my morning chauvinism— does the minister think that there is any possibility that the law schools of Toronto, Osgoode Hall, Windsor, Western and Queen's, might use something other than the Princeton law school admissions test by way of evaluating analytic capacity for admissions procedure?

Hon. Mr. White: I should think that would be possible, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, might the minister enter into discussion with these various law schools to see whether or not we are capable in Ontario of formulating our own admissions test on which to judge Ontario students?

An hon. member: Do you think we could rise to it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not even have to take a test.

Hon. Mr. White: I am quite prepared to discuss this and other matters, although quite frankly I am not entirely sure that this is my responsibility. However, I will ponder the matter over the weekend and form a conclusion Monday or Tuesday.

LIST OF IBM SHARES

Mr. Lewis: I always ask the minister questions on Friday to give him the weekend.

May I ask a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs? At the recent annual meeting of IBM, I think it was the president of IBM, who when queried about listing on the Toronto Stock Exchange, said, "We do not think it would be in the interests of stockholders to change unless it becomes a matter of law or good business." Does the government intend to ask IBM to list on the exchange?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I shall take the question as notice so that I can get some more information than the question affords and give the hon. member an answer.

Mr. Lewis: I am referring to the listing of the shares of IBM Canada and subsidiaries.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Right. I understand.

MOOSONEE AND MOOSE FACTORY TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. Lewis: Can I ask the Minister of Lands and Forests a question, Mr. Speaker, about Moosonee and Moose Factory? What has happened to the study of transportation between the two communities which the minister indicated would be undertaken when he visited those communities at the end of last year?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I attended the meeting in Moose Factory in February, and at that time I said one of the problems that should be resolved was the question of transportation from Moose Factory island to Moosonee for social, economic, cultural and many reasons. I would like to tell the hon. member that Moose Factory is in the mouth of the Moose River, in tidal waters—

Mr. Singer: Is it still there?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle:—and that the federal government has quite a responsibility in this matter of transportation. I have been in communication with the federal member for that area and I have suggested that there should be a task force or a committee comprised of federal and provincial representatives as well as local people.

This matter of transportation was discussed as recently again as two weeks ago, by the NOR committee, the Northern Ontario Transportation Committee, and it will be discussed at a future meeting. So there is considerable discussion under way. Again I do feel that the federal government has a very large responsibility in this area and that they also should be part of the study.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, since the lives of two communities are in some sense dependent on the building of either a causeway or providing some kind of transportation link, has the minister any idea of when this might occur? We have been years now in the process of discussing—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member has asked the question.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would like to say to the hon. member that again there has been a lot of work done. This winter I asked that local contractors give us an estimate of the cost of building a causeway from Moose Factory Island to Butler Island. We are also looking into another possibility: Many feel, and I feel, that there should be a ferry service from Moosonee to either Moose Factory or to Butler Island. Again I must repeat this has to be a federal-provincial arrangement.

Mr. Lewis: By way of final supplementary, what is the minister's estimated cost, given all these studies, of, let us say, a ferry service at breakup or prior to freezing?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, when the member says the "estimated cost," we had costs five years ago. The Department of Highways had a very extensive study at that time as a result of the large columbium deposits located about 30 miles southeast of Moosonee.

Those studies looked into the various modes of transportation, cable cars, tunnels, bridges, hovercraft, helicopters, every means of transportation. However the projected figures were exceedingly high and that is why today we think there should be some means of transportation using a ferry and the causeway, or a combination of both. These studies are proceeding.

ONTARIO GOVERNMENT LOGO

Mr. Lewis: One last question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker. When the Ontario government intercity telephone network was put out—the new listing—the logo that was used was in the form of an elephant, and now the information kit for the civil service has come out and again the logo used is in the form of an elephant. Does the government intend to adopt the elephant as its official logo form?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not think we intend to adopt it on all documents.

Mr. Pitman: Slow moving, rather dull.

Mr. Lewis: I thought there were certain analogies that could be drawn, like long memories.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Tourism and Information has the reply to a question asked the other day.

TOURISM STUDY IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On April 27 the hon. member for Rainy River asked a question in two parts. The first part: Is there a study on tourism in northern Ontario? The answer is yes, there is a study on the development of tourism in northern Ontario.

The second part: Is the 1968 study redundant? The answer is no. Many of the recommendations have been or are currently in the process of being followed up by our department.

Mr. T. P. Reid: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate what the purpose of this new study is and how much it is costing? It is being done by Proctor and Redfern, I believe.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well, of course, the purpose is to develop tourism in northern Ontario. We call it the DOTNO study. The cost of the present study will be \$34,000 of which \$18,000 has been paid to date.

Mr. T. P. Reid: By way of supplementary, can the minister explain what purpose this report is going to prove that the report which came out in 1968 did not prove? And, incidentally, how much did that report of 1968 cost?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: The study of 1968, I am informed, cost \$25,000, but was financed by ARDA.

The present study is to formulate planning concepts and functional guidelines to be used in aiding the department's field staff in administering their respective areas and advising prospective or present entrepreneurs in the tourist industry. The study will also serve as a short-term interim measure until another more comprehensive study called "Tourism and Auto Recreation Planning Study" is made operational.

Mr. T. P. Reid: By way of further supplementary, the government is studying us to death up there—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member will ask a question.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Does the minister think—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. T. P. Reid: If the government would hire people from the north to do these studies it would do something for the employment situation.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. T. P. Reid: Does the minister think that a firm can come into a community in northwestern Ontario and in a two-hour meeting with some of the local people be able to come back to Toronto and write a report that is going to have any application to tourism in northwestern Ontario?

An hon. member: That is a good question.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to look into this in the studies that are going on. I want to assure the hon. member that this government wants to serve his area so well, that this is why we are having these studies made.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce.

MEMBERS' COCKTAIL LOUNGE

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Prime Minister: In view of the misleading budget of the Treasurer—

Mr. Speaker: Order, Order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Withdraw.

Mr. Sargent:—and his desire for economy and all that nonsense, can the Prime Minister tell me how, in this multi-point question, he can justify the fact that—

Hon. Mr. Davis: One at a time.

Mr. Sargent:—we have in the dungeon, in the basement down there, the most lavish cocktail lounge in the Province of Ontario with two staffed employees sitting there for a month, who have not had one customer? How can the minister justify in the name of economy spending \$100,000 on a lounge that is non-operative—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What was the customer doing there?

Mr. Sargent: There were not any customers, but the people are there in their red jackets to serve the members if they are thirsty.

Mr. Nixon: The government did not get the Minister of Trade and Development to apply for the licence.

Mr. Sargent: How can the Premier kid the people of Ontario that he is going to save money when he can spend money like that?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member has asked his question.

Mr. Sargent: Can the Premier solve the problem?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member has asked his question. He will now allow the Prime Minister to answer it.

Mr. Sargent: Well, it sounds pretty good.

Mr. Speaker: No, no.

Mr. Sargent: Okay, how does the Premier justify it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will answer the first part of the multi-point question.

First, I recognize the member for Grey-Bruce has great expertise when it comes to the management of cocktail lounges. The point, I think, must be made that to my knowledge, there is no cocktail lounge in the north wing of the Parliament Buildings in this province.

Mr. Sargent: If the Premier wants to walk, in five minutes I will take him down there.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: They have to get a licence.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question: How does the Premier hope to kid the people? Is he going to hide the bar? What is he going to do?

Mr. Speaker: Order! That is not a supplementary. The member for High Park has the floor.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Did the member for High Park have a question? The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

INDUSTRIAL POLLUTANT INVENTORY

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. Sargent: It is the Bill Davis bottle club.

Mr. Burr: Has the minister asked industries for an inventory of all the pollutants and possible pollutants being used in their manufacturing processes?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, certain industries, by the very nature of their operation, use certain types of chemicals and substances that we feel may affect the environment in some way. They have been asked for information on those particular substances from time to time. There has not been a blanket request to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, to all industries for such an inventory as envisaged by the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The question period as extended has now expired.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, before moving to the other orders, it is a great pleasure to introduce to the members of this House, the hon. Mr. Colborne who is the Minister of Municipal Affairs from our sister Province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Villeneuve presented the report of the standing committee on human resources and moved its adoption as follows:

The committee begs to report that it has met and requests of the House permission to hear from Miss Barbara Chisholm, former director of the Victoria day nursery, and other interested parties at the discretion of the chairman on the subject of day care.

Mr. Nixon: Just before the motion is put, Mr. Speaker, might I just bring to your attention, sir, that this report asks permission of the House to invite a lady, Miss Barbara Chisholm to attend the committee to give her views on day care centres.

Am I to understand, sir, that this is going to be a standard procedure from now on, that before the committee on human resources can ask Miss Barbara Chisholm, or anybody else in the community, to come in and give their views they have to get the rubberstamp from the government?

Surely this is a ridiculous procedure and one that is completely unnecessary.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, having established the straitjacket two weeks ago, the government now has to live within it. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Lewis: By way of intervention, Mr. Speaker, all of us in this party know Barbara Chisholm well, and have worked—well, not all of us, but many of us—with her before on other matters and understand her competence in the field. We will vote against this motion on principle, Mr. Speaker, because we are not going to be bound by this that every single time we want to draw a citizen before the committee we have to gain the will of the government.

The fact is that the member in charge, the chairman of that committee, already carefully destroyed the research capacities of the committee by refusing to accept certain obvious motions for staff and support. This is an absurd procedure and I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the motion be withdrawn and that we not be subjected to this kind of scrutiny, school-mastering by the government. The committee is perfectly capable of deciding itself whom it will bring before it.

Mr. Speaker: I have been advised by the Clerk, who, I presume, has been advised by the clerk of that committee, that actually the motion was meant to enable the matter of day care to be referred to the committee, not necessarily to have the lady in question attend.

Mr. Lewis: Not individuals? That is not what the motion says.

Mr. Speaker: I realize that, but that is what has come to me through the administrative part of the committee. If that were so, then our discussion is beside the point but the motion is not properly worded.

Mr. Shulman: Then withdraw the motion.

Mr. Lewis: Let the motion go.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Withdraw the motion.

Mr. Speaker: I have no power to withdraw a motion.

Mr. Lewis: Well, let the motion be re-drafted.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps rather than putting the motion the House would agree that we adjourn the debate on this motion and by the first of the week either the motion can be redrafted or the debate can continue and be dealt with then. Would the chairman of the committee be agreeable to that and move the adjournment of the debate?

Mr. O. Villeneuve (Glengarry): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Villeneuve moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

TOWN OF ST. MARYS

Mr. Deacon, in the absence of Mr. Edgihoffer, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Town of St. Marys.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order before the orders of the day, the routine proceedings for motions have passed us without any motion from the government House leader that estimates be referred to the standing committee.

I understand it was the government's intention to refer Energy and Resources Management to a standing committee of the House on Monday next. Standing order 87—

Mr. Speaker: May I say that it is quite possible. I have had no information from the House leader but it is quite possible that this House could sit at 2 o'clock Monday and have such a motion and it would be referred to the committee later. I think the hon. member is premature in his point of order.

Mr. Peacock: Well, perhaps not, Mr. Speaker.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 20th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE AND FOOD

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: Estimates of The Department of Agriculture and Food, page 22, item 3, vote 103. I believe the hon. member for Huron-Bruce had one or two more comments.

On vote 103, item 3:

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I wanted some clarification with respect to the division of the various areas as between one telephone company and another telephone company. The problem seems to arise from time to time where a person is right on the boundary and he wants to become involved in one telephone system and he happens to be in the area of another telephone system and this means in many cases that he has to pay a toll charge to call to an area where he usually does his shopping and gets his supplies and so on. This means money out of his pocket and it means a great deal of inconvenience.

Does the Ontario Telephone Service Commission take any part, or is this solely the jurisdiction of each individual company to make these decisions and if an accommodation can be made between two companies then it is entirely up to them? Is this the stance of the commission?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Chairman, I well understand what my hon. friend is talking about. It is one of the most contentious problems to be right on the boundary of the telephone company's territory. There is no easy solution to it. However, the parties involved are urged by the Ontario Telephone Service Commission to try to work out the differences in a mutually satisfactory way. If they cannot do this, then the Telephone Service Commission then assumes the right to negotiate with the respective companies and tries to work it out. But it is not easy to resolve, because there are territorial areas that have been staked out on which debentures have been placed, based on the territories served and the individual telephone outlets in those areas. It is not just as simple as it looks to resolve these matters.

Of course, extended area service is the ultimate way to resolve it. I think you would recognize that, in the consolidation of telephone systems that has taken place in this province over the last 10 years and the proposed consolidations that are projected for the next three years, we are resolving

these matters. But there are still a few isolated cases that do cause concern.

Mr. Gaunt: In my experience, the argument goes something like this: If we give "A" the right to go into another area, then his next-door neighbour would want the same right, and it just snowballs. So the argument goes, "Sorry we just cannot do it because it will have a serious effect on our company's revenue, because other people will want out."

I am wondering if the commission actually has the power to say to any company, "You take this new patron or the person in question stays with the system in the area in which he is located." Does it have that power? I am not quite sure of the powers of the commission, whether it is a body that negotiates or whether it is a body that actually has these powers. Now I recognize that, in most cases, the commission does do a lot of negotiating.

I think in other provinces, aside from this jurisdictional question or division of area, they do do great work. I know I have had occasion to bring problems before them and I have always got satisfaction. The division of areas is a different matter and I recognize that it is a tough problem. It is very touchy, but I just wonder what the powers of the commission really are.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The powers of the commission extend to telephone companies that are chartered under provincial jurisdiction. Bell, as you know, is not so chartered.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, I know.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They have a federal charter so the powers of the commission are somewhat limited. But, as I explained earlier, Mr. Chairman, I doubt if there is anything I can add, other than defining the powers of the commission in this regard.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3 carried?

The hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): I just want to ask the minister about the particular areas that are not receiving the service that they had hoped. Has he looked into the possibility of some type of in-watt line or some emergency line in some of these areas that are having difficulty?

I am speaking, primarily, of the fact that some of these areas have difficulty obtaining a doctor, or obtaining the fire department. This was brought out the other evening at a meeting his deputy minister attended at one

of the schools. One of the children was injured and one of the teachers tried to get a doctor and they could not get anybody so he decided he would take the person to the city. He did, and he was at the doctor's office before the call even got transferred to him, and he said, "The teacher told me." The principal said, "This could have been a fire. It could have been a catastrophe of some other nature in the lab or something." "Really," he said, "it really is a concern to us." And I said, "I appreciate that," and I promised I would bring it to his attention. The fire hazard is also there, but they cannot seem to get the lines.

I do understand that by reason of the new dial system this could be speeded up a little, but they are still going to be faced with this same problem. The minister might comment. I do not know whether the department of the Attorney General or the fire marshal's office has knowledge of these particular things, but I know that they would be very concerned if they knew that people could not get through to a fire department or a doctor. It must be a problem.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend refers to a situation that I think happened within the last two weeks in an area that he and I know pretty well. I can easily understand the concern expressed. One of the problems there is that one of them is on a crank system, the old manual system—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Old crank on the wall.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —and it is hooked into a dial system. That is where the fire department was, anyway. I believe that by this fall the old manual system will be done away with and it will be dial, so that the two could be joined together and a normal long-distance service provided. However, extended area service, I am told, will be delayed a little while because Bell has to make certain arrangements in that particular part of the province with other than just the two companies that we are concerned about here.

I realize the problem, but it is not as easy to solve as it might look, because you have to work through the Bell in this particular case and I think Bell are honestly trying to do a job. We hope that we can get the date advanced a little bit from what might have been the target suggested the other night.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3 carried?

Mr. Gaunt: No. There is just one other matter that I want to bring to the attention of the minister, and it falls into much the same category as the problem mentioned by my friend from Oxford. It is a little different, but it is more or less on the same problem, and that concerns the number of people on one line and the difficulty of someone—particularly someone who is having an emergency situation, whether it be a fire or whether it be a doctor required or whatever—going to the telephone to make the call and there is someone on the line.

I know in one case with which I am familiar there were 14 people on one line and it was practically impossible to get that line. If a farmer wanted to call a veterinarian to come in at noon he might as well forget about it. It would be quicker to drive to town and bring the veterinarian out with him rather than wait for a clear line.

I know that this is a problem with Bell Telephone in rural areas, but it is not quite so pressing as it is with the small rural services in my area anyway. I cannot speak for other parts of the province, I am just speaking of my area. I do not know what the situation is in other parts but I can tell the hon. minister that in my particular part of the country Bell has a problem, but they have a system of phasing whereby they can split the lines and this seems to help.

In respect of the small rural telephone systems where they have up to 14 people on one line, it is just impossible to get that line, particularly on a stormy day in the wintertime when the women get on their gossiping. You might as well forget about it. Unless it is midnight it is hopeless.

I am wondering if there is any system whereby the commission could pursue this matter with the companies to see if there could not be some solution worked out. I have often thought in my more reflective moments that perhaps there should be some device on a telephone system whereby if any one party talked more than 15 minutes the line would cut off. In order to make a reconnection with the same person, he would have to redial. But I do not know. I would like to hear the minister's comments.

Mr. K. C. Bolton (Middlesex South): We should have it in the House, too!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not think that we will send out the hon. member's quote to all the women's institute members in the Bruce Peninsula.

Mr. Gaunt: No, but they know there is a problem though, just the same.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, that is right. I can tell the hon. member it is not easy to resolve either. We have had some meetings with the Bell over this situation but it is a very costly thing to implement such a service.

I hesitate to boast about it, but again the Blanshard telephone system, I think, has provided a first in having only two parties on the line in the service which they provide in part of the area, which they cover in the new telephone system that was just opened about two years ago.

This is a major step forward. Bell is exploring this and I hope that some day we will be able to reduce that incredible number of people who are on those telephone lines. The telephone is an absolute necessity, as I see it, in rural Ontario—and anywhere else for that matter—but it is a great help in rural Ontario. The fact that one cannot get the line causes some real concern.

I really do not know if there is an easy answer to it, unless we simply say we have got to start over again and rebuild all these systems to not more than two-party-line systems. That involves an enormous expense today. Just so phenomenal an expense that when you look at the distances that have to be covered and the number of telephone companies that are involved, even today, it becomes quite an exercise.

I can assure my hon. friend that we are concerned, but we have not been able to find an easy answer that is not so expensive that it is practically prohibitive.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on telephones? Shall item 3 carry?

Vote 103, item 3 agreed to.

Vote 103 agreed to.

On vote 104, item I:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 104, on page 24; item 1.

Mr. Innes: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Agricultural marketing programme, item 1, administration. The hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. Innes: This is vote 104, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 104.

Mr. Innes: We had the milk commission before us in the committee on physical and

natural resources a week ago and mention was made about the concern of the members over the cheese industry and how it is going to reflect on the whole dairy industry, if something in fact is not forthcoming shortly. I know that I have had representations made to me by various people in the cheese industry in southwestern Ontario, claiming that they in fact do not get the amount of milk that they would like to go into the cheese industry.

I appreciate the fact that they are on a quota, that they can go out and buy it if they see fit, but they claim that at the particular time that they would like to have this milk, there are other areas that also want it and that they cannot obtain sufficient quantities.

The minister might inform the House how many cheese factories there were last year as compared to this year, and how many pounds of cheese were made as compared to comparable years.

What is the trouble, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: I am just wondering whether this should come under item 2, or if it is properly under administration?

Mr. Ruston: Take them all up.

Mr. Chairman: No, we take them item by item. We are dealing with administration, as I called item 1.

Mr. Innes: This is an administration feature.

Mr. Chairman: That is what I am wondering. Item 2 has to do with marketing. Is that not what the hon. member—

Mr. Innes: It is okay; I do not care.

Mr. Chairman: I do not wish to be restrictive, but we must observe some order here and have two specific items.

Mr. Innes: This has to be a policy coming from the minister. It has to be redirected in some way and it has to come out. It has to be from the minister.

Mr. Chairman: In connection with the marketing?

Mr. Innes: I would say so. It should be ministerial. If not—

Mr. Chairman: The whole programme is the agricultural marketing.

Mr. Innes: —I will only go through the procedure again.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister wish to deal with these remarks under administration?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I am a little concerned about your system here because I think you are quite right. I do not detect the grants to cheese factories under administration and that is the first point we are talking about.

Mr. Innes: I am not talking about grants. I am talking about the number of cheese factories and the amount of—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It does not seem to me that that would come under the administrative programme. I just do not think so. Now if we are going to move on past that, I am quite willing to discuss that point, but I would like to follow the order, the procedure, if we could.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): On a point of order, we do not have a quorum.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry. I did not hear you.

Mr. Shulman: No quorum.

The chairman ordered that the bells be rung for four minutes.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, if you prefer I can refer to something in the first vote and let the minister answer the other when it comes to the next vote?

Mr. Chairman: I must say that I have no preference. I am just trying to go by the programme.

Mr. Innes: Could the minister tell the House what incentives have been carried out by his department in the export field re the great British market and foreign markets; and how have our exports increased to the other countries?

Mr. Chairman: Before the hon. minister replies, I presume item 1 has been carried. We are on marketing now.

Mr. Gaunt: No.

Mr. Chairman: Then we will keep the marketing discussion until we are finished administration on item 1.

Mr. Gaunt: There is just one matter under the administration part, item 1, Mr. Chairman. Under this particular vote, there is a \$50,000 grant given to the Royal Winter Fair.

Last year I made some comment with respect to the possibility of the Royal Winter Fair and other agricultural fairs setting up exhibits having to do with rural education, that is to say having displays of one nature or another dealing with various farm products—

Mr. Ruston: Do you want to make a note that the hon. member for High Park left the chamber.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald: He was taken out by the hon. member for Ontario South (Mr. W. Newman).

Mr. Gaunt:—dealing with their origin at the farm and taking them right through to the retail level and setting out the various price spreads and so on. I am wondering if the minister, or any of his department officials, pursued that or made that suggestion either to the Royal Winter Fair board or any other fair board, the Ottawa Winter Fair or even to the smaller fairs?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, that applied in the exhibit section of the information branch, which was carried some days ago.

Mr. Gaunt: The department still gives a grant to them here.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We give a grant to the Royal Winter Fair, but that has nothing to do with the exhibits section.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, on the same point of the Royal Winter Fair; has the minister a list of the directors of the Royal Winter Fair handy? I tried to find them a moment ago, but I have not got them. Could the minister list them right now?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, Mr. Chairman, I cannot. I have not got a list.

Mr. Makarchuk: Would his deputy have them?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, he does not.

Mr. Makarchuk: Well, if I remember correctly, would the list contain some rather famous names in Ontario in business and industry? I notice that very few, in fact nobody on that particular list really is related to farming in any direct way. If the Royal Winter Fair is in any way going to be representative of the agricultural industry in Ontario the least the minister can do is ensure that some of the people—some of the directors on this institution are actually involved in farming, and not the so-called gentleman

farmer, not members of the Ontario family compact or not people who seem to have been there for years and years and seem to remain there for the simple reason that they have been around for years. I would suggest that it is about time that you expanded that particular institution, and put people representing the Federation of Agriculture, the Farmers' Union and probably members from the marketing boards on the board of directors.

I realize the board of directors is a self-appointing institution, or a self-sustaining institution, but surely if the minister is going to hand them out \$50,000 each year, perhaps he might make a few suggestions to them, that the board of directors should be expanded so that it would be representative of the farming community of Ontario and not what it really is, the corporate elite of Ontario. I would like to hear the minister's comments on this.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to comment on that. My hon. friend, I think, has been misinformed.

There are many practising farmers on the board of directors at the Royal Winter Fair. Names that come to mind are Glen Reicheld, Reford Gardhouse, George Rodanz who has just sold his farm, Jack Fraser at Streetsville. Those are four names that just come to mind whom I know. These are all prominent farmers in Ontario. There are a great many others as well.

Certainly the agricultural section and the board of directors are made up of practising farmers in this province. These are men who are purebred livestock breeders.

Mr. Makarchuk: On the same point, Mr. Chairman, I agree that these are people who by and large do not live off their farms; this is a gentleman farmer operation.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, it is not; and it is unfair to say that. It indicates the member's abysmal ignorance of what he is trying to talk about.

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William): He qualifies for that all right.

Mr. Makarchuk: It is unfortunate that I do not have the list of names, but the invitations that are issued to the members to attend the Royal Winter Fair functions have the names of various people, the head of Supertest Oil and so on, who really are not representative of the farming community of Ontario. Let us put some people on there

who really have to deal with the nitty gritty of farming every day in the province, and not sort of the dilettante—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): He is right, 100 per cent right. Why is that?

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Makarchuk: —farmers that we have on there. I think this is one of the problems with the Royal Winter Fair. It is really not the kind of fair that attracts that many farmers or is as popular as it could be, because it has become more of a social institution than really an institution where farmers can gain some knowledge and some advantage by attending.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce wishes to participate.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, he may be wrong, but it boils me to go down there and see all that soup and fish, the high hats and that stuff and they are not representative of the farming people of this province. I walk around that place and I feel out of place.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Attaboy!

Mr. Sargent: That is not my ball of wax. So he has a point; he has a point.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Go there in the daytime! My hon. friend, Mr. Chairman, is talking about the night horse show. Go there in the daytime when the place is jam-packed with farm people and youngsters from urban schools and rural schools all over this province. This is the show window of Canadian agriculture.

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): That is right.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We are very fortunate to have it right here in the Province of Ontario. I think it is a disgrace for the opposition to say these things about the Royal Winter Fair.

Mr. Sargent: I do not say the minister is wrong, but talking about the horse show, we have a few horses and to get your horse in the Royal Winter Fair you have got to know somebody to get in the proper sequence of the jumping events. There is a lot of drag and society people at the top level who can get things done that the ordinary person cannot get done in the horse business, and you can put that in your pipe and smoke it if you want to.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: I am not any authority on—

Mr. Makarchuk: Take it off the floor then.

Mr. Sargent: —what I want to say. I should not have said what I said, because I forget what I wanted to say now.

The Walkerton Agricultural Society Christmas Fair is the biggest fair, I guess, in Ontario at that time of year. We give them \$1,000. I think that is pitifully small. I think I gave nearly that much one year in buying beef or something for that. I think it is a chance for the minister to do something for that part of Ontario which very much needs help and a \$5,000 grant would be the smallest he could give.

Mr. Chairman: Does the minister have any comments?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I appreciate the member's advice.

Vote 104, item 1 agreed to.

On item 2:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. Innes: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was speaking about the dilemma of the cheese industry and the representations that have been made by various people throughout Ontario to members, particularly in south-western Ontario, to the effect that they are very fearful that the cheese industry is not keeping up with the demand and that they are not getting the amount of milk that should be going into the cheese industry.

Furthermore, they also indicate that the Milk Marketing Board indicates that this is not true, that there is enough cheese. But on the other hand, they tell us that they are dipping into the cheese that is currently in storage, and that the cheese that should be ageing is not going to get the ageing it would otherwise have had.

I know that members of the board are concerned about this, and under the particular quota system at the moment it is rather difficult to adjust it the way one would like. I do feel it is a type of an emergency situation, a situation that could dwindle back consistently unless some effort is made in a special arrangement—possibly a percentage of each producer's milk, just a little percentage extra which I think could be worked out into another pool or something.

Mention has been made that the cheese industry could be a different setup of its own, a different pricing system of its own.

Now I am not knowledgeable to that extent about the cheese industry. I know by reason of what has been expressed to me. It appears that it is a product that is saleable, for which we do have a market and that we should make sure we do everything in our power to sell and make sure the factories get the amount they require; and that we progress in a very systematic way.

As I mentioned before, I would not mind knowing the amount of cheese that was produced last year as compared to the year before, and the export figures in comparison if it is possible. If not we will get it again.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend has raised some points that are of great concern to me as well, because I well understand the situation faced by a good many cheddar cheese factory manufacturing plants in this province. They are just not able to get enough milk at the present time to meet the demand at this time for cheddar cheese. A year or so ago, the situation was somewhat different. Before the price of cheese advanced, there did not seem to be quite the enthusiasm to manufacture it. Fortunately, with the rise in price that was generated by the national dairy commission there has been a marked improvement in the spread in cheese prices and our cheese plants want to get more milk.

The Ontario milk board, as I understand it, is having difficulties determining just where the industrial milk supply should be directed and it has worked out a plant quota system. According to that plant quota system, it is difficult to take milk from an industrial plant that is manufacturing powder and butter and direct it to a cheese plant, even though we all know that there is an enormous demand for cheddar cheese today.

I understand that discussions have been held between the milk commission and the Milk Marketing Board regarding this very difficult and complex situation, but there does not seem to be any easy way to resolve it.

Perhaps there are those on the milk board who do not feel the situation is of as great concern as my hon. friend from Oxford does, and I must confess as I do. It may well be that it might be a useful gesture, Mr. Chairman, to suggest that the Milk Marketing Board be invited to meet with the committee on resources—I believe that is the new name,

resources. The commission met there a while ago. I believe that if the Milk Marketing Board could come there as well, perhaps along with the commission, we might be able to learn just what their thinking is about this very complex matter. They, after all, are in charge of the marketing of milk in the Province of Ontario and I am sure they are—at least some of them—as concerned as we are. Perhaps that would be a useful way to bring all the facts out into the open.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister whether any farm missions went to Europe to The Department of Trade and Development offices?

We learn that the acreage cut for flue-cured tobacco will be down 50 per cent next year. Are we losing our markets in England? Are they going down?

I believe, if I remember correctly, the minister made a statement that we are selling some agricultural products to Japan. Have we Trade and Development offices in Japan or is there any consideration being given to that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: With regard to the export sale of tobacco to the United Kingdom, I believe the mission has returned from the UK and has been assured that, not only will the UK continue to buy as much as they bought in the past but there will be a modest increase in what their future projections are.

The problem really arises, as I understand it, regarding further cuts in tobacco acreage this year, because there has been a very substantial increase in the tonnage of tobacco grown in the past year or so, much beyond the target objective. I believe it was something like 30 million pounds over last year, or 28 million pounds—something like that—over what was projected.

This is something the farmers have no control over. This is simply a matter of good weather. Growing and harvesting conditions turned out a very high quality crop with a very excellent yield.

Here are the yields, Mr. Chairman: The yield for 1967 is 196 million pounds; the year 1968, 201 million pounds; the year 1969, 226 million pounds, and the year 1970, 201 million pounds. But the increase in yield per acre is the thing that really is startling, because the difference between the year 1967 in yield per acre of 1,529 pounds and 1970 of 2,178 pounds is about 600 pounds more per acre. So you can easily understand how they could

get into difficulty with an overproduction of tobacco.

However, while the sales are not as high per pound, or on the average as they had hoped they would be this year, the tobacco is moving and I venture to suggest that many farmers will end up with a sizable chunk of money with the increased poundage that they have to sell.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise one or two points in connection with the current problem of inter-provincial trade, particularly between Quebec and Ontario. I do so without any desire or intention of reviewing much of the detail, which has already been dealt with in this House during the amendment to The Farm Products Marketing Act.

The thing that disturbs me, and which I want to raise with the minister, is that everybody involved, including the minister, the Minister of Agriculture in Quebec, and the appropriate ministers in Manitoba, all say that they do not want an escalation of the interprovincial trade warfare which is now developing.

It is a little sad that everybody is professing not to want an escalation of this trade warfare when, in fact, we all seem to be captured in a set of circumstances in which the escalation is taking place. In short, we seem to be the victim of these circumstances.

Two days ago I happened to hear the noon farm broadcast and I was rather taken aback by a report from Quebec City or Toronto on the CBC—I am sorry, Quebec City or Montreal—to the effect that senior officials of the Quebec Department of Agriculture said that they had no recent contact with the minister and The Department of Agriculture and Food here in the Province of Ontario, that prior to that there had been rather intimate and close consultation, but recently there had not been. In short, it seems—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: May I say this, and I know my hon. friend does not want to say anything that is not correct—

Mr. MacDonald: I wanted to ask the minister!

Hon. Mr. Stewart:—that is absolutely false. There have been continuing discussions—I

was going to say on a daily basis, but certainly many times a week—with the deputy minister in the Province of Quebec and the minister's office. These discussions have been going on and, in fact they met just the day before yesterday.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay, I am glad to have that assurance and that report dispelled, but if the minister is continuing discussions, is the minister in a position to indicate on what products the Province of Quebec is contemplating retaliatory action vis-à-vis Ontario agricultural produce?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, I think we have that information. It will involve the legal marketing of eggs in the Province of Quebec through FEDCO. They are not trying to stop eggs going to Quebec but they are saying, as I interpret the information we have from the Province of Quebec, that they want those eggs marketed through their egg marketing agency. I really do not think there is anything wrong with that.

I believe as well that it may be applied to onions. There was a huge shipment of onions sent into the Montreal market from the Province of Ontario. I do not know who sent them in. I do not have that information, but I do know that they dropped in there.

There is no marketing board for onions in Ontario, as members know, and it just simply wrecked the Montreal market for onions for local producers of onions in Quebec.

They are stimulating their production of garden vegetables, onions particularly, in some of the marsh area lying east of Montreal, if I am not mistaken in the eastern townships. They hope to be able to control that kind of dumping. These are the only two products they have given any indication to us that they wish to in any way control.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, a danger in the situation is that both in the Quebec legislation and in our legislation here it is so drawn up that it applies across the board. Now while it applies across the board to all marketing boards in the Province of Ontario, it was obvious during the debates on the bill here in this Legislature that the minister was contemplating at the moment only one product, namely broilers.

Interestingly enough, in Quebec you have the same kind of situation with boobytraps, namely the legislation is drawn up so that it applies across the board, but the minister assures us that at the moment it is going to apply only to eggs and perhaps to onions.

You see the potential for escalation is really massive and I just want to raise once again—I do it not as an Ontarian, not as a member of this Legislature, but I do it as a Canadian—this nation is drifting toward dissolution, and indeed this government, in other areas that are not appropriate to this debate, is adding to the tensions and the threat to the unity of this nation. Within the context of these estimates we are adding to it in the field of agricultural produce.

My plea to the minister would be—and I put it to him as a question—is there going to be continuing consultation with the department to minimize the application of the massive powers that have been taken by both this Legislature and the Quebec National Assembly, at least until we get some resolution of the constitutional problem in the courts, or preferably until—if I may accept the minister at his own word—we have the federal marketing legislation, C-176, which he seemed to suggest was an alternative to coping with this problem?

His argument was that since we have no assurance as to when C-176 was going to become effective we had to move with these new powers within the jurisdiction of the Province of Ontario. In short my plea to the minister, and I ask for his comment on it, is let us cool it, let us not heat it up. It is all very fine to declare verbal and political warfare on Ottawa—both federal-provincial and interprovincial warfare, but having just gone through a convention in Ottawa where I had a chance to get an up-to-date picture of the feelings of people in various parts of this country, I am convinced we are drifting toward dissolution in this country.

There is a sort of psychological drift to separatism in Quebec, and a reverse separatism in the rest of the country, English-speaking separatism. Which to put it bluntly says: "Okay, if Quebec wants to go, let them go." That is all very fine, that maybe will give a little emotional release for the moment, but the net effect is a pretty serious threat to Canada. And as one who has a deep conviction that if Quebec goes, Canada as we have known it goes, I ask the minister: What is being done to cool it in this area which is a pretty important area of the interprovincial trade on food and agricultural products?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Before the hon. minister replies I must point out that I realize it is very difficult to discuss marketing without

reference to the bill that was passed very recently in this House. I was listening very carefully to the hon. member for York South. In my opinion he did not really infringe upon the rule of the House that forbids any reflection upon the bill itself. I just want to bring to the attention of the committee that we should not reflect upon a bill that has already been passed in this House and I say this for the guidance of the minister in his reply as well. The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope that I too can remain within the context of the rules of order as far as the estimate before us is concerned.

There are two or three things that my hon. friend from York South has asked. I specifically want to relieve my mind on the fact that he leaves the impression that it is only Ontario and Quebec that have this kind of broad legislation. Might I point out that the Province of British Columbia has had this kind of legislation for years. A section of their marketing Act contains precisely the same thing as we have.

The Province of New Brunswick has had it for, I do not know how many years, perhaps since the time their marketing Act was drawn. But it is a fact of life. The Province of Nova Scotia, on March 18 of this year, introduced exactly the same kind of legislation.

Mr. MacDonald: Then our problem is even greater than I had anticipated.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Exactly!

Mr. MacDonald: It has the net effect of what the minister is saying.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It spreads across these various provinces. The fact that it is there on the statutes as general legislation controlled by the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Board in its application to the various commodity boards within Ontario is, I think, reassurance that the problem will not be escalated. Now it applies to broilers coming into this province. That is the only commodity to my knowledge that it does apply to under the Act. But it also applies to broilers in the other provinces as well. To my knowledge there is no other commodity that is under that type of control other than broilers or eggs.

I really do not think there is a great deal more that I can add to this debate other than to point out the generality of the legislation, and I think that therein lies some safety.

My hon. friend talks about the problems between Ottawa and Ontario and between Ontario and Quebec. There is the most amicable relationship that I can imagine between the Deputy Minister of Agriculture in Quebec, and his minister with me and my deputy in the Province of Ontario. There has never been the slightest hint of animosity in any way that I know of.

Mr. MacDonald: Has the minister ever heard of divorces in which the parties split amicably? The minister's point is not impressive. Sure if you are decent human beings you may be amicable, but our problem is we are drifting apart.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, we are not drifting apart, Mr. Chairman, we are not drifting apart at all. I respect the position that Quebec has taken as far as eggs are concerned. I am sure that the minister and his deputy in Quebec—and in fact the various marketing organizations in Quebec—respect the position that the Province of Ontario, and indeed other provinces have taken concerning broilers. There has to be some stability brought into this market situation as far as poultry products are concerned.

I went through this debate, Mr. Chairman, and I am hesitant to get into it again, but it is of concern to me that we have got to this place when we saw this coming years ago. We just could not get any action at federal level. Now I am not pointing blame at the federal government, because we asked them to bring in some type of a poultry products commission for marketing at the national level.

They saw fit to bring in general legislation. In their wisdom, perhaps that is the thing to have done, but it has generated a furor of complaint from those who want no part of a national marketing plan—usually from the same people who want no part of a provincial marketing plan. But that is their prerogative. We may differ with their reasons as to why they have taken this position, but in a democracy it is their right to take that position.

But I think we who have a responsibility to primary producers—be it any province in this country—as provincial legislators must accept that responsibility and we must try, in our opinion, to do the things that are necessary to protect them, but at the same time work with the federal government in bringing about what we think is the proper solution at national level—and that is why I support it.

I do not criticize the federal government on their national plan. I support the national

plan even though there are many producers in Ontario who are opposed to it. I support it because I think it is the proper thing to do. But I have the assurance, and it is pointed out clearly—and I have a copy of the bill right here in my desk, Mr. Chairman—in section 7 and in section 17 that no commodity can be brought under the national legislation unless a majority of the producers across Canada is in favour of that legislation and of the action being taken.

Having said that, we have to recognize that the responsibility ultimately rests with the marketing boards in the respective provinces where that commodity is produced. The Farm Products Marketing Board in Ontario reports through The Department of Agriculture and Food to the Legislature of Ontario. Our position was clearly enunciated on some of these matters, particularly beef, as I answered my friend the other day. We have already excluded beef from marketing legislation in this province by that particular Act that was drafted in 1968 affecting that commodity.

As far as eggs are concerned, we have had two votes on eggs opposing quota marketing in this province because our producers, in my opinion, took the position that if they were to accept quota marketing of eggs in this province and leave the borders wide open, they would be in the same predicament as Ontario broiler growers.

Just as late as this morning, I had the opportunity perchance to meet the chairman of the Ontario Egg and Fowl Producers Marketing Board who feels very keenly that if there is some hope of getting this national legislation through or getting some type of a national plan established, the egg producers of Ontario, despite the local opposition that has built up to their plan already, will pass such a plan. I have been assured by a good many very large egg producers in Ontario that this is the case.

I am hopeful that by supporting the federal government in its implementation of the national legislation, we can get it passed through the House of Commons and have it become effective, but only to apply to those commodities for which there appears to be a need today.

We already have it in the dairy commission of Canada. We already have dairy products under The National Dairy Commission Act. We have The Wheat Act covering feed grains and wheat. Surely it makes common sense to go the other step and try to strengthen the position of Canada's producers of these commodities that can be produced

in such abundance and on such short notice and bring about some stability to the marketplace. That is my position, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Brantford.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, on the same point, I understand the minister said that when the case comes up before the Supreme Court of Canada on May 31, Ontario will be making representation at the court. Could the minister indicate what the theme will be. Will we oppose provincial marketing legislation which would restrict the transportation of produce from one province to the other or will we be there just as observers?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, we will make our decision as to what position we will take and it will be made known at the time of the hearing.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about tomatoes—and I think this was mentioned briefly the other day with regard to the tomato paste industry. I think the minister had said that growers could not see their way clear to handle them because of the price differential, but I wonder if there has been any serious discussion on this matter.

As to potential business, it seems to me that one figure I heard mentioned was that possibly 10,000 acres could be grown. We are importing that amount of tomato products in paste form and we are now growing about 20,000 acres of tomatoes. This would be half of what we are growing now.

Has the minister given any thought, or is there advice or help that might be given to the farm areas by the Ontario Development Corporation and The Department of Agriculture and Food to try to bring this in as a new industry? I realize there is a price differential, but there may be some variations in the quality of the product that would allow the person to produce these tomatoes at a price that would give him a reasonable profit with some assistance possibly through provincial incentive as we are doing in other areas, especially in manufacturing.

If we could produce and grow 10,000 acres of tomatoes, this being a new-found product, then we could afford probably to put some public funds in this to get it off the ground. I know there are some problems to overcome, but it seems to me that we have

to look at these things. We are importing such large quantities of products while at the same time our farm economy is slipping.

About 10 years ago in Essex County alone there were 1,200 dairy farmers, some of whom had small herds. Today there are 220. In Kent county there are only about 45 dairy farms. Most every farm now is on a cash crop basis. This is not working out too satisfactorily with the price of corn and soybeans. We have to have some other crop that will at least bring in returns on the acreage.

I think that the government is going to have to take a real serious look at some of the large imports that we are making and see if we cannot create a new industry. I believe the tomato industry is one that the government should be taking a really close look at and meeting with the farm groups and seeing if something cannot be worked out.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2, at least item 2. The member for Middlesex South.

Mr. Bolton: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister if he would comment on the problem which seems to be faced by the farmers in getting adequate prices for milk and eggs. I preface this question by reporting that I had a communication yesterday from Robert King of the National Farmers' Union which said: "Tomorrow morning at the Argyle Mall in London, a group of farmers will be giving away milk and eggs as a general protest about the prices that they are being offered."

This is obviously a marketing problem and a problem of farm income. I wonder if the minister would care to comment on that?

Mr. Innes: Does the member agree with that?

Mr. Bolton: That is not what I am saying. This is what is happening. I want the minister's statement about what his response would be.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the member disagree with that, the gesture or demonstration part of it?

Mr. Innes: Does the member for York South agree with it?

Mr. MacDonald: Does the member for Oxford disagree with it?

Mr. Innes: I asked the member for York South.

Mr. Bolton: Mr. Chairman, I was asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food from whom I hoped I would receive a reply.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I thought maybe the comments I just had in the debate with my hon. friend from York South might have led my friend from Middlesex South to realize that by stability in the market we mean an increased price for the product that these farmers had to sell. Anyone who knows anything about the egg business recognizes that the price that has been paid for eggs in Ontario over the last few months is anything but satisfactory.

So I would hope that some type of stability might be brought about in the pricing structure of eggs through some type of supply management—certainly not the kind of supply management that generates the overproduction of eggs in this province or in any other province at a price where they cannot be sold at a viable price to those who produce them.

There are many price structures that might be associated with what that satisfactory price might be. I suppose the farmer that has a substantial laying flock might be of the opinion that he could produce cheaper than somebody with a few hundred hens. I think all those things have to be taken into consideration, and I am sure they are by the Egg and Fowl Producers Marketing Board, in the determination of the type of plan that it hopes to place before the egg producers of Ontario.

With regard to milk prices, I am not sure what kind of milk the hon. member refers to as being given away. I hope that it is pasteurized milk, because I think the hon. member would appreciate the health regulations that must be recognized in this regard.

I have not heard many loud complaints concerning the price of fluid milk to the producer. Certainly the price of industrial milk may leave something to be desired. It is in the neighbourhood of—what? Is it \$4.75 or thereabouts with the government subsidy? I believe about that price, with the government subsidy attached?

Certainly anybody would like to see more money for that product. But what happens is that the federal government is establishing the subsidy and is paying that subsidy on a national basis for milk. Of course, off that price comes the amount of the holdback that the Canadian Dairy Commission takes off the subsidy for the export of milk products that

cannot be used in Canada. And I would suppose that one of the best reasons for introducing the market-sharing quota in which Ontario and Quebec are participating—here is another illustration of the farmers of Quebec and Ontario participating in a joint programme that they themselves worked out—is to reduce the amount of milk products that has to be shipped out of this country as surplus products on the world market at far below the price of milk received by producers in this country. This is really what it is all about.

Now if there can be a more satisfactory price established, we are all for it. But at the moment, with the kinds of surpluses that have built up through overproduction of butter and, to some degree in the past, of cheese—although I do not see that surplus in cheese staring us in the face this year—I see no real solution other than to massively inject more money from the public treasury into the Canadian Dairy Commission subsidy programme. I am not sure what the intention of Ottawa is in this regard. I would be somewhat doubtful if they were going to move in that particular direction.

Mr. MacDonald: In other words, this government is going to supplement what the farmers can get in the marketplace?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, that is what has been going on to a very substantial degree.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the principle I enunciated, and both the minister and the Liberal spokesman raised some doubts about it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, I think one has to get all one can out of the marketplace, and I suggested that to Mr. Olsen last summer when I felt the price of cheese—it was pegged at 46 cents a pound—was far too low, and he raised the price of cheese to 51 cents a pound at the Canadian Dairy Commission's support level. That generated an increase of about 29 cents per hundredweight, I believe, in the price of milk. And the price of powder was increased as well to 24 cents. So that resulted in a net increase to the farmer of 29 cents per hundredweight. That is what I mean by getting more out of the marketplace.

But by the same token, the federal government's continuing its \$115-million subsidy to the dairy industry of Canada is a substantial injection of public funds from the public treasury to the industrial milk producers of Canada.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I just comment briefly on this. There was an interjection which I did not respond to personally but I think it is a substantive point. It was this: Do I agree with these giveaway programmes that have taken place in Guelph and apparently are to take place in London tomorrow?

There is a continuing problem of relationships between the urban and rural communities, and when the farmers take a stand on an issue they would need to be pretty obtuse not to recognize that they have got to take into account the public relations aspects of that problem.

I was interested to discover, for example, that the Ontario Federation of Agriculture is now meeting with trade unions, tenants' associations and such groups in the cities to discuss with them their proposals for lifting education tax off property because there is a potential urban backlash on that issue and they are trying to cope with it.

I think there is essentially the same kind of a problem in the marketing of farm produce in the city. In some areas we have achieved some degree of security in terms of the prices to agriculture. The minister says, "milk." But he has just reminded us that this has been achieved, if it has been achieved satisfactorily, only with the injection of \$115 million in public funds.

But to let the city people know that, for example, the price of eggs is ludicrous at the moment—

Mr. Sargent: The hon. member is right for once.

Mr. MacDonald: As a public relations proposition, how do you get this information across? Well in this instance, a group of Ontario farmers said: "We are getting very little for eggs anyway, and as a bit of advertising we will give them away."

Mr. Spence: Who said we were against that?

Mr. MacDonald: Your Liberal critic asked—

Mr. Innes: I said yes.

Mr. MacDonald: —were we in favour of it, and I am rising to say, "Yes, I am in favour of it." I ask him in turn, "Are you in favour and if so why were you asking me the question?"

Mr. Innes: I am not in favour of the eggs and the milk. The eggs are okay, but they could have corrected their situation had they

wanted to in the milk proposition, because they are on a quota system. And if they themselves cannot manage their business to arrange to get enough quota, which is available, it really is not the fault of the public.

Mr. MacDonald: What I am saying is that my support for them is unqualified. The Liberal critic has just indicated that his is somewhat qualified.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Welland South.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Chairman, I want to get on to dealing with inspection and quality control of agricultural products marketed in Ontario.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, are we still on item 2?

Mr. Chairman: On marketing? the member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: Yes that is right. I happen to represent a riding, Mr. Chairman, the Welland South riding, which contains a large number of marshlands. This marshland is being increased year by year for more marketing of vegetables in that particular area. The report some 130 years ago said there was a great possibility that this could increase the potential of marketing vegetables in the area.

The point that I want to raise is that these particular growers in this area find that they do have some problems of marketing their vegetables within the area. One of the reasons is that when you enter a large store in the area, such as Dominion Stores, A & P, and Loblaws, you can buy potatoes which say, "Ontario No. 1 Potatoes" in big letters—"Ontario No. 1 potatoes." People buy them and when they get them home and look at the package it says, "Produced in United States."

I was wondering what the department has in mind to control the marketing or labelling of certain produce in Ontario. The other one is canned peaches that can be picked up in the supermarkets. Again, if you add a little bit of water and a little bit of sugar to it, you will find out it meets Ontario standard No. 1, but yet it is produced in the United States. Yet in the Niagara Peninsula there are trees just laden with fruit—but no buyers.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! I thought the hon. member was going to be speaking about marketing. The hon. member is really on item 3.

Mr. Sargent: This is marketing; 100 per cent marketing!

Mr. Chairman: Item 3 is quality control.

Mr. Haggerty: That is right.

Mr. Chairman: I think the hon. member's remarks would be more—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is in the next vote, quality control of—

Mr. Haggerty: I have continued this far, Mr. Chairman, you might as well let me go through this.

Mr. Chairman: There is somebody who wished to speak back on the thought we were pursuing a moment ago, if the hon. member would keep his remarks for item 3.

Item 2, the member for Brantford.

Mr. Makarchuk: Yes. Back on marketing, Mr. Chairman: In the previous years on the estimates we always asked the minister to try to find out the reasons for the price differential that the farmer gets and what the consumer pays, and we suggested that possibly he should make some effort to give the public an indication of the price spread that exists, and also perhaps include the comments of the department itself on whether it is a fair price spread or it is not a fair price spread.

I think the minister did say last year he was going to look into some of these matters and perhaps make them public in the press or on the radio. I was just wondering if the minister has done anything or is moving in that direction, because that is one of the major problems—the share of the consumer dollar the farmer is getting these days.

We all know the farmer's share is falling down, and despite the fact the government may bring in production controls, or the farmers may have production controls, the price at the other end is still set by somebody else and the farmer has very little to say on this matter. I think to a great extent the consumer is basically ignorant of the relationship that exists between the amount the farmer gets for his produce and the amount the consumer pays.

I think it is the responsibility of the minister's department somehow to bring it to the attention of the consumer, and the farmer I am sure will pick up this information. In the process, the minister may have some type of suasion, moral suasion or whatever it is, on some of the retailers or wholesalers in terms

of controlling the prices or passing down to the farmer a greater share of the consumer dollar.

The minister mentioned he was going to do something about this last year. I wonder if he has done anything in the intervening period?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Obviously what we have done has not registered with my hon. friend.

Mr. Makarchuk: Well if the minister did, he would not have the problem now.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, there is no solution in that kind of talk.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I am no authority on marketing, but I would like to have a couple of moments of dialogue with the minister in a long-view look at the whole problem of this marketing. I am amazed at the magnitude of the problem and the intricacies that seem to be solving themselves, partially in spite of politicians. But I would say to the minister this: No plant, whether it is in manufacturing or any area of our economy, can continue to operate at half production. Full production would seem to me to be the answer for perfection. I would like to suggest that, if our agricultural plants across the province are to be continually operating at controlled production, half production, or what have you, we will have a very dull future.

I am wondering if there is any area in which we could say perfection in marketing would be, or it would be if our plants could sell their complete output and we would have a very healthy economy for all our people. Why I say this is, this would never happen, but if it could happen in marketing this way, that all our farmers could sell their complete production, then we would have heaven on earth as far as agriculture is concerned.

But I am asking the minister, with all the technology we have in refrigeration and preserving things for the future, if we could establish area food banks? The minister has probably heard a lot. I do not know the answer to it. But if we could have area food banks, giant refrigeration units could store things for the future, out of all the output of our agriculture plants. When we go around the world offering foreign aid to people, instead of giving them cash we could give them food. Then we could turn back dollars

to our people. I wonder if there could be some working arrangement with Ottawa to say, "Here, if you are going to do these things around the world, here is money in the form of food—beef or what have you." Is there ever any chance to solve our long-term marketing problem by looking to the future and doing this thing through food banks and refrigeration?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, as my hon. friend is likely very well aware, through the food and agricultural organizations there is the World Food Bank. It is not as easy to get rid of surplus food products to some nations as one might think, because each of the developing countries has its own economy to think of and most of those economies are based on an agricultural foundation. They are very jealous of the right to produce and expand food production within their particular countries to the place where they get into the export market.

Mr. Sargent: May I ask a question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: In spite of the fact that we are told half the world goes to bed hungry at night, is it still a fact there is no market for this food?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I doubt those statements very much that half the world goes to bed hungry every night. They may not have the type of balanced diet that we enjoy in our standard of living here, but I doubt very much if they go to bed hungry every night.

I think we have to recognize that the idea of preserving surplus food products, that is conserving and storing them, has been tried by our friends in the United States. Perhaps there is no country in the history of the world that has stored more agricultural products than has the United States. They have used many of them in giveaway food programmes, not only in the United States but outside of the United States. But I think we are all agreed that it has not really resolved anything, because they simply go merrily on producing.

With all the restrictions that have been placed on production, even in the United States there still remains a problem of enormous overproduction of some commodities. I appreciate the concern my hon. friend has expressed and, on the face of it, it is quite logical, but I am not so sure that it is that easy to implement.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, on the matter that was raised by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, I feel that he expresses the views of many people in the Legislature and in the community. It is simply a matter not so much of technology but a matter of co-operation among governments that could use our tremendous productive capacities for the good of those beyond our own nation. The minister of course is well aware of the problems and there is no simple solution.

I have two specific things I would like to put to the minister. The first has to do with the apple producers and their marketing problems. The minister is aware of tremendous overproduction in the world market, and recent reports and pictures have indicated the destruction of huge supplies of top-quality apples in France and Italy and subsidies from those governments to farmers who are prepared to root out their orchards.

I have been approached by a number of apple farmers in Ontario who really face a most bleak prospect and outlook. Even those who are prepared to almost hand-polish the fruit and sell it over a couple of planks at a local market to people who appreciate this special kind of service, are finding more and more that the prices they are able to get from the community simply do not meet their basic expense requirements.

I know that the apple marketing board—is it called by that title?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The Apple Marketing Commission.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, the Apple Marketing Commission has been in operation for some two years now, and if anything, I would say the problems are substantially worse than they were when the commission took over. I am not complaining that they have not done a good job, I am simply saying that the net result is the situations the producers find themselves in now are practically disastrous.

The owners and operators of farms or orchards that have been in productive and profitable operation for three generations are now simply facing the alternative, and apparently there is not really any alternative; they are just rooting out their orchards and trying to go into some other means of production, and they are having difficulty to decide what to do. I would like to know what sort of advice the minister is giving these farmers? What prospects can be held out for an improvement in that situation?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, first of all, we recognize there are some real problems in the apple marketing industry. But here again it goes right back to the incredible increase in production that has taken place in Italy and France particularly since the end of the Second World War. Markets that normally were enjoyed by countries such as Canada in European countries have suddenly disappeared. And to add insult to injury, this last year it is estimated that 1.5 million cases of apple juice were brought into this country from Italy, France and other European countries. Really, where is our market going to go?

This is the reason we called an apple marketing conference, the first one of its kind ever held in Canada, in Toronto last fall. We had all of the apple-producing provinces represented at that conference. I think it at least brought things out in the light. We were able to take a good look at the situation, but there is no easy solution for it.

We have provided, in the capital grants programme that we introduced as of April 1, 1971, the right for farmers who wish to take out those orchards to qualify for capital grants. There are many old orchards in this province that should be cleaned up and removed. That may help a little to relieve some of the problem, but it is a world surplus situation. There is just no question of it at all. We are caught in the grips of this very difficult problem, and I find no easy solution.

My hon. friend suggests that the apple commission may not have been able to accomplish a great deal in the last two years in strengthening the position of the apple grower. I hesitate to think what the position of the apple grower in Ontario would have been without the apple commission. This is the other side of the coin. And while juice and peeler apples—as my hon. friend from Grey South knows so well, really the apple-growing area of Ontario is actually centred now in that part of the province in the Collingwood area.

Mr. Sargent: That is why we should put a school there.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We feel that there is just no easy solution to this matter of juice and peeler apples. Now, we have made certain grants to—

Mr. Sargent: An agricultural college for Thornbury and Clarksburg!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —to some companies to help them with these problems, help the producers to market a little better the products of their orchards. I must confess, it is not a very bright future as I see it at the moment.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, one small point in addition. I know that the commission and the marketing branch of the department have done their best to assist in increasing the consumption of apples in the province, but when I look in the fruit cooler of our own refrigerator at home during the winter, I see all sorts of oranges and grapefruit there at 79 and 89 cents a dozen for the oranges.

There are always apples there too, but I often think of how successful the citrus fruit industry has been in maintaining prices and ever increasing consumption. We serve apples in our home in the middle of winter and people say, "Is this not marvelous, you have got apples."

There just does not seem to be an appreciation that modern storage, gas storage particularly, keeps them as fresh as when they were picked off the tree, and that they just are not that sort of a special treat that you get for two or three weeks in the fall when you see them in bushels out along the highway.

I do not know what the answer is, but maybe it is an education in advertising. I have often felt that perhaps even with the expenditure of a lot of initiative and money, we still have not broken through that barrier that keeps most families spending a lot of money for citrus fruits when we have got this tremendous attractive alternative immediately available.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend has raised a very good question, and that is promotion of this apple product, because it is a major product in this province of ours. The food council, following the apple industry conference we had, have embarked upon a major promotion programme involving not only our apple producers and the Apple Marketing Commission in Ontario, but on a national apple promotion programme, "Canadian Apples for Canadians," and we are now right in the midst of this programme.

There has been a special press kit distributed to 130 food editors in Ontario. The kit contained a photograph, four recipes from our new apple booklet currently under revision, and five press releases dealing with controlled atmosphere storage, and the quality of apples that come out; general information and uses of Canadian apples and

their low-calorie benefits. And this is something we should be stressing.

Now this was sent with a covering letter explaining the nature of the campaign and requesting their full support. There were four press releases distributed to our regular mailing list of 750 food editors during the week of April 26—this week. Six radio tapes and scripts dealing with promotion of controlled atmosphere storage were distributed to 70 radio stations in Ontario. The material was sent with a covering letter as well. Retailers' handling fact sheets—for those who handle the apples—will be sent to produce buyers and supervisors of retail food chains in Metropolitan Toronto.

Letters were sent to all extension personnel and department heads informing them of the campaign and soliciting their support in their local areas. Letters to Canadian catering companies such as Versafoods, Cara Operations, Canteen of Canada, asked them to feature Canadian apples on their menus. Special publicity was used—in "Carnival of Books" at the Ontario Government Bookstore's birthday celebration apples were available to all guests.

In the Canadian Restaurant Association 1971 Food Services and Hospitality Show apples will be distributed at the Canadian Dietetic Association booth tagged with the sign "ACDA, approved diet dessert."

These are just a few of the ideas that have been developed by the food council and are in effect right now to try to relieve this incredible surplus of apples that we have built up in Canada today. In British Columbia, in Ontario, in Nova Scotia, in Quebec, it is a major problem and we are focusing every effort we can on trying to bring to the attention of consumers—as my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, so well suggests, perhaps we should make our consumers more conscious of the delightful qualities of home grown Canadian apples and that is what we are trying to do.

Mr. Nixon: I just would like to point out that we will certainly support that programme. But I wonder how many people here, or in the gallery, or in the community, know that we are at the peak of the apple promotion advertising campaign, because I just do not think it is making that kind of an impact and I regret to say it. I wonder how many people in the gallery are not aware of the Esso NHL Power Players programme. Maybe you need Stan Randall or Eddie Sargent Enterprises or somebody who would

take hold of apple selling with a little more imagination. think it would be great to give free apples at the opening of the government bookstore; I think that would be marvellous. If we are at the peak of the apple advertising campaign now—well I cannot tell it from the valley.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2. The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: A question, Mr. Chairman. The minister mentioned that there is a World Food Bank. In view of the fact that we are the leading production province in this whole nation, what do we give to the World Food Bank each year in contributions of food and what is our revenue from that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, as a province we do not make any contributions. Anything that is done is done through The Department of Agriculture at Ottawa.

Mr. Sargent: Can we measure what comes out of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I cannot at this moment. I really cannot. I doubt very much if we can.

Mr. Sargent: It seems to me if this department is spending \$2 million in marketing, its people should know where the final outlet of our production is. Is it the UN in New York that handles distribution for the World Food Bank?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is done through the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations with headquarters in Rome, and the Canadian government participates in those programmes.

Mr. Sargent: Does the Canadian government have liaison with the Rome office?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, yes.

Mr. Sargent: And the minister does not know what comes out of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I cannot tell the member the exact amount. It is purchased by the federal government.

Mr. Sargent: I think it might be a good idea to find out when we are spending \$2 million there.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, just one other point: We were treated to a considerable discussion about the recommendations in the

fifth volume of the McRuer report dealing with marketing boards; I wonder how the minister is setting up his administration to review these recommendations, with the possibility of amending the legislation to undertake the safeguards in marketing that were recommended in that report.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I have any lawyers left in my department after the debate last night, I will turn the McRuer Report and The Farm Products Marketing Act over to them and say, "Go to work and advise us of their conclusions."

Mr. Nixon: The minister certainly does not want to get rid of any of them.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2. The member for Brantford.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I should not have any, according to your friend next to you.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, on the matter of marketing, last year or the year before we raised—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Nothing but hot air—known as the windjammer of Downsview.

Mr. Makarchuk: That is one of our natural resource industries.

Last year we raised the possibility of the minister using some of the surplus food that we have in storage, such as cheese, powdered milk and so forth, in trying to provide it to various institutions in Ontario and possibly in Canada. The minister said that he would consider this matter. Would he indicate now if he has looked into it or has he made any decision on this?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I did not hear what the member asked me.

Mr. Makarchuk: Two years ago we raised the possibility that surplus food in storage in Ontario be used to supplement diets either in schools or various institutions around the province. At that time the minister said that he would consider this proposition, and I just wondered what he had done in the meantime?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is safe to say that the government is still considering the idea.

Mr. Lawlor: The government goes on indefinitely considering it.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, the government is taking its time about it, that is quite obvious. But surely, in a period of high unemployment and with the considerable

number of people on welfare, and taking into account that there are many institutions even in Toronto and other areas around the province that supply free meals to transients or people out of work, would this not be the logical time to possibly use some of this food instead of letting it lie around in the warehouses and provide it to these institutions so that they can serve it out to these people as supplementary diets? Does the minister not think that this would be the logical thing to do instead of having it lie there?

Mr. Chairman: Item 2.

Mr. Makarchuk: I would like to hear the minister's comments on this.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I gave the member my comments.

Mr. Makarchuk: The minister did not give me any comments. He said that he was still looking at it. Is he planning on doing anything about it or not?

Mr. Lawlor: The minister said that he was contemplating on it.

Mr. Makarchuk: When this issue was raised the last time, Mr. Chairman, there were headlines in the local papers that the Minister of Agriculture and Food was going to consider this proposition. Two years later he says he is still considering. He is the most considering minister there is in the House, and let me tell you it is pretty hard to beat that record.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister has not done a thing about it and he does not intend to. He is too obtuse to say so.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Makarchuk: In other words, the minister is just refusing to do anything. Am I correct in assuming that?

An hon. member: That is the best he has to give.

Mr. Chairman: The minister has given his answer.

Mr. Makarchuk: The minister had not given an answer. The members of the House just want to make sure the minister is getting the message, that is all.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, we are all concerned over the sale and the increase of sales of Ontario-produced-and-grown agricultural products. I

was wondering if the minister ever considered requiring, during the sale of articles in supermarkets, other stores and so forth, that in the packaging and the wrapping, any Ontario-produced or Canada-produced-and-grown articles have a tag or some type of a little marker inserted so that the purchaser knows that it is Ontario-grown?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Here again, this comes under quality.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I bring it under marketing because we are interested in selling and marketing of Ontario products. I am not discussing the idea of the quality of the merchandise.

Mr. Chairman: We will get to that point in just a moment. There is nothing further on marketing anyway.

Anything on item 2?

Vote 103, item 2 agreed to.

On item 3:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There are some of the marketing boards that do this now with containers marked "Produce of Ontario" or "Produce of Canada." You see apple cartons that are stamped "Produce of Ontario"; "Ontario apples."

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Minister, I would go even a little further than that. Rather than have it on display in the supermarket when they package, regardless of the size of the package, let there be some type of little card or tag attached to the product at the sale end so that the purchaser knows that this is an Ontario-grown or Ontario-raised agricultural product.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: All right.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3. The member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, in respect to packaging quality control—I suppose packaging is part of quality control—I was wondering about the new packages, the styrofoam packages that eggs now come in. I presume that this is an improvement insofar as breakage is concerned. It protects the product and brings it to the customer in better condition.

I wonder about two things and whether the minister has some answer on them. First of all, does this add considerably to the cost

of the eggs and the cost which now is absorbed, not by the consumer but by the producer and therefore his price is driven down a bit? It may not be significant; I do not know.

The second is in connection with pollution. The old cardboard packages would break down easily in the incinerators or in the sanitary landfill, but the styrofoam is not quite as degradable as the old packages. I wonder, with the quantity which is now produced and the quality of eggs that are sold, whether this adds to the real hazards in the whole field of pollution? I wonder if the minister has some answers in these two questions?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I really could not give the member a positive answer on either one, because I frankly do not know. It is something that we can look into. I suppose that there could be some problem there, but I have no idea what the answer is.

Mr. Young: Just looking at it, it looks as if the cost might be much more, but I do not know. It may be that this is one factor in the depressing of the price to the producer.

The other part, it seems to me, is important. We ought to be looking at the whole matter from the point of view of the pollution that is being caused by this kind of packaging here and in many other areas.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, on the same point, this is related to frozen foods or packages of frozen foods in the supermarkets. Does the minister consider—this has been raised before—some form of date of the food to ensure that it has not been frozen and refrozen or remained on the shelves for a period of time, by which it could be harmful to the people who are buying the food? What are the regulations regarding the time that frozen food can be kept, and whether any control is carried out right now by the department to ensure that it is relatively fresh or that it has not suffered any damage in transit or in storage?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is a very difficult subject. There is no question about that at all. There has been some consideration given to it by our department and by other departments of government where this has been tried. It has not worked very satisfactorily. There are many problems associated with it, but I can tell the members that the whole matter of grading quality regulations is under review by the Deputy Ministers of Agriculture across Canada.

They had a meeting recently and this was one of the points of discussion, as well as including some of the suggestions that have been made here this morning. The desirability of dating frozen products is very difficult to determine, and I am not so that sure it would always be in the best interests of the consumers themselves.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, on the same point, I am not too sure why it would not be in the best interests of the consumers themselves. I am sure the consumer is interested in getting fresher produce, and it will also make the retailer or the wholesaler a bit more selective about the products that they turn out and the amount they order and there will be some kind of control.

As it is, they could just put packages on top of packages, and the packages at the top are being sold. The ones at the bottom may remain at the bottom for months and months, in which case they may spoil and some consumer eventually gets stuck with this thing, or there may be a reshuffling. This is where I think dating would be helpful.

The minister says this matter is under review. Could he indicate when the review will come to an end so we can have some specific date from him, seeing that he is considering other things forever?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I cannot give that date, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue the idea of the dating and also the grading. Going into the supermarket, quite often a purchaser of meat products believes that he is buying a red brand quality of meat, only to find out after going through the experience, that it was anything but red brand.

My suggestion to the minister is, should there not be some type of regulation required in the packaging of the food that its grade also be included? Apparently the supermarkets are only interested in disposing of the article. They do not care whether it happens to be red, blue, commercial or even a utility brand of beef. Would the minister care to remark on that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I see a certain amount of value in this business of dating the packages, quite frankly, from the producer's standpoint. This is why it is under review at the national level. It has to be done at the

national level if it is going to be effective, because many of these products are distributed on a national basis through the various food brokers, wholesalers and processing companies. I think there is a great deal of merit in the suggestion and I would like to see it further explored.

Mr. B. Newman: Would the minister then consider asking the big chains to voluntarily undertake a grading and a display of the grade in the sale of their products? I at this time specifically refer to beef products.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: To what products?

Mr. B. Newman: Beef.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: To beef?

Mr. B. Newman: Yes

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, that is strange.

Mr. B. Newman: You go to a store and you buy what you think is a red brand of beef, a steak red brand, and you find out that you are buying commercial or utility brand.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not know how the hon. member would find that out.

Mr. B. Newman: You can usually tell by the taste, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh no, you cannot tell by the taste, definitely not. As I understand it, all beef that is sold in the food outlets is graded beef. There are various grades of beef, but it is graded beef and there are many supermarkets who pride themselves on selling one standard grade of beef.

Mr. B. Newman: But do they?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: As far as I know they do.

Mr. B. Newman: They say they do.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They say they do and we have no reason to believe that they do not. I would think it would be quite a serious thing if they were trying to mislead the consumer.

Mr. B. Newman: It would be easy to check. All you would have to do is check the invoice.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The consumer can check himself, because it is stamped right on the beef. The grade is right there on the beef.

Mr. B. Newman: But likewise the beef product, when purchased, is also trimmed—and if it is anything but a red brand of beef it is trimmed so that the consumer could not see the blue or the commercial labelling on it.

I will tell the minister from practical experience of my own purchases that it is all right for someone else to say otherwise.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Brantford.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, on the matter of dating again, the minister said that this would be something that will have to be looked into at the national level. I cannot understand his reasoning. If the minister can deal with broilers on a provincial level, surely a simple matter of ensuring that the local beef dealers put a date on when either product is put into the coolers in the stores, when it arrives or leaves the storage area, is not that complicated a procedure?

I do not see why the national level should be involved with the dating. Most of the warehouses are located in Ontario. The originating centres are in Ontario and the dating can be carried out here very effectively.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3?

Vote 104, item 3, carried.

Vote 104 agreed to.

On vote 105, item 1:

Mr. Chairman: Agricultural education research programme—item 1.

The member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Chairman, before we get into that I was wondering if the minister had any comment or had an answer to the question that was asked by the member for York North in regard to disbursements of funds for research and development of northern Ontario agriculture?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have those figures and I will table them, Mr. Chairman. I do not think this is the place that you want me to read that long list of figures off, surely?

Mr. T. P. Reid: No, as long as they will be made available to the members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh sure!

Mr. T. P. Reid: May I ask, if I am not getting ahead of the votes—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That was dealt with yesterday.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Pardon me?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That was dealt with yesterday.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I have not seen the figures. Under research and services is there any particular programme going on?

Mr. Chairman: That is item 3. Is there anything further on item 1 of this vote? If not, shall we carry it? The member for Oxford.

Mr. Innes: Agriculture, economics and research council. What does this research council really do? In what areas does it work?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is the federal Agriculture Economics Research Council, and the provincial contribution to that organization is \$7,500 on an annual basis.

Mr. Innes: There are no personnel? That is just a straight grant?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, Dr. Haslett is a member of the board of governors of the Agriculture Economics Research Council. He is director of the economics and statistics branch of our department.

Vote 105, item 1 agreed to.

On item 2:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oxford.

Mr. Innes: This particular vote takes in the whole orbit of education, it takes in the various colleges, the University of Guelph and what have you. There is one specific point that concerns me very much, and I hope the minister will appreciate the concern that we in our particular area have over the threat, or should I say the rumour, that the satellite college of Fanshawe now located in Woodstock—the Fanshawe agricultural satellite—rumour has it that this college could be stopped. Now this has been brought to my attention and it is of great concern to the people in that particular area.

I want to relate just a little bit of what has transpired. As he recalls, the Kemptville school and the Ridgetown school for many years did a real service for those particular areas. Then the Centralia school was opened up and it had a tendency to draw students from the other areas, not so much from Kemptville but certainly from the Ridgetown area up to Centralia.

Consequently, these two other schools are not getting the number of students they would like to have. I think I am right in saying that, and I could be corrected, but I do understand from the report of the minister that at the Ridgetown school last year there were 28 graduates, including 21 in home economics, and there were 25 teachers. I understand that they would like to have some more students there. But when the Centralia school was opened up in Huron—and one of my hon. friends is here from Huron; I hate to say anything about it.

Mr. Gaunt: Go ahead, go ahead!

Mr. Innes: I think this was a political football. I hate to say this—but I do believe this was true and it was draining students from other areas.

Mr. Nixon: It was designed to help the Minister of Highways and Transport.

Mr. Innes: That is true—to some, mind you; not wholly. On the other hand, I do not see why this department should say to the people in our particular area who are doing a good job—these students, incidentally, go back and forth each evening to their college—that there is no way we could get the students to go to Ridgetown or Centralia, in the greatest respect, so why should you people be threatening this particular little school that is doing a real service to our area in a radius of about 60 to 70 miles? This threat is a threat and I hope that it is not true, because if it is, it is going to be dynamite for this department to interfere. I say this with the greatest respect, because there are a group of people who have devoted a lot of their effort, money and time to get this started.

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear!

Mr. Innes: If the minister does happen to take it out, I can tell him that it is going to continue through local support. And if that happens, this government is going to be in serious difficulty. Maybe the minister would like to comment.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the matter that my hon. friend raises is of concern, but I do not know how he and his party and others in the opposition can continually criticize this government for the expenditure of funds and also when we try to correct an absolute duplication of service.

Mr. Innes: The minister is not duplicating anything.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It certainly is a duplication of service. Take the duplication of service that was being provided through the satellite colleges at Woodstock and at Simcoe with the other agricultural colleges.

Mr. Nixon: Take some of the money from the licensing offices and keep the school open.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: These courses are simply being provided to a group of students who could just as easily have been at Ridgetown or at Centralia if they wanted to be.

Mr. Innes: It is not right.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Just a minute. When that programme was started—and I assumed some responsibility for having got it started in that area—

An hon. member: Good move!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —it was given to us on the understanding that the people who wanted to attend that course would be adult farmers who wished to have the opportunity to attend an adult educational type of programme in such an agricultural course. We were not told that they would be grade 12 students.

We were not told that they would be students coming right out of high school and going right into that course rather than going on to Ridgetown or Centralia, where we have all kinds of space, all kinds of teaching facilities and nobody using that space—at least, not being used to the full. We were very much aware of that.

It started out as an experiment. We provided staff, seconded to the Fanshawe College, through the community colleges branch of The Department of Education. We believed it was worth a try. The result was that there were very few full-time farmers who availed themselves of that course. They were grade 12 students.

To put it in the words of my friend, the principal of Fanshawe College, he told me quite frankly that he had almost unlimited funds to go out and, as he described it himself, “rattle the bushes in the high schools and collegiates of western Ontario to produce students for the Fanshawe satellite at Woodstock and at Simcoe.” It was a clear indication to me that the original intent of the programme was not being carried out.

And through discussions that we had with him, and with members of his board as far as our staff is concerned, we came to the

conclusion that we would carry the programme on until May 15, 1971. This was the agreement, and it was to be terminated at that time as far as our department was concerned.

I see no reason why there should be the continuance of a school at Woodstock or at Simcoe, when there is all kinds of classroom space and teachers available in the other two agricultural colleges in western Ontario, that are being maintained by our department. Surely this is outright duplication and waste of government funds to the extent, I think, of something like over \$70,000. Now as a responsible minister of the government, surely to goodness it is my responsibility where I see duplication to try to do something about cutting it out. That is the reason why we made the decision, as far as we are concerned, to end the agreement with Fanshawe College to provide staff. I believe that the Treasury Board has so advised The Department of Education and The Department of University Affairs, where, I believe, the community colleges will eventually rest, to the effect that there should be no more expansion. In fact, there should be no more agricultural courses provided in the community college setup across the province, while there are obviously empty spaces available for these students to attend in other areas.

My hon. friend may ask what happens to the students that already have taken the first year of the course at Fanshawe satellite colleges. We have still an obligation to them in as far as our department is concerned. We offer those students the right to attend either Ridgetown or Centralia and we will have someone visiting those students and offering them this opportunity to attend those courses at a very nominal figure. I think this is fair; it is right that they should be offered it, because they embarked on the programme, perhaps thinking the programme would be carried on. But it was really only an experimental programme. If they came in last year to that course, they must have known full well, if the principal and the staff at Fanshawe College told them, that the agreement would end on May 15, 1971, because it was a formal agreement and that was the date of conclusion.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further discussion? We have arrived at 1 o'clock. There has to be a termination here. Will there be further discussion of item 2?

Mr. Innes: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: It is not carried yet then.

Hon. Mr. Bales moves the committee of supply rise and report it has come to certain conclusions, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the House that the handsome group in the gallery is from Chesley, Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: They are just in, and we welcome them.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Bales moves the adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at 1 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 30, 1971

Federal-provincial participation in rent supplement programme for 1,100 families, statement by Mr. Grossman	1061
Involving municipalities in federal-provincial rent supplement programme, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Peacock, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Singer	1061
Provisions for payments to designated mining municipalities, statement by Mr. Bales	1065
Mining revenue payments reduced this year, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Stokes, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Jackson	1067
Postponement of provincial election date, question to Mr. Guindon, Mr. Nixon	1069
Establishment of Old Fort William in Thunder Bay city area, questions to Mr. Guindon, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis	1069
Negotiations with Hydro-Quebec on James Bay hydro projects, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Nixon	1070
Downgrading of teaching capacity in community colleges re manpower retraining, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Pitman, Mr. J. R. Smith, Mr. Makarchuk	1070
Second Gertler report on Niagara Escarpment or Peninsula, questions to Mr. Brunelle and Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis	1071
Use by law schools of Princeton law school admissions test, question to Mr. White, Mr. Lewis	1071
Government intention to ask IBM to list on Toronto Stock Exchange, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Lewis	1072
Study of transportation between Moosonee and Moose Factory, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Lewis	1072
Ontario government logo in form of elephant, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis	1073
Study on development of tourism in Northern Ontario, questions to Mr. Guindon, Mr. T. P. Reid	1073
Cocktail lounge in basement of legislative building, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Sargent	1073
Industries asked for inventory of pollutants used in manufacturing, question to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Burr	1074
Motion to adopt report, standing committee on human resources, Mr. Villeneuve	1074
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Villeneuve, agreed to	1075
Town of St. Marys, bill respecting, Mr. Deacon, first reading	1075
Estimates, Department of Agriculture and Food, Mr. Stewart, continued	1076
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Bales, agreed to	1098





ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, May 3, 1971

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 3, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We have guests with us today in the east gallery from the George Harvey Secondary School of Toronto; and in the west gallery St. Mary's High School of Hamilton and we are also to have some Boy Scouts from Wyoming. A little later, at 2.30 p.m., in the east gallery we will have students from the Queen Mary School in Peterborough.

I am sure you would want to extend a welcome to these visitors today.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Questions, did you say, Mr. Speaker? Where are the ministers?

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

OFF-TRACK BETTING

Mr. Nixon: I thought with that caucus the Conservative Party had today a few more of them would be in, but I guess they must have gone back to the hustings.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice in what way he is keeping tabs on the expanding off-track betting industry. Is he looking forward to some special regulation or is he just leaving it to the local police to keep tabs that they are not breaking the law?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): This whole question of off-track betting of course is a very troublesome one.

As the hon. member knows, the legal provisions are under the jurisdiction of the federal government, not ours. As far as I know, in the normal course of the administration of justice and the enforcement of those laws in this province the local police or the Ontario Provincial Police both—and for that matter I suppose the RCMP as well—when they learn of infractions of the betting

and gambling laws, carry out investigations in the normal way and charges are laid.

My information is that a great number of charges have been laid, certainly in the Metropolitan Toronto area anyway, in respect of some of these shops.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Can the minister tell the House how many off-track betting outlets there now are in the province?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I cannot. That type of information would not be available to me. I do know that in a number of the county towns there seem to be a number opening and closing. I was interested the other day to note that there are four in Peterborough, and one in Lindsay for instance. I imagine these are being opened and closed with great rapidity by the operators.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, has the minister yet arrived at a provincial philosophy about off-track betting shops?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: A provincial philosophy?

Mr. Singer: What is the hon. minister going to do?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: At the moment the policy of the government here is that this is something that falls completely under the statutory authority of the federal government at Ottawa.

Unless they change the law or until we have wider jurisdiction or authority here in the provincial field, my friend's question is completely hypothetical.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, does this government intend to make any representations about this situation to the federal authorities?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: At the moment there is not very much that should be done, in my own mind, as far as this government is concerned. Usually in matters of this kind, any suggestion that emanates from the provincial government does not get very far as far as our friends at Ottawa are concerned.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary—

Mr. Nixon: All purpose entry!

Mr. Singer: Does the minister disown his predecessor's views, which he expressed sometime—I guess about last November after the House had risen?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It may be a very dangerous thing to disown something that one is not too sure of—if it was said in the first place—but I do not disown anything that my predecessor said.

Mr. Singer: That is the minister's trouble.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Keep trying!

FARM DEATH OF ONTARIO HOSPITAL PATIENT

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health: Has he undertaken an investigation into the situation that resulted in the death of a patient at the Rideau Regional Hospital School at Smiths Falls who was working on a farm labour assignment, particularly in view of the fact that the local coroner says that some of these young people are being exploited as farm workers?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not, as minister, done this. But I will check and see whether the mental health branch has undertaken such an investigation.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Is the minister aware of the policy of the department which puts these young people from the hospital schools out as farm labour and does not adequately investigate their situation?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I cannot accept the last half of that offhand, Mr. Speaker, but I am aware of the policy of trying to have the young people who are capable of it out in the fields of labour, in farm labour in particular, as much as possible.

The latter half, the allegation that they are exploited, I will have to assess.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier—

Mr. Speaker: Order please! I wonder if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would hold his question. The hon. the Prime Minis-

ter has a statement that he intended to make. Does he have the permission of the House to revert to that order of business, and then we will return to the hon. Leader of the Opposition?

An hon. member: The Prime Minister is going to announce an election.

Mr. Speaker: Do we have this concurred in?

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have a hopefully not too lengthy statement on bilingualism in the Province of Ontario. This is the first opportunity I have had since assuming my responsibilities as leader of the government to comment on this subject. I believe it is important that I state clearly the determination of the new government to continue the general philosophy and programme which was set in motion by my predecessor, the member for London North (Mr. Robarts). They will serve as our guidelines.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the basic principle of the bilingualism policy was established at the first federal-provincial constitutional conference in February of 1968. At that time the government of Ontario agreed to provide, wherever feasible, public service in French as well as in English, so that the people of Ontario would be able to deal in either language with the various levels of government with which they come in contact.

At the second constitutional conference, in February of 1969, this statement was elaborated upon by the submission of three propositions regarding our linguistic policy. Among the objectives of Confederation it was proposed that firstly, Canada should be a bilingual country while maintaining its multicultural character; secondly, all governments in Canada should provide, wherever practicable, public services in the English and French languages; and thirdly, all Canadian parents should, as a matter of equity, be able to have their children educated in either or both of the official language.

In addition, the first two articles of the 1969 agreement between Ontario and Quebec regarding educational, cultural and governmental co-operation and exchange set out the commitments of the two governments on the question of linguistic rights.

In that agreement it was stated that, firstly, we will provide within the areas under our jurisdiction, and wherever feasible, public

services in the English and French languages, secondly, we will provide education, wherever feasible, to students of the French-speaking and English-speaking minority in the language of that minority. We will also provide them with the means to acquire a good command of the language of the majority.

The approach which has been developed should be clearly understood. I want to repeat here, as explicitly as possible, that a wider and more formal recognition of the French language in Ontario will not force anything on anyone. Our policy does not require everyone to become bilingual. It does not mean that we are trying to force two languages and two cultures upon every Canadian.

As the first volume of the report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism stated, a bilingual country is one in which the great majority of its citizens may well be unilingual. Therefore what Ontario's policy means is that the legitimate requirements of Ontario's French-speaking population are being met and will continue to be met.

Despite the discussions at the Confederation of Tomorrow conference, at the six federal-provincial constitutional conferences and at the many meetings of their associated committees, a firm agreement among all the governments of Canada has yet to be reached on the best method to proceed with any formal constitutional change on the question of linguistic rights. However, in the same period there has developed a consensus on attitudes. Much has already been accomplished by governments in implementing practical changes in educational and other programmes and in ensuring better liaison among governments to exchange information in this area.

The next constitutional conference is to be held in Victoria in June. Further discussion is planned on this topic at that time.

In our province, Mr. Speaker, we have always stressed that the most effective method of ensuring the provision of public services in both the English and French languages is by means of the legislative and administrative processes of each government. We believe that changes made in this way will create a sound foundation for any future constitutional agreement regarding linguistic guarantees. The new government intends to proceed in areas within our jurisdiction to meet the principles set out in the propositions and statements of the government of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to set out the bilingualism programme of the government. In doing so, I shall deal with it under eight categories: The structures required for implementation, the provincial public service, municipal services, judicial services, the Legislature, education, translation services and bilingual districts.

Firstly, the structures for implementation: At the first constitutional conference in February of 1968 the government announced the creation of four task forces to investigate the provision of bilingual services in the provincial public service, the administration of justice, municipal administration and the Legislature and provincial statutes. The policy which I am putting before the House today is based partly on the experience we have gained in the last three years in the field of bilingualism and on further studies made during that period.

One year ago, the then Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Roberts) announced the appointment of the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. W. A. B. Anderson, as the co-ordinator on bilingualism. It is his task to co-ordinate and oversee the implementation of Ontario programmes for the provision of bilingual services. Last autumn, the government created a committee of advisors on bilingualism made up of representatives of each department and agency to assist the co-ordinator in his work.

During the last four months, all departments have been examining the extent to which bilingual services are provided in their departments and agencies. They have also been preparing specific programmes to meet the government guidelines.

Provincial public services: Insofar as the approach we are taking regarding the provincial public service is concerned, it should be kept in mind that when we began an examination of this question it was in the knowledge that there already exists a substantial amount of bilingualism in Ontario's public service. This is particularly true in areas where there is a concentration of French-speaking people. Over the years the government has recruited bilingual personnel and some documents have been produced in both languages in order to serve effectively the French-speaking areas of the province.

As the second stage in our bilingualism programme and to supplement the bilingual personnel already on staff, French-language courses were begun in the spring of 1968. Instruction has been provided for members of the Legislature and for civil servants whose

duties require a knowledge of French. In the three years since the programme was launched close to 2,000 civil servants, both in Toronto and in the field, were nominated by their departments for the French-language courses given in Toronto. Language centres now operate in Sudbury and Ottawa to handle the increasing demand for French-language instruction among Ontario civil servants. We estimate there will be approximately 700 civil servants enrolled this year, 1971-1972.

These two important factors—the existence and recruitment of competent bilingual personnel and the language training programme—have provided us with a sound basis on which to plan our next steps.

The programme I am outlining today will enable us to reinforce and improve the bilingual services we are already providing to meet the needs of French-speaking Ontarians. In addition, we have decided to implement the following specific measures:

1. To give a definite framework to the provision of bilingual public services in Ontario, all departments and agencies of the government of Ontario will be directed to give attention to the provision, wherever feasible, of a full range of bilingual services, beginning in those—

Mr. Nixon: Directed to give attention wherever feasible?

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right.

Mr. Nixon: Does the Premier not think he is taking too much risk?

Hon. Mr. Davis:—beginning in those areas of Ontario where there are concentrations of French-speaking people. The main concentrations occur in eastern and northeastern Ontario in the counties and districts of Stormont, Glengarry, Prescott, Russell, Carleton, Nipissing, Timiskaming, Cochrane, Sudbury and Algoma. Other concentrations are to be found in the vicinity of Penetanguishene, Welland and in parts of the counties of Essex and Renfrew. I would stress, Mr. Speaker, that these areas will serve as guides in the provision of bilingual public services and we do not intend to be rigidly bound by them.

2. Government agencies in these areas will provide over-the-counter services in English and French. In addition—

Mr. Singer: Clear, concise and forceful.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I recognize the member for Downsview has very little interest in bilingualism, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps some of the others have.

Mr. Singer: I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) will now be able to communicate with his Quebec counterpart.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In addition—

Mr. Singer: Is the Minister of Agriculture able to speak with Monsieur Toupin?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Flexible and realistic!

Mr. Singer: Why should he worry about Monsieur Toupin?

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Eat the peanuts and leave us alone.

Hon. Mr. Davis: A very germane observation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member was better in the front row, we could hear him.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, the member heard it, did he?

In addition, those agencies which have personnel in areas of French-speaking concentration will review their staffs to determine the positions in which bilingual skills are necessary or desirable.

I should underline at this point, Mr. Speaker, and I want to be most emphatic about it—

Mr. Singer: Emphatic? Ah, here we are!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are members ready? That this policy will be implemented in such a way that the careers of those unilingual persons holding these positions will in no way be affected.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I recognize the members opposite really are not that concerned about the civil service; I happen to be!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the problems in this regard which have developed at the federal level, and I wish to make my commitment very clear, and I repeat it: The careers of unilingual persons in the public service will in no way be threatened now or in the future. I should also add that the future entry or promotion of unilingual persons into the Ontario public service will not be affected by our policy on bilingualism.

3. All government agencies will begin to establish a priority list of official documents for printing in both English and French, such as birth certificates, drivers' licences, instructional manuals and hospital insurance certificates. These will be produced in both languages as soon as possible.

4. We are implementing measures pertinent to job advertising and language testing designed to facilitate the recruitment of bilingual personnel.

In the field of municipal services, Mr. Speaker, many municipalities in the northern and eastern parts of the province already provide a number of services in both the English and French language. Again, this situation has developed in response to the practical necessity of providing services for the residents of those municipalities, many of whom are French-speaking. On this basis, we have decided to take the following steps:

1. We intend to introduce amendments to The Municipal Act to permit any municipality in Ontario to provide its services in the English and French languages.

2. An amendment will be introduced to The Highway Traffic Act to permit any municipality to provide all municipal public information and traffic signs in English and French.

3. We will make available to municipal elected representatives and officials the government's language training facilities. Courses for clerks, assessors, and treasurers will be given, as needed, in French as well as in English. French versions of various municipal statutes will be made available.

4. To alleviate the financial burden which might be imposed on participating municipalities, the government will consider reimbursing those municipalities, subject to a formula to be devised by the Treasury Board in co-operation with The Department of Municipal Affairs, for expenditures which are incurred as a direct result of the provision of bilingual public services.

A special task force of the committee of advisers on bilingualism is already looking into this question. The government intends to work closely with the municipal liaison committee in developing these measures.

In the field of judicial services. In considering a more extensive use of French in Ontario's judicial services, we must bear in mind that relatively few members of the judiciary and bar are bilingual. This is an important limitation on the steps the government can

take. But we intend to introduce certain measures as a start in improving the situation.

The immediate aim of our policy is to expand the provision of bilingual services, both verbal and written, as quickly as possible. It would be misleading to raise the expectations of the French-speaking population of Ontario without being able to meet these expectations. The development of sound bilingual procedures in the judicial administration of the province will require time and patience. However, we will begin by taking the following steps:

1. Throughout The Department of Justice and Attorney General a continued policy will be pursued to recruit additional bilingual personnel in those areas having a substantial number of French-speaking residents. This approach will ensure that judicial offices in French-speaking areas will be adequately staffed with bilingual personnel. This programme is now under way.

2. To increase the numbers of bilingual judicial personnel, the language-training facilities of the government have been made available to these people at the three provincial centres where such instruction is given.

3. The translation of legal documents commonly served on the public poses a particular problem since their format and/or content are regulated by statute or by long-standing rules of practice and procedure. However, even with these restrictions, certain documents can be rendered in bilingual form. The Department of Justice and Attorney General will begin by producing in English and French judicial notices commonly served on the public. In addition, a variety of legal documents, such as subpoenas and summonses, will be accompanied by an information sticker containing the essential details in French. The next stage of our programme will be to explore ways of permitting the use of French in the courts of Ontario, beginning in the lower courts.

We will seek close consultation with the federal government, as its Official Languages Act is implemented, concerning those sections of the Act which affect the courts. We believe that the experience with bilingualism in the federal courts, as well as in those of Quebec and New Brunswick, will help us to develop sound and realistic programmes for our own provincial courts.

Fourthly, the Legislature: I should like to turn to the subject of bilingualism in the Legislature.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that on July 22, 1968, the government introduced the following motion, which was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED,

That, henceforth, every member of this House, may as a matter of right in this House, address the House in either of the two official languages of Canada.

We now propose to give more substance to this motion by taking the following steps:

1. The debates of the Legislature will continue to be recorded in whichever of the two languages, English or French, is used. Therefore, members are free to use and should be encouraged to use, whichever language, English or French, is most natural to them.

2. Resolutions, motions and questions will be printed in the Votes and Proceedings and the order and notice paper in whichever of the official languages they are tabled.

3. Although the bills and statutes of the House will continue to be printed in English only, unofficial French translations will be made available by the appropriate departments of those statutes likely to be of general interest.

4. As more competent translators become available, other statutes and regulations will be made available in unofficial French versions.

In the field of education: Since the announcement in August of 1967 that French-language secondary schools will be established within the publicly financed school system, 63 bilingual schools have been developed. Of these, 22 offer the entire programme, except for English, in the French language.

At the elementary level, there were more than 90,000 French-speaking students in 329 schools last year. We are equally encouraged by the development of the two French-language teachers' colleges at the University of Ottawa and Laurentian University.

The legislative and administrative action taken in this area met with the spirit of the recommendations made in the second volume of the report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Therefore, we believe we are recognizing our responsibilities in the field of education, and that legislatively we are fulfilling it.

The task of implementing the legislation is being carried out in various parts of the province. The steps taken by different school boards give us good reason to believe that our approach is both sound and successful.

There have been a few problems. Although any new programme is bound to have some growing pains, these relatively minor difficulties are being overcome and the spirit and intent of the legislation passed in this House in 1968 is being fulfilled.

I am pleased to report to the Legislature that our discussions with the federal government for financial support of these programmes has been well received. In 1970 we were reimbursed for the programmes we had already undertaken at the elementary and secondary levels to the extent of approximately \$15 million. In addition, negotiations are currently under way regarding post-secondary education. We are confident we shall be receiving further assistance for that level.

I should make it quite clear, however, that these funds are not coming to us in the form of a windfall. They represent a reimbursement of a portion of the money we have already expended and will continue to expend on bilingual education in the province. We shall also be entering into discussions with the federal government for financial assistance regarding other parts of our bilingualism programme.

In conjunction with these steps being taken in the areas I have covered, the translation bureau in The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship is being expanded to meet the new demands which will be placed upon it. The review of our translation and interpretation needs which The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship is now undertaking includes a thorough examination of the implications of the government policy on bilingualism.

I must stress that a great deal of what we intend to do will depend, both in terms of physical facilities and of personnel, on the development of our translation facilities. To help alleviate the problems we are encountering in this field, I have directed The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship to develop programmes to ensure that in time we will have an adequate supply of interpreters and translators to meet our needs.

Without progress in this area we will face considerable difficulties in implementing our proposals. However, I must caution everyone that this will not be an overnight process but will take time and patience. Nonetheless, I am confident we will succeed in this area.

Bilingual districts and the national capital region: At the same time as we were considering the measures I have outlined in the

provincial public service, municipal administration, judicial administration, the Legislature and education, we have also been considering whether it would be advisable to define bilingual districts in areas where there are significant concentrations of French-speaking students. The members will recall that the federal government, by The Official Languages Act enacted in 1969, provided for federal bilingual services in the national capital region and in such federal bilingual districts as might be set up. It also required the federal bilingual districts advisory board, when considering the boundaries of such districts, to consult the provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to acknowledge the very helpful way in which the bilingual districts advisory board has kept us informed of its work. The government of Ontario does not believe that it will be necessary for Ontario to establish bilingual districts for provincial purposes. The need for districts must be related to the type of service to be provided by each jurisdiction. We think that provincial bilingual services can best be provided in the way that I have been describing, without the need to set up specific districts.

I should stress that we recognize the special emphasis given by the federal government to bilingualism in the national capital region. We fully intend to do our part to ensure that our national capital is a place of which all Canadians can be proud. As I have already mentioned, we fully support the efforts being made to date by the municipalities in the national capital region to increase their provision of bilingual services.

With the introduction of the measures I have announced today, Mr. Speaker, I believe that Ontario has a solid basis for an effective and meaningful programme of bilingualism. Our policy will be a continuing and progressive one in our endeavour to improve the provision of bilingual public services in Ontario.

For the people of Ontario to recognize that French is an official language of Canada does not in any way alter the position of the English language in our province. Our aim is to ensure the maintenance and development of certain services provided to the English-speaking community while ensuring that those to the French-speaking community more fully meet their needs.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that Ontario has made a solid commitment to the principle of bilingualism as a matter of equity for our own residents and as a large contribution to the continued and future strength of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: There will be 21 minutes added to the question period.

Oral questions? The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

DEPUTY IN EDUCATION TO DEAL WITH FRENCH NEEDS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, further to the Premier's statement, did he announce in the body of his statement that there would be an additional deputy minister appointed in The Department of Education dealing exclusively with French education, as has been requested?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, I did not.

Mr. Nixon: Is there any thought of moving in that direction?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not at this moment, Mr. Speaker.

REDUCTION OF GRANTS FOR FRENCH EDUCATION

Mr. Nixon: A further question. Has it been a part of the statements made by the Premier's colleagues, the Minister of University Affairs (Mr. White) and the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch), that grants for special French education would in fact be reduced in 1972-1973?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall any such statement. There were grants introduced a year ago for the bilingual programmes in the elementary and secondary schools related to the funding provided from Ottawa. As it relates to Laurentian or Ottawa University with respect to the bilingual character of their own programmes, I have not heard of any anticipated change.

Mr. Nixon: A final supplementary, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker: Is the government going to raise the financial assistance that it gives to the French-Canadian association that has been very vocal in putting forward the views of the French community to the government and to others in this area?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure really to what the hon. Leader of the Opposition is referring. There are a number of groups and organizations that have been making requests to the government.

Mr. Nixon: This is L'Association Canadienne-Francaise d'Ontario.

An hon. member: The Leader of the Opposition sounds like Mr. Diefenbaker.

Mr. Nixon: That is the main spokesman.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not sure whether the request has come in for support this year. If it has we will certainly consider it.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. Nixon: Not on this question.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): As a supplementary.

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): If I may add to the Prime Minister's reply—

Mr. Nixon: May he?

Hon. Mr. White: I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition is referring to some of the detail contained in the letter to the University of Ottawa, which was based on recommendations of the committee on university affairs and which informed the university that the special grants, which were by way of being emergent grants and which were provided because the scale of the bilingual operation was small, would be progressively reduced in the years to come, as indeed will be the special emergent grants available to universities like Trent University.

The reasoning of the committee on university affairs, and the advice which they proffered to me and which I accept, was that these institutions are now getting up to a scale where these special grants are not necessary. The purpose of formula resource allocation is to build into the formula all of the needs of the institutions; and we are progressively vacating special grants of every kind.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary to the Minister of University Affairs, if you will permit me: Would the minister not agree, however, that the financial problems, in an emerging university or otherwise, in providing French education in all subjects would be a special drain on their financing, and at least some continuation of the special grants should be considered in the light of the programme announced by the Premier?

Hon. Mr. White: I think this is not necessarily true.

When Trent get up to about 4,000 student units they will no longer receive any special grant. The special grant which they received in the past was based on the fact they were below optimum scale. The number of student units at the University of Ottawa is something like 21,000, and it is thought that the scale of operation in the English lectures and in the French lectures has now reached the point where additional grants are not needed.

We are phasing the reduction in these special grants to every type of institution over several years so that there will not be any radical dislocations.

The University of Ottawa has a surplus of approximately \$3.5 million which, I should like to point out, comes from prudent management. This change does not actually relate to that very favourable financial situation. At the end of this year, they will have about \$2 million in surplus, once again the result of good management no doubt, and here again not directly related to the advice offered by the committee on university affairs.

We are making certain grants for capital purposes to the University of Ottawa and this morning I received a letter from their rector thanking me for making extra provision for their building needs. I think Mr. Speaker, that when this matter is explored in greater depth during my estimates, the members of the Legislature will be satisfied that the recommendations of the committee and the fact that I have accepted them are entirely appropriate.

Mr. Pitman: I have a supplementary of either the Prime Minister or the Minister of University Affairs: In all that was read this afternoon, will there be any assistance to Glendon College which is trying to provide bilingual education here in the city of Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think that question should be appropriately addressed to the Minister of University Affairs. The statement deals in terms as it relates to the areas of public administration and so forth. The problem as it relates to Glendon College is internal, within the university itself, and I think that it would be more appropriately answered by the Minister of University Affairs.

Mr. Pitman: I would like to direct a further supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Would the Premier not consider the possibility that that university is providing education for translators, the very people that he regards as being in very short supply in the statement that he just made?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, whether Glendon College could effectively help us in this regard is perhaps debatable. I certainly would not say it could not. I think if the member for Peterborough recalls correctly, there has been some change in the approach on the part of Glendon College itself which might be a matter of interesting discussion during the debates on the estimates of the department.

Mr. Pitman: They had to change. They had no choice.

Mr. Peacock: They adopted instruction in French.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a supplementary over here?

Mr. H. MacKenzie (Ottawa Centre): Yes, a question of the Minister of University Affairs, Mr. Speaker: Is it a fact that the minister is terminating a \$300,000 grant in the school year 1972-1973 to the University of Ottawa, which grant was for the purpose of bilingual costs?

Hon. Mr. White: At one time the extra cost of bilingual programmes, when the operation was smaller in scale, was thought to be seven per cent. A few years ago that was stabilized at \$1.5 million, which at that time equalled six per cent. We have informed the university this year the amount will be reduced from \$1.5 million to \$1.2 million and that eventually this special emergent grant will be phased out for the reasons I gave earlier.

Incidentally, while I am on my feet I would like to say that we are providing a special grant—I think it is \$100,000—for Glendon. None of this is to in any way diminish our endeavour so far as bilingualism is concerned. We are very hopeful that the federal government will accept the recommendation of the bi-and-bi committee and that certain additional resources will be made available by the federal government, which has indicated some sympathy for the recommendation without taking any action on it. If those resources are made available by the federal government we will, in turn, make them available to the institutions concerned.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A supplementary question of the Prime Minister: In view of the government statement on bilingualism, what explanation is there for the fact that for most of the year no visitor can receive information in French from the staff of the Ontario government reception centre

in Cornwall, a city with a 54 per cent French-speaking population and a heavy flow of French-speaking tourists?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that I have not personally availed myself of the use of the reception centre, I shall find out.

Mr. MacDonald: I have a second supplementary question, if I may, of the Prime Minister. Would this Prime Minister consider making available to the House the reports of the five task forces that studied areas and means by which bilingualism might be encouraged in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I certainly could consider it, but I would have to observe that it is highly unlikely I shall make them available.

Mr. Peacock: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the Prime Minister would report to the House, since it was not raised in his statement, the success of the programme of instruction in French for the 2,000 civil servants nominated by their departments; and to what extent they are using the language in their daily work?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot comment on all 2,000 of them. The information I get is that they are using it in a general way, a goodly majority of them, not all 100 per cent.

FRENCH CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I have a question of the Prime Minister. Is the Prime Minister aware that a good deal of the correspondence that members of this Legislature receive is in the French language; and is there any possibility of getting assistance from the government for translating and for answering these letters in the tongue in which they were received?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I understood this service was already available. If it is not available to the hon. member, I will make sure that it is.

EDUCATION RESEARCH OFFER

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: Is he now prepared to accept the generous offer of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers Federation to provide \$25,000 to fund objective research facilities for the committee looking into the cost of education?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is not now ready to accept this offer. It is being discussed with my colleague, the Minister of Education, but at the present moment the answer is no, to be precise.

Mr. Speaker: Did the Leader of the Opposition have any other questions? If not, the hon. member for Peterborough.

UNIVERSITY ENROLMENT

Mr. Pitman: I would like to direct my question to the Minister of University Affairs. I wonder if he could tell us whether he has discovered yet how many extra places the universities are being asked to provide for the class coming in next fall.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, the estimation was 4,000, then it was 3,500 and the most recent estimation is 2,200; but, as I think I mentioned to the House a week or two ago, the system of forecasting is rather rudimentary and it is based on the number of applications a year ago and the proportion of duplications which were experienced a year ago.

If one applies that factor to this year's applications, one ends up with this aggregate number, which is in excess of existing places by something like 2,200. There are a number of variables, one being the anticipated shortage of space which might induce potential students to make out more applications than they would have done in previous years.

We have removed the one per cent limit, as my hon. friend may know, so that the universities are encouraged to accept all qualified applicants next September, and I am very optimistic that this will indeed prove to be the case.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I might ask the minister a supplementary. Does he expect there will be any shortage of places as has been suggested by at least one or two universities?

Hon. Mr. White: I think my previous answer dealt with that.

Mr. Pitman: How many of those people—that 4,000—are expected to be elementary school teachers who will not receive jobs?

Hon. Mr. White: The figure of 3,500 was mentioned at one time—not as the number who would not receive jobs but rather the number who were required to have one year of university before going into teacher's college. There are so many variables at work

here and the system of forecasting is so imprecise that these figures are not very helpful.

It was for that reason I requested the university presidents, in a letter to them dated last Monday, to establish next year in the committee of presidents a clearing house for applications. I am quite sure that they will accede to this request. In fact, I think this was one of their expectations anyway. A year from now we will have a much more precise idea—well in advance—of what the number of qualified applicants will be.

REDUCTION IN SIZE OF DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

Mr. Pitman: If I might direct another question to the Minister of University Affairs in relation to this whole business of forecasting: I wonder how he can relate his forecast on assuming the ministry that he would reduce his department by 10 per cent to the budget statement which indicates that his department will be increased by five per cent.

Hon. Mr. White: I am very glad to have an opportunity to clarify that. The Leader of the Opposition said last week that The Department of Revenue, of which I was the minister, could not have been very efficient because the numbers of members in the department were going to fall by 26, which was the largest such diminution on the list. Of course that is the result of all of the work done by many people within the public service under my leadership during the past 12 months.

Now then, the work of budgeting is undertaken almost all year around and it is certainly undertaken very rigorously starting September. The figures to be seen in the estimates this year were prepared very largely in the months prior to my appointment as Minister of University Affairs. The members may recall that on March 1 I said that my hope would be that within 12 months I could reduce the number on staff in the department by 10 per cent. I have not relinquished that hope; but the numbers to which the member is referring were prepared months ago.

RENT REVIEW BOARDS

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I might direct a question to the Attorney General.

Could the Attorney General indicate how many municipalities have set up rent review

boards on the basis of the legislation which was passed in this Legislature a couple of years ago?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I will have to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough has further questions on behalf of his party?

INDOOR PARKING AT UNIVERSITY

Mr. Pitman: I would like to ask one further question of the Minister of University Affairs.

Has the minister had a detailed look at the student services building which is being put up—or which is going to be put up—at the University of Waterloo? In view of his statement last week, how does he explain the fact that one floor of this building is related to indoor parking for 36 cars?

Hon. Mr. White: I know nothing about that project as yet, Mr. Speaker. The member is not referring to the University of Western Ontario, is he?

Mr. Pitman: No, I am referring to the University of Waterloo.

Mr. Singer: He only knows about one university.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South.

LAKE ERIE ICE CONDITIONS

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A question of the premier: Is the Premier aware that the present ice jam at the eastern base of Lake Erie has created undue hardship to vessels trapped in the heavy icefield? Is the Premier aware that the present ice conditions are causing unfavourable weather conditions in the Niagara peninsula and are creating temperature inversions which have resulted in a series of high air pollution readings in the Buffalo, New York, area?

Why has the Ontario government allowed the ice boom to remain in operation at the eastern end of Lake Erie five weeks longer than the normal April 1 removal date? Will the minister make representation to the proper authorities, the International Joint Commission, to have the ice boom removed by April 1 in the calendar year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly analyse very carefully what the hon. member has asked and see what I can do about it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

LEGISLATION OVER WATERFRONT LOTS

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management for which he has had notice of a sort. Has the hon. minister had an opportunity to look into the problem and the position of the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority by way of enabling legislation over waterfront lots on Lake Ontario?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, at the present time the Metro authority fill regulations do not cover waterfront areas. Legislation is to be proposed to amend The Conservation Authorities Act to permit the description of the authority's jurisdiction covering waterfront areas.

Mr. Lawlor: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the minister would be kind enough to give us any indication as to when that legislation might be forthcoming, as there is some urgency?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I hope to introduce such amending legislation in the current session.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Dovercourt.

EMPLOYEES OF WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BOARD

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Labour, notice of which has been given.

How many people were employed by the Workmen's Compensation Board in the year 1965? How many people are employed by the Workmen's Compensation Board at the present time? How many people are employed in the appeal system of the Workmen's Compensation Board?

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if that question should not properly be placed upon the notice paper?

Mr. De Monte: I did give the minister notice of the question, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. G. Carton (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I can answer it very shortly.

The answer to question number one is that 1,368 were employed in 1965; the answer to question number two is 1,391; and the answer to question number three is that there are seven in the review committee, six in the appeal tribunal and three in the board itself.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): I have a question of the Minister of Energy and—

Mr. Speaker: Well, I believe in being fair and alternating the questions.

The hon. member for York South.

CANADIAN GYPSUM POLLUTION

Mr. MacDonald: I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

In view of the 30 years' effort by the residents of Weston to secure relief from the pollution of Canadian Gypsum, could the minister indicate how soon some relief can be achieved following the issuance of ministerial orders in April?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member indicates, this has been a rather long-term problem with this particular plant. The ministerial order was served on the company in March, 1969. The order stipulated that certain things had to be done and certain equipment had to be installed. Those things were done by November of that year. This included a 40-foot stack and a steam generator, a cupola odour-control system, and bag house dust collector.

The problem now is that there is some problem with the abatement equipment that has been installed. It is not doing what it is supposed to do, basically.

The company now has an engineer working full-time on corrective action. The air management branch, of course, is also continuing its surveillance.

Apparently their most recent problems were mineral wool fallout and problems with the exhaust system which resulted in violations of dustfall regulations. As a result of this Mr. Speaker, prosecution is being considered by my department.

The company is also on the air pollution index list for sulphur dioxide emissions, and it reduces its operations as required during high API episodes.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister indicate at all specifically when some relief is going to be achieved after this long process?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the final date for compliance with our ministerial order was March of this year, so they are in violation of that order and as a result of that I would assume that we can legitimately undertake some form of prosecution. I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that the problems are mechanical in nature. There are failures which, of course, the company does not appreciate. There is no intent to violate the law or continue to aggravate the people in that area. By the very nature of the industry, of course—

Mr. MacDonald: That is a matter of some doubt.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I think now, since the ministerial orders—at any rate, as a result of this latest episode they are beyond the deadline so I would assume some sort of enforcement action will have to be taken.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

HYDRO DISCOUNT PRICES IN USA

Mr. T. P. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Can the minister inform the House whether or not those companies and corporations in the United States that are receiving an export of power from Ontario Hydro are being given the advantage of the seven or eight per cent discount that is being made up by the rate stabilization fund of Ontario Hydro in the current prices?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe they are. I am not absolutely certain. I have never considered that particular point, but I am sure they are not. I might say that the amount of export by Ontario Hydro to American companies and utilities is less than the amount we buy back in the run of a year. We make a healthy profit on this sale.

ELIMINATION OF FISHING LICENCE FEES

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests. In view of the elimination of fishing licence fees, can the minister indicate if any cutback is contemplated in the enforcement staff of The Department of Lands and Forests regarding fishing laws and game laws?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand why there should be a reduction in the number of conservation officers by the removal of the angling licences. I do not see why that should be brought about because the conservation officers still have to check on the number of fish caught, sizes and whether the anglers are resident or non-resident.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

TREATMENT FACILITIES FOR CRIPPLED CHILDREN

Mr. MacKenzie: A question of the Minister of Health: Is the minister aware there are reported to be 100 crippled children in the Ottawa area not now receiving treatment because of lack of facilities? Is the minister aware these children may not receive treatment for three to five years if they have to wait until the proposed new children's hospital is completed? Will the minister endeavour to provide in the immediate future adequate temporary facilities if necessary for treatment of all crippled children?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice and give a full report to the hon. member in the House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cochrane South.

SAFETY OF CLOSED MINES

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Yes Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs. Does the minister intend to take action this session whereby amendments will be made to The Mining Act to make sure that areas and municipalities where mines have finished operating are left in a safe condition, as requested by the town of Timmins in its brief to the natural resources committee last fall?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of this right at the moment, but I will check into it and report back.

Mr. Ferrier: As a supplementary, I wonder if the minister is aware that the previous minister has made a commitment that he would try to see that some action was taken in the very near future on this important matter.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I am not aware of that commitment, Mr. Speaker, but I will check on it.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Neither is the prior minister.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

FISHING WITHOUT LICENCES

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. What does the minister intend to do concerning fishermen who were caught fishing without licences and prosecuted prior to the Treasurer's announcement on April 26?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the legal profession.

Mr. Ferrier: That is one thing in the minister's favour.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I think this is a matter—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I have discussed this with my own legal branch and they in turn are consulting The Department of the Attorney General in this matter.

Mr. Gaunt: Would the hon. minister inform the House as to the decision arrived at?

POLICE ACT ARBITRATORS

Mr. Peacock: A question of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. When does the Attorney General intend to establish the council of arbitrators under The Police Act as he proposed he would do during his visit to Windsor on government business recently?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No sir, I am being misinterpreted again, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gaunt: They are picking on the minister.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: But in any event, any such action would obviously require some statutory enactment. As a member of the Legislature I am sure the hon. member will be aware of the introduction of that bill if his attendance record keeps up.

Mr. Peacock: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: In appointing the arbitrator to inquire into the dispute between the Board of Commissioners of Police for Windsor and the Windsor Police Association, would the Attorney General have in mind the principles that would underlie such council of arbitrators in selecting the arbitrator in this instance?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure of the full import of the hon. member's question, but in respect to the comments that I made in Windsor, they were dealing more in respect to the province-wide situation rather than any particular situation in that locality.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nipissing.

ONR EMPLOYEES' MEDICAL BENEFITS

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs.

Will the minister intervene in the unilateral decision of the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission to stop the use of ONR Employees Medical Association as the administrator of the benefits under the agreement between the ONR and the employees?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a transfer going on of the ONR from my department to the new Department of Transportation and Communications. Possibly the chairman of the ONR may want to comment on that particular matter. I do not know; I will leave it open to him.

Mr. A. Johnston (Parry Sound): Mr. Speaker, there are negotiations being carried on in respect to the member's question and I would ask that he leave that question for a few days until we finalize negotiations.

Mr. R. S. Smith: A supplementary to the member for Parry Sound, Mr. Speaker: Could I ask him if it is actually under negotiation

or whether a decision has been made by the commission and sent by letter to the employees' association?

Mr. A. Johnston: A decision was made by management but the commission in its wisdom is studying the decision that was made in the hope that we may reconsider the decision of management.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Ferrier: May I ask a supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Ferrier: In matters of this importance it is not desirable in terms of good management-labour relations that the unions be consulted in view of the fact that they were very happy with the medical arrangement they had with that plan?

Mr. A. Johnston: I would agree with the member's comments, yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

DREDGING OF ST. CLAIR RIVER

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, regarding plans for the dredging of the St. Clair River announced April 14: What percentage of the mercury in the St. Clair River is estimated to be in the southeast bend cutoff channel, which is about to be dredged?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I will have to get that information for the hon. member. I did not realize that we announced that we were dredging the St. Clair River for mercury. I will have to get that information.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, while the minister is getting that information would he find out also if this is the place where the mercury concentration is the greatest?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

DOW CHEMICAL LAWSUIT

Mr. Bullbrook (Sarnia): The last question answered by the Attorney General refreshed my mind in connection with a question I directed to him about three weeks ago, and I am wondering if it is in order that I redirect it?

The question at that time was: Had he been properly quoted in connection with the Dow Chemical action as saying, relative to the constitutional question involving the bed of the river, "Let the fish sue us"?

Secondly, does that exemplify the attitude that the Province of Ontario took in connection with that suit?

Thirdly, what action or liaison was taken by this government, and in particular his department, to see if the federal government would join in this suit to resolve the constitutional obscurity involved?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member has reminded me about that.

In answer to question number one the answer is no. In answer to question number two the answer is no, and in answer to question number three the federal government was perfectly aware of the intention to start an action in the manner and in the way in which an action was started.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of supplementary, are we to understand in this House that the quote in the Globe and Mail, of which the minister is aware, therefore is a misquote? And secondly, would the Attorney General answer directly as to whether he invited the federal government to join in the action as a co-plaintiff?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I am not too sure that the proper verb has been used there as far as "invited" is concerned. They were certainly aware of our intentions; they were certainly given a full opportunity to join in the action if they thought it necessary or feasible to do so.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, I have another supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: All right, a supplementary.

Mr. Bullbrook: It has been ruled in order before, for the member for York South, so may I direct a supplementary to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, who seems to know more about this than the Attorney General?

Mr. Speaker: You may direct a question to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. The minister does not have to answer it.

Mr. Bullbrook: Since the Attorney General is not aware of the question of the background of this matter relative to the involvement of the federal government, could the minister advise whether the federal government had been invited to become a co-plaintiff in connection with this action?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, the federal government, as the hon. Attorney General indicated, was aware of what we were doing. Correspondence outlining certain proposals was sent to the federal government last fall and they indicated in their answer that they were not prepared to enter into a legal action at that time.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of supplementary, did the federal government take any position in connection with what I call the constitutional obscurity?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale.

PROTECTION OF TENANTS

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General: Does the Attorney General intend to introduce legislation in the near future amending The Landlord and Tenant Act in order to protect tenants so that a utility like hydro cannot be cut off by the landlord?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated to a previous questioner, when legislation is introduced in the House the hon. member will learn of it along with everyone else.

Mr. Peacock: But the attendance of both of us depends—

Mr. Trotter: By way of a supplementary question, as the minister who is responsible for the administration of The Landlord and Tenant Act, does the minister think it is proper that a landlord should cut off utilities for the tenants?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: If the hon. member is asking for a personal opinion, the answer there certainly is no. But whether this is a safeguard that can be written into a piece of legislation like The Landlord and Tenant Act—

Mr. Trotter: It is in the bylaw.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —is something that is quite different.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

DISCOUNT POLICIES OF CAR MAKERS

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A question of the Minister of Public Works: In view of the fact that at least two car manufacturers in Canada, one of which is North American-controlled, continue to have a fleet discount policy, is there any need for the province to subsidize the "big three" to an amount estimated by the Premier a week or 10 days ago at \$750,000?

An hon. member: By whom?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, in the first place I think I made it clear last week when I made a statement about this that the figure of \$750,000 was based on the tenders received by the manufacturers in the last call last fall, which were manufacturers' suggested retail list prices, and that I did not know of anybody who went in off the street, individually or collectively, and bought a car at the ticket price.

I can only say what I said last week, that we are meeting with the manufacturers and the dealers and will be discussing with them what their proposals will be and that at the present time we have authorized tenders to be called on—I think it is 140—vehicles which are emergently needed by the OPP and that we will be accepting bids as we have in the past, for vehicles from any manufacturer providing they meet the specifications which the operating departments require.

Mr. Deacon: A supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has now expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Villeneuve from the standing committee on procedural affairs presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following applications for private Acts and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient:

Cadmus Associates Limited.

The city of North Bay.

Morton Terminal Limited.

The town of Burlington, provided that the bill is not considered by the private bills committee before May 25.

The village of Wasaga Beach.

The township of Pelee.

The towns of Burlington and Oakville re the county of Halton.

The city of Guelph re the Guelph General Hospital.

The city of Peterborough.

Presenting reports.

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I presented the report of the human resources committee. As this report was worded precisely in the terms of the motion moved at the committee by the member for Parkdale and passed by the committee, the opposition being in the majority of those present, I find some difficulty in understanding the objections by the Leader of the Opposition and others.

However, I am sure that the members of the committee would have no objection, if the member for Parkdale does not, to rephrasing the report to clarify its obvious intention to read as follows: "Your committee asks that the question of day care be referred to it."

I point out that in the terms of the motion establishing standing committees, the committee already has authority to send for such persons as it sees fit relating to any subject referred to it by the House.

I therefore move the adoption of the report in its amended form, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Villeneuve from the standing human resources committee presented the committee's report as follows:

Your committee asks that the question of daycare be referred to it.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to make our position abundantly clear for the sake of the chairman of the human resources committee and others: We in opposition feel that it should not be necessary for the committee to come before the House to get some kind of approval, rubber-stamp or otherwise, for the Premier to declare it is in order or out of order, or whatever it may be—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: —and that they proceed with the business that is obviously theirs if they have any independent responsibility whatsoever.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: The wording of the first motion was obviously in order as it was put in the committee and for the consideration of the committee under the direction of the chairman that the daycare centres be examined and certain experts brought forward by name in the resolution be called before the committee.

But surely it is not our place, as members of the Legislature, nor is it the place of the leader of the government, to give his personal approval as to the day-to-day business of this committee which must maintain its independence. Mr. Speaker, in clarifying our position—if it needs any clarification—I say that frankly I still think that the committee should have the power to call in or to examine daycare centres without referring it to this House at all.

Surely, this is not necessary under the new approach to the committee. As it is we are not, of course, going to stand in its way. We believe, on this side, that the committee's usefulness is substantially impaired since they are required to get some sort of special permission from the government whenever they want to take any initiatives on their own.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might just add my comment to this?

Mr. Nixon: The Premier is the man who said the committee was out of order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not.

Mr. Pitman: It seems to me the government has reached the height of ludicrousness to have to come to this Legislature to deal with a subject which is obviously within the purview of this particular committee.

Surely it will not be necessary from now on for the chairman to come here? Perhaps the Prime Minister might want to reply. Surely it will not be necessary for the chairman of that committee to come here every week to tell the Legislature that we are going to examine something which is under one of the departments over which this particular committee has been given jurisdiction, or has been given some degree of concern?

Perhaps the Prime Minister may like to clarify that right now so that we do not get into this kind of silliness week after week.

Hon. E. Dunlop (Minister without Portfolio): They have no jurisdiction!

Mr. Lawlor: Just like a mother hen.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Broiler!

Mr. Lawlor: A broiler, all right.

Mr. Pitman: Oh, come on!

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): What broiler?

Mr. Pitman: Get the government off this hook.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the report be received and adopted?

Report received and adopted.

Mr. Singer: The Prime Minister leads on fearlessly.

Hon. Mr. Dunlop: That is right!

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves, seconded by Mr. Carruthers, that the estimates of expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972 of the two departments hereinafter named be referred to standing committees as follows:

The Department of Energy and Resources Management to the natural and physical resources committee.

The Department of Public Works to the estimates committee.

Also that unlimited substitution of members be permitted on all standing committees while considering estimates referred to them, provided that the chairman is informed of any set substitutions at the start of each meeting.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: Certainly, we are glad that it has been that unlimited substitution in the committee that is going to examine the estimates has been made clear, but what I am concerned with is why it should be necessary to refer an estimate to anything but the estimates committee. Since we cannot have unlimited substitution, I do not see that it makes any difference, unless it is contemplated that we would have two estimates being examined by committee at the same time as the House itself would be in operation.

As a matter of fact, while I am on my feet, I would like to say that while I know there was consultation among the whips in this matter, still it does not seem reasonable that we are going to undertake the examination of Lands and Forests estimates in the

House this afternoon and in the committee that is being established, or at least having these matters referred to it by this motion, that Energy and Resources Management, a very closely allied topic, will be examined, in another place.

I think it would be much better if it might be possible for the House leader and the whips who are concerned with the ordering of this business, to try and get subjects that are not quite so closely allied, so that the individuals closely concerned with both departments are not going to be torn in their responsibility.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join with the Leader of the Opposition in expressing acknowledgement for the part of the motion that allows or permits substitution of members on the committee while it is dealing with estimates. But I am not so sure the government intends to prevent concurrent sittings of the committees to which the estimates are referred. I hope it does indeed not intend to have the Public Works estimates, now referred to the estimates committee, and Energy and Resources Management now referred to the natural and physical resources committee heard concurrently while the House is also considering Lands and Forests.

Last session when an estimate was referred to committee that estimate was dealt with before the same committee or another undertook a second estimate. I hope that will be the case hereafter in this session and that Public Works and Energy and Resources Management will not be dealt with concurrently outside the House. I do recognize that the committee may consider an estimate concurrently while the House is sitting.

I would like to remark, Mr. Speaker, that this motion comes just minutes before the committee on natural and physical resources, I believe, begins its consideration of The Department of Energy and Resources Management. That was the reason that last Friday I raised with the Speaker the question as to whether the order referring estimates should be put before the House then, so that there was some formality to the notice which the government House leader had given us by way only of a note last week.

I would ask the government House leader if he would indicate to us, during this debate if possible, the government's intention with regard to other estimates going out from the House for consideration in committee?

I would like to remind the government House leader that we have only a limited amount of time before us for the consideration of estimates. There is an overall limit of 90 sittings of the House. Moreover, within that period there is a limit on the referral of estimates outside the House to within a period of no later than 30 sitting days following the introduction of the budget.

That puts another limit, of another 30 days, on the work of committees on estimates. It would be helpful to members on all sides of the House, Mr. Speaker, if the government House leader would indicate now if possible what other estimates he wishes to refer from the House to the standing committees.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there is merit in the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition and by the member for Peterborough and—

Mr. Peacock: Windsor West.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —and it is not, I may say first of all, the intention to have two committees sitting at the same time. The intention would be to have the estimates of one department being dealt with here in the House, and one before a committee. The reason for the mention in the motion which I just made with respect to the estimates of Public Works, is they were not referred to in the motion which was adopted by the House on March 31, when the standing committees were set up.

In that motion there was also the paragraph saying committees numbered one to four inclusive may have no conflict of membership with one another; nor may committees numbers five, six and seven have a conflict of membership with one another.

There was some confusion as to whether there would be substitutions. It is my understanding that when estimates of any department are referred to a committee that committee becomes a committee to deal with its estimates. It becomes a committee of estimates and the substitution takes place there. That is clear, I think, in the Votes and Proceedings of April 6; and it appeared on page 32 of the Votes and Proceedings in the report of the striking committee, "substitutions are to be permitted in committees one to five only when considering estimates"—

Mr. Nixon: Why is the minister moving?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Why is the member thinking of Thursday?

Hon. Mr. Wishart:—which makes it clear when it was raised here in the House last week, “such substitutions to be announced to the chairman by substitute members at the opening of a meeting.”

There seemed to be considerable confusion when I announced on Thursday last that the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management would go to the natural and physical resources committee. Members of the opposition, including the Leader of the Opposition, I believe, stood up and questioned—

Mr. Nixon: All the minister has to do is make it clear.

An hon. member: Well read it!

Mr. T. P. Reid: It was not clear to the member?

Mr. Nixon: The minister is now offering an amendment, for heaven's sake.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: My statement was that I did not have the record in front of me, but that it was all on the record.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The member for Simcoe East (Mr. G. E. Smith) got up and contradicted the minister.

Mr. Nixon: Now he is offering an amendment.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well perhaps my motion today will set everybody right.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, prior to the vote, I am wondering if you could clarify what explicitly constitutes a meeting? I recall last year having some misunderstanding in connection with this—“substitution is called for before each meeting.” Is that at the beginning of the daily session or does that apply to any of the evening sessions also?

Mr. Speaker: That is with the standing committees that are dealing with estimates outside of the House—

Mr. Bullbrook: Perhaps I have not made my question clear. Is the beginning of a meeting, for which substitution is permissible, in the afternoon? Or could we also have a beginning in the evening where there can be an additional substitution?

Mr. Speaker: I would think that if the standing committee has convened earlier in the day and recesses and they convene again later on, it is a continuation of the same meeting and the substitution should have been made to the chairman of that com-

mittee prior to the commencement of the afternoon or earlier sitting.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am glad we have that ruling, sir. Thank you.

Mr. Singer: Except that he cannot rule because it is handled by the committee, which is independent.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. minister have some explanation he wishes to make? Right.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): A short one, Mr. Speaker. The bill deals with three items and it provides for legislation to permit the establishment of the proposed Yonge Street Mall in Metropolitan Toronto. The metropolitan corporation wishes to establish that mall for a seven-day period this year.

The limitation on the amount that may be spent in any year for the reception of persons of distinction is removed; and thirdly, the restriction on the sale of liquors in metropolitan parks, which applies through the provisions of The Public Parks Act, is removed. The provisions of The Liquor Licence Act will continue as before.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Does that include Queen's Park?

EXPROPRIATION ACT, 1968-1969

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Expropriation Act, 1968-1969.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the essential points dealt with in this bill are firstly, the method by which costs will be taxed—that is costs of the Land Compensation Board; and secondly the jurisdiction and the date upon which that jurisdiction will be exercised by the Ontario Land Compensation Board.

Mr. Singer: Does that one get royal assent today?

WAGES ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Wages Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, this bill repeals a couple of provisions in The Wages Act which the government believes should now be repealed. One is designed to ensure that at least \$2.50 per day for the wage earner was exempted after the attachment had been made, and another which removes the exemption from seizure where the debt is for board or lodging or where the debtor has no dependent; and finally, we are now carrying through to the ultimate the abolition of wage assignments with the one exception still remaining for credit union wage assignments.

TOWN OF BURLINGTON

Mr. Kennedy moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Town of Burlington.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF HALTON

Mr. Kennedy moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the County of Halton.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF PETERBOROUGH

Mr. Pitman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Peterborough.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

VILLAGE OF WASAGA BEACH

Mr. A. Johnston moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Village of Wasaga Beach.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

GUELPH GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. Worton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Guelph General Hospital.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MORTON TERMINAL LIMITED

Mr. Spence moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Morton Terminal Limited.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

NON-RETURNABLE BOTTLES

Mr. Gaunt moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to prohibit the use of non-returnable bottles.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF PELEE

Mr. Paterson moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Township of Pelee.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF NORTH BAY

Mr. R. S. Smith moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of North Bay.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CADMUS ASSOCIATES LIMITED

Mr. Haskett moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Cadmus Associates Limited.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Breithaupt moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PRIVATE INVESTIGATORS AND SECURITY GUARDS ACT, 1965

Mr. Breithaupt moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Private Investigators and Security Guards Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

WILLS ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves second reading of Bill 1, An Act to amend The Wills Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed to.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE ACT,
1968

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves second reading of Bill 2, An Act to amend The Administration of Justice Act, 1968.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I have a few comments on the principle of this bill, Mr. Speaker. The bill in the first instance removes the word "indictable" so that summary conviction offences now permit people outside of the province to be brought back into the province for that particular kind of offence.

I would like the minister, if possible, to indicate at the end of the debate what range or depth he intends to introduce into that measure. In other words, what is the *raison d'être* of this legislation? What kind of summary conviction offence has he got in mind for bringing people from, say, Vancouver to Toronto at public expense? Is it infractions of The Highway Traffic Act or failure to file governmental returns of various kinds or liquor offences under the peculiar power and jurisdiction of the Province of Ontario? Just what is the purpose in this regard?

In any event, I would counsel the government, if I may do so. The types of offences involved basically under Ontario summary conviction jurisdiction are relatively minor in nature and very often only procedural, and what the real intent of that particular area in this legislation might be puzzles me, although it does not completely escape me that there could be circumstances in which it would be of some utility.

Secondly, on the general overall purport of this legislation, I have wondered about the necessity of altering the wording from The Administration of Justice Act, which was amended in 1968 and 1969. I thought it covered the ground pretty well, but again the

minister may enlighten me as to why he feels it is necessary to substitute the words "under any Act" in section 7 of the present legislation.

If I may go a little afield, I think that possibly the reason may be that he wants to bring direct thought to bear on a diverse panoply of legislation going from interpreters, court reporters, the various county Acts, The Supreme Court Act and all this other legislation, so that when he says "under any Act" he has given it a greater designation than exists perhaps in the present legislation.

If that is so, I would like the minister to turn his mind to the necessity of all the rest of the legislation, or pretty well all the rest of the legislation, coming before us later on this afternoon. In other words, my claim is that under the section as amended or even as it was prior to amendment, he has all the range, power and authority that he needs to set up the fee schedule for interpreters, for court reporters, for jurors, for witnesses in criminal actions in the courts of the Province of Ontario.

Why does the minister feel it is necessary, having this section in effect and in force, to come forward with other legislation during the afternoon referring back? This confers power in a very broad way, requiring the payment of fees for anything required or authorized under any Act to be done by any person in the administration of justice and prescribing the amount.

When we get to, say, The Crown Witnesses Act, we refer back to this Act, which I consider redundant and unnecessary. But perhaps the minister can say that there is some legal formality that must be gone through in order to achieve that.

My third point on this legislation is that I would like the minister to explain to me the explanatory portion on section 2—it is not part of the legislation—where it says that the amendment of section 2 "enables fees payable by the Crown or the public for the purposes of various other Acts, to be prescribed by one scale." The little words, "by one scale," intrigue me. By what scale is the minister thinking of? What is the one scale? Is it maybe to make his task a little easier? Is it in the case of, say, court reporters, that irrespective of whether these reporters are dealing with tribunals set up under the government, various agencies under which quasi-judicial proceedings take place, the courts themselves, or by way of perhaps special examination in a wide range of forums

to which people appear, that there would be a uniformity of rights for reporters under these contexts, and the same applicable to, say interpreters, the same applicable to witnesses? Is that the intent of the words "by one scale"; or is there some other notion?

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate before the minister replies on second reading? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, just by way of a further and fuller explanation, I hope, than on first reading: I am sure the hon. members are aware that under the present legislation the director of public prosecutions may authorize the expenses of bringing a person charged with an indictable offence from a place outside or in Ontario to the place of trial in Ontario.

In the past there has been no statutory authority in existence which would provide for payment of such expenses in an instance where an accused person for a summary conviction offence has to be brought to trial from another jurisdiction. This will permit that. The provisions of section 1 of the new bill remove these restrictions and allow the director of public prosecutions to authorize the payment of such expenses, irrespective of the type of offence committed by the accused.

This authority, we feel, under motor accidents; in case arising under The Juvenile Delinquents Act (Canada); in cases, for instance, under The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act and other similar types of provincial legislation. This fills a very real hole and a very real gap that exists in these pieces of provincial legislation at the moment. It also removes financial considerations by a Crown attorney in matters of election of appropriate procedures where he is authorized to prosecute an offence either as an indictable or under summary conviction procedure.

My hon. friend says that power should be used very sparingly. I disagree. If the question of justice requires the payment of expenses for people to be brought back here, then I think that is an element that is a consideration that happily we should be able to avoid and this is the purpose of the legislation.

In relation to his second point, The Administration of Justice Act, 1968, in clause (b) of section 7 authorized the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to make regulations providing for the payment of fees and expenses for services in connection with the administration of justice. Certain regulations in this

respect were made in June, 1968, with effect from January 1, 1968, with regard only to fees and expenses arising from the now-revoked Administration of Justice Expenses Act.

The amendment under this bill sir, will enable fees payable by the Crown or the public for the purposes of various other Acts dealing with the administration of justice to come under one schedule, to correlate all of these matters together, to bring them under one scale so that these matters, first of all, will be handy in one schedule. I certainly believe that in the past, in attempting to relate some of these fees payable under a multitude of pieces of legislation, it is far handier for the practitioners, for the administrators and for the people who get paid the fees to have the money in one place, available from one statute and the words "fixed by one scale," mean exactly that. For instance, for court reporters, no matter what the tribunal, no matter what the type of trial, there will be one fixed scale for them under the legislation.

The other pieces of legislation that we are going to be dealing with this afternoon in the main relate back to this particular bill, Mr. Speaker, in that the question of fees and correlating them under one schedule under one Act, one regulation under one Act, relates to witness fees and expenses, jurors' fees and expenses, justice of the peace fees and expenses, and fees and expenses arising from coroners' investigations and inquests. I hope that deals with the enquiries of my friend.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, there are some questions I would ask which I thought it improper to ask on second reading. I wonder if it could go through Committee of the Whole House.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I have no objection.

Mr. Speaker: This bill shall then be referred to Committee of the Whole House.

Agreed to.

COUNTY JUDGES ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves second reading of Bill 3, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: This party has no particular objection to the appointment of the new judges, sir. They are probably very necessary. This is as true of the county court scale as it is true of other areas of judges in this province—as the Attorney General is learning in a rather devastating way these days insofar as the provincial judges are concerned.

Switching of jurisdictions will help this whole area very greatly, but until this is all done I cannot see how this party can take exception to the new judges.

More importantly, perhaps, is the business about fees for court reporters. As I say, this begins a series of bills where the levying of fees and the setting up of scales are contemplated in the legislation.

If I may just make reference to Justice McRuer at 810 on this matter, he says, in his conclusions to his chapter on court reporting:

The whole process of court reporting is in a very confused and disorderly state. There is no overall plan for employment, remuneration, discipline and promotion of reporters. The problems created by this condition are serious and require a comprehensive approach to their solution. There has to be an efficient and satisfactory system for reporting the proceedings of the court in those tribunals whose proceedings are reported. There must be a complete reorganization of the system.

I am pointing this out, in making some emphatic use of Justice McRuer on this occasion, for the future delectation and mind-broadening aspects of the Attorney General. One cannot take exception to the legislation as to the fee schedule, but without a thorough reorganization this move is not going to be particularly beneficial.

As the Attorney General mentioned earlier, the alterations that have been made, or the regulations passed under The Administration of Justice Act of three years ago were the only regulations that were passed under that Act. The rest of the panoply, the rest of the machinery of justice has lain fallow since that time, and I think quite questionably, because the purpose in bringing in the Act was to begin reformulation and reform within the courts themselves. The only regulations that were passed; regulation 104/71, particularly sub-paragraph 4 thereof; had to do with fees

and expenses in general: "Shorthand court reporters will be given \$7 an hour with a maximum per diem rate of \$35."

There are other provisions made in regulations 112 and 130 but they do not touch upon these matters, so really in effect very little has been done to rectify the iniquitous conditions, if one reads Justice McRuer's words, that exist. I suppose the Attorney General, even as a lagging witness to the processes of justice as the new boy, can be commended to a point in bringing in the changes that are so requisite in these fee schedules and in the reformulation of the courts and the way in which these offices of the courts operate.

I think this is as far as I want to go. I had some misgivings, as I will under The Justices of the Peace Act, about the problem that had arisen with court reporters who, under their documents of office, are permitted to charge fees to the general public, having performed their basic duty to the courts and no doubt to the general public and to the legal professions, at a scale that is determined by them.

I hope the legislation herein envisages the scale that will be mandatory and binding even in that context, because the Minister of Justice has deliberately preserved the sections of The Public Service Act, and I suppose those other areas in the law of Ontario, where reporters can charge fees for their transcriptions without any obligation to pay them over to the Treasurer of Ontario but simply to pocket them.

I say there is nothing wrong, it seems to me, in their being able so to do. What is wrong is for them to be suzerains over their own fee schedule; that must be limited by legislation. They cannot charge, in my opinion, whatever the market will bear in order to extract from the profession, and therefore from the client. The cost of justice is high enough in this province without permitting abuses of that kind and I hope this legislation covers that specific point also.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Lakeshore touched on something that deserves much more elaborate attention. That is the whole question of the adequacy of court reporting in our criminal courts, in our civil courts, before our administrative boards and so on. I do not think they can have escaped the attention of the minister the recent remarks made by Mr.

Master McBride about fees charged by court reporters.

One of the matters that has caused very great concern is the adequate supply of court reporters, not only in the criminal process but throughout the whole process of the administration of justice—and I do not omit, in fact I deliberately include, the proceedings before administrative boards and so forth.

Criminal appeals often are delayed until a transcript is made available. This goes through all levels of our criminal courts. Sometimes it is very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to obtain with any expedition at all a copy of the transcript of a criminal trial. The practice unfortunately has grown of having to pay extra fees for a hurried transcript, which makes no sense to me at all. If the transcript is there, or if the words are on tape or on some kind of machine, and in the normal course of events it is needed for further proceedings, I do not think that the wealthy litigant or the larger legal firm, which is perhaps prepared to lay these moneys out, should get greater service than the poor litigant.

Some of the problems we have had with people being held in our jails pending an appeal have resulted from this very thing. I would have hoped, I think with Mr. McRuer, that somewhere soon—and perhaps this is too soon—we would have heard from the Attorney General that we have advanced sufficiently far in our study of new techniques in this field that there could be a standardized system of better reporting proceedings before our various tribunals.

I know there has been a great deal of experimentation. The Bar Association has studied this; The Law Society of Upper Canada has studied it. The extent to which these things have been successful, I am not sure nor whether or not such people as IBM or the large computer companies who might be able to assist us have been consulted.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly difficult to properly service the whole course of administration of justice when we have what is apparently a dying profession that is so badly needed, which is not properly servicing our system. There seems to be little encouragement or enthusiasm to entice young people into the profession of court reporting. The number of people who are expert at it is increasingly diminishing and some of the newer persons who are attracted, perhaps are not as skilled as some of the people who are getting older and who are going to leave that profession in due course.

I think this is a matter of very very serious consideration that I hope the Attorney General plans to give his immediate attention to. He does very little in here. He is patching up one little hole, and there is nothing wrong with this insofar as it goes, but insofar as the whole course of the administration of justice is concerned I can foresee very little real improvement.

The faults are just so obvious and they are known to every practising member of the profession—the ability to obtain transcripts reasonably and quickly and promptly, the ability to have reporters available, all these things, it is a problem that permeates our whole system of justice in this jurisdiction and in many others. I know other jurisdictions worry about it as well. In fairness, I cannot berate the Attorney General for not coming in with a package that is going to clean up all these problems, but it is a constant source of worry and it gets worse as time goes on and this is not going to do a great deal to improve it.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, as far as the court reporters are concerned, I must say that I agree with much of what has been said here this afternoon, although I will not agree with the hon. member for Lakeshore that the whole system of court reporting in this province is in an inequitable stage. I will merely say I think the system is ripe for reform, and one bite at a time.

This is stage one of a reform because, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Downsview, you have the conundrum here, as we have it in so many other areas, where in spite of the fact there is a great deal of flexibility in respect of the fees charged by reporters, that is in some cases they are charging just exactly what the traffic will bear, and perhaps in many cases even more. Nevertheless, in spite of the very high incomes that some of them have, we are having a great deal of difficulty getting competent help in this field.

Obviously there has been a great deal of experimentation over the last few years. I was interested, as I visited the criminal court just last Friday morning at the old City Hall, to note there that just about all the court reporters are now using the stenomat system. I am not too sure that this is the answer. I do not know enough about it. It is an improvement, obviously, but it may not be the ultimate. The steno typing system was used for a while and there are grave defects in that as well.

Certainly, I would agree that the court reporting in this jurisdiction as in most other jurisdictions is one that is ripe for reform. One thing that we have to clear up is the whole fee situation. We should standardize this and make it a little more equitable; and this is exactly what we hope to do in this particular bill.

I can assure the hon. members of this House that it is not only the day-to-day practitioners of the law who have difficulty in getting transcripts. I find that the Attorney General, so that he can properly decide in some matters which cases should be appealed and which cases should not be appealed, is also having difficulty getting transcripts of the evidence of some of the criminal trials.

In respect of the county court judges, this bill authorizes an additional county court judge to the county of Wentworth, and three additional judges having jurisdiction anywhere in Ontario.

I appeal to the members of the House, sir, to let this bill, if they will, go through to third reading, in the hope that we can get it through as quickly as possible.

Last week, the annual bill at Ottawa respecting judges was introduced. I find to my horror that the federal government will not include in the annual bill any increases in judges in any county or district court anywhere across the country until the enabling bill at the provincial level has not only passed second reading and third reading but also has had royal assent. Therefore, if we are going to get these judges at all this year, I am afraid that we have to go full steam ahead with this particular bill. Why they cannot take it as a matter of good intention on our part—

Mr. Singer: They know the government too well.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —once it has gone through second reading, I do not know, but they will not go that far. If we could, sir, because I do not believe there is any objection to the increase in the number of judges from any part of the House at all, I do believe we can talk about court reporters and the whole question of the fees in relation to court reporters under other legislation. I would appeal to the House to permit this to go through without going through the necessity of the committee stage.

Mr. Singer: We might even hear about it in the minister's estimates.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I am quite prepared to do that if the Attorney General will permit me asking one question through you, Mr. Speaker. The question has to do with those reporters who are salaried but whose terms of appointment do not prohibit them from taking extra fees. Is this regulation going to set a limitation upon what they may charge?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Only the broadest request has gone out so far from the minister's office in respect of these regulations relating to the fee. I want to see them standardized no matter what the tribunals, no matter what the jurisdictions, no matter what the level of the courts are concerned.

Mr. Lawlor: No matter who they are going to?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I simply have not had the discussions with my officials yet in that detailed a manner respecting what these actual fees should be. This is still a matter that is being formulated; or perhaps has already been formulated within the department but it has not yet come back to me.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, if I may just for a moment, we will get this clear.

Mr. Speaker: We are out of order, but if it is a quick question, I think the minister will answer.

Mr. Lawlor: It is more in the form of a statement. All the member for Downsview and myself are doing is we pointed out the abuse; you are aware of it and this is the thing we want clarified and corrected in this legislation.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I appreciate that. Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed to.

CROWN WITNESSES ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves second reading of Bill 4, An Act to amend The Crown Witnesses Act.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, Bill 4, with respect to Crown witnesses, affects criminal proceedings only. The present scale of fees

is notoriously inadequate as set out at 861 of McRuer;

Witnesses other than qualified experts attending criminal trials at the instance of the Crown and the Supreme Court, general sessions of the peace, county court, judges criminal court, before a magistrate trying an indictable offence or conducting a preliminary inquiry, and in proceedings before a grand jury, receive \$6 a day, 10 cents a mile travelling allowance, and up to \$8 per night living expenses, if they cannot return home at the end of the day.

It goes on further down in summary conviction cases before a magistrate or a justice of the peace—as they then were—

Witnesses receive up to \$4 a day and 10 cents a mile. There is no provision for any further relief in exceptional cases.

This legislation, I trust, is designed to correct that fallacy and the inadequacy of fees, which only reacts against the working principles in the operation of justice. I would refer the Attorney General to the fifth recommendation of McRuer in Chapter 56, having to do with witness fees. It simply says: "The scale of witness fees should be the same for all courts and tribunals."

I would trust that is precisely what he means when he says in his headnote: "Where the amounts will be made uniform with fees payable by the Crown in other similar matters."

Certainly this is restrictive to a certain range of courts, but has he—and I asked this question about another matter—envisage a different hierarchy or scale of fees for different levels of courts and different kinds of tribunals, or is it his intention to bring in a scale of witness fees which is the same as recommended by McRuer? Does he accept or does he reject McRuer under this particular heading?

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the business in section 1 of the new bill, subsection 3, where the Crown attorney with the approval of the director of public prosecutions may order payment in certain extraordinary circumstances for the preparation of the trial case or for preparing any document or article. I wonder why he feels that is an amendment from—I think the wording previously was that it had to do with the office of the Crown but not the director of public prosecutions—whether he feels that is necessary? Can this discretion not be left to be reposed in the Crown attorneys themselves? Why do you have to go to the director of public prosecutions—an extra bureaucratic step—in

order to get approval for matters of this kind? Are our Crown attorneys not sufficiently trustworthy, sufficiently men of integrity, and of knowledge as to what is needed and what is not needed in the presentation of the case to make that determination on their own hook?

Thirdly, if it was felt necessary, why not give the presiding judge that power? Surely he is closer to the evidence, closer to the case, more able to decide on the spot as to whether or not there was legitimacy in the preparation; whether the preparation contributed to the solution of the case or whether the document was really a necessary document. Why do you go off to the director of public prosecutions under that head?

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to enter the debate? If not, the hon. Attorney General.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the series of bills relating to fees. Most of these matters really were discussed under one or other of the prior bills. Again, it is a question of the type of events here. Up until now we have only been able to pay witness fees and expenses in respect of indictable offences. This clears it up.

The big question here, of course, is that at the moment witnesses called at the instance of the Crown in summary conviction proceedings are paid at a fee of \$4 per diem from the public funds of Ontario. To put it mildly, that payment is rather out of date. This will remove that differentiation between indictable and summary proceedings. The whole point, as I said earlier, is to standardize these fees. The present rates in respect of indictable offences are fixed at the moment in the schedule to The Crown Witnesses Act. They were last revised in 1956. These are pretty archaic in relation to today's economy. They are out of date and we want to bring them up to date.

The proposed amendment provides that witness fees and expenses under all criminal proceedings at the instance of the Crown, whether with regard to either indictable or summary conviction offences, be fixed under the provision of The Administration of Justice Act by regulation at uniform rates. We want to take a look at the total package and put them in a far more flexible way under the regulation so that they can be dealt with as a total package.

This amendment also clarifies the authority of Crown attorneys and the director of public prosecutions in instances where compensation

should be granted, in addition to the established fees and expenses, to a witness. This is in addition to those established fees and expenses to a witness, and it is obviously the view of the department and the minister and the government, otherwise it would not be before you, that we feel that there should be the extra safeguard of the approval of the director of public prosecutions in this matter.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed to.

JURORS ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves second reading of Bill 5, An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, as I read Bill 5 I wonder if the present incumbent of the office of Attorney General has seriously considered the kite flown by his predecessor about doing away with juries? And perhaps we could have the benefit of his opinion in this very serious matter as this bill proceeds through, or perhaps we are to take it that the storm stirred up by his predecessor when he flew that kite has been sufficient to set that problem aside for an indefinite period?

That would be my second guess. I would think that would be a more logical thing. Perhaps the Attorney General when he comes to address himself to this bill could comment on that? The inclusion of the words "drugless practitioner" is interesting. I suppose it is somewhat in keeping with the exemptions presently there.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I have got another one.

Mr. Singer: I am sorry, the Attorney General is saying—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, the member is on the wrong one.

Mr. Singer: Am I on the wrong one? Bill 5—The Jurors Act. Is that not the one we are doing?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I am sorry. He is right.

Mr. Singer: Is the Attorney General with me? We are doing the same bill?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes.

Mr. Singer: Good. Drugless practitioners. Is there a Drugless Practitioners Act in the province?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Yes.

Mr. Singer: There is? And that is defined, is it?

Mr. J. Renwick: That is right.

Mr. Singer: We can identify a drugless practitioner. Is there any necessity in this bill, for instance, to relate the definition sections with the applicable statutes? I suppose we can define with reasonable certainty a physician, a surgeon, a dental surgeon and so on, but I was just wondering if there might be a necessity of having cross-references in the definition?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: My reason for interrupting the hon. member is that if he wants to talk about more professions in here I intend moving an amendment. I just thought I would give him notice.

Mr. Singer: Give us the amendment first.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: All I really want to do is add practicing optometrists as well.

Mr. Singer: That of course changes the whole concept of the statutes, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Well, I thought if the hon. member was going to take a whack at me about drugless practitioners I should give him the opportunity now of taking a whack at me in regard to practicing optometrists.

Mr. J. Renwick: What about the stockbrokers?

Mr. Singer: Yes, and what about the friends of my colleague here from Huron-Bruce—chiropractors—being included in that? Would that not be logical?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Is a drugless practitioner not a chiropractor?

Mr. Singer: He is very concerned as always with the wellbeing of various segments of our community and he has expressed great concern about chiropractors.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Drugless practitioner.

Mr. J. Renwick: Drugless practitioner.

Mr. Singer: Is a chiropractor a drugless practitioner? I just wondered, Mr. Speaker, whether or not there might be some kind of cross-reference, because the automatic definition as contained in The Jurors Act might not necessarily refer to the other statutes that bear that name.

The second thing is that I see we are not going to do very much about grand juries at the moment, and certainly some of us and Mr. McRuer have some concern about the effectiveness of the grand jury system at all.

Mr. J. Renwick: The member wants them abolished, does he?

Mr. Singer: Yes I do. In fact if the hon. member for Riverdale wants to I will give him a ready reference to some of my earlier speeches, and with pleasure he can read them.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: How about ordinary juries?

Mr. Singer: I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, since we are in the hour—

Mr. J. Renwick: That's a change from the past session!

Mr. Singer: I find great difficulty talking above the nattering of the hon. member for Riverdale. If he would be quiet for a moment we could proceed.

I am just wondering if this represents the total consideration of the Attorney General insofar as the grand jury system is concerned? The new Attorney General—and granted he is substantially lacking in experience in this field—seems to answer none of our questions in the House. He recently tabled a very large tome dealing with coroners' courts with the announcement that he does not intend to introduce any legislation.

I just wonder if he has in mind any genuine legal reforms. He is tidying up a few loose ends here. I wonder whether or not he might have any thoughts about the reformation or even the abolition of the grand jury system?

Mr. J. Renwick: —destruction of the individual's rights!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: You anticipated me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I thought the hon. member was on his feet previously.

Mr. Lawlor: He is trying to refuel.

The recommendation of McRuer, under the heading in this situation which is 7 of chapter 56, is: "Jury fees should be raised to provide adequate compensation for wage earners requested to render jury service." He has considerable portions there and I do not know if you are going to place your emphasis upon just drugless practitioners, Mr. Speaker, or upon practising drugless practitioners. It is terribly important as to the adjectives that are going to be used in this and the exclusions. There are 23—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is fully practising drugless practitioners.

Mr. Lawlor: That is fully practising—I think we will have to move an amendment to that effect.

There are 23 different categories of people under the Jurists Act who are presently excluded or permitted not to attend upon jury nor have jury duty. Adding to the list—I do not know if that is a good principle, I rather suspect it is not, I would like to hear more reasoning behind it. The wider the swath of individuals called for jury service, the greater involvement in a fundamental duty of citizenship.

This exclusion of individuals, I suppose, is theoretically on the ground that the duty they are doing as drugless practitioners, actually practising or not, is greater in terms of the public weal than the benefits they are conferring or the necessities of the day, greater than that of exercising their duties as citizens. I mean if you have got a bit of Greek mentality you would say that there is not any higher responsibility, that being a juror is the primary one. That is what they did all day in Athens you know, they heard cases, the whole citizen body, and made judgements and cast stones. This is the—

Mr. Singer: Did not include the slaves.

Mr. Lawlor: Nevertheless, for those who were not slaves, the most civilized portion of the population perhaps, this was how they preoccupied themselves in that particular regime, which was—whatever the natterings of the member for Downsview may be—some-what a higher mentality on the whole than preoccupies the citizenry around here these days.

The recommendation number seven, therefore, should be brought into complete effect.

I will not go over the terms of the fees paid in Ontario to jurors. They are gratuitously low, if that is the word, \$10 a day. Again, I think the minister will agree that an updating and a reform in this particular area is vitally necessary. I have only one reservation about the legislation and that has to do with payments to justices of the peace, the terms of releasing jurors and the terms of empanelling jurors.

This seems to me to run directly adverse to the recommendation of McRuer and we will come to it in a few moments, about justices of the peace generally; namely, they ought to be salaried, period. They ought not to be dependent upon funds coming from some outside source or for some incidental and relatively petty duty such as empanelling jurors and what not.

They get paid some ridiculously small stipend for performing that function. It is an antiquated carry-over from earlier history in this province, and why you seek to perpetuate it in your gleaming, if not glittering, legislation, strikes me as a failure of nerve, as a failure to move ahead and abolish the collection of them.

There is a plethora of these little fees that are hanging out all over the place, which is a way of the justice of the peace currying favour with people in authority and what not, to get these little tasks and pick up an extra emolument on the side. Why do we not grow up and have a thorough-going system of justice and pay people what they deserve to be paid instead of the kind of legislation that the second page, at least, of the bill indicates and embodies?

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate? If not, the hon. Attorney General.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the philosophy behind the amendment to include drugless practitioners, and now the amendment that I would like to move with respect to optometrists as well, is one that I admit has escaped me as well. The only thing in defence of the amendment that I can say to the House is simply that these professions have asked for the amendment to exempt these people from jury duty.

Originally, I suppose, the theory was to cover people who are liable to be called out in emergency operations of some kind or another—people who may find their jury duty conflicts with their duty to the public. But, as I say, I have no strong feelings about it one way or the other and if the House wants

this bill to go to the committee where we can call in the representatives of these professions, I would be glad, certainly, to facilitate that, although no one has suggested it as yet. In so doing, sir, I would like to move, if I may, that section 1 of the bill be deleted and the following substituted therefor—

Mr. Singer: We can only do that in committee.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: All right. I was trying to obviate the necessity of this bill going into committee, but never mind, I will do it in committee. I think I have given the House a caution anyway that I intend to do that later on.

In respect of the whole question of the future of juries in this province, this again is something—

Mr. Singer: The government is carefully considering it.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, the government is not carefully considering it. The minister is not even carefully considering it. This is a question that I have not been able to direct my mind to as yet.

Mr. Singer: Read some of the former minister's speeches.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I will certainly read some of the speeches of my predecessor in respect of this matter, and I was also quite intrigued to find that the hon. member for Downsview was going out of his way not to express an opinion on the matter either, so that—

Mr. Singer: Oh, in so far as petit juries, let us keep them.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Well, I am glad to have this view and this opinion and these suggestions from various members of the House. I am sure the hon. members are not really too concerned about the existing system of payment of jurors' fees at the moment. In respect of the future of JPs in the province, I must say to my friend, the hon. member for Lakeshore, that I shared at one time with him, the view that all Justices of the Peace should be salaried individuals and all of these petty minor fees, collectable by some of these individuals, should be abolished. Certainly that is exactly the trend and that is the policy of the government in respect of the urban areas. All new appointments for Metropolitan Toronto, for instance, are permanent salaried individuals.

However, the great majority of the Justices of the Peace throughout this province, in the rural areas especially, are people whose duties in no way could justify the payment of a regular salary to them—in no way—and therefore, sir, I suppose that question really should be dwelt with under the later amendment—my hon. friend is perfectly correct, the later bill under The Justices of the Peace amendment Act—but because my friend brought it up, I did not want to be accused of not answering his inquiries here.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney General would permit a question. Is he aware that under section 12 of The Interpretation Act, the provision is that “legally qualified medical practitioner,” “duly qualified medical practitioner,” or any words according legal recognition to a person as a medical practitioner or as a member of the medical profession, means a person registered under The Medical Act?

In other words, The Interpretation Act, which applies to all statutes, has a provision for a definition relating to the medical practitioner but when we get down to drugless practitioners, and so on, I wonder if a person selecting jurors could say that somebody who administers a few aspirins to a sick child could be a drugless practitioner. Because there appears to be no necessity to refer in that profession, or in any of the others, to a particular statutory interpretation and I return to the point and wonder whether the minister would not reconsider that.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: This is a matter, I think, that we can best deal with in committee stage. Certainly this matter has been considered.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: This bill shall then be submitted to the Committee of the Whole House.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, is it the wish of the hon. members that it go to the Committee of the Whole House or to—whatever committee we call it this year—it used to be legal bills, but I have no views on it. Would the hon. members rather that it go to the standing committee rather than the Committee of the Whole House?

Mr. Singer: Committee of the Whole House; all right.

Mr. Lawlor: Committee of the Whole House, because the other committee is loaded

with those fellows and they will not listen; so I prefer to talk here.

Mr. Speaker: The minister then directs the bill to go to the Committee of the Whole House.

Agreed to.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves second reading of Bill 6, An Act to amend The Justices of the Peace Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Singer: The member already made his speech under the previous one.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes I did, however there is no harm in making the same speech over again.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure he will not repeat the same remarks.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, recommendation number one of McRuer having to do with justices of the peace says the whole system—again, the whole system—pertaining to the office of the justice of the peace should be reorganized. He points out there are 925 justices of the peace in the province, as much as they can determine. There are apparently an unknown number of unregistered justices of the peace of whom the government has completely lost track in its endeavour to appoint as many functionaries as it possibly can under the right banner—the true blue and whatever it is that goes with the Tory Party. The thing has fallen into a total state of ruination.

In this particular legislation the recommendation as to fees is under section 8—that all justices of the peace should be paid a salary based on the demands on their time as shown by a review of the duties they perform. It does not seem to me that this legislation does say in so many words that that is what they intend to do.

The minister himself has said that it is a distinction between the rural areas and the urban which would be the basis of the distinction. I think McRuer wanted it to be based upon a time factor. I do not think this bill needs to be sent to committee personally, if, in the course of sending it on to third reading the minister might just indicate as to whether a time factor in the scale of fees is considered admissible and if that is precisely what he wants to do.

There are pages setting out the present fee structure of the justices of the peace in this book; minor item after minor item. Again it is an excrescence—it is a kind of a barnacle on the belly of the whale, if you will—that there should be a whole host of these petti-fogging fees designed to support and maintain justices of the peace in this province. It is an outworn, thoroughly arbitrary system.

The great number of these fees are levied against the accused person; that is being perpetuated. The government wiped it out, lock, stock and barrel—and I gave the government credit for it—under the previous Attorney General, touching Crown attorneys. But the dregs are still there—the bottom of the barrel is still there—in this business of the justices of the peace.

I would ask the Attorney General to give good thought to and to move immediately in the area of cleaning that thing up, just as McRuer indicated quite a few years ago now that it ought to be done.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Attorney General?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, in all fairness, because a great deal of the work of this session as far as my portfolio is concerned is going to involve words and suggestions and criticisms of the administration of justice in this province by one J. C. McRuer, I think I might as well get it off my chest right now. I do not believe that every word in every one of those reports is manna from heaven or ultimate wisdom coming down to us from on high.

There are many suggestions in those reports which I reject. One of them is the question, for now in any event, of making every justice of the peace in this province a salaried employee of this province right there.

Mr. J. Renwick: I think it is fair to say that Mr. McRuer does not think so either.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: At the moment, as I have indicated, in most of the urban areas we do have full-time salaried justices of the peace. As our urbanization in this province goes on, more and more full-time justices of the peace will be appointed to cover the needs of the people of this province.

I think the hon. member for Lakeshore should bear in mind that the purpose of providing people in this category is as a service to the public. As far as the rights or the payment of justices of the peace are concerned, these are a secondary matter in my book.

What I am looking for is the provision of worthwhile, accessible, experienced, conscientious people to provide a service to the public and in most areas of the province, geographically speaking, we feel that this can still be done by means of the payment of fees for services provided.

At the moment there are 23 full-time, salaried JPs in Metropolitan Toronto. There is one in Chatham. There is one in Whitby. There is one in Waterloo. One is in Kitchener. One is in Niagara Falls and one in Sault Ste. Marie. A total of 30 in the province.

The salaries and working conditions of these full time JPs was established in 1970 by an order-in-council and they are within the scale of \$9,705 to \$11,349 per year.

Mr. J. Renwick: Are they all Tories?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: They have a varied allowance up to \$120 per month for night duty.

It has been found in practice that the limitation of jurisdiction of full-time JPs to city or metropolitan municipality areas is very inconvenient. Also there is a crying need to appoint full-time justices of the peace in county, district and regional municipalities with province-wide jurisdiction.

This new amendment in subsection 2 provides for the appointment for justices of the peace for any part of Ontario, upon the same terms and conditions as the appointment of such justices of the peace for cities and metropolitan municipalities. In effect, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing with this particular amending bill at the moment is to do just what my hon. friend envisages, but I feel I must say to him, however, that in no way at the moment, do we feel that all of the JPs should be full time right across the province.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, with the minister's indulgence, as this probably will go through to third reading, we will avoid the business of the opinion of the whole House. I wonder if the minister would answer me a question?

This is a pretext for a question, Mr. Minister. Does the minister then, on his general approach to McRuer, say that he does not consider necessarily that all the droppings are manna from heaven? Does he agree with the following statement about justices of the peace?

We discuss and condemn the fee system in the administration of justice elsewhere

in this report. It is subversive of the administration of justice. The payment of judicial officers on a piece-work basis necessarily diminishes the public respect for law and order. The fee system is a real inducement to justices of the peace to curry favour with police officers in order to "get business."

I think we can all say that we are independently minded with respect to McRuer. No one is more severely critical of him than myself, but that kind of statement must stand. When you get to McRuer you have to give, in my opinion, very good reasons why the minister objects. I cannot see the minister objecting to that kind of statement.

Mr. Singer: That was a question?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That was a question?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed to.

SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves second reading of Bill 7, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, in connection with Bill 7—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, could I also indicate to the hon. members that in committee stage here I intend moving an amendment which will permit the uniform ticket amendment to come into force on a specified date, rather than merely on royal assent.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I would imagine, as I read this bill, that those people who are concerned about computers and management consultants and all sorts of people like that have had a hand in the drafting of this bill.

On the surface it sounds like a wonderful idea. If we only have a uniform ticket where people put Xs and Os and the policeman can hand them out quickly, the whole course of administration of justice is going to move very quickly. In theory I think this is a grand idea.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell my friend, the Attorney General, about a little incident that happened to me. I went through a red light one day and on the opposite—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Shame!

Mr. Singer: —side was a policeman who pulled me over and gave me one of the presently existing uniform tickets.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Outside of Metro?

Mr. Singer: No, in Metro. The Metropolitan Toronto uniform kind of a ticket where he fills in the Xs and Os, and so on. The summons followed up to advise me that, five months after that date, if I wanted to plead not guilty, I could hie myself off to the city hall and plead not guilty for going through the stoplight. I do not think I had any defence anyway.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, I wonder the extent to which the Attorney General has gone beyond the computer operators and scientists and beyond the management consultants. Is he satisfied that what sounds like a new and modern and up-to-date system is really going to speed up this system of the administration of justice?

Because it is ludicrous, Mr. Speaker, that committing the offence of going through a red light is going to take five months before you, in fact, get a hearing before the court, if you want to argue about it.

I am all in favour of anything that is going to speed this up, but I get worried about the word "summary," as in The Summary Convictions Act. The predecessor of the present minister (Mr. Wishart) found great solace in the words "summary procedure" in The Landlord and Tenants Act. And we all know that "summary" there means very little.

I have not got very great faith in computer scientists or in management consultants insofar as speeding these things up are concerned. I would like some kind of analysis from the Attorney General as to whether or not, when we get the new forms, it is reasonable to assume it is going to be more efficient, it is going to be more speedy, while still protecting the rights of the people who are going to be affected.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: On this bill I would like to know too precisely what the minister has in mind. What range of offences does he intend

to place on the ticket? Liquor offences? I would not think it was absconding husbands in this instance, as it was on the previous bill which I wanted to have greater clarity placed upon, before we gave our assent over here.

I ask what precisely does the hon. minister have in mind? I mean precisely. I want to know specifically what range of offences the hon. minister thinks will operate in this particular fashion. Whereas previously this section was confined to Highway Traffic Act offences and has considerable validity there, in a wider swath of offences I would think that, from the point of view of sheer operation, it may not work half as well.

There is one specific point I want to bring to the minister's attention. The major section—section 1, subsection 3, coming down to paragraph 8 of subsection 3—the minister talks about the issuing officer on one side of the fence and giving out the summons portion of the ticket. Then the information portion of the ticket goes in to the police headquarters—I suppose before the justice of the peace. But the minister has made a special provision in paragraph 11 that the informant need not be the same person as that who issued the ticket summons. It seems to me that the informant is after all the individual who swears before the justice of the peace that an offence has been committed. What is the minister's intention—that anybody within the operatus of the police do this and not the very individual whose personal knowledge or whose personal allegation it is a so-called offence has been committed? Ought not the man who issued the summons in the first place to the person on the spot be also the individual to swear that an offence was committed before the justice of the peace? This is a minor matter perhaps, but it is one I think that has some pertinency to this kind of legislation.

I want to join my friend in Downsview in scouting the efficacy of this kind of legislation, as to precisely how the minister deems it is going to operate and what area that he thinks it is going to serve the public in a way better than the present system of issuing summonses and what cost he envisages as possibly being saved to the public purse in the process of bringing this particular sort of measure about.

Does the measure also resemble that in the Ouimet report of the information type of summons of criminal offences under the Criminal Code that are set forth there as a more expeditious way of getting cases before the courts? These are some of the questions that occurred to me while reading this legislation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, first of all, a form of uniform traffic ticket has been in use throughout the province for approximately 10 years and any of the reaction to the use of this form that has come into the department over that time, and anything that I have heard as far as the legal profession is concerned or the public is concerned, has been good.

Just so that I do not want to have any words put in my mouth that this afternoon everything I do is contrary to the hon. J. C. McRuer in his report on the royal commission inquiry into civil rights, and because so many of these words have been thrown at me this afternoon by the member for Lakeshore, I should refer him this afternoon to the report by Mr. McRuer, page 740, in which in referring to the uniform traffic ticket procedure, he has said: "We have had no submissions criticizing this process, that is the uniform traffic ticket process, except that it is too seldom used."

Well by widening it, by making it applicable here in Metro Toronto and having it come up with a form that permits it to be fed into the Metro Toronto computers, the idea is that we are doing exactly what Mr. McRuer has asked us to do.

In relation to the other Act to which, hopefully, the new ticket will be applicable, they all relate to traffic control. This is the main principle behind it, so that under the new procedure a uniform traffic ticket could be issued for offences against such Acts as The Motorized Snow Vehicles Act, The Highway Improvement Act or The Public Commercial Vehicles Act. I can assure my honourable and learned friend that it is not the intention in any event to use this for such matters as liquor offences or matters such as that. They relate directly to traffic control matters.

Under this system too, I think I should point out that the offender will have the advantage of knowing right on the spot what he is charged with since he is handed the summons immediately, while under the system such as that which is now in effect in Metro Toronto for instance, a person may not receive a summons for several weeks following the time the offence was committed.

In respect of the procedures under the Act I should point out that there are really two new procedures provided for under this bill. Under subsection 4 the court may determine that certain offences may be settled out

of court, and from a practical point of view this will be in nearly every case where such a ticket is issued. The court in this case will mean the senior provincial judge of the criminal division in the area where the ticket is being issued.

In cases where charges may be settled out of court, the court may then prescribe a fixed amount for the out-of-court penalties and every police officer will have this schedule with him, and when a summons is issued he may then enter upon the summons itself the amount of the out-of-court settlement which the court has already prescribed.

Mr. Singer: Would that differ from the regular area?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes it will. Under the old procedure if a case could be settled out of court the offender had to fill out a small blue piece of paper which was at the bottom of the summons and send it into the court with his signature of the back, and then when his plea of guilty was accepted the court would send out the notice to the offender of the amount of the fine and the offender was then to forward the fine to the court. So no wonder it was indicated to my hon. friend that up to five months could elapse before the matter would finally come to trial.

As a practical matter this creates a very great problem for the court officials, and since in all cases as a practical matter the amount of out-of-court settlement is fixed by the court and entered by a clerk, it seems much more efficient—and I emphasize the words “it seems much more efficient” to have the officer complete this portion of the summons and then an offender can simply, if he wishes, settle out of court, sign the back of the summons and send the amount of the money indicated on the face of the ticket.

I have here, if the hon. members want to see it, a draft of what these things should look like, in case there are no traffic offenders in the House today.

It should be made clear, sir, that the officer in filling out the amount of the penalty is in no way exercising his discretion, but is simply putting on the summons a figure which has been fixed by the court. It is also provided that no officer may accept payment of any out-of-court settlement, and the reasons, of course, for this are pretty obvious.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question, it is right on this point.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: This “fixed by the court” business puzzles me. Why is it not fixed by the regulation or fixed under some Act? What have you got here? Take an example. Somebody has an overweight vehicle and one is issuing a summons to them. Does the minister say that the court in advance—or some court, I guess through the county judge or through the chief judge of the provincial judges or whoever it is going to be—have set their own schedule of what the fine or penalty will be arising out of an offence?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, sir.

Mr. Lawlor: Surely that is within your jurisdiction? This is a most curious thing that they should do that.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No. There are cases where flexibility from certain area to certain area across the province requires that some of these fines be of differing amounts. The standardization, though, does come because it has to be through the senior provincial judge of the criminal division in the area where the ticket is being issued. As time goes on, I am sure that we will get a more standardized amount laid down by the judges themselves.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney General could advise if this, in fact, means that the senior provincial judge, say, in Lanark—who is a genial and kindly man—could fix the penalty for speeding at the lowest limit set out in The Highway Traffic Act; whereas the senior provincial court judge, say, in Lambton—who is not quite so genial—might say speeders are terrible people and he is going to fix the fine at the highest possible rate? Does the Attorney General think this is reasonable? Because surely the offence, whether it is committed in Lanark or committed in Lambton, of speeding five miles over the limit, is the same offence? If there is going to be arbitrary fixing of penalty in one area, this could lead to very serious inequities.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I think my friend will find that as time goes on here, and these fines are standardized, his fears that there will be grave differences between the fines levied in these cases will disappear. Again, it is a question of moving cautiously, not slowly, but moving cautiously, into an area where more and more we are trying to standardize these.

Mr. Singer: The speeches at the convention indicated that the minister was going to move with imagination.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The other major change in the procedure is contained in subsections 8 and 9. These subsections provide that the officer who issues the ticket shall sign the face of the information certifying—and I am getting here to the point made by my friend, the member for Lakeshore—will sign the face of the information certifying that he has delivered the summons portion to the offender. This certificate is then receivable in evidence as sufficient proof of the personal service of the summons in the absence, of course, of evidence to the contrary.

Under the existing old procedure, if an accused did not appear at the time indicated on the summons the court could proceed in his absence only when the proof of service of the summons was made or a warrant could be issued for the offender's arrest. In no case could the court adjourn the matter to a subsequent date unless proof of personal service was made. This would require each police officer being present in court to swear that he served the summons personally upon the offender.

The amendment permits the court to accept as evidence the certificate of the officer on the face of the information, that he has delivered the summons personally to the offender and thus the court may then adjourn the matter until some subsequent date. I am sure my friend will agree this new practice is preferable to the existing one.

Subsection 11 simply spells out what is already the general practice in the laying of informations. By the subsection it is made clear that the informant or person who lays the charge need not be the same person as issued the traffic summons. In effect, this will permit a single officer to appear before a justice of the peace and swear that he had reasonable and probable ground to believe that the offence contained in the information had been committed. His ground for so doing would be the signature of the officer on the face of the information. Thus, a report in writing of one officer is being used as reasonable and probable grounds for another officer to believe that the offence had been committed.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this be referred for third reading? Agreed?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Oh, I am sorry. I have an amendment on this one.

Mr. Speaker: There is an amendment? Then the hon. minister would direct it to Committee of the Whole House?

Agreed to.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could then move third reading of Bill 1?

Mr. Speaker: Well, I must point out to the House that the time has arrived for another order of business. If this is the only bill, perhaps we could deal with it.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: There are just four bills here, sir, for third reading, that I think will take 30 seconds with the compliance of the House.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 1, An Act to amend The Wills Act.

Bill 3, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Bill 4, An Act to amend The Crown Witnesses Act.

Bill 6, An Act to amend The Justices of the Peace Act.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 8, by Mr. Makarchuk:

RESOLUTION: That this province request the federal government to amend The Bank Act to enable the Ontario government to initiate provincial legislation to expand the services and functions of the Ontario Savings Bank so that it will be able to operate in all fields of commerce currently available to chartered banks and trust companies, in order to provide meaningful competition in the banking field, lower interest rates, and give this government another financial tool for the encouragement of growth in vitally important areas of the provincial economy.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Cochrane South, resolution No. 8 standing in my name.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brantford, seconded by the member for Cochrane South, moves resolution No. 8.

Mr. Makarchuk: In moving this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I have considered the fact that banking comes under the jurisdiction of the federal government. At the same time, I have taken into account the current political climate in Canada and the hostile reaction that would come from these existing financial institutions should this province move into the field of banking. This of course should not prevent us from discussing this matter and acting on the resolution.

The foremost advantage of a provincial bank is that it could be used by the provincial government as an effective instrument to stimulate economic growth, to direct growth and development in socially desirable areas or to direct growth into slow-growth areas such as northern Ontario.

It would also be in a position to provide real competition to the existing chartered banks. Presently the Canadian banking industry is composed of nine federally chartered banking companies, five of which own 85 per cent of all Canadian branches. The industry has all the characteristics of an oligopoly selling basically undifferentiated products with little or no competition. The unanimous decision by the banks to increase service charges by 27 and 33 per cent is the most recent example of collusion and lack of real competition in the banking industry. The banking industry has been able to maintain its oligopolistic position by creating several barriers to competition.

First, as mentioned earlier, the politics of this nation have always been such that bank profits always come ahead of people. As a result, I can foresee that the Senate Committee on finance and banking which has to review the application for a charter would be very susceptible to influence by the existing chartered banks to deny issuing of a charter.

It should be noted that the Bank of British Columbia, hardly a socialistic enterprise, was issued a charter which denied the government of British Columbia any right to hold shares or have shares transferred to the government of that province. In spite of this Mr. Speaker, there is a change in the political climate coming and as a result there should be clear discussion of this matter.

The second barrier to entry is the fact that chartered banks control the clearing system. Consequently they are in a position to set the charges for other institutions at rates which could restrict the competitive ability of the new institution. Having enumerated some of the obstacles, I should like to say very emphatically that despite barriers the prov-

ince should go ahead with plans to establish a provincial bank.

The reasons are many, but basically they could be generalized in the statement that the province would have another very effective monetary tool to use in the social and economic development of this province. First, a judicious use of interest rates. The bank could ensure that interest rates charged by commercial banks would be more in line with the ability of the borrower to pay.

It should be noted that bank profits in the last few years have increased by what I consider an unconscionable amount. The cumulative figures for 1968 to 1970 show the following increase in profits: The Royal Bank had an increase of 26.3 per cent; the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce was 32.3 per cent; the Bank of Montreal was 98.8 per cent; the Bank of Nova Scotia was 28 per cent; the Toronto-Dominion Bank was 29.5 per cent; National Bank had 32.2 per cent and the Provincial Bank had 31.1 per cent increase in profits. The average is 39.7 per cent, or roughly a 20 per cent increase per year.

It is interesting to note that while the workers were told to hold the line at six per cent, and now in Ontario after the budget at five per cent, nothing was said to the banks by the same individuals.

Another point is that if the figures for 1967 were included, profits would still be much higher. The high profits reflect high interest rates charged by the banks. Although various groups in society are blamed for inflation, it should be obvious that the banks themselves have contributed more to inflation than anybody else. Our high rates are reflected in higher home mortgage payments, higher cost of production and hence higher cost of consumer goods.

Although a provincial bank may only have a small percentage of the lending market, it could still provide the competitive edge which would force the existing chartered banks to be very cautious about raising their interest rates. Other advantages of a provincial bank are that it could assist the government in carrying out socially useful economic policies.

As an example, money at lower interest rates could be made available to industries wishing to locate in areas where growth is desirable, such as northern Ontario. Small firms which offer less security than larger firms and which are unable to turn to the equity market because they are generally closely held and because they lack financial contacts that are available to those larger

corporations, would find a provincial bank more receptive to their needs.

Promoting innovation and strengthening the technology of the province should be another major task of the bank. It should be noted that economic growth is not only linked to the availability of natural resources but also very closely linked to the development of new technology, of brain power. This will not only help us to fulfill the needs of the people of Ontario but also build up our industries' competitive muscle. Assistance for rationalization of industry should be another function of the provincial bank. Relatively inefficient manufacturers could be consolidated into more efficient and competitive units. These are some of the functions that a provincial bank can perform but by no means all.

In conclusion, I wish to say that there will have to be much more planning of our economy by the people for the people, instead of by the corporation for the corporation or just to maximize profits. What is good for General Motors is not necessarily good for the people of Ontario. In order to come to grips with the problems of housing, pollution, urban sprawl, public transportation, full employment and others the province will have to use various methods to achieve these very desirable ends. A provincial bank is only one of the means but it is a very important means, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, this motion is a most interesting one and it does receive some qualified support from this party. I will set out our own particular views in a few moments. It is regrettable to me that the new Minister of Revenue (Mr. Winkler) in whose jurisdiction this matter now lies is not in the House to share our concern over this situation. I believe that it is most important that we consider this kind of expansion of the functions of the Ontario Savings Office so that we may be able to use the kinds of tools which are most important and relevant to our own development as a province.

In the 1970 volume entitled Ontario Government Services there appears on page 377 a very brief comment on the Province of Ontario Savings Office. We are told and I quote:

The purpose of this programme is to authorize the Treasurer of Ontario to borrow money by means of deposits in any

amounts and from any persons and to open offices in Ontario for this purpose. Moneys borrowed are used for any of the purposes of the Province of Ontario specified in The Agricultural Development Finance Act. Conditions as to interest and repayments that govern deposits are fixed from time to time by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we go on and are told that there are now 21 savings offices operating and the list of towns and cities is rather short. Aylmer, Brantford, Guelph, Hamilton, London, Ottawa, Owen Sound, Pembroke, Seaforth, St. Catharines, St. Marys, Toronto, Walkerton, Windsor and Woodstock. This is the network of offices which is available to the citizens of the province insofar as this old deposit function is concerned as operated by this government.

We are referred, then, in this booklet, to the authorizing legislation. This legislation is The Agricultural Development Finance Act, RSO 1960, chapter 9, a one-page statute of five short sections. Of course, the most important of the sections is the one dealing with the use of moneys. Section 3 says this:

Moneys borrowed under this Act shall be used for any of the following purposes: for the public service, for works carried on by commissioners on behalf of Ontario, for the covering of any debt of Ontario on open account, for paying any floated indebtedness of Ontario, and the carrying on of the public works authorized by the Legislature.

There is, therefore, Mr. Speaker, a broad use and area to which these moneys can be put. The statute is there which would allow a development within the province of this facility and, of course, the general public would benefit.

What can be done? How, in fact, can the savings offices be used to give us the kind of tool we need to assist in the development of our province? The former Minister of Revenue (Mr. White) told us in his estimates last October 20 that he had commissioned certain internal studies of the savings office. The member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) pointed out in those estimates that the financial report for 1970 of the Province of Ontario showed a net decline in the savings office net receipts, from a 1969 high of \$10,329,000 down to \$1,743,000.

It was pointed out at that time, either that there must be some defects in operation or that there is a failure to make a decision to

compete. The failure to make loans is obviously an important reason for the change in development of the use of the savings office.

We were told by the former minister that there was to be, as he called it, a sophisticated managerial management consultant study of the whole operation. We have not seen it as yet and certainly, as the opposition critic for this department and specifically for this function, I would look forward to seeing this report long before the estimates for this year come before us again. But the Minister of Revenue, as he then was, in his estimates last year, did refer to the proportionate differences and problems that the savings offices had with respect to the banks and trust companies.

He said this at page 5263 of Hansard for October 20, 1970:

We have increased our deposits absolutely; we have not kept up with the increased deposits in the chartered banks in this country, nor have we kept up with the deposits in trust and loan companies and such like.

So there, Mr. Speaker, is the problem. This whole function has been allowed to lurch along from day to day without any real direction from this government. It has not kept up. The Minister admits that; he admitted it at the time, and I believe that the situation is still the same today.

I should make it personally very clear that I do not favour any expanded function of the savings offices to be a means by which active tools of competing monetary policies are developed to offset the federal requirement of primacy in this field. The idea that different monetary policies could exist could be as disastrous as this government's recent agricultural policy which challenges some of the more interesting tenets of confederation.

The acceptance of positive changes could see the savings office grow into an urban development bank. While this resolution before us might go much further, I would like to give my views on this one important area. It is in this area that we could develop a useful financial tool for the encouragement of growth within the province.

Mr. Speaker, a provincial urban development bank could help meet the need for lower cost housing in the province. In 1969, Addison Planning and Research Limited produced a report for the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board on housing needs in the Metro Toronto planning area. It showed that in the 10-year period between now and 1980, about 400,000 new dwelling units would be required to adequately house the population of this area.

However, just one-third of those dwelling units would be within the income range of the people in the area. A further third would have to be provided in the form of public housing and a final third would require some sort of government action to reduce costs, if they were to be purchased or rented by the people in the area paying a normal percentage of their income for shelter.

The fact I want to underline is that only one-third of the required new dwelling units would, under present policies, become available at prices which people could afford to acquire unassisted.

The government of Nova Scotia has recently announced that it could get a home built for just over \$10,000, exclusive of land costs, if many of the normal luxuries and finishings were not incorporated. An urban development bank might finance this kind of lower-cost development.

One asks if the need still exists in Ontario for this kind of housing. This government's own housing programme, which was announced in the Throne Speech has been revealed as a fiasco. The double talk and the patched-up policies were quickly seen through, not only by the press, but by most other citizens within the province. It is clear that the needs still do exist.

One of the problems with financing under the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation rulings in the past has been the federal government's use of housing funds as a regulator for the economy. The supply of funds, therefore, tend to dry up in a period when the government has decided on a more restrictive economic policy.

The federal task force on housing has called for a new form of financial institution which makes available mortgages to people in smaller centres across Canada.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Province of Ontario Savings Office, as it might be developed, could perform this role. In a revitalized Savings Office we could develop in Ontario a pacemaker in the public sector which might bring down the costs of financial services in certain areas.

The urge for competition might become all the more important for all concerned. In this way we could further complement the activity of the Ontario Development Corporation by having a readily available source of long-term investment capital within the structure of this revitalized Savings Office.

The need exists and certainly a framework for action exists. This government should

use the framework to fill the need. Co-operation, of course, with the federal government would be needed. In the last few weeks we have seen the path of co-operation strewn with challenges and manifestos. The government is always happy to receive money in contributions to programmes from the federal government but the gratitude seems to be rather short-lived.

In a real spirit of development and co-operation, some of the changes in the financial and banking structure in Canada, which this resolution calls for, could be usefully implemented to benefit all of the citizens of Ontario.

I think the resolution has merit and I think that it should, in general, be supported by the members of this House.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ontario South.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this resolution I would like to comment upon a number of points which the member for Brantford appears to have either ignored or completely misunderstood.

I do not want to quibble over semantics, but the resolution refers incorrectly to the Ontario Savings Office as the "Ontario Savings Bank." This is perhaps a minor error but it is important to make it clear that this agency was established to serve primarily as a borrowing facility for the provincial government. The term "bank" implies extensive public services and operation which were really never intended.

The Ontario Savings Office operates under the authority of The Agriculture Development Finance Act. It was established in 1921. Deposits received from the public are carried in individual accounts on which interest is paid and cheques can be issued. All moneys received on deposit and not required for current operations by the savings office, are transferred to the credit of the consolidated revenue fund and are used to finance the general operation of government programmes.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): That is taken straight from the estimates book.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the resolution either failed to recognize the lines of legislative responsibilities for banks and trust companies or else is just unrealistic.

The provincial banks would require a petition to the federal government for incorporation, but trust company operations are already regulated under an Ontario statute, The Loans and Trusts Corporation Act. All nine banks in Canada are chartered, or in other words, licensed by Parliament under the terms of the federal Bank Act.

In addition to regulating the auditing of accounts, the issuing of stocks, the setting aside of reserves, The Bank Act regulates the banks' relationships with the public, the Canadian government and the Bank of Canada. It is highly improbable that the federal government will allow the provincial government to operate clearly in an area of finance which is, and should be, nationally regulated.

It is also highly improbable that the federal government would make an exemption in the present provision in The Bank Act which stipulates that no individual or associated shareholders may vote more than 10 per cent of a bank's closed shares outstanding. This would mean that the provincial government would have to relinquish 90 per cent of the shares in such a bank. For the sake of argument, if this limitation was waived so the provincial government could be the only shareholder, such a monopoly would impair the meaningful competition this resolution seeks to establish.

Notwithstanding the above technical and philosophical hurdles to the possibility of establishing a provincial bank, there remains the most important question of success. Canadians are known as savers, and generally seem to prefer depositing their money as opposed to investing it. But the establishment of a 10th bank would simply create a diversion of saving funds from existing corporations rather than creating a new supply of capital.

It may be argued that even if the pool of mortgage money available remains the same, at least some of it would then be at the disposal of the provincial government, and hopefully lower interest rates could be offered. This possibility, however, is very dubious, due to the competitive market forces. The government can scarcely charge lower rates on mortgages without seriously impairing its ability to earn an adequate return on a capital investment.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution asks for another financial tool for government encouragement of growth in vitally important areas of the provincial economy. Substantial encouragement to growth is already being exercised by this government through existing financial

arrangements. The Ontario Housing programme has a budget this year of over \$158 million, adding to OHC's total housing investment of \$545 million since 1966.

The industrial incentives and development programme has been allocated over \$40 million to provide technical and financial services and loans to encourage and assist in the development and diversification of industry in this province, and to provide equalization of industrial opportunity. In addition, this government announced in the Throne Speech for this fourth session that preference will be given to Canadian-owned businesses seeking grants and loans under our incentive programmes.

A venture capital fund will also be established to assist in the financing of small Canadian businesses which have exceptional potential but which involve greater risks than are acceptable to conventional lending institutions. A new five per cent tax credit to corporations announced in the budget last week will encourage job-creating investment in machinery and equipment and will serve as a direct stimulus to our growth.

Government debts and spending, coupled with severe controls on government costs, will put more money in the hands of consumers, and within this field the emphasis on giving the private sector more spending power reflects this government's basic view that perhaps for too long we have accepted the need for new and expanded government programmes to move into new areas of social and economic concern.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): One of the most negative statements ever made in this Legislature.

Mr. W. Newman: We will continue—I could say something but I will not—we could continue to move into an area where problems of priorities demand our government goes.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Say it. Go ahead, say it.

Mr. Lawlor: As a right winger, a progressive of the party, I am surprised at the member.

Mr. W. Newman: Well, as long as the member for Lakeshore belongs to the waffle group he can stay there.

But at the same time we must move out of the areas where our money, administration and control are not so necessary. Banking does not need our participation. By 1984 governments will control more than half the

gross national product. The idea that governments must do even more should not be entertained. It comes as no surprise that the hon. member opposite should sponsor a resolution calling upon the government to invade yet another area of the private sector.

Mr. Lawlor: It comes as no surprise that the hon. member can think of all the reasons against it and none for it. Not a single reason pro. What negative thinking. He can do better than that.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): He is supposed to be progressive.

Mr. W. Newman: I am trying to control myself. If members are not careful I will not. We are all too familiar with—

Mr. Martel: Who wrote that?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, the hon. member for Ontario South has the floor.

Mr. Stokes: Tell him not to be so provocative.

Mr. W. Newman: If you fellows would stop being so left we could get on with the right business of the House. We are all too familiar with his party's views that the social good will only be advanced by more and more government intrusion and control. I do not subscribe to that premise at all, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lawlor: Do not let the opposition get under your skin. Fight back.

Mr. W. Newman: —and therefore I cannot support this resolution.

Mr. Martel: What else is new?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cochrane South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this resolution by my colleague, the hon. member for Brantford, although there is one thing that I would like to see in this resolution and under this plan, and that would be for these savings offices to be extended to northern Ontario, especially if this resolution is carried out and a bank is formed.

I am informed that my hon. friend from the Conservative Party is misinformed, because I gather that the OHC now lends money below the NHA lending rate to developers and private builders.

Mr. Martel: Oh the hon. member for Ontario South forgot to tell us that.

Mr. Ferrier: Now I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is important to create a bank that is not just another conventional bank without any exceptional interest in or empathy for the Province of Ontario, particularly northern Ontario; one with no particular desire to deviate from the banking cartel.

What we are advocating here is a bank that will be more responsive to local conditions and needs, particularly in the north, and one that will encourage the development of indigenous financial resources and thereby foster additional economic development particularly in the north.

At present, the banking industry is concentrated in nine chartered banks, five of which own 86 per cent of all Canadian branches. Rather than genuine competition existing among the banks, we have co-operation as is illustrated by uniform increase in interest rates or increases in certain service charges. They all go along with it. The consumer is always the loser. When the prime interest rate from the Bank of Canada to the chartered banks goes up, all borrowers are informed that the interest rate on their loans will automatically go up. When the interest rate to the banks goes down, the interest rate to the borrower does not drop accordingly, but stays the same. The consumer is always the loser with the present bank setup.

The provincial savings bank is limited in that it cannot borrow money from the foreign exchange markets or the lenders' last resort, that is, the Bank of Canada. Also it cannot make loans to borrowers whether individuals, small businessmen or corporate bodies. This is needed.

Northern Ontario is remote from the southern financial centre and we suffer from a shortage of capital and credit facilities. The foremost advantage of a provincial bank, if it were designed to serve the needs of the north and other slow-growth areas of the province, is that it would be more sympathetic to the needs of these areas of the province and thereby stimulate the economic development of these areas.

According to the Financial Post, the regional bank's familiarity with local needs and the resultant willingness to put up capital for local ventures is one explanation for the diversification and dispersion of industrial development in the United States. Presumably, a bank more in tune with local needs would be more willing to grant credit to enterprises that might not receive funds from the established lender. My information is that

in many, many areas loans of probably over \$10,000 have to be okayed from the central head offices of the banks. Sometimes they are not as sympathetic to the outlying areas of the north as one would hope.

In short, capital and credit availability will be expanded to serve local needs and conditions should the bank be set up. I attended a development conference in Cochrane about two or three years ago and one of the things brought up was the great difficulty that a woods industry in Hearst had in getting capital to expand and grow. In fact, this industry could not get any money from the Canadian banks. It had to go outside Canada—had to go to Belgium to get the money it required.

I think it is a crime that Canadian banks, or rather lending institutions, would not help this company and numerous others like it in the north, but this is so often the case.

At that same conference, the Canada Permanent Trust Company said that it does not make loans in northern Ontario because they are too costly to service. It is not that it is discriminating against the north, the company says, but there is not enough business there to make it viable for it to set up offices there.

Mr. Stokes: Whose fault is that?

Mr. Ferrier: We did have a truly northern company, the Northland Trust Company. This was making some impact in the north in terms of mortgages that it was giving out but one of the larger shareholders had to get out of the company. No other northerners would buy his shares so they were sold to a southern company which is not as sympathetic to northern interests as the original company was. I think that this loss of control of this company in the north is very regrettable. I think that it says something rather adverse about some of the northern business people and people with wealth.

Now the provincial bank, should one be set up, as is suggested in this resolution, with northern branches, could take up the slack in making loans to northern businesses and to provide mortgage money for housing. Northern housing seems to be at a standstill these days. We need a lot more housing; low rental housing and so on. While OHC is doing its bit, there is a lot more needed.

Moreover, the uses to which northern Ontario savings are put are largely dictated by southern interests. A provincial bank with northern branches could reduce the outflow

of northern Ontario savings and make more northern Ontario money available in the north. There are vast amounts of money in insurance and pension funds coming out of the north that are not being used for our benefit and there should be some way of keeping that money in the north and having development of our enterprises and I suggest that a provincial bank could do considerable about that.

It is important that we get capital in the north in terms of development of our natural resources, movement into secondary industries and expansion of the service industry, plus additional money for business and housing, all of which is in short supply as far as capital is concerned.

D. W. Bishop has appeared on CBC television on more than one occasion. He has charged that stockbrokers of this country are shipping out Canadian money, through Wall Street and other American financial areas, that could very well be used to develop our own resources. He sees this as an important way of eroding our own autonomy and restricting the development of our resource base in the north of Ontario and in other northern parts of the country.

I think that a provincial bank might be able to provide some of the developmental capital that is so badly needed. By being able to borrow from the foreign market or from the Bank of Canada these capital resources could be found.

We need secondary industry and if money was more readily available, it could help with the diversification of the northern economy. I do not think that there would be any lack of people coming to borrow this money.

There is the experience of a province which did move into banking—the Province of British Columbia. The terms of incorporation of this bank were that the province per se could not own any of it, a restriction which some of us are not altogether happy with. Let me just review some of the positive aspects of the operation of this bank.

One thing is that a local money market has developed in Vancouver and is partially responsible for the growth of economic activity in Vancouver. Perhaps this could very well take place in northern Ontario.

The Bank of British Columbia operates with a lower prime interest rate than its large eastern competitors—that is, 7.25 per cent as opposed to 7.5 per cent. It has forced a reaction from the other banks that

had made them more service-conscious in the west. Eastern banks have allowed their local staff more autonomy in credit decisions. Its convenient banking hours have been adopted by competitors. The Bank of British Columbia offers slightly higher interest rates to depositors.

Currently, the bank has 10 branches. This figure will nearly double by the end of next year. Branching into Alberta is planned, but only after British Columbia is saturated with 50 to 60 branches. A profit was obtained in the first year of each branch operation, compared to three to five years required by other chartered bank branches. The bank has been very successful in attracting institutional and corporate moneys and has more cash available for loans than it has borrowers. From available material, it is difficult to assess the success of its lending operations.

Alberta has operated treasury branches over the years whereby they solicit savings, make loans, sell drivers' licences, fish and game permits, collect utility bills and so forth. They have provided a very worthwhile service to the people of Alberta.

I think, in terms of the benefits that will accrue from a provincial bank and the very few costs involved, that the establishment of such would be a great benefit to our economy, especially the economy of northern Ontario and the slow-growth areas of this province. I wholeheartedly support this resolution that my colleague, the member for Brantford, has introduced today.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

Hon. E. Dunlop (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, it had not been originally my intention to join the debate on this resolution. But the interest which it has sparked in the House, combined with the time left on the clock for five members and no other private members being on the list—

Mr. Stokes: The minister is going to support it.

Hon. Mr. Dunlop: —I feel that I should be able to enter this discussion briefly.

We have listened to some quite extraordinary statements from the members for Brantford, Kitchener and Cochrane South.

Mr. Stokes: And Ontario South. Those were most unusual.

Hon. Mr. Dunlop: Let me say, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be, on the part of members opposite, some extraordinary misconceptions as to the function of the Ontario Savings Office. The term "bank" has been used erroneously in describing it because perhaps to those who use it, it appears to be a bank in the sense in which most people use a bank. They deposit money and have chequing privileges. Indeed, the royal commission on banking—under Chief Justice Porter I think it was—really defined a bank as being a deposit-taking institution.

Only to that extent can the Ontario Savings Office be regarded as a bank. They take deposits and they lend the money, but they lend the money to the Province of Ontario for the purposes, primarily agricultural, prescribed in the governing legislation, the statute which was enacted in 1921, by the government of Ontario.

This is a very valuable and useful undertaking to the development of the economy of the province. My hon. friend—

Mr. Stokes: It does not help the north very much.

Hon. Mr. Dunlop:—from Kitchener pointed out that there were very few offices and he listed the number of towns in which these offices exist. These tend to be small towns in rural Ontario, or in Toronto, places where there are substantial numbers of civil servants who wish to take advantage of facilities furnished by a bank.

Originally it was a combined rural-service operation—both service to the rural economy and service to the rural residents, plus service to the provincial civil servants and, indeed, to anyone else who wished to make use of this service.

I can see some points in the observations of my friend from Cochrane South that perhaps more of these offices should be established in northern Ontario. I would rather agree with him, as do all members of this side of the House, that more of everything should be established in northern Ontario. I believe, however, that this matter is now being very carefully considered by my colleague.

Mr. Stokes: For 28 years.

Hon. Mr. Dunlop: Careful consideration sometimes takes a goodly length of time. However, the careful consideration that he is giving to it commenced when he assumed this portfolio on March 1. He may well have some very substantial views to advance on

the reorganization of the Ontario Savings Office, not in the ridiculous manner suggested—that the government of Ontario should enter the field of bills and banking, which under section 93 of The British North America Act is clearly assigned to the government of Canada—but in other ways by making use of the services of the Ontario Savings Office more attractive to the people that it is primarily to serve.

As had been pointed out by my friend from Ontario South, however, another deposit-taking institution is not going to increase the supply of capital. Those people who wish to deposit do so in the institution which is most convenient to them and which from time to time gives them the most attractive rate. Sometimes it is a trust company, sometimes it is a bank. It might even sometimes be the Ontario Savings Office. It is that kind of switching of existing capital, rather than increasing savings, which would happen with any changes made in the Ontario Savings Office. It seems, therefore, that the whole basis of this resolution, which surprises me not that it came from a member supporting the socialist party, but it surprises me that it apparently receives even qualified—and you notice how careful they are to see it qualify—support from the Liberal Party, or at least one member of that party, which is not always noted for its solidarity—

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): I agree with that.

Hon. Mr. Dunlop: I am not surprised that the socialists wish to twist an understanding of our banking system in the resolution.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): You do not have to twist the understanding. The hon. minister just does not understand.

Hon. Mr. Dunlop: Oh my friend, I should ask the member to withdraw that, but my surprise is at the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, I am about to consult my watch. I observe the time which the private members of the Liberal Party have not wished to use in this debate to express their qualified approval—

Mr. Peacock: Do not anticipate.

Hon. Mr. Dunlop:—and what their qualifications are. If they wished to speak, they have had every opportunity through the whips.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, I take it you have not accepted the motion of the hon. minister—

Mr. Speaker: No, the motion is not required.

Mr. Peacock: —for the adjournment of the debate.

I listened attentively to his intervention, which I know that hon. members always do in this House, and I wanted to speak to one or two of the points which he raised: the first being that the Province of Ontario Savings Office, through deposits placed with it, contributes, I believe he intimated, substantially to the capacity of the Province of Ontario to invest in capital works of the province, and thereby relieves the province of the necessity, to some extent, of raising moneys elsewhere.

And as I listened to the minister, Mr. Speaker, I turned to the details of the non-budgetary transaction tabled by the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) in his 1971 budget speech this time last week, and refreshed my memory about the flow of non-budgetary revenues to this government, which I have discussed a number of times in the past as being completely arrogated to the Province of Ontario, which represents substantial amounts of savings in the hands of employees of the Province of Ontario largely, and in the hands of a number of other persons who are clients of the government.

These savings relieve the government of Ontario much more, many times over. The extent to which the government of Ontario is relieved from borrowing by virtue of the transfer of net deposits from the Province of Ontario Savings Office to the consolidated revenue fund.

In that table of non-budgetary receipts and credits, there is the sum of \$500 million provided by the Ontario government's share of contributions to the Canada Pension Plan. There is some \$90 million in contributions received from the teachers' superannuation fund and I recognize—and I am sure the minister would be prompt to correct me—that not all of that or any of the subsequent items I wish to list would be net proceeds to the government of Ontario.

There would be some reduction of that \$90 million amount of contributions by virtue of cost of administration of the

teachers' superannuation fund and of course, the pay-out of benefits to persons eligible for retirement.

Another very large flow of savings from persons in an employment relationship with the province or one of its subsidiary bodies, is the Municipal Employees' Retirement Fund, which is estimated to provide \$77.4 million in the current budgetary year, over and above the net general revenues flowing to the province.

Then we have the contributions of the civil servants of the Province of Ontario itself, through the Public Service Superannuation Fund, of \$99 million. All of these, I think, compare with the amount received in net transfer from the Province of Ontario savings deposit of only \$10.6 million.

I depreciate the value of that somewhat in regard to the flow of savings from all these various sources in the province to the Treasury because they are obviously many times the weight of what is obtained from the Province of Ontario savings deposits. They have made it unnecessary for the province of Ontario to borrow in the money markets of the world in the last several years. Yet I do not wish to depreciate the value of transfers too much in light of what has been put before the House by way of resolution today, Mr. Speaker.

Obviously the amount of \$10.6 million is a rather substantial one in the hands of an operation such as the Province of Ontario Savings Bank, or office. When it comes to availability of credit to small businessmen, particularly in northern Ontario, those who cannot obtain from any other source—the chartered banks, the Ontario Development Corporation, or the other institutions listed by the member for Ontario South—the \$10.6 million estimated to be transferred to the Consolidated Revenue Fund is not a large addition to the non-budgetary transactions of the province, but in the hands of a genuine depository and lending institution which the Province of Ontario Savings Bank could be, it is a very nice sum with which to start, and to be used in all of the ways referred to by the member for Brantford and the member for Cochrane South in their addresses.

So on that score, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer the remarks of the Minister without Portfolio and suggest that the—

Hon. Mr. Dunlop: I thought the member was echoing them.

Mr. Peacock: Sorry.

Hon. Mr. Dunlop: I thought largely he was echoing them.

Mr. Peacock: I would like to suggest that in terms of what is being proposed today, that is a very adequate amount, but in terms of comparison with what is already available to the province in the way of savings received by it from very large numbers of people in its employ, it is a rather negligible sum.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other hon. members wishing to enter this particular

debate? If not, perhaps the hon. House leader would call the next order of business.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the clock is approaching very closely to the hour of 6 o'clock. Perhaps if you would care to glance at it, you might consider it close enough to adjourn.

Clerk of the House: House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 3, 1971

Checking on expanding off-track betting industry, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Singer	1103
Death of patient at Rideau hospital school while working on farm, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon	1104
Continuing bilingualism programme of former government, statement by Mr. Davis	1104
Additional deputy minister in Department of Education dealing with French education, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	1109
Grants for special French education reduced in 1972-1973, questions to Mr. Davis and Mr. White, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Pitman, Mr. MacKenzie, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Peacock	1109
Government assistance in translating and answering letters to members in French, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Stokes	1111
OSSTF offer of \$25,000 to fund research into education costs, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	1111
Extra places in universities for incoming class next fall, questions to Mr. White, Mr. Pitman	1112
Reducing Department of University Affairs by 10 per cent, question to Mr. White, Mr. Pitman	1112
Rent review boards, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Pitman	1112
Student services building at Waterloo University, question to Mr. White, Mr. Pitman	1113
Ice jam at eastern end of Lake Erie, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Haggerty	1113
Enabling legislation over waterfront lots on Lake Ontario, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Lawlor	1113
Number employed by Workmen's Compensation Board in 1965 and 1971, question to Mr. Carton, Mr. De Monte	1113
Securing relief from Canadian Gypsum pollution, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. MacDonald	1114
Hydro discount prices in export of hydro to the United States, question to Mr. Kerr, Mr. T. P. Reid	1114

Cutback in Department of Lands and Forests staff through elimination of fishing licences, question to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Makarchuk	1115
Crippled children in Ottawa area not receiving treatment, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. MacKenzie	1115
Areas where mines have finished operating left in safe condition, questions to Mr. Bernier, Mr. Ferrier	1115
Fishermen prosecuted for fishing without licence before April 26, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Gaunt	1115
Establishing council of arbitrators under Police Act, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Peacock	1115
Stopping use of ONR Employees Medical Association as administrator of benefits, questions to Mr. Bernier and Mr. A. Johnston, Mr. R. S. Smith, Mr. Ferrier	1116
Plans for dredging St. Clair River, question to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Burr	1116
Attorney General's statement re Dow Chemical lawsuit, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence and Mr. Kerr, Mr. Bullbrook	1116
Protecting tenants so utilities like hydro cannot be cut off by landlord, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Trotter	1117
Fleet discount policy of car manufacturers, question to Mr. Auld, Mr. Deacon	1118
Report, standing committee on procedural affairs, Mr. Villeneuve	1118
Report, standing committee on human resources, Mr. Villeneuve	1118
Motion to refer Energy and Resources Management and Public Works estimates to estimates committee, Mr. Wishart, agreed to	1119
Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading	1121
Expropriation Act, 1968-1970, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, first reading	1121
Wages Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, first reading	1122
Town of Burlington, bill respecting, Mr. Kennedy, first reading	1122
County of Halton, bill respecting, Mr. Kennedy, first reading	1122
City of Peterborough, bill respecting, Mr. Pitman, first reading	1122
Village of Wasaga Beach, bill respecting, Mr. A. Johnston, first reading	1122
Guelph General Hospital, bill respecting, Mr. Worton, first reading	1122
Morton Terminal Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Spence, first reading	1122
Use of non-returnable bottles, bill to prohibit, Mr. Gaunt, first reading	1122
Township of Pelee, bill respecting, Mr. Paterson, first reading	1122
City of North Bay, bill respecting, Mr. R. S. Smith, first reading	1122
Cadmus Associates Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Haskett, first reading	1122
Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Breithaupt, first reading	1122
Private Investigators and Security Guards Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Breithaupt, first reading	1122
Wills Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, second reading	1123
Administration of Justice Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, second reading	1123
County Judges Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, second reading	1124
Crown Witnesses Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, second reading	1127
Jurors Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, second reading	1129
Justices of the Peace Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, second reading	1132
Summary Convictions Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, second reading	1134
Third readings	1137
On notice of motion No. 8, Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. W. Newman, Mr. Ferrier, Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Peacock	1137
Recess, 6 o'clock	1147



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, May 3, 1971
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 3, 1971

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Chairman: The Department of Lands and Forests. The hon. minister.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Never mind counting.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Point of order—no quorum.

An hon. member: Here we go again.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! We shall check and see if we have a quorum.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Two shy; we need two.

Mr. Chairman: Call in the members. The bells have rung for four minutes, there should be a quorum.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Once the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Snow) is here there will be a quorum.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to once again present The Department of Lands and Forests' estimates.

These remarks this evening are intended to emphasize my department's increasing awareness and concern about the social and economic needs of the citizens of this province and the benefits which can be obtained through the wise management of our renewable natural resources. To meet the challenges of the Seventies, we clearly recognize the need to become even more responsible to the changing requirements of our population.

As a first step in the development of a new management philosophy, my department carried out a thorough review of its goals and objectives. After considerable study during the past two years, these have been redefined in terms of the social and economic benefits which The Department of Lands and Forests can provide from the publicly-owned lands,

waters and forests and can encourage from the private lands of the province.

A major internal reorganization has recently been initiated to achieve an even greater decentralization to the regional and district offices and to establish an administrative structure at head office which will focus attention on the newly-defined objectives. The new organization will provide more effective and efficient service to the public within the present complement of staff.

Our department has long recognized the need for the public to be involved in the planning which affects them. In 1950 the minister's advisory committee was established and has continued to represent public points of view. For a number of years we have had district recreational advisory committees. Their role will be broadened to consider wider implications of land use.

More recently, other advisory committees have been established. The Algonquin Park advisory committee has submitted a fairly comprehensive set of recommendations concerning Algonquin Park policies. These include a suggested updating of the purposes of management of the park, as well as their latest thinking about road systems, canoe routes, hiking trails, youth camps and a general forest policy. We are now studying these suggestions and working out their implications in managing the park.

You are also aware of the work of the Quetico Park advisory committee which recently completed its hearings at Fort Frances, Atikokan, Thunder Bay and Toronto and is now studying the information gathered.

As evidence of our increasing concern with the outdoor recreation requirements of the residents of Ontario, I would like to mention a few of the user surveys and studies which are being carried out to obtain the information required for more rational and effective planning.

Hunter interviews and fishermen creel census programmes are being expanded and more use is being made of questionnaire surveys. Fifty thousand hunters are being contacted annually by mail. Last year a similar survey

of 35,000 fishermen was also introduced. We are now obtaining additional information about the utilization of the fish and game resources and more importantly about the users and their preferences.

The department is also expanding its work in park visitor studies and household surveys. We are co-operating with the federal government in the Canada outdoor recreation demand survey and with The Ontario Department of Tourism and Information in the tourism and outdoor recreational planning study.

We have now completed the plan for the north Georgian Bay recreation reserve and will soon have in print a report and set of maps outlining the imaginative land-use zoning system which was developed for this area. You will recall that this attractive part of Ontario was set aside by legislation some years ago because of its outstanding recreational potential and relative proximity to Toronto.

This report is the culmination of extensive studies by outside consultants and experts within my department, coupled with extensive public participation in its formulation. The planning concept which has been developed for this area will be extended to other parts of the province. My department is also involved in the interdepartmental planning activities concerned with regional development and regional government.

A record number of people enjoyed our 108 provincial parks last year. Day use increased 16 per cent over 1969, reaching 12 million visitations. An even greater increase in overnight camping was recorded in 1970. While the fine weather experienced last summer was undoubtedly a factor in this tremendous increase in use, there can be no doubt that we must be prepared to accommodate a steadily increasing number of people in our provincial park system.

Two new parks, Carillon and Sandbar Lake were opened last year to serve the growing public demand, and many new facilities were added to existing parks. This year, two more parks will be opened to the public—McCrae Point on Lake Simcoe just east of Orillia, and Shoals Provincial Park on Highway 101 between Wawa and Chapleau.

A number of other sites throughout the province will be available for limited use while they are under development this year. These include Tremblay Beach on Lake St. Clair, Frontenac north of Kingston, the Kendall winter recreation area near Orono,

Fushimi Lake near Hearst, and Iroquois Beach near Port Burwell. In addition, development will be started on Charleston Lake in Leeds county, and Methodist Point in Simcoe county.

It is our policy to provide a wide variety of recreational opportunities both in the provincial parks system and on other public lands. For example, plans for 1971 include the development of new public skiing areas, an expansion of canoe routes and wild river parks, more cross-country snowmobile trails and the preservation of additional historic sites.

In keeping with this policy of diversity, I am pleased to report on our plans to establish the first underwater park in Canada. Fathom Five Provincial Park, to be located off the Bruce Peninsula, will protect nearly a score of shipwrecks ranging from old sailing vessels to early steam tugs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: An exciting interpretive programme will provide both diving and non-diving visitors with an explanation of the fascinating history and unique ecology of the Bruce Peninsula.

As a result of the planning work carried out on the north Georgian Bay recreational reserve and in response to the growing public desire for wilderness experiences, it is our intention to convert Killarney Provincial Park to a primitive park. All existing logging licences have now been relocated outside the park boundaries, making way for the establishment of wilderness zones in major sections of the park including the Killarney-Ontario Society of Artists Muriel Lake area. A programme will be initiated this year to remove the remaining nonconforming uses in other parts of the park in order to achieve a primitive setting throughout the park.

Also in this same vein, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be able to say that we are near agreement with the federal government in our negotiations to establish a national park of over 400 square miles in the Pukaskwa area on the northeast shore of Lake Superior. I might add that we are also studying areas for another national park in southern Ontario.

Many of our urban residents are ardent hunters. To alleviate the growing shortage of hunting areas in southern Ontario, long-range land acquisition and landowner agreement programmes have been established. The former will provide multi-purpose public recreation areas for year round use, while the

latter will permit hunting on properties owned by private citizens, municipalities and conservation authorities. Fifty agreements have already been signed.

Wildlife populations, particularly deer, have experienced the most difficult winter in the 18 years for which snow depth records have been kept. In the southern deer range, snow accumulated continuously from the first week of December until the second week of March. While the cold was not extreme in comparison with other winters, the chill factor attributable to wind was greater than usual.

In the most extreme areas, four-foot snow depths were reported. Fortunately in some areas one or two short thaws followed by cold weather created a crust on which deer could walk, but this condition was not general. The cutting of trails and browse helped deer to reach food supplies in many of the yards. Experience has demonstrated that similar severe conditions in 1958-1959 and 1959-1960 winters caused serious mortality. Surveys are being conducted to determine the extent of winter deer mortality.

My department's land acquisition programme has also been directed to meet the diverse needs of our citizens.

The Niagara Escarpment, stretching from Niagara to Tobermory, is one of the great natural features of Ontario's landscape. The government's recognition of the escarpment's value to the people of Ontario led to the implementation of a number of Niagara Escarpment study recommendations, including a large-scale programme to acquire areas of outstanding natural beauty which could be developed for park and recreational use. As our contribution to this programme we have acquired over the past year 3,030 acres of prime recreational land at a cost of just over \$1.71 million.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): They could have bought it for half too.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Elsewhere, significant purchases included 70 acres containing the Indian burial mounds on the Long Sault Rapids near Rainy River. These are the largest native monuments in Canada constructed by prehistoric Indians about 2,000 years ago. Another 300 acres in Burleigh township northeast of Peterborough were acquired to preserve the Peterborough petroglyphs. These mysterious rock writings are the most extensive of their kind in eastern North America. Archaeological studies indicate that they are

linked to prehistoric people, evidence of whom is found around the globe south of the Arctic circle. Casual visitation of this undeveloped site is already 2,000 people per year.

Our purchases are not limited to park lands. For example, last year we acquired 4,620 acres for fish and wildlife management and 4,316 acres for reforestation and forest management.

On March 19 I directed that all sales of Crown land for cottages be stopped. Thereafter, Crown lands for this purpose will be available on a lease basis only. Procedures for leasing are now being developed and will be implemented when adequate land use plans have been prepared.

Our action in instituting leasing of Crown lands for cottages recognizes the sensitivity of shoreline areas where most cottage sales occur. Improper development under private ownership can mar scenic values and impair healthful environment.

Leasing will preserve public title to these important areas and permit conversion to public use in the future, if and when this should become desirable. Also, leasing under the conditions we propose will ensure that residents of this province will be given consideration ahead of non-residents in obtaining sites for cottages on the lakes of the province most suited to cottage development.

Except for two peak periods in June and August, the 1970 fire season was normal and the department was able to hold the burned-over acreage well below the 10-year average. In 1971, we plan to continue developing new technology to increase the effectiveness of our initial fire attack. Land-based fire bomber aircraft will be employed for the first time this year to drop fire-retardant liquids.

Of vital concern to the department is the economic health and vigour of Ontario's forest industry. Softwood lumber and plywood prices have shown some improvement in the last few months and prospects are bright for the remainder of the year.

The pulp and paper industry has not fared nearly so well due mainly, but not entirely, to the disastrous effect on earnings of the revaluation of the Canadian dollar. Every possible means of improving the economic viability of this segment of our industry is being explored. Reducing the cost of transporting wood through the rationalization of timber licences is one possibility. Lowering stumpage charges in remote areas is another.

The production of pulp chips from saw-mill and veneer mill residues has continued to grow and has now reached the point where three-quarters of a million tons are being produced annually. This amount represents a more efficient utilization of Ontario's current timber harvests.

Mr. Sargent: And who is getting the money out of it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The prospects for still further increases are encouraging, particularly with the recent development of independently-owned roundwood chip mills.

A substantial expansion of the forest regeneration programme is planned in 1971, including the planting of approximately 20 million more nursery stock seedlings. The total regeneration effort this year is expected to reach a record level of 155,000 acres treated and 70 million seedlings planted on Crown lands and agreement forests.

Steps are also being taken to upgrade the quality of the nursery stock to improve survival; to develop and test new silvicultural equipment; to increase the efficiency of regeneration techniques; and to modify harvest cutting to ensure maximum environmental protection and a continuing supply of industrial wood.

The department's contribution to the Ontario seasonal employment programme has provided work for approximately 1,600 men during the last four months. Several hundred separate projects were undertaken across the province, including dead tree removal in the provincial parks, improvement of sanitation facilities, fish and wildlife habitat improvement, trail construction, campground development, road right-of-way clearing and timber improvement projects.

I am pleased to announce a substantial expansion in our summer student employment programme in 1971-1972, which will make it possible for my department to provide summer jobs for nearly 5,000 students. The increase in regular summer employment includes 150 additional junior rangers and 250 students working in the provincial parks, as well as approximately 1,000 secondary and post-secondary school students working in the new provincial students' programme called SWEEP.

In concluding my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would like to re-emphasize the goal of The Department of Lands and Forests. It is our goal to provide a continuing combination of resource development, outdoor recreation

and quality environment which is most consistent with the social and economic well-being of the citizens of this province. All of our plans and activities are—and will continue to be—dedicated to the achievement of that goal.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the minister for providing me, earlier today, with a copy of the remarks he was going to make this evening. I am sorry that I was unable to do the same for him, because I did not have them completed. Nor do I have them now, but I will go ahead and cover some of the areas that are of concern to the people of this province in regard to The Department of Lands and Forests and its operations, and the other areas of government that perhaps could be supplying more support to this department and to the minister.

I would like to make a few remarks concerning the budget last week of the Treasurer, as it concerns this department. The Treasurer in his budget indicated the preference of this government, this Tory government, for placing funds in the hands of the private corporate sector, to create employment. The alternative of direct government expenditure to create employment was turned down and nowhere else in the estimates is it more noticeable than in this department.

This department is more closely associated with those areas of the province where the highest rate of unemployment exists than any other department. The minister and I, and the critic of the New Democratic Party as well, represent areas of the province where unemployment is double the provincial average rate.

Outside of the SWEEP programme and the other programme that the minister indicated tonight—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): SEED and SOLE!

Mr. R. S. Smith: Seed and soul?

Mr. Stokes: SEED and SOLE!

Mr. R. S. Smith: Well it is a government without a heart; I do not know about its soul. I will not comment on that.

But the department's other programme, the Ontario seasonal employment programme, has done very little in our specific area. I think the total amount for the Nipissing district was \$9,000, and it created somewhere

in the area of five or six part-time jobs for two or three months.

Mr. Sargent: Only \$9,000? They spent that on booze in one night.

Mr. R. S. Smith: This is hardly a very great amount when you consider that more than 800 people were on the unemployment insurance rolls in my area. And I am sure that the same problems exist in the areas of the minister and in most of the areas of the northern part of the province, where this department is perhaps the area of government closest to the people.

Direct capital expenditures would and could create immediate employment in areas where the need for the jobs is most acute. Again I would point out that in the northern part of the province, the percentage of people unemployed over the past few months has been between eight per cent and nine per cent. Most of those people who were unemployed—or a good number of those people—were the unskilled tradesmen and the semi-skilled tradesmen who could have been, and could be in the very near future, employed in capital works projects in the parks of this province if the government had chosen to follow a different line than that pronounced by the Treasurer in his budget of last week.

I do not believe that government must do everything for people, but certainly when moneys are being expended by a government to create employment, there are other ways of doing it than by providing it for the corporate structures of our province to increase their profits. I believe that in the northern part of the province and in the eastern part of this province there will be very little direct result from the programme of tax benefits to large corporations. Most of that money, if it is going to work, will be spent in the secondary manufacturing industries of this province, and, as the minister is well aware, there are very few of those in the districts that he or I represent, or that are represented by the northern or eastern part of the province.

I think then that perhaps the major critique of the budget and the estimates of his department could be directed to the lack of funds set aside for capital expenditures within our parks and in the other areas of the department that would create jobs in the areas of the province where they are most badly needed.

I would like to spend a few minutes on some of the announcements that have been made by the minister and by the other officials

of the government, or members of the cabinet. Three or four weeks ago in the Throne Speech, it was announced that the government had accepted in part the policy of the Liberal Party, and had indicated that it would stop the sale of Crown lands. We accept this as a move forward by the government, and as a submission of the government to the concern of the public, rather than what it would have done if it had been left to its own devices.

However, as soon as the minister made that statement the question arose as to how the leases would be extended to the individuals who applied. I certainly expected that, perhaps in his opening statement tonight, the minister would indicate to us what procedures would be followed in order that people may obtain these lands.

As he is well aware, in different districts of the province there were a number of subdivisions ready to go ahead on the sale basis, and a week and a half before the announcement in the Throne Speech the districts were advised to withhold any properties they had for sale. Over the winter months, however, many people made inquiries, and some people had been told that lots would be available to them this spring. The minister indicated last summer that he was contemplating some change in the policy of the government in regard to this, and I should think that the decision was made a good while ago.

I do not think the decision was based primarily on the report that was tabled here last Thursday. There were many other considerations which had to be taken into account before that report was published. But I do believe that the minister has had plenty of time to devise a system by which these people who have been waiting for some time could be given the opportunity immediately to lease these properties that were available under sale.

I notice in his remarks earlier tonight he said, "Procedures for leasing are now being developed and will be implemented when adequate land use plans have been prepared." I find that a little difficult to understand, but I take it that he means when the subdivision plans have been prepared. The point of fact is that in many areas of the province there are subdivision plans that were ready to go for sale and I cannot understand why the difficulty in establishing a policy to provide a basis of lease in a very short period of time.

Many people are concerned and most people have shown their good faith in that they are prepared to accept the government policy

of leasing and are awaiting the decision of the minister in regard to this matter.

A report that was tabled last week indicated a number of very interesting things, but perhaps the statement that appears on page 15 in regard to summary of evaluation sums up the reason for the decision of the minister to change the policy of the government.

I will read that statement:

It appears that the present method of disposing of Crown land falls short of the new departmental goals and objectives because it does not meet the environmental standards and the social and economic benefits criteria of these objectives. To meet these criteria would require revision in the rate structure and the imposition of more adequate control over land use.

As I understand it then, the government feels that, through leasing, they can control the land to meet the goals of the department in providing the economic and social benefits to the people of the province.

I believe that this has been readily accepted by a good proportion of the people in this province for a good long time. It certainly indicates that the arguments that have been presented by the government opposing the suggestion that Crown lands should not be sold really did not hold water when it came right down to what the goals and the objectives of the department were.

I should think that the goals and the objectives of the department have been a long way from the policy of the executive council for a good number of years. The former Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) indicated last year that we should not implement such a policy because of the fact that many of our people could not go down to Florida and buy property as there was legislation passed there to retaliate against our policy. I guess this might be compared to the "chicken and egg" war.

But on the other hand—and it is pointed out in the minister's own report—no non-residents of the State of Florida are able to buy Crown land in that state. It is also pointed out in here that most of the other jurisdictions close to us, and including other provinces of Canada, have had a policy similar to what we have now taken up.

This however, does not deal with the whole problem. It only deals with a small but significant 15 per cent of the sales of cottage properties that will take place. I believe that the government should move ahead to study methods by which the sale of private lands

in recreational land-use areas could also be controlled—

Mr. Sargent: The government has sold us down the river consistently.

Mr. R. S. Smith: —so that they do not fall into the hands of non-Canadian citizens.

An hon. member: The river has got mercury in it.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I believe that it is important that the government establish some method by which they can obtain private recreational land before they move out of the hands of Canadian citizens.

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. S. Smith: The Land Acquisition Corporation that was announced in the budget will have \$20 million made available to it this year, and perhaps it would be a significant move if this department were provided with authority to step in where private land sales are being made and, with the funds available through the Land Acquisition Corporation, to obtain first option on this type of property.

Along with that I believe that they should move ahead with a bill such as was presented by the Minister of Mines last year, when he was a private member, to control the sale of tax lands from the municipality so that the provincial government has first option on the lease as well. The fact that the minister has brought in legislation—

Mr. Sargent: They are trying to wake themselves up over there.

Mr. R. S. Smith: —to control the sale of 15 per cent of the recreational Crown lands in the area will not really answer the problem as it exists, and as the growth in non-Canadian ownership will increase. The facts are likely that within the private sector there will now be more sales to non-Canadian citizens, which might even offset the policy that has been established by the minister. I think that his first step is a good one, but it certainly will not cure the problem unless he takes the initiative to control private sales as well.

The other point I would like to bring up is in regard to the announcement of the Treasurer of the discontinuance of the residential fishing licence. I will not go back over the history of the introduction of the fishing licence, which I believe was done by the

former Treasurer, perhaps not with the concurrence of the minister and maybe even not in conjunction with him. At that time, the announcement seemed to come from the Treasurer, and the Minister of Lands and Forests was left, should we say, holding the bag—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Holding the rod.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Holding the licence anyway.

Particularly in the northern part of the province I think the minister experienced some difficulty, and even in his own riding there were a number of people who were rather irate about the residential fishing licence. This may be part of the reason why it has been done away with, but I think if we read the statements that the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) made the other day we should ask the minister for a further statement in regard to this. The minister said, and I quote:

This licence fee was introduced in 1968 as part of a general move to bring user fees more in line with the cost of services provided by The Department of Lands and Forests. While this objective remains generally valid—

Now that is the point that bothers me and I think will bother a good number of people. While this point is generally valid—I think the present Treasurer restates the reason that the previous Treasurer brought in the residential fishing licence.

He indicated that the user should pay for the fish and wildlife services that are provided through this department. Again, the present Treasurer, although he removed the fishing licences, indicated a belief in the same principle. I would expect from this that perhaps after the next election, if the Tories happen to be successful again, which is quite unlikely, we would have initiated another fishing licence, based on the same premise. Likely at a much higher cost too, to make sure that it does pay more than \$1.6 million. I would ask that the minister state unequivocally that this is not the case and that the fishing licence, as far as he is concerned and as far as the government is concerned, is a thing of the past and perhaps something that they would not like to remember. I think it is important that the minister allay the fears of the people that have been created by—

Mr. Sargent: That is the only thing that the hon. Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics has to hold his hat on.

Mr. R. S. Smith: —the rather ambiguous statement of the Treasurer.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): That is nonsense!

Mr. R. S. Smith: The minister has read what he said. He said he still accepts the same principle, and the minister obviously does, too.

Mr. Sargent: The \$3 Treasurer! The \$3 fishing licence.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sargent: That is the biggest thing he has got in his budget— \$3.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Three dollars!

Mr. Sargent: And more expensive beer!

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks in regard to the question of mercury pollution as it has affected the lakes and the fish, particularly the fish in the northern part of the province. We have had long discussions in regard to the fishing in Lake Erie and the question of the Dow Chemical suit which the government has brought against that company.

In the area of professional legal expertise, I think that many other members of the Legislature can, perhaps, be more critical of that than I, and I believe they have done that over the past few weeks. It appears that the move to sue Dow was nothing more than a charade of the government to cover up their inefficiencies in the production of an effective control against pollution across the province.

However, I would just like to review generally what has happened in regard to the fisheries within the northern part of the province particularly. I think it was early last spring that there were indications that mercury pollution had crept into the lakes of the northern part of the province as well as those on the boundary of the south. Some limited catches were taken and through the results of the experimentation that was done on those, a statement was made by the minister—I believe it was in late September—in regard to the percentage of mercury contamination in the lakes of northern and northwestern Ontario.

Most of the sampling had been done on a very small scale and the fact that the minister even made the statements that were made and produced the results that had been obtained has done a great amount of damage to the tourist operations in many parts of northern Ontario, particularly in the northwest, where it has been found that a number of operators, as I understand it, are not even going to open this year.

Of particular concern to me, however, was the fact that in the release of the minister in September of last year, there was a list of the concentrations of mercury in fish in the Lake Nipissing area. Through the release of that notification of the minister there appeared a great amount of comment in the Toronto newspapers as well as in a good number of the American publications.

The facts were that a very small number of fish had been tested from Lake Nipissing and I believe that the minister, in conjunction with the Minister of Energy and Resources, did a disservice to that area of the province by publishing these results which did not indicate that a wide enough experimental study had been done to produce a banning, in effect, of the eating of the fish from that lake.

During the following three or four months The Department of Lands and Forests did a much wider sampling of the lake and the results that were published at the end of January, or the first week in February, indicated that there was only one species of fish which was above the one-half parts per million level, and that the main species in the lake were all safe for human consumption.

I agree with the minister and with the department that if the results that were obtained had shown the contamination of mercury above that level then certainly we would have had to accept the fact that people should have been advised that this was the case, and that digestion of any large quantities of these fish could seriously damage their health. There is no question about that, but the fact of the matter is that the minister's first statement was based on a very small sampling and created an economic effect on that area that is going to be very difficult for the operators to overcome.

In the northwestern part of the province it is a different situation because there the fact did remain that a good number of lakes, particularly in the English water system, did have mercury contamination in the fish above what is considered to be the safe level. The fact of the matter is, the first reports that

came out of the department have done a great deal of damage to the economic stability of some areas of the province. I believe that the government, and the minister himself, should have been more careful to examine fully, what turned out to be the results of inaccurate testings that were taken from the lakes.

I believe the government should provide a much more active programme to promote these areas, particularly with regard to the type of fishing that can be done in these areas with safety, and look into the whole matter of where and when mercury pollution is at a level that contaminates the fish.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of other areas in regard to fish and wildlife that I would like to speak about, but perhaps we will cover them on the individual votes.

I would like to mention a few things with regard to the development of parks in the province and I would like to indicate to the minister that I was gratified by his announcement this evening, that the Ontario government was coming to some agreement with the federal government in the establishment of the national parks.

It has been my impression, and I believe this to be correct, that the reason why the government has not entered into a previous agreement with the federal government is that we did not want to give up the right to the resources based on the lands that the federal government wished to acquire. Apparently, the new agreements that have been made by the federal government with the Province of Quebec did not include a turnover of the property concerned to the federal government.

They have been done on a 99-year lease basis and the first 60 years of the lease are without encumbrance to the federal government; but after that the province has the right to take back the lands. At the end of the total lease, they do revert to provincial ownership. I would presume that the negotiations that are taking place now on the properties on the north shore of Lake Superior are on that same basis and I would hope that the government will be successful in the establishment of a national park there. However, I do not think the fact that the lands must be turned over to the federal government should prove to be a stumbling block in the establishment of these parks.

I would like to mention a few things in regard to Quetico Park and Algonquin and Killarney, although I notice in the minister's

remarks again this evening that he has indicated that all logging operations will be removed from Killarney Park. I would congratulate him on that, and ask him why he cannot extend this to include Quetico Park.

It has been the policy of the party to which I belong that the logging and timber operations should be stopped in Quetico Park which should remain as one of the few wilderness areas that are accessible to a good number of people.

Our policy in regard to Algonquin Park has been somewhat different to that and we have agreed in principle to the proposals that were made by the first provisional plan for Algonquin Park.

However, we are coming to the point where I believe that the people in this province are deserving of at least some information as to what decisions will be made on that park. The advisory committee to the minister, that was appointed about 20 months ago, has spent a considerable amount of time in producing what they consider to be a good policy recommendation to the minister for the use of that park. However, the minister has chosen not to make public the statement of the advisory committee. As a member of that committee, I question his right not to make it public.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. S. Smith: I believe that it is not an inter-departmental document. It is the report of a committee which was established by the minister and which he took great pains to announce both in this Legislature and across the province, and I believe that the minister has used this committee as a buffer since the time of its appointment to take the heat off the government and himself in regard to the decisions that must be made within that park and in regard to the decisions of policy as to how the park would be developed.

I believe that the minister received that report about five weeks ago, during the last week in March. Since that time he has been in contact with the committee through some of the people within his department, and I have been led to believe by what has taken place that the minister is not prepared to let the public know in the province just what the advisory committee is proposing.

Mr. Stokes: What has he proposed?

Mr. R. S. Smith: That is the problem I have.

Mr. Stokes: Tell me; I will not tell them.

Mr. R. S. Smith: As a member of that committee, I have indicated to the chairman by letter that I do not believe that I have the responsibility to withhold the recommendations of that committee for any longer a period of time than I think the minister in good conscience can take to read the report and decide what his feelings are on that report. The minister has had the report five weeks now, the committee has had—

Mr. Sargent: It has never sat since.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Pardon?

Mr. Sargent: It has never sat since.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The committee has had one meeting since that time, at which there were other documents provided to the committee; it has been very difficult as a member of the committee to decide why the other documents were provided, and what the committee was supposed to do with them. There were many on the committee who feel the same way, who are having some difficulty deciding just what the minister wants. I feel that it is a method of continuing the process, whether the committee has made a report or not.

I believe that the minister should certainly have the reports of his task force within the department and the recommendations of the task force on the implementation of different policies. I do not believe that those should be made public because they are inter-governmental reports requested by the minister of the civil servants within the department. But it is a different thing that a public body that has been appointed by the minister makes a report and there is even a hesitancy on the part of the minister to table the report.

I asked the minister some three weeks ago in the House when he would table the report and he said something about the fact that I should wait for the next meeting of the committee.

Mr. Sargent: That is tonight, is it?

Mr. R. S. Smith: No, the committee met on April 15, and a few days after that I went over and asked the minister again—although I did not do it in the Legislature; I asked him personally—if he would table the report, and of course I got the same answer: that he would look into it and decide whether it should be tabled or not. I think this is basically what he said. If I am wrong he can correct me.

The fact is that I would ask the minister that before we come to the vote that covers the recreational parks and that area of Algonquin Park during these estimates, he table that report so it can be discussed in the House both by him as the minister concerned, and by the other members of the Legislature who are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is not only for the benefit of the members here that the report should be published; there are a good number of people in this province who are looking to see where Algonquin Park is going and even though the minister and the government may not accept the principles enunciated in that report, I do believe that the public is entitled to know what they are at this time.

I would like to make a few remarks as well in regard to the forest policy of this government as it has been established over the past 30 or 40 years or perhaps beyond that. I would like to look at it for a few moments both in the long term and as well in the short term.

We discussed at some length this same subject last year in the estimates, and I put forward some suggestions based on the Economic Council report which at that time had just been tabled for a few months. The minister did not agree with all the contents of that report, and in fact he objected to a good number of the recommendations and comments that were made within it.

We had some discussion too at the time in regard to the Ontario Professional Foresters Association, and the minister read a letter in the House from the president of that association. There were some comments made by myself and, I think, the former leader of the New Democratic Party which might not have been too complimentary to the minister or to some of the members of the Ontario Professional Foresters Association.

The president of the foresters' association thereafter, I believe, sent a letter to all the members of the Legislature in which some of his remarks were, I suppose, not too complimentary to me or to the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald). But really that was not of too great concern to me, because I suppose that perhaps my remarks did question whether the first letter was intentionally provided to the minister or not. Since I am not able to read either the mind of the minister or that of the president of the foresters' association, I will leave it by saying that it is up to them to decide in their own conscience just what was the reason for the use of the

letter in the Legislature and whether it was provided for that purpose or not.

Second to that, there was some discussion in the Legislature about the methods used by the Economic Council in obtaining the information for the report. Apparently Mr. Cranston, who has since been retired one way or another from the Economic Council, was a little annoyed at the letter that the president of the Ontario Professional Foresters Association had written to the minister. He replied to the Ontario Professional Foresters Association and he happened to send to me a copy of his letter. I will just indicate Mr. Cranston's feelings in regard to this matter by quoting the last paragraph. He is addressing this to the Ontario Professional Foresters Association. His last paragraph reads: "Might we suggest that your association is in a unique position to postulate a forward policy for the forest industry in Ontario." Then he ends up with a question, "Do you contemplate such an undertaking?"

In other words, I think the Ontario Economic Council—and he was writing on behalf of the council—was really not too pleased with the input of the Ontario Professional Foresters Association to the policy of forest management within our province. Perhaps on both sides there is a major conflict of, perhaps, personalities or perhaps interests, but the minister shakes his head. I do not know.

I have read both letters and certainly there is a conflict of some kind. I am sure he has read both letters as well, but the minister and the foresters' association at that time indicated there were many of the recommendations and comments of the Council within the Council's report that he and his department did not accept.

I would like him to explain to me just how the Ontario Economic Council arrived at the decisions that they made and the pronouncements that they made within their report. It is important to note that the former deputy minister of The Department of Lands and Forests, until three days ago, was involved; it is right in this letter:

In 1964 when the Council first became involved in a review of Ontario's forest industry, a subcommittee of the Council consisting of Mr. Bailey, Mr. Silverside, Professor Love, and Mr. Ian Butters undertook to prepare to work for the Ontario Economic Council report.

It is rather hard to imagine how the deputy minister of this department, who invariably is influential in the setting of the policy of

this department, could be involved in an independent study of the policy of the department.

This independent study of the Ontario Economic Council, apparently in which Mr. Bailey was directly involved, recommends a number of things that the minister is not prepared to accept. I am not suggesting for one minute that this is anything to do with Mr. Bailey's moving out of this department. I am sure that he has reached higher heights because of the service that he gave to the government and to his department. But I find it difficult to understand how the minister can be so critical of the Ontario Economic Council's report, as he was last year within these estimates, and at the same time realize that his own deputy minister was instrumental in the development of that report itself. Perhaps the minister could explain this to me after when he comments on my remarks.

He shakes his head. Does the minister have a problem following what I am trying to ask him?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: You do one side while I do this.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Okay. Mr. Chairman, there are some other remarks I would like to make with regard to the timber industry, particularly at the present time. There are a good number of producers in our province who are having some financial difficulty in keeping their heads above water particularly because of the loss of foreign markets and the difficulty of staying competitive in the domestic market as well.

There is no question that the foreign export market of the Ontario forest industries have been hurt by the continual increase in the value of the Canadian dollar. There is no question that the home market has been decreased considerably because of the competition that has been created by the development of a number of plateboard and particleboard manufacturers in other provinces of Canada.

Many of the difficulties, however, do have a reflection on the policy of the present government, particularly in regard to the increased cost of production in Ontario and the lack of a programme, perhaps through the Ontario Development Corporation, to assist the present industries to re-tool or to expand in order that production costs may be decreased to compete in both the foreign and domestic markets.

The pulp and paper industry, the lumber industry, and the plateboard and particleboard producers lost their competitive position over the past four or five years perhaps because of the development and the interest of the federal government in its economic expansion programmes in the less affluent parts of Canada.

However, the other provincial governments have moved in to provide a considerable amount of assistance supplementary to the federal programmes.

Mr. Stokes: Why does the member not say the problems they are in are the result of the economic policies in Ottawa?

Mr. R. S. Smith: The hon. member for Thunder Bay can say that. He is going to be up in a few minutes.

Mr. Stokes: I thought the member would want to say that.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I did say that the problems we are in was partly because of the programmes of economic expansion in some of the other areas of Canada that have been fostered by the federal government.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The member cushions the blow rather nicely.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Trudeau does not care about Ontario.

Mr. R. S. Smith: But the fact of the matter is that there are many areas included in the cost of production in Ontario that have been affected directly by policies of this government. The availability of resources has been of continuing concern to many of the producers. I am happy to see the minister used the same words that I was going to use in regard to rationalization of timber licences within this province.

I do not know whether he would indicate that he is going to go as far, perhaps, as some other people would in regard to this rationalization, but it is important that the timber licence policy and the other methods by which timber and raw materials are made available to producers be completely reviewed. Because of the costs of transportation which are included in the cost of the raw material, there is no question that the privilege that has been extended to many of the timber licence holders in this province should be discontinued and a more rational approach should be taken to provide the raw material to the secondary manufacturing industry that is near the site of that material.

This basically has created large economic problems and costs of production for many of the producers.

There is also the question of the Ontario Hydro rates that have increased so dramatically over the past four or five years and, according to the chairman of the Ontario Hydro, will continue to increase at least at the same rate or perhaps at an even extended rate over the next five years. These two costs are under the direct control of government as well as the cost of stumpage and logging tax. I notice the minister mentioned that they were considering the changes in the stumpage charges in the far northern parts, I expect, of the province to help to create industries in that area because of the lack of use of the resource that has taken place.

I believe as well that the stumpage charges should be tied to the economic situation as it exists for the operators right across the province, regardless of whether they are in the far northern parts or in the mid-north. There is no question that stumpage charges can be geared to the economic conditions that exist over a specific time.

Since it is a major cost in the purchase of raw materials for the secondary industries, I believe that governments could decrease their income from this tax in certain periods when the company is in competitive difficulties, and increase the stumpage charges when the markets are better and the profits are higher.

These three areas, then, are considerations that should be taken by this government which could have an immediate effect on the competitive position of the pulp and paper and other forest industry-based producers. The government has continually refused to use the hydro electric rates of the province as an economic tool in assistance to the slow-growth areas, but I believe because of the fast increasing rates of Hydro, it is essential that a rationalization be made there as well.

The minister is aware of a certain number of smaller producers that are in difficulty and I would like to point out to him the one that is in my own district. The Abitibi mill in Sturgeon Falls has, over the past few months, had to reduce its number of employees by about 20 per cent in order that they might attempt to keep themselves in some type of competition with the industries that have been established in the eastern part of Canada as well as in the foreign markets.

Over the past four years in that one industry, the hydro rates have increased by almost

90 per cent and the cost of coal has increased by about 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent, so you can see that the cost of power for production in that mill has increased by an average of 63 per cent and will cost that company more than \$400,000 per year more in 1971 than it did in 1966. At the same time, and rightfully so, there are increasing labour costs.

They have other costs increasing at a lesser level than their energy and labour costs but altogether the costs of production have increased an average of more than 40 per cent over that same period. At the same time there has been no increase in the price that the end-product is being sold at in the domestic and the foreign market, so you can understand that in their plateboard mill they have gone from a position where they were showing a profit to where, last year, the losses in that small mill were over \$1 million.

For this reason they have had to rationalize their whole production and of course the first place they look to save money is in the work force, and as a result more than 80 people have lost their jobs in the past three months.

I think there are a number of other areas in the province where this same thing has happened, and I think that it is imperative that the government also take their share of the responsibility in providing a competitive position for the producers. The use of the hydro rate structure, I believe, should be used to alleviate these specific problems and the stumpage charges, in those areas where it is a major factor in the cost of the raw material, should also be used to attempt to alleviate the acute problem that exists today.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have covered, as well as I could under the circumstances, the things that are of particular concern to the people who look to this department for guidance and who look to this department, through their local industry, for employment within our province. Perhaps under the specific votes I will have more comments and some specific questions.

Mr Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, at this late hour I am going to attempt to provide a critique for the New Democratic Party of the activities of The Department of Lands and Forests since we last examined these estimates and to offer, to the greatest extent possible, some constructive ideas that might do the thing that the minister and his department are aspiring to—the wise management of our renewable natural resources.

I do want to congratulate the minister for the reorganization in his department. I want to say that the decentralization of decision-making powers within the department is a positive step inasmuch as people in the field, who have first hand knowledge of the situation, are obviously in a much better position to decide the policy than somebody sitting in the ivory tower down here in Toronto.

I think it is fair to say, from looking under the gallery here this evening, that you have quite a battery of advisors from the ivory tower. A good many of them did get their background from a long tenure of service in the north. You know that is where things are happening; that is where the resource is, and that is where, to the greatest extent that it is possible for me to do, I am going to attempt to see that a lot more happens, insofar as this department is concerned.

I want to wish those who have stepped up the ladder all the best and hope that they will, to the greatest extent possible, get The Department of Lands and Forests' wagon on the track and really make maximum use, for the benefit of the people of Ontario, of the huge store of resources that we do have.

I was a bit disturbed, Mr. Chairman, as I followed the minister in his remarks, that he went to page seven of a nine page document before he even mentioned what I consider to be the most important aspect of this department, from an economic point of view at least.

It is true that people in ever increasing numbers have become concerned about recreation and optimum use of leisure time; it is true that people are looking for diversion by way of hunting, fishing, boating, swimming, and recreation of every type; but I think that one must not lose sight of the fact that the timber resources that are in such abundance, particularly in the north, are not getting the kind of attention that they deserve.

It is quite significant, I think, that the minister should read through nine pages and only on page seven did he come upon what I consider to be the most important aspect of this department's operations. The Department of Lands and Forests will spend \$77.3 million during the forthcoming fiscal year, while net receipts will be in the order of \$40 million, for a net deficit of \$27 million. Resource development will cost \$44.9 million, while recreational expenditures will amount to \$25.3 million, and administration, \$8 million.

Revenues from logging tax and timber charges will amount to \$16.8 million, but the

cost of operating the timber branch will be \$18.5 million with an additional \$13 million for forest protection, plus \$2 million for forest access roads, some of which comes back to the province over an extended period of time.

While one would not deny the fact that the harvesting of our forest resources provides about 78,000 jobs with an annual payroll of \$400 million, it seems reasonable to expect that direct provincial government charges should at least cover the cost of operating the timber branch and a fair share of forest protection. This could be accomplished by greater harvesting of the unused allowable cut and not as an additional charge on present producers. According to most recent statistics, only 52 per cent of the allowable cut of conifers and 11 per cent of hardwoods are being presently utilized. These figures are calculated on a sustained yield basis, so one has to assume that a significant amount of our timber resources are over-mature and being wasted. This cannot be permitted to continue when we have such a high rate of unemployment, a surplus of raw material in Ontario and Ontario importing more lumber and more plywood than it produces.

The total productive forest area in Ontario is 165,700 square miles, of which 90 per cent is Crown land, and yet only 400,000 acres are being harvested annually. It is interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that the minister mentioned in his opening remarks that they were going to get up to about 155,000 acres reforested this year, when we have 400,000 acres being harvested. He will get up and he will rationalize and he will say, "Well, this is what we are actually doing but we are leaving to nature a certain portion, and we are scarifying a certain portion," and I have heard this for the last three years.

All I am suggesting is that the Brodie report in 1968, and indeed the Kennedy report in 1948, as well as the Ontario Economic Council report referred to by the hon. member for Nipissing, all mentioned that we must do more with regard to regeneration. We are not even taking care of the present amount that is being harvested, let alone catching up with the backlog that has built up to such significant proportions over the past number of years.

I am not suggesting we have a shortage of wood in the Province of Ontario at the present time. I am suggesting that we have more than enough wood. I am saying that if we are going to maintain Ontario's relative position in world markets, when one considers

that the forecast is for a doubling of the requirements for paper products up until 1980 and a quadrupling up to the year 2000—if we are going to maintain our relative position, reforesting 155,000 acres of 400,000 acres in annual cuts just is not enough.

It is estimated that our forests can sustain an allowable cut of 1.8 billion cunits—one cunit is 100 cubic feet of solid wood—and 87 per cent of this is on Crown land. At present, only 16 per cent of the allowable cut is harvested annually from Crown land, so that the minister can see that we have all kinds of elbow room here to create more job opportunities by more optimum utilization of our forest resources if we would provide some of the incentives that my hon. friend from Nipissing spoke of a little earlier.

Is it little wonder, Mr. Chairman, that the conservationists are perplexed when they see trees being cut in provincial parks when we are only using 16 per cent of our allowable cut? Thirty-eight companies have under licence 93,618 square miles of our Crown land. Many of these companies are utilizing less than 50 per cent of the allowable cut under licence to them, while other entrepreneurs are begging for cutting limits. One company, which has no limits of its own, has effective control of the hardwood species—that is, birch and poplar—on 15,000 square miles of prime forest land while another operator has been inactive for two years for the lack of timber. That is a disgrace, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Hear, hear!

Mr. Stokes: Based on information from The Department of Lands and Forests, the northwestern Ontario Design for Development goal is to provide 4,000 to 5,000 jobs in the pulp and paper industry. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is not going to happen under the present administrative policies of this minister and this department. I alluded to one entrepreneur who has been inactive for the past two years for the want of raw resources to maintain his operation.

I would like to draw to the attention of this House that at one time the prime licence holder had the final determination as to who cut any particular species on the limits under licence to them. This was not a very good arrangement. It meant that a lot of people who needed wood for their own purpose and for varied uses, were unable to get it because most of these prime licence holders had effective control over about 90 per cent of Crown land under licence to them and

effectively excluded anyone else who wanted it.

So the minister issued a directive to three of the prime licence holders—Domtar, Abitibi and Great Lakes—that they were to take all of the hardwood species on those 15,000 square miles. He passed off that responsibility from his own shoulders and the shoulders of his own department and gave it to another party. The minister took it away from the prime licence holder and gave it to another user. This is a relatively small operation and yet this company is allowed to play God on over 15,000 square miles as it affects the utilization of the birch and the poplar species, a species that is under-utilized to the tune of 89 per cent in this province.

I chatted with the person over the phone over the weekend. I found out that he did get some wood. He got 500 cords of birch wood, but he did not get it from this department. He did not get it from any one of the three prime licence holders that I spoke of. He did not get it from the company which was protected by the directive issued by this minister. He got it from another prime licence holder, one of the more responsible in the industry, Kimberly-Clark.

So he is going to have some wood to cut this year, but he has been without wood for the past two seasons because this minister saw fit to allow one relatively small company to allocate timber which is so badly under-utilized. I am speaking specifically of the birch and poplar species at this time.

Mr. Chairman, this cannot be allowed to continue. It is high time that the minister accepted his responsibility for the proper re-allocation of timber limits based on need and on maximum use on a sustained yield basis.

Having regard for the unused allowable cut, there is sufficient unused forest resources to sustain at least four more mills, each producing about 600 tons per day, which is just about as large as any we have in the province at the present time. This government, in co-operation with the federal government and private enterprise, must enhance the competitive position of the forest products industry by financial assistance in plant modernization and plant expansion, better utilization of exploitable forest resources through a continued programme of timber limit allocation—that is what I was speaking of a little earlier—and financial assistance in access road construction. This is something that is quite acceptable to most people in the province.

All one has to do is listen to the conservationists who have been asking that all cutting be halted in provincial parks, but they are quite amenable to the idea of reallocation of timber limits and providing limits outside of provincial parks, even to the extent of building access roads and reallocation of timber limits in order to achieve such an end.

Several lumber, plywood, veneer and other wood-producing industries, particularly in northern Ontario, could be sustained by using under-utilized forest species. This will only be possible if integrated logging and forest management practices, as recommended by the Kennedy report in 1948, the Brodie report in 1968 and the Ontario Economic Council in 1969 and 1970 are implemented.

Greater utilization of forest resources on a sustained yield basis could take The Department of Lands and Forests out of the red and allow it to become a producer of revenue instead of operating at a loss in excess of \$25 million annually.

This department has a forest economic unit whose only activity, according to the annual report during the past year, was to make a survey of rural private landowner characteristics in southern Ontario, and a Christmas tree consumer survey in Metropolitan Toronto. This is by the admission of the minister's own department. If you do not believe me, read it in the annual report released just about two weeks ago.

One would have thought that they could have employed their time to much better advantage by implementing programmes that would foster a better use of timber resources, thus creating more employment and more revenue for the provincial treasury. It is only through sound resource management that this department will achieve its objective of the optimum continuing contribution of renewable resources production industries to the economy of Ontario and its communities.

Mr. Chairman, I have some other remarks that I would like to make about the activities of this department and, getting away from timber for a moment, I would like to refer to a condition that exists in this department that has disturbed me. It has disturbed a good many of the employees in this department at the lower echelons and I hope that it concerns the minister, and his advisers sitting under the gallery at the present time; I am very pleased to see them here in such significant numbers.

I would like to find out from the minister how many conservation officers are now em-

ployed by The Department of Lands and Forests; this is the law enforcement arm—the one that enforces the fish and game laws in the province.

Some of the conservation officers in this province are charged with the responsibility of patrolling 2,500 square miles at a time when we have a relative few, but a very troublesome few hundred fishermen who take advantage of the situation with regard to insufficient conservation officers to police our fish and game laws.

It is very unfair, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that any conservation officer be charged with that responsibility—particularly in remote areas of the province where it is less accessible—for any one person to be charged with the responsibility of covering such a huge territory and ask them to do it with any degree of success.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the morale of these employees within the department has reached an all-time low due to the inability or the unwillingness of this department and this minister, to provide them with adequate assistance in order to patrol our forests and protect our fish and game.

When one considers that one group was stopped at the international border going over with something like 775 pickerel fillets. And that was the group that was caught. Think about the hundreds that are getting away with our precious resources, and I am speaking of our fish resources at the present time. I am also talking about those hunters who go into the forests and are looking for nothing but a trophy. They will allow hundreds and hundreds of pounds of meat to spoil, left to rot in the bush, just because they have paid for their hunting licence and think they have the right to waste our resources in this fashion.

I suggest to the minister, and to his department, that it will not be long before our fish and wildlife resources will be completely depleted, unless we have effective control of our fish and game laws in the province.

With regard to the reorganization that I spoke of earlier, and the discontent of a good many people at the lower echelons as a result of action taken to reclassify all former forestry technicians and all former wildlife technicians into one category of resource technician. This has caused a lot of animosity—certainly from what I can gather—throughout the province. I was wondering just how the minister is going to be able to justify this to his employees and maintain the esprit de corps that formerly existed in the department.

I wrote several letters to the minister on it and I did get replies. However, these replies certainly did not satisfy the people on whose behalf I was speaking. I am hoping that a little later on the minister will get up and explain the reasons why he took the action he did at the time that he did, when it was obviously met with such disfavour by people in his department. I do hope he will take into consideration the feelings of these people and, hopefully, that he will sit down in a realistic way with them to explain to them the reasons for it, and try at least to justify the action that he has taken.

I notice in going through the annual report that the minister does make mention of the resources development programme, which is undertaken by The Department of Lands and Forests with some financial assistance coming from the federal level. I had some first-hand experience of it last summer and I might say that I was quite impressed with what was going on in remote areas of the province—and I have been criticized for saying that The Department of Lands and Forests is the only provincial presence that is doing anything significant to assist our native people in the north.

At the expense of further criticism I am going to say I still believe that is a fact—that this department is the only provincial presence in the northern part of our province that really gives a damn about our native people. I will suggest, however, that in order to make even a small dent in the problems of those people more must be done.

I think the federal government should make more financial resources available to this department and I think this department should work much more closely with The Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, which has the responsibility for Indian community development work. I think with much more co-operation—speaking of federal-provincial co-operation, and provincial interdepartmental co-operation—you could accomplish even more than you are at the present time, in an area where help is so badly needed.

I would like to have the minister assure me, since it appears in his annual report, that they are making sure the rights of our native people are being protected and that their best interests are served. I would like to have him explain, at a later time, just how this department is protecting the aboriginal rights of our first citizens—and I am speaking about their right to hunt, fish and to trap.

From what I can gather, this right is fast slipping away from our native people and I

do not see the department standing up on behalf of these people and I think it is the only department that can effectively do this, since they do manage those resources insofar as other people in the province are concerned.

I would like to have the minister assert that he does abide by those treaty and aboriginal rights of our first citizens and assure this House and myself that those rights will be protected.

I want to turn briefly, Mr. Chairman, to the licences issued by this department. I would like to know how the issuers of licences are decided. I have had several complaints from people who are in the sporting goods business—who are in the business of catering to sportsmen—and yet a good many of them find it almost impossible to get the authority to issue the licences which go hand in hand with their operation. A good many people have suggested that these are political plums that are handed out by this department—

An hon. member: Oh, tut, tut, tut!

Mr. Stokes: I would not suggest that for one minute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: I would, and I can give you proof of it, right in York South; documented!

Mr. Stokes: I have had some degree of success in—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Nobody has written or spoken to me about it.

Mr. MacDonald: They predated this minister, to be truthful, but I think it is the system.

Mr. Stokes: All I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, is that the minister take another look at it. I think this should be done on the basis of providing a service to the people, rather than suggesting that: oh, well, we can have one only every 20 miles or one for every several thousand people or something like that. This is a service that you are supposed to be providing to the people of Ontario and if there is somebody who has a sporting goods store, it is unrealistic for the department to deny him the right to issue those licences. One has to go into a beer parlour or a hotel or even a garage to get one, and yet someone who is in the business of catering to hundreds of fishermen cannot have the right to issue these licences.

All I am suggesting is, take another look at it and I do not think the minister can realistically, in all good conscience, deny

somebody who is in the business of serving people, the authority to issue hunting and fishing licences.

Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend, the member for Nipissing, did allude to the fact that—

Mr. Lawlor: There is no division in the Liberal Party tonight.

Mr. Stokes: No, there is no division.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): That is right.

Mr. Lawlor: Complete unanimity in the ranks; the member is the only one here.

Mr. Stokes: The minister does mention in the annual report for the fiscal year 1969-1970 that the revenue from the sale of the former angling licences increased between 1969 and 1970 by—and I am quoting directly—a resounding 73 per cent as a result of the imposition of the \$3 resident fishing licence.

This is a licence that was in effect less than two years. It was recently abolished, as mentioned in the Throne Speech, and the explanation given was that it was too costly to administer and collect the extra \$1.6 million. Well, this is not a very good reason for abolishing something that has been in effect for less than two years.

I suggest that possibly it is more accurate to conclude that the public reaction was so great, with an election on the horizon, that this government decided the whole idea was ill-conceived and so they have decided to rescind a levy which has been in effect for less than two years.

Mr. Lawlor: Wonderful what an election can do.

Mr. Stokes: I want to suggest to the minister that his colleague mentioned that he was withdrawing the levy of \$1.6 million because it was too cumbersome and it was too difficult to collect the tax.

I want to suggest to the minister that if he looks at his provincial land tax, he does not get much more from that. And if you want to look at any bureaucratic monstrosity you should look at the provincial land tax across the province—the way it is levied and the problems that it creates, not only for the landowner in unorganized territories, but talk to the chief of the accounts branch and ask him the headaches he has had in trying to sort out the hodge-podge and in trying to collect that levy.

I suggest the minister take another look at that; maybe he would abolish that too. You only get about \$2 million a year out of it and you do not provide any service to the people that you collect it from. About the only thing you have done is that you have built some garbage dumps for these people in unorganized territories. The minister, I suggest, would be pretty hard-pressed to single out anything other than garbage dumps that it does provide.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Welfare, 100 per cent.

Mr. Stokes: One hundred per cent of what?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Welfare in unorganized territories—paid for by the provincial government.

Mr. Stokes: That is paid through premiums. Is the minister suggesting that the people who live in these unorganized territories do not pay premiums?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Welfare; I am speaking of welfare.

Mr. Stokes: They pay premiums on their hospital and they pay premiums on their health; they pay every other kind of tax in the province to a much higher degree, particularly the sales tax which is based on the consumer cost of any specific item, and the minister knows himself how much greater the cost of consumer goods are in Moonbeam than they are in Metropolitan Toronto.

An hon. member: Not here.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister should not arouse the hon. member from Schreiber, because he is red-headed, now.

Mr. Stokes: All I am suggesting is that if this is the logical reason for withdrawing—and I suspect it is not—well, let us assume that the Treasurer is accurate in saying that the collection of \$1.6 million for about 600,000 fishing licences became too cumbersome over a period of two years; maybe he should look at the provincial land tax, either withdraw it or give these people something for their money. I am sure my colleague—

Mr. MacDonald: Solid case

Mr. Stokes: —from Timiskaming, who himself lives in an unorganized territory, could tell us just how few services they get for the provincial land tax that is levied at the present time. I do not think these people object to paying a tax as long as we can assure them that they are getting something

for it. And I do not think that is the case at the present time.

Another thing that I want to get into is not in the estimates, but it is paid for and covered by the expenditures we will be voting on in these estimates. It is something that is alluded to in the annual report, where it says that the supervisor of the wildlife section has assumed responsibility for the research branch programmes along systems rather than disciplines lines. A practical application of this has been a study of the effect of proposed northern watershed diversions. This was the one item in the entire annual report that disturbed me the most.

I think most members of this House are aware that I have been greatly concerned by surveys that were undertaken by the US Corps of Army Engineers over the past several years, that were completely denied by the Ontario Water Resources Commission and by the federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources when I showed them proof positive that indeed the assistance of some people in the Province of Ontario was being sought by the US Corps of Army Engineers and being paid to survey our stream flows, water levels, ice thicknesses and slush conditions.

When I suggested that this in fact was going on, and gave them proof positive that it was going on, the only admission I got was from the federal Minister of Transport that he was aware that this was going on in the Great Lakes to study the possibilities of all-weather operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Never at any time did anybody in this government even suggest that anything that was undertaken by the US Corps of Army Engineers had the blessing of either this government or the federal government.

I spoke to a lawyer friend of mine in this building here the other day who had occasion to be up the Winisk River last year on a fishing trip. There was an aeroplane flying over and his friend said to him, "What is that aeroplane doing up here? You know you really do not see that many aeroplanes." "Oh, those are the people who are not here!" He said, "What do you mean?" "Those are the people who are exploring the possibilities of diverting water, selling it to the United States. But they are really not here at all, so just forget that you ever saw that plane."

I am wondering about the meaning of the item in the report I referred to. I must confess to this House that I was so per-

turbed I gave the minister advance notice that I was going to ask this question. But, more, I want him to answer it for me. "A practical application of this has been the studies of the effect of proposed northern watersheds diversions."

Everybody knows that all watersheds in the north run into Hudson and James bays; if we are going to divert it, it is going to be coming south. The rivers run north and south. I want to know what the minister is going to do; I do not expect he will answer right now, but I hope he will at the appropriate time.

Mr. Paterson: Ask him where all the US Army Engineers' boats were heading that were on Highway 401 today?

Mr. Stokes: The hon. member wants to know what the US Corp of Army Engineers boats were doing on Highways 400 and the 401? Maybe they figure they will take over the southern part of the province before they take over the north.

I want to get into another aspect of the activities of this department, Mr. Chairman. I want to remind the minister that he received a telegram about three or four days ago from the Commercial Fishing Association of Northwestern Ontario expressing a great deal of concern about mercury pollution along the north shore of Lake Superior.

Since early last fall, or since this report was made public about the mercury contamination of fish in Lake Superior, the commercial fishermen there have had a very difficult time getting their fish to market for the simple reason that it is picked up by a transport truck and hauled to Kemp Fisheries in Thunder Bay. It is kept there for about 24 hours.

It is then sent by another transport truck all the way to Winnipeg for analysis either by the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board or by some facility provided by the federal Department of Fisheries, and by the time one gets an analysis as to whether these fish are fit for consumption and for export to US markets, the fish is of very poor and questionable quality.

We want to know what this minister is going to do for the commercial fishermen who are affected in that way in Lake Superior. I think it is safe to say that the commercial fishermen who have been adversely effected by excessively high mercury content in the southern part of the province are getting attention, but no attention has been given to those so affected in Lake Superior.

I have committed myself to getting a reply from the minister for these commercial fishermen in Lake Superior. As a matter of fact, one of them is out on the lake now getting 50 lake trout at his own expense, at the minister's behest and request so those fish can be analysed to determine the quantity of mercury to see whether it is excessive and whether the fish are fit or unfit for human consumption. He is doing this at his own expense.

I am just wondering if the minister is going to take this into consideration and provide every assistance for these commercial fishermen to get their catch of fish analysed with the least amount of delay so that they can receive the maximum benefits from their activities as commercial fishermen.

I want to turn to other aspects of the fishery as it pertains to Lake Nipigon. I wrote a letter to the minister two or three weeks ago, and no doubt he has been very busy and had not had an opportunity to reply yet—at least I have not received it.

I am going to quote a few lines of that letter in the hope that I can provoke the minister into answering me, either later on this evening or at his first opportunity: "The commercial lake trout harvest in Lake Nipigon has declined from 617,000 pounds in 1919 to 13,000 pounds in 1969." I asked the minister on several occasions in the past why he did not undertake a realistic and a meaningful restocking programme to try to bring this fishery back, and on each occasion when I asked either he or somebody representing him, they said that his fishery was quite capable of restocking itself and maintaining a proper balance. Those figures certainly do not indicate that the fishery is indeed maintaining a proper balance when you have a reduction from over 600,000 pounds in 1919 down to 13,000 pounds in 1969.

The Nipigon coaster, the large lake run speckled trout; has all but disappeared and ceases to be an attraction to tourists and local anglers. The northern pike in this lake have been tested and many contain quantities of mercury well in excess of the maximum 0.5 parts per million which makes them unfit for human consumption. The sturgeon population has declined to the extent that our Indian population have stopped fishing them altogether.

Pulp logs being driven down the rivers are driving fish out of the rivers, polluting the river bottoms with bark and so on,, covering up and destroying the food such

as larvae and insects and so on and generally disrupting the ecology.

The same applies to the river mouths and bays where the log booms have been collected. Sturgeon and whitefish depend heavily on bottom larvae and other organisms.

Ontario Hydro raised Lake Nipigon in the Thirties by building dams and since then have been in the habit of building up the lake level of course, in connection with the dams at Pine Portage and at Cameron Falls, they have built up the lake levels all summer to a maximum in late September and October. Then they draw off water all winter for power requirements so that the lake is several feet lower in the spring—up to six feet, I am told by commercial fishermen and tourist operators.

We feel that this is resulting in the destruction of the spawn from the fall spawners such as lake trout, coasters and whitefish. For example, if the lake is up three feet and the ice is three feet thick or two feet thick, then all the spawn is five feet out of the water before it gets a chance to get covered over. It is either frozen or baked, take your choice.

The Ontario Hydro Ogoki diversion down the Jackfish River to Ombabika Bay has ripped out the river banks and is continually silting the waters of that bay, so much so that they are often the colour of coffee with cream in it.

The continual silting covers up the bottom feed such as larvae and disrupts the general ecology, not to mention what a disgraceful eyesore this is. There is a possibility that the lake is away out of balance. That is, the coarse fish such as ling and suckers, etc, have increased because they have not been harvested to any great extent.

These fish are now quite numerous and we believe they are taking a heavy toll of the desirable species especially at spawning time. It is obvious that the present team which is conducting a survey of this fishery under the capable leadership of Lorne Towne is understaffed and will now need assistance if anything meaningful is to result.

Since this is one of the most important fishery resources in the province, I respectfully urge you to give it the attention and the priority it deserves and so badly needs. I have had occasion to talk to Mr. Towne and many people at the district level in the Geraldton forest district and I am quite convinced that they are doing everything possible with the resources that they have to

make a realistic assessment of the needs and the requirements to rehabilitate that fishery:

I want to suggest to the minister in the strongest terms possible that it is completely inadequate for him to say that he is going to take a lake, hundreds of square miles, and put one biologist and about four summer students on it and say that he is going to do anything to bring this lake up to the important fishery that it once was and the significant place that it held in the economy of that area, both to our native population for commercial fishing and to the tourist operators in that particular area.

I do hope that the minister will not suggest something that is going on, like at Lac Seul, is adequate. I think it was in 1929 that they had a diversion there which flooded thousands of square miles of good timber land, allowed it to fall over and rot, and it is a real disgrace when you see it. You fly over it. You fly over the Ogoki reservoir and you will see thousands and thousands of acres of productive forest land were just allowed to flood. Of course, that resource was lost to the people of Ontario for future generations and it is indeed an awful eyesore.

I notice in the annual report where it says that the minister does have a team of biologists continuing their study in Lac Seul, a body of water with an area of over 500 square miles. He does have one biologist and four or five students studying that, 40 years after the fact.

I know my colleague from Kenora, the hon. Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier), will agree with me that it was a complete disgrace the way that was allowed to happen. When one considers that you do have a fluctuation from year to year, or from season to season, of from 14 to 16 feet, it is high time that, 40 years after the dam was built, you should have some idea—

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Forty-one years—the year that I was born.

Mr. Stokes: Forty-one years, my hon. colleague reminds me. I think of it as high time that the minister started making a realistic assessment of all of these things so that we might get the maximum benefit of the resources that he aspired to in his opening remarks this afternoon.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the minister a product of some diversion?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, not really. That was long before this minister was there.

Mr. MacDonald: No, I mean the Minister of Mines!

Mr. Stokes: I noticed another thing that I thought was worth mentioning. This is with regard to restricted fire zones. I am not going to spend any great deal of time on forest protection because I think that from what I can read and from what I can gather in my research and in my travels that our fire-fighting force in the Province of Ontario is equal to or better than any in Canada or on the continent.

I am wondering, though, in reference to something that does appear in the last annual report that had to do with restricted fire zones in a particular area of the province that had suffered from fume damage and that was at Wawa. I cannot name the exact page that this refers to, but it does mention that this department found it necessary to declare a certain area a restricted fire zone because it had been damaged by fumes. I suspect that it is sulphur fumes, as a result of the mining activity in the area.

I brought this up with the minister's colleague, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr), a little over a year ago—the result of sulphur fumes around Sudbury. I wanted to know if the people of that area were going to be given compensation—particularly the native people on the reserve out at Whitefish, where they claim that over 40,000 acres of productive forest land had been irreparably damaged. I am wondering what the minister thinks of damage to the resources by fumes and what he proposes to do about it in the interest of the people of Ontario.

I am also wondering what the minister is going to do. I see in his report that he has a very close and effective liaison between the Ontario Water Resources Commission and they are very actively pursuing, so they say, on a co-operative basis, those areas that have been adversely affected and taking some action to correct it.

Now, I suppose it is unfair to say that the minister should have found mercury pollution the moment it happened. I suppose it would be unfair to say that the minister is responsible even for all the natural mercury pollution that occurs in many areas where there is no industrial activity. That would be unfair and I am not even going to suggest that the minister—this minister anyway—is responsible for any mercury pollution in the province at the present time. But I do think he has to share some responsibility for the adverse effect that the effluent from the many,

many pulp and paper mills is having on our fishery resources, on the quality of water, and on the impairment of our quality of life any place in the Province of Ontario where we have pulp and paper mills and the activities associated with such industries.

I know that the minister who represents a northern riding and happens to have a paper mill in his riding, is well aware, as I am, of the adverse effect that the effluent from those mills is having and has had for a number of years, and I am just wondering just what the minister says to his colleague when he discusses these problems.

I know his colleague has said that the pulp and paper industry is the worst offender in Ontario at the present time, from a water pollution point of view. And I am just wondering what the minister says to his colleague and just how serious is this minister, when he suggests that he does bear and accept the responsibility for maintaining good water quality, and that he accepts the responsibility for protecting our marine life in this province. How can he justify statements like that and still allow this pollution from an industry that owes its existence to the resources that are under the management of this minister; how does he justify those statements?

I did want to make a brief comment about the many surveys and the many programmes that have been instituted by this department, and in co-operation with other departments at the provincial and indeed at the federal level, and I think that this minister certainly takes the cake for coming up with all of these cute little names that people hang their hat on.

I noticed the Prime Minister doing it the other day, but this minister is very, very actively pursuing the CORDS—the Canada Outdoor Recreation Demands Survey—of 1968-1969. He also has a TORP survey—the Tourism Outdoor Recreation Plan.

I notice that his particular interest in this is in association with the goals and objectives of the designs for developments across the province, particularly the one recently unveiled in northwestern Ontario—phase 2. He is suggesting; maybe he is not suggesting, but I suppose he, along with his colleague, the Minister of Tourism and Information, has told those who were responsible for formulating this document, that there is a possibility of creating employment and a more viable economy in northwestern Ontario if they use the CORDS and the TORP survey in order to make better use of the tourist resources that we have in that area.

I do hope that any information that he does make available to The Department of Treasury and Economics will foster the kind of employment and job opportunities that are needed in that area; that he will be more realistic when he suggests a number of job opportunities there as opposed to the number of job opportunities that this government—on the advice of this minister—aspire to as a result of the design for development survey, where he suggests that 4,000 to 5,000 jobs will be created as a result of increased activity and better utilization in the forest products industries over the next 20 years.

If it is realistic to expect that we can create 18,000 jobs over that period of time by better utilization of the resources that are in such abundance in the north, I suspect that we can cut that down to about five years instead of 20 and provide those 4,000 to 5,000 jobs in the forest products industry over a much shorter period of time. And let us be a little more ambitious than has been indicated by this government in the Design for Development—phase 2 for northwestern Ontario.

I am not finished yet. I have mentioned the CORDS and the TORP. We also have the SWEEP—that is the Students Working in an Environment Enhancement Programme; we also have the SOLE programme—the Summer Of Learning Experience. The minister has mentioned about the SEED programme, but I have never been able to determine just what they meant. Maybe when he has a moment —

Mr. Pitman: Shared experience.

Mr. Stokes: Shared experience? I was particularly concerned, Mr. Chairman, when the Prime Minister—

Mr. Lawlor: Is it TORP or TORPID?

Mr. Stokes: I was particularly concerned last winter, Mr. Chairman, when I heard the hon. Premier mention the number of jobs that are going to be created as a winter works programme. Correct me if I am wrong, but I think there was something like \$5 million in total made available as a result of two winter works projects. One was to clean up provincial parks in the eastern part of the province, and the other was to cut dead elms from alongside Highways 400 and 401. So naturally, being a northerner and a little bit parochial, I started to raise the dickens with the minister and officials of his department. So I thought we should be getting a piece of the action in northern Ontario. So we did. He put about 30 or 40 men to work building

privies in one provincial park. I think we hunted and got hold of two carpenters and he built—I think it is—about 20 double compartment privies in an area in Thunder Bay riding.

Mr. Lawlor: His special contribution to the north.

Mr. MacDonald: We have an expansive minister.

Mr. Stokes: He did, he built some privies for us in the north. I suspect they will be used by tourists from the south.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): It must have been a double holer.

Mr. Stokes: He also did—

Mr. MacDonald: One for every citizen in Moonbeam.

Mr. Stokes: He also did a little bit of line cutting on some proposed road that he is going to build. He did provide a little bit of employment as a result of some tree thinning and I think that the total amount of all the projects was in the neighbourhood of \$57,000 or \$65,000 out of the \$5 million that was spent across the province in a winter works programme. I could be a few thousand out, but I think that is about one per cent. I think that is what we received of that winter works programme.

I am just saying that for a minister who comes from the north I think that he could afford to be a little more parochial and see that a little more of the largesse that is passed around finds its way up to the north where it is so badly needed.

We do not have any elm trees to cut down, but I can stand here all evening telling the minister ways and means by which he can make those so badly in need of employment productive in a very useful way—a way that will accrue to the benefit of all of the people of the province. I suggest that one per cent of that amount is not sufficient.

I also notice that the minister mentioned an economic impact study which was undertaken in 1969 to discover the economic contributions that recreation and forest industry had made to local and provincial economy, particularly in provincial parks. That is Algonquin Park. I know that we are presently engaged in doing one for Quetico Park.

I suspect that the result of that survey and the master plan that the minister hopes to have for six provincial parks, including Algon-

quin, will, I hope, put him in a position to state the ultimate use to which all of the parks in the province will be put. I am speaking particularly of those parks that are of significant size, where the minister does think that a multiple-use concept is the realistic approach to the maximum and the best utilization of the resources within the confines of those parks.

As a member of the Quetico committee I think that it is becoming more obvious every day that more and more people are becoming concerned about the ultimate use of all of our large parks in the Province of Ontario. Certainly certain very vocal and avid conservationists across the province have focused attention on both of those parks.

It was heartening to hear the minister say that he had finally decided to make a primitive park out of Killarney. Hopefully he will come up with a determination for others, such as Lake Superior Park. I share the responsibility of coming up with a realistic long-range management plan for Quetico and we do hope that we will be able to give the minister some very good advice and guidance on that in the very near future.

I do have several other matters which I would like to bring to the attention of the House at this time. I think in closing though, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to mention the problem that I know has been bothering people in this department in northwestern Ontario and I know that it has been brought to the minister's attention. That is the problem of people who have squatted on Crown land without authority but, as they say, with the more or less tacit approval of certain people who were employed by The Department of Lands and Forests over the years.

I think that some of these cottages were burned down after giving notice to these people that they had so many days or hours, or a stipulated length of time to vacate the premises. Indeed, many of these cottages have been destroyed. There was such a furor over this that I think now the only way that camps can be destroyed is by a ministerial order.

I suspect there has been a moratorium on such orders in order for the department to assess the situation and come up with some way that we might be able to accommodate those people and, at the same time, protect the legitimate plans, present and future, for Crown lands.

I did some digging, Mr. Chairman, as a result of representations made to the minister

and his department, and to me personally, by the group that calls themselves the Wilderness Owners Protective Association. They do have a resolution that says the department should do certain things.

As a member of the recreation and land-use planning committee for four forest districts in the north, this has come up and I have come across an agreement that covered a similar situation. It was an agreement that was entered into between the Kimberly-Clark Corporation and certain other people who were squatting on Crown land along the north shore of Lake Superior—at Terrace Bay to be more specific.

After Kimberly-Clark had acquired this property there was the problem of what to do with the people who had these unauthorized cabins on what ultimately turned out to be private land. There is an agreement that they had entered into on December 30, 1948 which seems to have worked very well. It has been in effect for 23 years now and I would hope that the minister would take this into consideration and possibly give it very active study and I hope that it will satisfy both the department and the people affected. I understand there is upward of 500 people who stand to lose their cottages because they did not take the trouble of gaining tenure to this land before they decided to acquire one that was already there but had been abandoned by somebody else. I am going to send a copy of this over to the minister; hopefully he will take a look at it and it might solve the problem and keep peace on all sides and still protect the interests of the Crown.

With those remarks, I will close now, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister wish to reply?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I do not see that foul wolf bounty in these estimates. We take it that either it has been abolished or perhaps, I say depressingly, it has been overlooked. Does it still exist?

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the minister will cover that—

Mr. Stokes: It is still there.

Mr. Chairman: —but actually at this stage the minister is replying to the two leadoff speeches.

Mr. Sopha: I know that. I have just raised a point of order. There may be an error in

the estimates. I have looked it over four or five times and I cannot see it. I am merely optimistic.

Mr. Stokes: It is still there.

Mr. Sopha: Perhaps the minister would let me know.

Mr. Chairman: I really do not think that is a point of order. If the hon. minister wishes to reply to the hon. member's remarks—

Mr. Sopha: The minister might reply to it.

Mr. Chairman: The minister probably will.

Mr. Sopha: The point of order is is there a typographical error in the estimates?

Mr. Stokes: That is not an expenditure. That is a revenue, so it would not appear in the estimates.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure what the member is referring to.

Mr. Sopha: The wolf bounty that he pays out.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am sure we will come to that in the appropriate vote, Mr. Chairman. That will be on the last vote, I believe.

An hon. member: I want to vote for that one.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I think that is on the last vote, Mr. Chairman. Vote 1103, recreation programme.

Mr. Sopha: Good God, you do not call that recreation.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): The member will have to wait around.

Mr. Sopha: The point of order I want to raise is that it was always in the estimates, was always voted by the House. Where is it now?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the hon. member—and I sort of agree with him that it is more difficult to find the various items—this is a new way of presenting the estimates and it is under The Department of Treasury and Economics.

Mr. Sopha: Good heavens.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am sure if the hon. member would care to discuss it with me—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): The member for Sudbury has been crying wolf too often.

Mr. Sopha: I want to know when I am to make my speech in defence of the wolves. That is all I want to know.

Mr. Chairman: Well, perhaps under the section on wildlife resources, we might be able to squeak it in there.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House I would indicate that tomorrow I would anticipate we would return to the estimates of The Department of Agriculture and Food after the budget speech of the hon. member for Scarborough West, and we may attempt some second readings.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): May I ask the House leader—coming down, I heard on the CBC, with its infallible accuracy that the speech is to be given at 4:30 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is right.

Mr. Sopha: And we will deal with estimates up until 4:30?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And possibly some second readings.

Mr. Sopha: Fine.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I understand 4:30 is the hour which the CBC made for these arrangements.

Mr. Sopha: Are they pre-empting the children's hour?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know that I can answer that.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment, I wonder if the House leader could be perhaps a little more specific as to second readings, exactly what he has in mind. Is it the taxation statutes; or what is it he is going to deal with?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Second readings on the order paper!

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): That is a big help. There are quite a few of them.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) has one bill; and Bill 19, I think, I shall bring forward tomorrow. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) would like to get on with second reading of the bill which he introduced today, the bill respecting Metropolitan Toronto. I expect it will be printed tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at 10:28 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 3, 1971

Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Bruinelle	1151
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to	1174



ONTARIO

SEPT 1960

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

**(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We have many guests with us today. In the east gallery we have students from the Main Street School in Toronto and from the Belle River District High School of Belle River; in the west gallery, students from Woodland Centennial School of Dunbarton and from the Great Lakes Christian College of Beamsville. Also, in both galleries, we have students from the Waverley Drive School of Guelph.

A little later in the afternoon, in the east gallery, we will have students from St. Denis Separate School of Toronto, from the Ontario School for the Deaf at Milton and the Wm. E. Brown Senior School of Wainfleet.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE AND CONFERENCE ON NATIONALISM

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. Can he make available any correspondence with the government of Canada leading up to an agenda to be discussed at the constitutional conference in Victoria next month?

Second, will we hear from the government, before the conference, the stance that this administration will take in the areas to be discussed; and third, will there be an opportunity to discuss the government's position before the delegation leaves?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the three-part question:

Firstly, the correspondence with the federal government; there was a personal letter from me to the Prime Minister of Canada related to the federal-provincial conference. I cannot recall the exact phraseology; in that it was confidential it would not be appropriate in any event.

There will be no difficulty whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, in my outlining to the members of the Legislature at some later date but well in advance of the conference, the agenda and perhaps the position that Ontario will take as it relates to those items that are on the agenda.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, with the concurrence of the Leader of the Opposition, I have a very brief statement to make, in reply really to a question from the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis).

In the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, it was announced that my government would call an Ontario Conference on Economic and Cultural Nationalism to air a wide range of viewpoints and to put into perspective the many and diverse problems affecting the Canadian identity.

It is my intention to call this conference from June 23 to June 25 and the site selected is the Medical Science Centre at the University of Toronto.

A number of well-informed persons, prominent in the various fields of economic and cultural affairs, will be invited to address the conference. Two speakers will discuss each issue from different points of view, following which there will be a panel discussion—comprising the two speakers plus three additional knowledgeable persons—to discuss the various points raised. Concluding each panel discussion there will be an open question period from the floor.

I must stress, Mr. Speaker, that the whole purpose of the conference is to inform and educate and to ensure that the various views on this complex topic are heard and the issues fully considered prior to the formulation of government policies.

The Legislature will not be adjourned for the conference. However any interested member may attend if he so desires. The conference will be open to the news media so that the general public, sir, may have access to all of the varied ideas and viewpoints expressed.

It is imperative, Mr. Speaker, that a broad spectrum of opinion be represented at the conference. It is our intent to invite persons

who have the capacity to influence as well as reflect public attitudes. These will include businessmen, trade unions, all levels of government, the academic community, cultural groups and our young people.

It is the purpose of my government, Mr. Speaker, through this conference to provide a forum that will permit informed, full and frank discussions of the serious issues and alternatives facing all Ontarians and Canadians. Many of the philosophical issues concerning economic nationalism have been treated somewhat emotionally, and perhaps even irrationally, by a great many people. If we are to resolve our problems in the fast changing environment of today we must discuss the issues in balanced terms.

The pragmatic, realistic side must be measured against cultural erosion and the dream of Canadian nationhood, if we are to look at nationalism in perspective. A further look at the availability of capital and entrepreneurial, technological, managerial and even artistic resources are vital to an assessment of Canada's position. Unfortunately, little objective research has been devoted to these issues. They require further consideration and it is hoped that the conference can examine some of these areas, pursuing the discussion to a point where policies can be effectively reviewed.

While the precise conference agenda is still being formulated by the Ministers of Treasury and Economics (Mr. McKeough) and Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman), the conference themes will include the political and social alternatives to nationalism and continentalism, the costs of economic nationalism, the constitutional and legal aspects, and the possible future policies for Canadian industry and resources.

The issues to be raised, Mr. Speaker, at the Ontario Conference on Economic and Cultural Nationalism are vital. I am determined that we will be able to deal realistically with the costs of Canada exercising a higher degree of independent action in various fields.

I know the hon. members will join with me in looking forward to a productive conference leading to new approaches on complex issues touching upon every facet of our economic and cultural life.

Mr. Speaker: As the comments of the hon. Prime Minister constitute a statement, I will add six minutes to the question period.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I might put a supplementary question to the Premier on the topic I was discussing before he reverted the House to ministerial statements, can he make it clear as to whether or not the House will have an opportunity to discuss a specific position taken by the government on federal-provincial relationships before the conference in June? Will he, in fact, organize one of the standing committees to discuss constitutional matters on a broader basis and to discuss them with the government's advisers on constitutional matters to assist in the preparation of Ontario's position?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of the government to have a committee of the House—I forget the exact phrase that was used last year, a constitutional committee I believe—which will be dealing with this in a broad way prior to the conference in June.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): By way of supplementary, if I may Mr. Speaker, does the Premier yet know of whom the government contingent will consist? Does he know whom he is taking with him?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know some of those who will be going in June, Mr. Speaker. The total number and the names have not been finally determined yet. I shall inform the House just as soon as I can.

Mr. Nixon: I think he is wondering if there is room for one more.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Is the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson) going with the Premier?

Hon. Mr. Davis: He might make a very valid contribution.

Mr. Nixon: He will hold down the back of the plane.

Mr. Speaker, a further question on the Premier's statement: Has he received any communication from the other provinces as to their willingness to participate in the conference, the details of which he announced a moment ago?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there has been some indication of interest, but the other provinces have not been officially invited, so I cannot comment on that until we have sent them an invitation.

Mr. Lewis: It is quite a programme.

EVICITION OF OHTA PRESIDENT FROM HUMBERVALE APARTMENTS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the hon. Minister of Trade and Development: Is he going to reconsider the bailiff's eviction from Humbervale Apartments of the president of the Ontario Housing Tenants' Association? The eviction, I believe, has been occurring either today or will in the immediate future following a lengthy court case.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the circumstances. I will take the question as notice.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, perhaps you will not permit a supplementary on the basis that the minister is taking it as notice; but is he not aware of the discussions that have taken place in this House over a number of months concerning Michael Carson and the fact that, for no specific reason other than his activities on behalf of tenants, court cases have been brought against him by the minister's department?

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Shame!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I do not necessarily know. This is editorializing.

Mr. Nixon: It is not editorialization. The minister should be aware of that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, the Leader of the Opposition is editorializing. I am not familiar.

Mr. Trotter: A vicious act by government and the minister does not know about it in his department. An absolutely vicious act!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not familiar with the specific case the hon. member is talking about. He is talking about an order having been issued by a court. I would have to find out about that, Mr. Speaker. He has added some editorial matter as to what is being done—

Mr. Nixon: Incredible!

Mr. Trotter: It is incredible the minister does not know that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —for a special reason. If that is the case, there would have been an order issued. I will find out about it.

Mr. Trotter: It is factual. The bailiff is at the door.

Mr. Nixon: The judge said there was no reason.

Mr. Trotter: By way of supplementary question! How soon?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As soon as possible.

Mr. Trotter: How soon is as soon as possible when the sheriff is at the door?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Trotter: The minister is afraid to answer, I will bet anything.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I said as soon as possible.

Mr. Trotter: I will bet anything he knows the answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that the eviction is scheduled for 12 noon, tomorrow, will the minister give us his answer before the House adjourns today?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will do my best to do so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

SPADINA EXPRESSWAY DECISION

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: Can he tell the House what the status is of the appeal to the cabinet on the Ontario Municipal Board's decision to allow Metropolitan Toronto to proceed with the Spadina Expressway?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is still before cabinet.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Is the Premier concerned with the municipal board decision today which would permit Metropolitan Toronto to proceed with the acquisition of lands that are associated with other expressway construction in the Metropolitan area?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this has not been referred to the government. The matter before the government is the approval or otherwise of the Spadina Expressway.

Mr. Trotter: A supplementary question: Has the Prime Minister any idea when we will get an answer from the cabinet in regard to the Spadina Expressway?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Very shortly.

Mr. Trotter: Pardon?

An hon. member: How long is very shortly?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a further question of the Premier relating to the review of government policy: Can the Premier indicate to the House what type of review is being undertaken by the government—probably The Department of Municipal Affairs—on the present status of regional government with particular reference to the problems in the Niagara region brought to the attention of the province and to the attention of the government by the city of St. Catharines?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I attended very briefly a meeting with the mayor and council of St. Catharines along with the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales), the distinguished member for St. Catharines (Mr. R. M. Johnston) and, of course, the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch). That meeting commenced this afternoon—or at least this morning at about 11.30. I have not had a report on that meeting since that time.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: The Premier is not aware that any review of policy is being undertaken?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I stated, the council and the mayor of St. Catharines met with the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Minister of Education, and the member for St. Catharines relating to the problems of that municipality in the Niagara regional government. The meeting, I think, started roughly at 11.30 this morning.

FARM DEATH OF ONTARIO HOSPITAL PATIENT

Mr. Nixon: A question of the Minister of Health: Has he any information to impart to the House regarding the death of Elijah Sanderson who had been a patient in the Rideau Regional Hospital; particularly with reference to the indication from the coroner that the responsibilities of the department had been less than adequately fulfilled?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): No, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to report today. I undertook yesterday in re-

sponse to a question that the matter would be investigated.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

CONFERENCE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: In view of all the advance planning that has taken place for his conference on foreign investment, can he indicate to the House which speakers have so far been approached to represent the various interest groups he indicated in his tabling of the letter?

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Is Eddie Goodman going to speak?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would say at this moment that Mr. Goodman has not been invited to participate, but certainly if he determined to be one of those who wish to ask questions from the floor and so on—

Mr. Pitman: That is too bad; I hope he is there.

Mr. MacDonald: He has been moved from the head table.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How about Laxer?

Hon. Mr. Davis: A number of people have been contacted, Mr. Speaker, and when I have the complete list I shall let the hon. member know.

Mr. Lewis: Is the member for Don Mills (Mr. Randall) on the list?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, neither is the leader of the NDP, unfortunately—

Mr. Lewis: No, I understand that; but he is still in the Premier's party.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for Riverdale (Mr. J. Renwick) suggested that the NDP leader should be, and I really had to bypass that.

Mr. Lewis: That is unfortunate for us both.

An hon. member: I hope the Premier will ask Walter Gordon.

COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTRES

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I put a question of the Minister of Health?

Can the minister clarify for the Legislature the position of cabinet on the funding of

community health centres in light of his colleague, the member for Quinte's (Mr. Potter) remarks in Ottawa last week that the Ottawa Health Centre was unlikely to receive a grant but a private Belleville doctors' clinic would receive government grants?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I do not think that is an accurate report of the statement. I was at the particular meeting. Neither of these groups—Dr. Tulchinsky's group in Ottawa and the Belleville group—in my opinion can expect to receive cash grants or subventions directly.

What we are assessing at the moment in the department is whether or not some kind of system of loans could be developed that would be attractive enough to such clinics or community health centres so as to make them wish to use them later.

That is the situation at the moment, and I think in relation to any clinic or community health centre in this province at this particular time, I cannot encourage them to make application for direct cash subventions.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, when does the minister think a policy will be announced on this in view of those who are waiting for future prospects?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well I am not in any rush, Mr. Speaker, to announce policy on this. We have a couple of these community health centres in the province, as the hon. member knows, in Sault Ste. Marie and St. Catharines. Their viability, how well they work, how well they are supported, is still very much open to question, at least in relation to the St. Catharines one.

Therefore, before entering a programme, in other words one which would allow subvention to groups or clinics across the province, I think we will have to be very careful in assessing whether they are viable as presently organized and proposed, particularly by Dr. Tulchinsky's St. Catharines establishment and the one he is working on in Ottawa.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, because I am somewhat taken aback, the minister then is reassessing the very strong recommendations of the Ontario committee on the healing arts that community health centres in Ontario be a pattern for delivery of medical services in the province?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No I am not, Mr. Speaker. But I do feel that this year,

and for a number of years in the future, we should encourage these community health centres as a matter of experimentation, and I would very much encourage them so far as information and other advice and health is concerned. At the same time, I cannot suggest that the government be committed to a total programme of grant formulas giving direct capital assistance to them. So, on the one hand, I do not quarrel for a minute with the principle; as a matter of fact there are many signs that during this year we will have a dozen or perhaps a score of different types of clinics coming forward in the province, and as I say these will be very suitable for an experimental period of two or three years.

ADDITIONAL STAFF FOR DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Mr. Lewis: Another question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Health:

On page 14 of the budget announcement it is indicated that 332 additional staff members had been approved for The Department of Health, almost all of whom will be required to staff hospitals for the mentally retarded and the new school for retarded children at Picton. Is my information correct that 230 to 240 of those people in fact will be at Picton and have been authorized as of May 1, 1971, leaving less than 100 staff members for all the other Ontario Hospital schools in the province in the next fiscal year by way of additional complement?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I think the member is approximately right. I do not know whether it is 240 or 260, but the balance is approximately that.

Mr. Lewis: Then Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, are we to assume the problems of staffing that emerged around the Orillia hospital school recently, and which the minister indicated were true of Smiths Falls and other similar institutions, have in no way been resolved by government and that government will opt out of significantly increased staffing for the next fiscal year?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, there has been some amelioration but they certainly have not been resolved.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, may I assume from this that the minister himself is unhappy about the way in which the moneys are allocated for services to people in his department?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: My mood is hardly relevant to the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): We all agree there is not enough money.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I would suggest that I would be very pleased to go into this in depth and in detail when my estimates are before the House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

EXTRA POLICE COSTS FOR ROCK FESTIVAL

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Could the Attorney General tell us what success, if any, the government has had in collecting the sum of \$87,856.70 from Orange Productions Limited, being a firm that carried on a rock festival in Mulmur township late last summer, and against whom the government passed an order-in-council forcing them to enter into an agreement to put up this kind of a bond, and the former Attorney General indicated that they should pay this sum of money to the government for damages resulting from extra police costs?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to take that question as notice.

Mr. Singer: Could the Attorney General advise us whether or not he has any plans to bring under control rock festivals that might take place in this province this summer?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I think if the hon. member will be patient, government policy in this regard will be announced.

Mr. Singer: Yes, yes; definite as usual.

Mr. Trotter: We sure have to have patience, I say to the minister.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

DRUG-TAKING IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Health.

Could the minister indicate what kind of co-operative effort is being undertaken by his department and The Department of the

Attorney General and The Department of Education to try to understand and come to grips with the pressing problem of children being given and taking drugs in elementary schools?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I specifically have not met with my colleagues in their departments but, as far as I can recall, our three departments themselves are working together on this problem. For instance, the alcoholic centres are another field in which we have this overlap, so I cannot give any categorical answer this afternoon.

Mr. Deans: Might I ask if the minister would consider setting up a joint study group to try to come to grips with this difficulty, because there are more and more children, as he knows, who are being fed drugs who do not realize they are getting them until they have had them.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I can assure the hon. member this is certainly a matter of significant concern for the three of us and it will not be too long before I will be able to report some forward movement in this field.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

FURNITURE IN MINISTERS' OFFICES

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I have a question of the Minister of Public Works. Would the minister inform the House whether those chattels and furniture that adorn the offices of the ministers of the Crown are provided at public expense? And if they are, when the minister's office is furnished, does the property and the furniture vest in the minister?

The second question is, was there any damage done to the exchequer when his colleague on his right, the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko), recently sequestered all the furniture from the offices of the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Wells) when there was a cabinet shuffle, leaving him, it is said, with not so much as a paper clip?

Mr. Nixon: Is he still using an orange crate?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I will inquire about the first part of the hon. member's question. I happen to know something about the second part, dealing with my colleague, the

Minister of Social and Family Services; I was surprised to learn that the desk which he had removed from the office of the Minister of Social and Family Services was the one he had taken there from the Provincial Secretary's office when he went there some time ago. So it is now returned to its original spot.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They did leave paper clips.

Hon. Mr. Auld: There were two paper clips on the floor.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale.

SHORTAGE OF WELFARE FUNDS

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. Is the Premier still adamant in his policy to not assist Metropolitan Toronto or any municipality as a result of their shortage of funds because of the heavy welfare rolls?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the government's policy in this regard has not changed. As I read the press clippings today, they have made the approach to the federal government. The Minister of Social and Family Services is analysing the problem as far as this government is concerned at this moment; and certainly we have supported the Metro people as it related to their request to the federal jurisdiction.

Mr. Trotter: A supplementary question: Am I correct in assuming that no matter what the request of Metropolitan Toronto will be in this matter, they are going to be turned down, that it is really a wasted effort?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I guess the hon. member can assume that which he wants. The government has been requested to consider this and we will take a look at it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS EXCEPTED FOR PAYMENT

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I have a question in four parts, of the Minister of Health. Will the minister advise us why, under the private physiotherapy plan and regulations, physiothera-

pists are excepted for payment for treatment calls where they are not members of presently approved clinics and where patients, while not under home care, are unable to attend clinics where they exist?

Secondly, why are recent graduates of physiotherapy courses unable to open clinics and be approved for payment under OHSIP regulations?

Thirdly, why are the regulations not the same for the average and usually elderly citizen here as they are for the Workmen's Compensation Board patients, where full and higher payments are made to any physiotherapist as long as a medical doctor has prescribed treatment?

Fourthly, is it true that there are simply no funds available for these treatments when other paramedical care, such as chiropractic, has been approved?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I will not try to answer that seriatim, but in general may I make these comments.

Firstly, the reasons for these anachronisms relate to the history of the relationship between physiotherapy and the delivery of health services generally, in that physiotherapy grew out of the use of hospitals. The clinics themselves that we have in the province are really an extension or a satellite operation of the support that was given to physiotherapy as an emanation of the general hospital service.

Secondly, what the physiotherapists may be asking, and is implicit in these questions, is the establishment in this province of a total self-regulatory, full-fledged fee-for-service profession, hitched into OMSIP as the medical profession is. That question is much too large for me to jump at, certainly in the first few months that I may be in this portfolio. The obvious scope of such a development financially and upon our health delivery systems can be appreciated by the hon. members.

The other point with regard to the board—there never has been, as far as I know, any great degree of absolute consistency between Workmen's Compensation Board policies in relation to services in the paramedical field and those of either OMSIP, OHSIP or the OHSC.

Finally, it is not a direct question as to whether we have enough in the way of funds. As I mentioned earlier, the funding of a total physiotherapy fee-for-service system in this province would be extraordinary.

But the more important thing at the moment is, even if they were to be placed in that position I have no way of seeing at this minute how we could possibly control the costs and, from a statutory point of view, adequately control the profession. Therefore, it is in the works, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough.

STUDY OF COTTAGES ON MUSKOKA, KAWARTHA LAKES

Mr. Pitman: I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. I wonder if the minister would indicate whether any charges have been laid in the courts as a result of his department's activities and the activities of his colleague, the Minister of Health, in relation to a survey made of cottages on Muskoka lakes and on the Kawartha lakes last summer?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any charges that have been laid as a result of the surveys. It is quite possible that there may be one or two.

I am assuming the hon. member is referring to our septic tank survey inspection. I know that there were a number of corrective instructions or violation notices—whatever you want to call them—issued to some cottage owners. As far as I am aware, Mr. Speaker, those orders were carried out by the cottagers.

Mr. Pitman: If I might ask a supplementary: Is the minister prepared to carry out any direct followup to ensure that those instructions were carried out by the cottagers?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, Mr. Speaker, inspections were made of the cottages until the weather became inclement last year and surveillance was followed up by the local medical officer of health's inspectors in the various areas. At that time, of course, there were some problems regarding closed cottages. A lot of the cottages were closed and it was hard to find the owners. But these inspections will be followed up this spring, together with our 1971 programme of inspecting septic systems, mainly in the same area.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I could ask the minister one further supplementary? Is it

possible for cottage associations to secure a list of those cottages which were inspected and found faulty so that they themselves can carry on continuing surveillance of that particular lake system?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: First of all, Mr. Speaker, that would indicate some compliance or agreement to allow cottage associations to inspect individual septic systems. As the member knows, that arrangement would have to mean that the cottage owner would have to give permission to somebody else to enter his property. I do not think it would help the situation if we publicized the names of those cottagers.

I think, to get the co-operation of the cottage owners, it should be left with the government.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a further supplementary? Is the minister going to continue a surveillance every year on all lakes of Ontario? I am assuming that situation will be continued year after year.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, Mr. Speaker. What I mean is that in the areas that the government inspects, such as the Kawarthas last summer—and we will finish that area this summer, we hope—there will always be a followup in the event that a septic system is still faulty. If it is not corrected, there will be a followup. If it is corrected I would assume, at least for the time being, that particular cottage owner will be left alone. He will just be subject to the normal inspection that is carried out by the local medical officer of health staff in each area.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wellington South.

HOME PROGRAMME VEHICLE

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development. Can the minister tell us what plans he has for the future use of the large vehicle that is sitting in front of No. 10 highway garage in regard to the HOME programme? It has been sitting there for months and doing nothing. Can the minister tell us what his future plans are regarding this vehicle?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I did not know that there was a vehicle sitting outside any place up there. I will find out and get the information for the hon. member.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Ask the member for Don Mills. He will know.

Mr. Breithaupt: I thought that was the one the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Wishart) was going to repaint.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

CHRONIC CARE FACILITIES IN ESSEX COUNTY

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health.

An hon. member: Bring the Prime Minister back north with you.

Mr. B. Newman: In view of the acute shortage of chronic care facilities in Essex county, likewise in view of the comments of the local medical profession that acute care facilities are now used from 10 to 15 per cent of the time by chronic care patients; and in view of the fact that it will be eight to 10 years before Riverview Hospital can be incorporated into the IODE Memorial Hospital; and likewise, in view of the fact that a recent Riverview Hospital report says the institution's facilities are so inadequate and obsolete that the health and safety of its 250 patients are endangered—is the minister prepared to reconsider his decision and go on with the reconstruction or the provision for additional chronic care facilities in Essex county?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, may I ask that that be put on the order paper?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce; the hon. member for Lakeshore. Sorry.

NO-FAULT AUTO INSURANCE

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

A question of the Attorney General: What is the situation at the present time with respect to the committee on uniform legislation for the Dominion of Canada with regard to no-fault automobile insurance? That is the first part of the question.

The second part is: What is the situation with respect to this government as to the Attorney General's status on proposed policies for no-fault insurance?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I honestly do not know but I will find out for the hon. member and report back to him and to the House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

PORT DOVER LIFT BRIDGE

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): I have a question of the Minister of Highways and Transport. The Port Dover lift bridge is operational, is it not? What was the final cost of that bridge?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): If the Port Dover bridge has become operational, it has become operational very recently. I will have to get the information with respect to the cost for the hon. member.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Got a ticket on the raffle?

Mr. Gaunt: Who won the raffle?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

OSC FINDINGS

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs: As a result of the findings at the Ontario Securities Commission regarding the Osler firm, does the minister intend to see that charges are laid against Mr. McDermott?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): That matter is under consideration in the department.

Mr. Shulman: Will the minister inform the House?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If the government takes action, the hon. member will be well aware of it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex South.

U.S. ENGINEERS' VEHICLES

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): A question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management: Could the minister enlighten me as to where the caravan of vehicles belonging to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, travelling eastward from Essex and Kent

counties, was going yesterday? What type of work are they going to be doing in our province? What special arrangements have been made in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I will have to get that information from my department. I am not aware of that cavalcade.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

FARM MARKETING LEGISLATION

Mr. Sopha: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Justice. Can the minister tell us who will represent the government of Ontario at the hearing on May 31 before the Supreme Court of Canada with respect to the Manitoba marketing legislation? What will be the instructions given to counsel as to the position he shall take in that court by way of intervention on behalf of Ontario?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I shall be glad to provide the name and the instructions for the benefit of my hon. friend and the House.

Mr. Singer: When will it be?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Well, I think I can probably do it shortly. I was going to say tomorrow but I appreciate that the House is not sitting tomorrow—on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

TEACHERS' COURSES

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education. Did the Minister of Education announce that those teachers who are qualified to teach trainable retarded children under the authority of the regulations would be eligible for clear admission to summer courses sponsored by The Department of Education and winter courses conducted by school boards? If so, was this memorandum issued to various people in The Department of Education and to the various school boards, and will the course calendars be changed to make it clear that deemed qualified teachers are not being discriminated against? And will the deemed qualified teachers be granted certificates for courses successfully completed previously?

Hon. R. Welch (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice and I will be very happy to get all the answers for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE FUNDS

Mr. Nixon: A question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Was he consulted by the Minister of Education, or the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), before the decision was taken to cut off funds in support of the community college adjuncts in Woodstock and Simcoe, associated with Fanshawe college with special agricultural courses?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there was some discussion within the government and I believe between the Minister of Agriculture and Food and the Minister of Education. In my prior capacity as Minister of Education I had discussed this matter with the then and now Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Is it tacitly understood then that the Premier approves of the decision to close down these community college facilities?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of closing down community college facilities. It is a rationalization of the courses to be offered compared to those at Ridgetown and the determination by The Department of Agriculture and Food that some of them can be more effectively given there.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question, just so that there will be no misunderstanding: Is there some possibility then that these facilities that have been in operation will continue to be operational since he says they will not be closed down?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it depends on whether or not there are certain course offerings that it would make sense to offer within those communities.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: I am afraid that is still not clear for those people in my constituency who are specifically concerned. The Minister of Agriculture and Food said that as of May 15 there would be no more funds and therefore they will be closed down.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this relates to a decision by the Treasury Board. Certain priorities have to be established. Whether

or not there can be other course offerings within those two municipalities, not necessarily related to agricultural courses, will have to be determined.

Mr. Singer: Can the Premier not answer anything directly?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I can. The member does not understand.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Ask a simple question.

Mr. Singer: The question is simple; it is always the answer!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

REDUCING HOSPITAL COSTS

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health regarding methods of reducing hospital costs. Is the minister publicizing or promoting the new inexpensive non-mechanical artificial kidney device that has been developed at the University of Maryland, a device which is used at home, requiring no fluid and no blood pumps, for a cost of about \$250?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I will have to take that as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

STUDENT HOUSING RENT REBATES

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): I have a question of the Minister of University Affairs, Mr. Speaker, who is not in his chair. Would he look into the reason why students in married quarters, living in housing built by the Student Housing Corporation on the campus of the University of Western Ontario, can get rent rebate from the municipality while students living in married quarters on the University of Waterloo, in housing built by the Student Housing Corporation and situated on the university campus, are not able to get rent rebates because it is on university land?

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Minister of Trade and Development will be glad to get that information.

Mr. Good: No, I asked that department and they do not know anything about it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

ALCOHOLISM IN THE PROVINCE

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): A question of the Minister of Health: Has the minister accepted the findings of the director of research for the Addiction Research Foundation, on the reliance by wineries in the Province of Ontario for their sales on purchases by alcoholics; secondly, on the relationship between the general consumption of alcohol and the incidence of alcoholism in the province?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I believe I have done nothing more than read the same press reports that my friend has. I am speaking here as a layman, but I think that the problem is probably much broader than that outlined from purely the medical point of view as it appeared in the press.

Perhaps at some other time with more backup advice for me, I could debate this in detail.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale.

DETOXIFICATION CENTRE PROGRAMME

Mr. Trotter: I have a question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker.

Does the Attorney General intend to change the system of arresting people who are charged with being drunk by taking them to detoxification centres or drunk farms?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: This is a question that the new government is making a very serious attempt at investigating—the whys, the wherefores, and also the required funds for such an expanded programme.

Mr. Trotter: By way of a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, is the present Attorney General aware that we have been promised the government was going to do something like this ever since Kelso Roberts was Attorney General? When are they going to do something?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, the present Attorney General is aware that this present government only took office on March 1.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order; The hon. member for High Park.

OISE BUILDING

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker.

Who is responsible for the fact that when the library of the new OISE building was built, no facilities were put in for lighting? And is the minister aware that a ceiling that had to be ripped out as a result had won an award before it was ripped out?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I did not know that the building won a prize for something. So, to answer the second question, I did not know that. I did not know about the lights either and I will make it my business to find out about both.

Mr. Nixon: It is the most expensive building in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

ODC LOANS TO SERVICE INDUSTRIES

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Trade and Development: When does the minister intend to announce the details of loans to service industries in the Ontario Development Corporation which were announced in the Speech from the Throne?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Probably this week.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

USE OF FRENCH
AT INFORMATION CENTRE

Mr. MacDonald: A question of the Prime Minister: Is the Prime Minister in a position today to inform us as to why the government information centre in Cornwall for most of the year cannot give information in French in an area that is predominantly French?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have asked for that information and I expect I will have it for Thursday afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

AIR POLLUTION IN TORONTO

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, if I could manoeuvre around

the member for High Park. Is the minister prepared yet to table the list of Toronto industries that are polluting the Toronto air? He promised that several days ago.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is talking about the industries under the air pollution index they were tabled.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary: The minister just tabled a list of those that were ordered to desist. How about the list of those that are in fact polluting?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, that would take six to eight months to compile.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, can I gather from the minister's last reply that he does not know which industries in Toronto are polluting?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I know exactly which ones are polluting. We are aware of them.

Mr. Singer: Well, if the minister knows exactly, why can he not table now a list of all of those which are polluting?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That can be done, but as I say it will take some time to compile that list.

Mr. Pitman: Send the member the telephone book.

Hon. E. Dunlop (Minister without Portfolio): Very good! Send him the telephone book.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: First of all we would want the hon. member's definition of the word pollution.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: My question was answered, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

EXPRESSWAY LAND PURCHASE

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Highways.

Why, in the buying of land for the E. C. Row Expressway in Windsor, are real estate agents being used to persuade the people to sell?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I have to suggest to the hon. member that he pursue that with the government of the city of Windsor, because the land acquisition programme in instances of that kind is undertaken by the municipal authorities.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Inasmuch as The Department of Highways is paying 75 per cent of the cost, does the minister know whether this cost was in the original estimates?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would have to assume, Mr. Speaker, that The Department of Highways knew that was in the cost. It does not always fall, incidentally, that it is any more or less expensive to buy directly or buy through real estate agents. The fee for such a service is usually charged to the seller.

Beyond that detail—

Mr. Bullbrook: It is added on to the sale price.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —I cannot explain it to the hon. member because, as I say, the authorities who are in charge of these ventures are the municipal partners. I can only assume that the department was aware of the cost and found it to be satisfactory.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, if the fee is a cost to the seller, that means that the money he receives for selling his property to the expressway is going to be that much less.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, that is quite true. But if he is satisfied in net terms, I suggest that it is no real problem.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that today the House rise for the dinner interval from 5:30 p.m. until 8:30 p.m.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills. The hon. member for Dovercourt.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. De Monte moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act amending The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for monthly payments to the widow of a workman killed in an industrial accident of 70 per cent of the average earnings of the workman. The bill further provides for a minimum compensation to an injured workman of at least 85 per cent of his average weekly earnings during a time of temporary total disability.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 17th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD (concluded)

Mr. Chairman: Page 26, vote 105.

On vote 105, item 2:

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Chairman, when the House rose on Friday last I was in the process of talking to the minister about a situation at Woodstock and Simcoe involving the closing of the Fanshawe agriculture courses at Woodstock and Simcoe.

Since that particular time the people in that community have expressed their concern over what is termed a real reaction throughout not only the Oxford county area, but also the surrounding counties of Perth, Waterloo, Brant, Elgin and Norfolk.

I want to read to the minister what the then Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) said when he introduced the bill to establish schools in May, 1965. The main essence of the establishment of the colleges of applied arts and technology was this—and I read this from the transcript in Hansard:

As for the programme, our plans are not yet advanced to the point where I can be specific and definite. Besides, the emphasis not only could but should—and I underline that should—vary from one community to another as local needs dictate. In general, however, one may recognize three major responsibilities of every such college:

1. To provide courses of types and levels beyond or not suited to the secondary school setting.
2. To meet the needs of graduates from any secondary school programme, apart from those wishing to attend university.
3. To meet the educational needs of adult and out-of-school use, whether or not they are secondary school graduates.

I would hope to see the following range of offerings in most if not all colleges of applied arts and technology, the choice—and I underline this—to be determined by local circumstances as indicated above and extended where a particular need exists in a community.

It lists the various categories, and (d) category happens to be agricultural and agricultural-related programmes, at least in rural areas, in co-operation with The Department of Education.

So that sort of sets out the format of the concept of the farm management courses that were offered in Woodstock, the satellite of Fanshawe, and at Simcoe. Since Friday, I might mention to the minister—and I want to be sincere and fair about this because I really think that he has overlooked something that is very important—the warden of the county has made a statement which is quite strong. The mayor of the city of Woodstock has also made a very strong statement attacking the proposed closing, and the two governors who are representatives on the board of governors for the Oxford area have both complained very bitterly about it because they feel it has and is providing something that cannot be provided at the other schools.

The minister has said that it is a complete duplication. Yesterday afternoon at 3 o'clock the people who became so concerned about this particular problem called a meeting, and last evening 181 people came to the Fanshawe college at Woodstock and I was asked to be present. It was a very significant group of people who felt very strongly about the closing of this particular setup of buildings there.

I might mention to the minister—and he knows perfectly well—that this operation which was previously an old county home has beautiful buildings, beautiful grounds, and was almost given to the college for \$7,500, as was mentioned by the warden last night. He said: "You know, if we had sold it to them for \$200,000 they would never have closed it, but we did this to try and help and get the thing off the ground."

Last evening the people there—including 61 students—were asked how many of them would have gone to another college if they had had the opportunity. And out of the 61 only two said that they would have been able to go to another college, and another two said that they would consider. So out of the 61 only four could have availed themselves of another institution.

So it left 57 people that the community feels they are helping to provide a farm management course and a course in relationship to people that would not have been provided to them otherwise. This is something that I hope the minister will take heed of.

A large petition was sent around and signed by a large number of them. I want to read the comments that were voiced by the students. As they wrote their names down they wrote a little item beside each one just to show how strong they feel about the whole setup. I will just read these in the order they were on the list.

One said: "Our son started at Ridgetown and transferred to Fanshawe because Ridgetown did not offer the course required. Fanshawe does. It serves the local boys who under no circumstances can get away to residential colleges."

These are all individual items, I might say.

Another one said: "I can go to Fanshawe and do not need a high-school diploma."

A present student said: "I can live at home. This college gives more practical work than anywhere else."

The next student: "Good practical course, close to my home, permits me working at home and going to school."

The next student: "A lot of students will go to Fanshawe that would not go to any other school."

The next student: "It is more satisfactory for students to commute to agricultural college and be able to work at home on the home farm."

Here is one from a very fine person whom I know, a lady who has lost her husband and has two sons: "I had one son who graduated from Fanshawe agricultural course, and one son just finished his first year. I think the course should continue."

Here is another one, mother of a son and daughter who have attended the courses and feel it should be continued in this community: "I am a graduate student of this school and am now taking responsibility for the farm and feel much credit is due to the course given. Therefore I feel strongly that it should be definitely continued."

Here is another one, from the father of a son who completed his first year and has received excellent guidance in down-to-earth farm operations: "I feel strongly that the school should be carried on."

"I heard of Fanshawe agricultural college and enjoyed the course immensely. The course at Fanshawe is down to earth, realistic and very, very useful." That is from a member of county council, also connected with students who have taken a course here at Fanshawe.

Here is another member of county council: "Very concerned due to local participation."

Another member: "Fanshawe fills a definite need in the district. This course allows us, the students, to get practical experience in farming. This course gives students the facts, not any side dressing. The practical applications of this course are beneficial and will be of extreme value upon graduation."

Another one: "This course, I feel, is a great asset to the community and allows those who are unable to leave home to get an education."

Another one: "Also it can be applied the same day as you learn it. The practical aspect is great and directs itself to farming."

So those are some of the comments that have been expressed by the people who gathered last night in the number of 181. They feel very concerned about it; they feel this has done a very down-to-earth job for the people who are concerned. As I mentioned, I said, with the greatest respect, that I am very certain that a large percentage of these students would in no way go anywhere else. This is what really concerns me. I do differ with the minister on this concept, because it is so true that these students would in no way go anywhere else. I certainly appeal to him, please, for \$70,000. Lord heavens if we cannot save that somewhere else in this large budget to help out 40 students each year, there is something wrong with this government.

I kid you not, Mr. Chairman, I am serious that these county councils, the chamber of commerce, the city of Woodstock; and likewise the complement of the same three groups in every area surrounding feel the same way. I would like to send the minister over the copy of this petition, but I think it is going to be presented to him if he will see fit to see these people. Apparently, they are currently in the process of hoping that they can have an audience with him and the Minister of Education and, I hope, the Minister of University Affairs. I hope that the minister will accept them because they are a most sincere group. I have a copy of the petition here, but I think they will be presented to him in a more formal way. I have a photostat of them all.

I want the minister to know that the people in that area are really up in arms. I appeal to the minister to use his good offices and good judgement to reverse this decision because, if he does not, I can tell him that this school is going to carry on. If it has to

carry on through funds that are going to be raised by the taxpayers who are currently overtaxed and are paying educational taxes, it is not going to sit too well with the people in my area. I have pleaded with the minister and I hope we will see fit to cut somewhere else if he has to cut. If this government cannot afford \$70,000 to operate these two schools which have done such a good job, I think it is time they moved over.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): They should take the \$70,000 out of their \$1 million PR propaganda budget.

Mr. Chairman: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I want to join with my colleague from Oxford with perhaps some more specific information on the Simcoe agriculture school that is associated with Fanshawe. I had the good fortune and the honour to address the student body down there. To set the Minister of Agriculture and Food's mind at ease, he knows that William Knowles, member of Parliament for Norfolk, representing the Conservative Party, is on the board of the school and I know has addressed the students as well.

I do not think the idea is that we go down there to talk politics but simply to talk about the role of government in the farm community. I was very impressed at the initiative of the students in having the local politicians attend to give them our views on not only legislation pertaining to agriculture but tax reform, regional government—the sort of things that they as young farmers working day-to-day on their dads' farms or on the farms of relatives in the community, would be dealing with. The minister knows that these farmers, practical dirt farmers, are certainly concerned with tax levels as much as anyone. They would be the first to congratulate the minister if the saving of these funds would, in fact, be of any assistance to the agricultural community.

I think the member for Oxford has pointed out quite clearly and explicitly this is not the way it is seen. It is seen as false economy indeed and another pressure tending to direct the young people away from their own communities so their work on the farm scheme is lost. In the views of a good many they are not going to have the kind of education that is going to be directed along their specific needs.

The Simcoe school, I think, emphasizes the local kind of agriculture. They do concern themselves, of course, with farm management in a general sense, not exclusively tobacco or dairying or anything like that—I see from the list of local citizens who have taken part even beyond the local agricultural rep, who I think took a major role in the course along with the staff that was there from time to time and on a regular basis. I felt the course was a good one and I was most impressed, I would say, with the initiative and the healthy outlook of the young men who were taking part in these studies.

I was quite interested in the minister's comments on Friday when he said that the original concept was to provide practical agricultural training for, let us say, mature farmers who, with time off during the winter and slack times, could come in and have some special short courses. I am not prepared to say that the school concept is a bad one since it seems to have emphasized the opportunities that have been made available for the last few years now to the young men who, for a number of reasons, cannot leave home or feel that they cannot leave home to avail themselves of the opportunities at Guelph, for the diploma course, or at Ridgetown for a similar course, or even at Centralia.

I was also interested in what the member for Oxford said when he quoted specific references from the students. Some of the references that were given to me by students who came to see me over the weekend on this issue and others who have contacted me by telephone and by letter were maybe a bit heated because of the circumstances. I found that many of them said that among their classmates, there was practically none—very few, if any, who were prepared or could, in their own decision, leave their responsibilities at home and go away to an agricultural course which would require living in Ridgetown, or Guelph, or Centralia.

I was quite struck by the attitudes that were expressed by even the parents. In at least one case, one son had gone to the diploma course in Guelph—beautiful campus, great facilities—a course that has been established for a long time; but in comparing the advantages to a young man who is prepared to go back on to the farm or continue his responsibilities on the family farm—at least in one very forcefully put view where there was direct family comparison—there was the decision that the practical work, the course content at the school at Woodstock, was

very superior to what was offered at the diploma course in Guelph.

The feeling was that over the years there had been a broadening—and I do not deny the generally valuable aspect of a broad education—of the course at Guelph to the detriment of the practicality of the course which is designed not to be a liberal arts education for all—the value that such an education must have—but to be of specific practical application to these young men who want to know about farm management, feeds, fertilizers, tax concepts, the responsibilities for establishing a farm estate, corporations, all of these things, and they want that in the shortest possible time, in the most specific possible way.

The course at the Woodstock school I think is especially valuable, since I am informed that there is attractive land of about 100 acres, I believe, in association with the school and that the first-year students are even now in the process of putting in a crop, or at least the decision is being postponed waiting for the results of the government's deliberation. This is the sort of work surely that would provide the experimental aspect to what these young men are doing on a practical level in their own home situation.

I would agree with the member for Oxford and others who have spoken on this, that surely with the funds under consideration the minister might do well, at the very least, to put the schools on probation for an additional year; that it is easy to find places in the budget where this \$70,000 could be found. The member for York South has suggested that the advertising campaign on Ontario: "Is there any place you would rather be?" could very readily have supplied that fund and left another \$700,000 left over to do the advertising that the government has felt is necessary over the years.

There is \$3 million that has been allocated to the duplication of licensing facilities on the basis of the government programme that has been so substantially under criticism in recent weeks.

I hesitate to raise this because I feel there might still be an opportunity for the minister opposite to reconsider a decision which I think has been entered into on faulty advice. Surely this is the kind of conservation of tax money which is not in the best interest of the farm community? The minister knows the farmers are more sensitive than any other group. They carry a heavy load for education costs already—an inordinately unfair and

heavy load for education costs. They would be prepared to examine carefully any proposal that would cut these costs. I believe the minister is making a mistake.

I hope there is nothing that has been in the evidence, or the information put forward from this side or from any other source, that would preclude the possibility of a reconsideration. Surely this is an area where reconsideration is called for. We are here discussing the specific expenditures of this department and the minister in co-operation with The Department of Education, at the present time—soon to be in co-operation with The Department of University Affairs—has the say-so, I would say not only on the establishment of special education facilities for farmers but the continuation of these facilities.

The minister knows of the pressure in many areas of the community to extract this responsibility from him and from his department. And if he is prepared to abandon this experiment—and it has been a successful experiment; at least it has not been proved otherwise—then surely he is going to abdicate the kind of responsibility that I know he, as Minister of Agriculture and Food, has fought to maintain so that this department, which historically has had a responsibility for special education in the farm community, is not going to be precluded from the continuation of that responsibility. Certainly he would get support on this side if he would move to the continuation of the schools. I do not believe that the possible saving of \$70,000 is going to be merited on an examination of what is being offered and what it means to the agricultural community in Oxford and Simcoe and the surrounding counties.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister to know that many people in my area are concerned about the proposed closing of the Fanshawe course on farm business management. I was not aware that we have so many in Waterloo county attending that course, but there has been flak ever since the announcement was made last Thursday in the Legislature and the announcement hit the fan. There were phone calls the next day right up to noon today. I have been getting phone calls asking what can be done to ask the minister to intervene and do something so this course not be changed.

I think the key to the whole thing is that we have a need being served here in a localized area and, as mentioned by the member for Oxford, this was the prime purpose of the course in a community college setting.

The entrance requirements at Ridgetown, for example, I understand, do not admit mature students over 19. The entrance requirements would preclude some students who are eligible to go to the Fanshawe course from entering the Ridgetown course. If the closure of this college is nothing more than to get all farm education courses under the agriculture education and research division and out of the community college, then I would say that is not a valid reason for closing this school.

The community college there, according to these people who have phoned me, is serving a tremendous need in a localized area of about five or six counties. The minister says duplication is one reason for the closing. We have duplication all across the province in other areas, but we would not expect a student in high school to attend a school somewhere other than in his vicinity. Because of that, we have students attending high school.

As an example, the Waterloo-Oxford High School, the secondary school there, gives courses suitable to that area, which is a farming community—courses that are not given 15 miles away in the Kitchener-Waterloo collegiates. And there we have on a broader scale the same situation, where farmers' sons and daughters in the area surrounding the Woodstock campus of Fanshawe are being served.

From my information, practically all of these students return each day to their homes to carry on their normal farming duties before school and after school and in the off-school season and between the first and second years. When they are at the school, they are getting a practical knowledge of farming not available in many other areas.

These students, I am told, go out almost daily to the best farms in the area. Believe me, there are good farming units in that particular part of Ontario.

An hon. member: The best!

Mr. Innes: Hear, hear!

Mr. Good: What they are gaining here is not a highly technical education in agriculture as that of Guelph, but let us bear in mind—

Mr. Innes: Hear, hear!

Mr. Good:—that fewer than 10 per cent of the graduates of Guelph ever end up in actual farming operations.

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. Good: They are in allied operations such as the feed business or somewhere else. But here we have a need being served to actual people who are engaged as tillers of the soil and the growing of produce.

Mr. Innes: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): And outstanding in the field.

Mr. Good: This is something that is serving a tremendous need. If this programme has been developed by accident, I would say so much for the good. The department should learn that here it has something which has community acceptability, and the very fact that the community is so worked up over the proposed closing of it, I would say, should lead the minister to believe that the government has here one of the most successful experiments—at one of the least costs probably—of any course that has ever been offered.

As this party has said before, the \$70,000 expenditure that was given in the newspaper headlines as the main reason is absolutely not valid. I could mention half a dozen other costs that are greater than that which should have been cut out years ago in the training programmes of this government across from us.

May we, as opposite members, and as members whose ridings are being affected—and the students of this college all live in the ridings, one might say, of members here in the House this afternoon—may we ask that the minister give very serious consideration to the continuation of this programme? Not only the continuation of it but the expansion of it into other parts of the province so that the basic fundamentals and rudiments of farming in its practical sense can be continued for the students who need it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Middlesex South.

Mr. K. C. Bolton (Middlesex South): Mr. Chairman, I should like to speak on the same issue; the continuation of the community colleges. It has been suggested that the closing of these colleges is based on the need to save money and the need to avoid duplication. It would help in reaching a decision about this if the minister could tell us in what way there is duplication?

I would like to ask him how many students from the agricultural colleges at Guelph, Ridgeway and Centralia really return to the farm from which they came, or go on to a farm of their own? How many of them, because of the nature of their education, are diverted into related agricultural interests—such agribusiness ventures as feed supply, fertilizer companies and operations of that nature?

Would the minister not agree that a very high percentage of those who go to receive agricultural training should return to the family farm to improve the quality of agricultural effort in their own community? If the minister is really assured that the existing colleges provide that kind of training, that sort of emphasis, then I would be interested to hear that from the minister's own lips.

Also, it was suggested in the minister's reply recently that these other colleges were quite easily available to all students who wished to receive agricultural training. Yet it does seem rather clear that a community college provides the chance for a man to maintain his family responsibility, to attend the school and still look after the farm. I am quite certain, without knowing Oxford county in detail, that there are many young men who could not simply pack up, leave the farm and take a course.

I recognize there must be an avoidance of duplication; there must be the saving of money. But there are two ways of looking at the use of money. One is the saving of it. The other is the wise use of it. If the saving of \$70,000 is going to mean that a fair number of young men are deprived of the chance of really first-class practical training, then it would seem that \$70,000 would not be saved. So much an investment would be wasted. In other words, the failure to use the \$70,000 might be the saving of \$70,000 and the loss of great potential from our young men who require this training and could benefit from it.

So, when the minister answers the questions posed, I would like him to give us an indication of his own view as to whether or not Guelph, Ridgeway and Centralia really meet the total need for agricultural education or whether or not there is a place for a community college like the ones that we are referring to.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a comment or two in this regard. I, of course, would like to echo the comments made by the member for Oxford. I also, in my riding, have several students attending these courses, and these

names are on the list mentioned by the previous speakers.

Mr. Chairman, I am most interested in this particular school pertaining to farm business management, as I am a great believer in the continuance of small business and I consider a family farm very closely connected and considered to be a small business. Because of this, I will join my colleagues in strongly recommending that these schools continue in connection with the Fanshawe College. By discontinuing this expenditure of \$70,000 we are certainly discouraging studying or discouraging the opportunity for these young people to continue in the business of farming.

I would just like to say that, to me, a farm business management course, as conducted at these schools at present, must continue to operate if we are to have co-ordination of actual farming on a small-scale basis.

Mr. Chairman, I have to go along completely in support and hope that the minister will reconsider his decision.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to my friends in the opposition parties defending the right of the further expenditure of \$70,000 in one particular school and that is the school at Woodstock, which is a satellite of the Fanshawe community college located in London.

There is no one who could agree more than I with what has been said on the validity and the wisdom of the course. It is a delight to hear the kind words that have been expressed regarding the quality of the education provided, because the education provided in this particular course is planned, directed and taught by members of the staff of the Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food, working out of Ridgeway on a loan basis to Fanshawe college. So we appreciate those sentiments that have been expressed.

Might I suggest that it is difficult indeed for me to rationalize how the opposition can be so incredibly critical of the government's expenditure in money used for education in this province and then turn around and, where it suits their political purpose, recommend the expenditure of additional money such as this.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Educational frills.

Mr. Nixon: The minister started and we will be at it for a while.

Mr. Innes: Be fair—

Mr. Nixon: There is \$1.7 billion to spend on education.

Mr. Innes: Be fair to the children in this province.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I listened to everything that was being said by my friends opposite and said nothing in reply. Now, I hope they will do me the same favour.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, we will say what we like.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The hon. member said that this was \$70,000 in this particular school. Multiply that by 50 counties and districts across the Province of Ontario and you have got \$3.5 million, if my mathematics are right.

This is what can happen and I suggest to my hon. friend that not only is the board of Fanshawe college interested in continuing this school, but they want to place a similar school in every county served by that college.

We have other community colleges across the length and breadth of Ontario and are now demanding that the same course be offered in their particular counties as is offered on this experimental basis at Woodstock.

Mr. Good: This serves seven counties.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This serves seven counties. But does my hon. friend from Waterloo realize that his own Conestoga college wants to establish the same kind of course in the county served by his school?

Mr. Good: They do not need it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, yes they do, because they are out now asking how many students would be interested in coming to that school.

Mr. Nixon: Does not the minister think the farmers should have this kind of service?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I told the member on Friday that it was I who worked with Fanshawe college in developing this as an experimental programme for adult farmers. That was the intent and the purpose of it.

Mr. Nixon: And it is the minister who is removing the funds.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is what happened when it was established. The fact of the

matter is that the average age of the students at Fanshawe college agricultural course is the same as that in the other schools. And for the hon. member for Waterloo North to stand up and say that the requirements at Ridgetown preclude the acceptance of students over 19, simply indicates he does not know the facts. Because that is not a fact and if you have been sold that bill of goods and you have bought it hook, line and sinker, obviously you do not know what is really going on. I suggest you learn before you get up and make those kind of statements in public.

Mr. Good: The education requirements are different at Ridgetown than they are at Fanshawe.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We do not believe nor accept that to be the case, and I defy you to prove to me one single case where that has happened. Now there could be an isolated case where a student has been accepted in one school and not in another one—

Mr. Nixon: Not too sure of yourself.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —and vice versa. But the same course and requirements were established right through the piece. This is something that my hon. friend cannot deny, because I have gone into that very definitely.

Mr. Good: If my research is incorrect, I stand to be corrected. The only point you have made up to now—

Mr. Nixon: Well, he is not sure of that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The hon. member for Middlesex South asked how many returned to the farms. Roughly over 50 per cent of all the students in the various agricultural colleges—that is in the diploma courses—returned to the farms as actual farm operators, farm managers, helpers on farms, what have you.

Most of the balance of the students graduating each year from those courses go to the agri-business community. And I think that in that particular area they are serving the agricultural interests about as well as anyone can expect students to do. There certainly is not room for all those students to go back to the farms from whence they came. Some of them have to find alternative opportunities of employment. But it seems to me that when they are going to the agri-business community they are serving a very useful purpose in the continuing development of agriculture in this country.

I am amazed at the fact that all of the hon. members opposite have stood up and said, "Well we have got several students coming from our particular county or our riding attending the Fanshawe college." Let me say, Mr. Chairman, there were only 40 students in total attending the Fanshawe college at Woodstock.

Mr. Innes: In one year.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In one year. In total in one year. Now how many does that really represent from each of the counties? My hon. friend from Perth stands up and says, "Several students from my riding are attending that college." I am not denying they are. How many really are coming from Perth to this school? And then are we to establish a similar school in Perth county?

Mr. Good: You do not need it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is the question I have to ask, my hon. friend, you say you do not need it. Am I to say that there is not to be a school in Perth county? Am I to say that?

Mr. Good: You do not need it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You do not need it? Then you are saying that you do not need a school in Perth county?

Mr. Nixon: He is saying that closing the one in Oxford—is that a solution to that? You are wiping the slate clean. You are just evading your responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: But the hon. Leader of the Opposition has to recognize, Mr. Chairman, despite his stampeding over there, the fact that when you permit one county to have a school you have to do that for every county.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is just as axiomatic as it can be. This is what happens.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Do you think the solution is to close the whole thing?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Now as far as I am concerned, I did not make the decision to close the Fanshawe College, as my hon. friends opposite are suggesting I did. I did not make that decision. I simply suggested to the Treasury Board in the determination of the budget, that as far as I was concerned there was available space for all the students

to be absorbed in the community colleges, in agriculture at Fanshawe and Simcoe without any difficulty whatever in the present accommodations which we now have, both at Ridgetown and Centralia.

Mr. Innes: If they would attend.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If they would attend.

Mr. Innes: But they will not.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend says they will not attend. Let me go into this if I may—and Mr. Chairman, surely I have the right to be heard in this House on our side of the argument. I listened to theirs and never interrupted once.

When the course was established one of the people came to us and said: "Look; I just have to have this school here if my boy is going to get a chance to attend agricultural college. We have got to have him at home on the farm. If you have this school established at Woodstock, this boy will be able to attend an agricultural college and pick up his diploma in agriculture, because we need him at home on the farm. I cannot afford to let him go off to Ridgetown or anywhere else to get this course."

The boy could hardly wait until graduation day to take a job in another county—as soon as he graduated. Who are we to believe? Are we to believe that this boy's services were so indispensable to that farm that he could not afford to take five months in the winter of two years to attend a residence class at Ridgetown or at Guelph or at Kemptville?

Mr. Good: He would not have gone if he had.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: But you see just as soon as he got the advantage of attending that course in Woodstock for two years, he was not needed on the farm at all. Away he went.

Mr. Innes: That was not an advantage; that was a privilege.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Away he went to another place. Now are we to believe that it was so essential; that that is the case? These are the things that have to be taken into consideration when we are trying to determine how best to economize and save money. To me, it is interesting to hear our hon. friends opposite say: "Spend \$70,000 at Woodstock. Spend \$70,000 in every district and county across this province on this course," because I suggest—

Mr. Nixon: The hon. minister is saying he does not believe what the farmers tell him. He does not believe them.

Hon. Mr. Stewart:—Mr. Chairman, to my friends opposite that if they say that this course—

Mr. Good: Take the car off the road back and forth to Muskoka.

Hon. Mr. Stewart:—is to continue at Woodstock, we have to say that it is right and fit and proper for every community college in Ontario to establish the same kind of an agricultural course.

If that is what we want—my hon. friend from Oxford says, "Oh, no, that is not it; just give it to me; give it to my people in Oxford and Woodstock—"

Mr. Nixon: They have it now. We are saying, "Do not take it away."

Hon. Mr. Stewart:—"but say 'no' to everybody else."

But you want to say, "Discriminate against the rest of Ontario." That is what my friend from Oxford is saying.

Mr. Nixon: Nonsense! Absolute nonsense! The minister is abdicating his responsibilities. He is saying wipe it out, and then he is saying it is not his responsibility, that he does not decide it. He is like Pilate—washing his hands.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The continuance of the course is not my responsibility. I simply said the space was available.

Mr. Nixon: The minister just said to the Treasury Board that this should be closed.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The space was available. The students at the Fanshawe school in agriculture at Woodstock and at Simcoe could easily find accommodation in these other places.

Mr. Nixon: I think the Minister of University Affairs should take it over because this minister certainly cannot handle it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Now my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, suggests that the agricultural educational programme be taken over by The Department of University Affairs.

Mr. Nixon: The minister is not handling it well.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: All right, that is what his position is. I want that clearly recorded, Mr. Chairman, that the Leader of the Opposition, of the Liberal Party of this province, says this, that agricultural education should be taken over by The Department of University Affairs. Let Hansard record that.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order. Is the minister finished?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Go ahead, the member wants to talk.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, sure. On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, because the Minister of Agriculture and Food is clearly trying to mislead anybody who might possibly dig through Hansard to read his remarks, although why they might do that I am sure that I would not know.

My point is that if this minister is going to close the school, then the Minister of University Affairs might as well take them over—what is wrong with that reasoning?—because the minister is certainly not accepting the responsibility to administer the schools effectively.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Leader of the Opposition what schools he is referring to when he says that the Minister of Agriculture and Food is seeking to close these schools? What schools is he referring to?

Mr. Nixon: The one at Simcoe and the one at Woodstock.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: All right, those two schools are already under The Department of University Affairs. I have nothing to do with either one of them.

Mr. Nixon: And the minister is closing them.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have nothing to do with either one of them, and I am not closing them.

Mr. Nixon: The minister told the Treasury Board they were not necessary.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I did indeed.

Mr. Nixon: There he is.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: But I am not closing them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, is trying to make a case. He is trying to make a case, but he cannot do it—

Mr. Nixon: The case is there.

Hon. Mr. Stewart:—for the simple reason that I recommended, as my purpose should be and as a responsible minister of the Crown should accept the responsibility where he sees an obvious saving. He should point out to the Treasury Board that space is available in other colleges for these students and suggest to the Treasury Board that it is not in the interest of economy to maintain duplication of services—and call it what you like that is what it is. If my hon. friends opposite want to have duplication of services then it is all right with me; they can carry on, as far as I am concerned. But let it be clearly understood—

Mr. Nixon: Well a moment ago the minister said it was all right with him.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is all right with me if the Treasury Board and the government decides to carry on these schools. But let it be clearly understood there is duplication of services, there is unnecessary expenditure of money, and if that is what we want in this province then why should the opposition be screaming all over the place about the high cost of education? The two positions are completely inconsistent, and there it is.

You just cannot have your cake and eat it too, as far as I am concerned. I have no qualms about it whatever.

Mr. Nixon: We want the schools. The minister can have the cake.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend from Woodstock says the school is going to continue—there is nothing in The Community Colleges Act to hinder the acceptance of public funds for the continuance of these schools. If that is what they want, so be it. There is no problem whatever.

The agreement that we had to provide staff on a loan basis comes to a termination on May 15, 1971, and that was clearly established last year. There is nothing new about that. The Fanshawe board knew about it, the Fanshawe president knew about it, his administration knew about it. It was a perfectly amicable agreement arrived at in my office to which we appended our signatures.

Mr. Nixon: What about the kids when they came the first year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There it is. I do not know what they told the kids, but that is what happened.

Mr. Nixon: The minister should concern himself. The schools are to be concerned with the students and nothing else.

Mr. Good: He just does not care.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friends opposite say I should have concerned myself. The president and the administration of Fanshawe college wanted the complete administration of the schools in their hands. All they wanted us to—

Mr. Nixon: Oh, the minister is not responsible for that either?

Hon. Mr. Stewart:—do was to provide on a loan basis to them the members of our staff to accommodate their teaching programme for this last year, and we agreed to do that up to May 15, 1971.

What happens from then on is someone else's determination, not mine. I have made a recommendation. If the government does not go along with it that is fine with me, that is a decision that has to be made, and I am sure the suggestions that have been made this afternoon will be taken into consideration.

I have to ask myself— regarding the testimonials that my friend from Oxford read into the record—how anyone could compare the course of education at Fanshawe with courses of education offered in other colleges when they did not share the same students.

Mr. Innes: Is the minister questioning the students? Do not question me, question the students.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is fine, I am just asking how that position could be taken. Now the thought occurs to me—

Mr. Nixon: One from each family, I think that was made clear.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The thought occurs to me that there might be some difference in opinion in this particular regard. We were told that the—

Mr. Nixon: Did the minister say it was not a very good point?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Stewart:—out-of-school students were not accepted at Ridgetown or Centralia. They are. You do not have to be a secondary

school graduate to be accepted in admission to Ridgetown or Centralia or Kemptville or Guelph or New Liskeard—the five colleges operated by our department.

My hon. friend knows that perfectly well that this is the case, and has been ever since the school started. We believe that there are students who may drop out of school for a variety of reasons, work two or three years on the farm and then say, "I would like to go back to school and get an agricultural diploma." They are accepted back into the course. This has happened and it happens all the time, so let us get our facts straight on these kinds of things.

We recognize the advantage of being able to live at home and drive to these schools. It has a good many advantages as I see it. I think there is also something to be said, Mr. Chairman, for the advantages of living in residence—my hon. friends opposite will know better than I. The member for Oxford, being a graduate of the Ontario Agricultural College, I think would be the first to recognize the advantage of living in residence during a college career. I think there is something to be learned there that is useful to people in later life and it seems to me to be a major advantage that I have never had.

Mr. Innes: That is quite true, but if you cannot afford it what do you do?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There may be some who cannot afford it. Let me say that student loans are available to any student who wishes to avail himself of them to attend any of our agricultural colleges on the same basis as they are available to any student in this province. Surely we have tried to do everything possible.

I simply suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is very difficult to have one's cake and eat it too.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2 carried? Item 2?

Mr. Innes: Will the minister entertain delegations to see him specifically on this? Would it be fair to ask if they should see you, see the cabinet, see the Prime Minister or the Minister of Education or the Minister of University Affairs? Whom should they see?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, Fanshawe college does not fall under our department at all—you will see no reference to Fanshawe college in this budget estimate of mine. It is not there. The members has raised this because he wanted to attach blame to me for a recommendation I made. That is why he raised it in these estimates.

Mr. Innes: It was the minister's recommendation.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Of course, he did. That is why he raised it. Now, if my hon. friend wants to send a delegation in—and I am sure he has done a good deal in generating the interest in sending that delegation in—

Mr. Innes: No, I have not.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —because I know of the political action which is going on out there. Do not ever think I do not. I know it very well because my county is next to the member's and I know very well what is going on.

If there is a delegation which wants to come to meet us, the members of the government, they should then address themselves, in my opinion, to the Minister of Education, in whose department community colleges are now administered and to the minister of The Department of University Affairs, to which the administration of community colleges will be transferred. There is nothing to do with it under The Department of Agriculture and Food estimates whatever.

Mr. Nixon: Except that minister recommends that the schools be closed.

Mr. Innes: Yes, and he also lends the teaching staff to Fanshawe college. Is that not true? You must pay them.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What did you say?

Mr. Innes: The staff that is lent to Fanshawe college—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That agreement terminates as of May 15, 1971.

Mr. Innes: —must have been paid up until now by The Department of Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, they were paid by the department for community colleges for their services. We did not pay them.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, the minister says that this is not his concern. Well, will the minister categorically deny the report that the education and research division of The Department of Education has gone on record as saying that it wants to get all agricultural education back into The Department of Agriculture?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not know what the hon. member is talking about.

An hon. member: Well, quite frankly you do not.

Mr. Good: This division of which we are talking is not under The Department of Agriculture. Secondly, it is under the community colleges branch of The Department of University Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, this is agricultural education in our community colleges, and research is under The Department of Agriculture and Food but the courses taught at the Fanshawe satellite colleges in Woodstock and Simcoe are not under our department.

Mr. Good: Exactly, and the minister wants all education in agriculture back under The Department of Agriculture, is that not correct?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I want, Mr. Chairman, to avoid the provision of facilities that are not being used to capacity—

Mr. Good: The minister did not answer my question.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —and the duplication of services in our area.

Mr. Innes: Answer his question.

Mr. Nixon: That is not what he is talking about at all.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, the minister either evades or will not answer the question. Is it not true that he wants this course back under The Department of Agriculture and not associated with The Department of Education in the community colleges?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have never said anything of the kind at any time, and I refuse to be drawn into saying that today.

Mr. Good: Well, has his education and research division gone on record as saying it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Not that I know of. Absolutely not. I am assured by the director of agricultural research and agricultural education that this is not the case, Mr. Chairman. I had never heard it referred to before until my hon. friend from Waterloo wanted to drag out another red herring.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oxford.

Mr. Innes: Would the minister inform me what the cost per student is for the Ridgetown school?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I can get that figure. I have not got it right at my fingertips.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 2 carry?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have not got it here. We can get it, but I have not got it here.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3, research and services.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Education.

Mr. Chairman: Still on item 2?

Mr. Spence: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry; I did not see. The member for Kent.

Mr. Spence: In regard to the College of Agricultural Technology at Ridgetown, we are very proud of it in our area—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Some of the member's friends are not very proud of it.

Mr. Spence: They never criticize Ridgetown.

Mr. Innes: We want to take care of the little people.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Some of your colleagues said the course at Ridgetown was not as good as that being offered at Fanshawe.

Mr. Spence: They said something about some student who could not qualify in Ridgetown, but I must say that I am very proud of the college at Ridgetown—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am glad to hear you say that.

Mr. Spence: —and I do not think my colleagues indicated or meant that the Ridgetown college was not doing a good job.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: All I know is what they said.

Mr. Spence: I was here, Mr. Minister, and my hearing is pretty good. I turned my hearing aid right up, and I thought I got a good understanding of what they meant.

Mr. Chairman, we are very proud of Ridgetown College, the research job they are doing and what they are doing for the number of students at the college. But in the Province of Ontario there is a large segment of the agricultural industry where the net return is not satisfactory to keep a man, wife and family on the farm today.

I wonder if the minister would give any consideration to carrying out a pilot project at these agricultural colleges where a student or someone would carry out a project that would operate the same as an average farmer would operate and could make a livelihood under good conditions or conditions recommended by the college. I think this would serve a very good purpose and one that the agricultural industry would like to see carried out.

Of course, this year we do not want any great expenditure, but if a project like this could be carried out I think that a few top, educated individuals or students of agriculture could farm and produce an income that would keep a man, wife and family in the way they should be today. If you could do this it would be something I would think the agricultural industry would be very interested in.

I wonder if the minister would give any consideration to a pilot project such as this? Maybe I have not explained it the way I should, but I think the minister understands what I mean.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the course at Ridgetown does not lend itself to the type of programme my hon. friend suggests, but the course at Centralia is developed along the lines of practical management training out on the farms. There are research projects going on at Ridgetown which do involve the costs of production of various commodities, but the actual operation of a farm is not carried on because it is on a 12-month basis and these students are there for a period of only 20 weeks at the most in any one year.

Mr. Spence: In fact, the minister does not give any consideration to this being carried on at any of the agricultural colleges?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is carried on at Centralia through the working of the students with practical farmers during the 20 weeks they are at Centralia. If the group was interested in dairying it would work with a dairy farmer; if it was interested in beef, it would work with a beef farmer, hogs, poultry, and so on, and they establish costs of production patterns, returns what have you, based on the projected expenses of operating the farm and I think do get a good deal of practical farm management experience in that regard.

They also get farm management training in the other courses, but it is done in a different way because the facilities are on the campus;

at Centralia they are not, so there is a difference in the type of structure of the two courses.

Mr. Charman: Anything further on item 2?

Item 2 agreed to.

On item 3:

Mr. Chairman: Research and services; the hon. member for Brantford.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, just a few comments on the matter of economic planning in the field of agriculture. Every year, of course, we discuss this with the minister and suggest that more action be taken in this field, and I notice this year in the annual report of the Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario that there are a few projects underway or that have been completed which are aimed in this direction.

But it seems to me that in view of the importance that agriculture has in Ontario and the effect it could have or does have on the economy of Ontario, there should be considerably more research going on. Right now, I notice, research is limited to agricultural daily marketing and policies. There is farm finance and taxation which I suppose is a very useful one to the Treasury Department, and some on farm production and management. Here the government is dealing with the relevance of economic planning to commercial farms in Canada. Perhaps if the minister could start setting some economic goals for the family farms in Canada, particularly in Ontario—and I assume that one of the more desirable social goals is to try to preserve the family farm in this province—perhaps some of the research should be directed in this area.

What I would like the minister to comment on is to find out exactly—for the future, for the following years—whether he is going to do some really intensive economic research relating to agriculture in Ontario because there are problems. The minister knows them. Perhaps he can at least find out what some of the problems are—not that the government does not know what some of the problems are—but perhaps in some way we can accurately fit them into the jigsaw puzzle that makes up our whole economy and plan from there and try to set some goals for Ontario agriculture and try to ensure that the family farms in Ontario are preserved.

I think this should be one of the functions carried out in the minister's research department. At the moment, the minister is not

doing that kind of work. I would like to hear the minister's comments on this. I would like him to indicate whether he intends to do this kind of economic research and if he is, when is he going to do it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member's inquiry, I think he is confusing the Agricultural Economics Research Council of Canada, to which we contribute \$7,500 as a province, with the Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario, which is described as research and services in this particular vote. They are two different things entirely.

The terms of reference of the Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario, to which we are referring here, include:

Programmes of research in respect of agriculture, veterinary medicine and household science: to select and recommend areas of research for the betterment of agriculture, veterinary medicine and household science; to stimulate an interest in research as a means to developing in Ontario a high degree of efficiency in the production and marketing of agricultural products.

That is what the Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario is all about. That is the group to whom we are referring in this particular vote.

My hon. friend's points, I think, are well taken in regard to agricultural economics research, and we do this on a national basis with each province contributing. Our share is \$7,500. It is made up of grants from the various provinces, the Canada Department of Agriculture, farm organizations and agribusiness across Canada as well. That is the source of funds that is directed to this organization. We dealt with that, Mr. Chairman, if I might mention, in an earlier vote that was carried last week.

Mr. Makarchuk: May I correct the minister? The amount is not \$75,000, it is \$7,500. Is that what he is referring to on the administration?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am sorry; it is \$7,500.

Mr. Makarchuk: Fine.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If I said \$75,000 I am wrong.

Mr. Makarchuk: My point again is that the research carried on at the federal level may apply to Ontario and does, in many cases, apply to Ontario. But, at the same

time, there should be some kind of policy originating from this Department of Agriculture and Food relating to agriculture in Ontario, to ensure that it continues to exist in its viable form; to ensure that the family farms will continue and to examine the possible alternate production of various commodities in order that there remains a viable industry.

I think that some of this kind of research can be done on the provincial level more than is done at the moment. The government has a few projects going on that are related to Ontario, but I think the government should be involved in this field at much greater expense than it is at this particular time.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3?

Mr. Ruston: Item 4, Mr. Chairman, on research—I mentioned this the other day. I would like to ask the minister if he has looked over the Topcon report with regard to the Vegetable Growers Marketing Association? I got a letter away today to the Minister of Revenue in Ottawa with regard to imports of some canned tomatoes and tomato paste. I think this is something that should come under a fair amount of research. It seems to me that there is room here for some work to be done. I see under research it says, salaries \$2.5 million; services \$8.8 million. I am just not sure where all these are put in, but I am wondering about the crops we are growing. We are growing tomatoes, No. 2 tomato crops in Ontario. I think we are producing 300,000 tons for processing, as peeled tomatoes; and we are importing tomatoes. I see that tomatoes that come in from Spain come in at 6.9 cents per pound for value for duty purposes.

According to the Topcon report, there seems to be the possibility that there should be anti-dumping legislation put on this. Of course we know that this is up to the federal government, but I wonder if the minister has ever consulted with The Department of Revenue in Ottawa. They are the ones who have to do with the duties and dumping duties. Has he ever consulted with them on matters such as this?

We also have tomato paste coming in at prices for value for duty from U.S. 19 cents, Italy 18 cents and Portugal 13 cents. I am wondering if this is not an area for the Minister of Agriculture and Food for the Province of Ontario as one interested in increasing the income of farmers of Ontario. Since not only does it increase the income of the farmers of Ontario, it creates new employment, anything

produced in the country, in my opinion, is very important rather than importing it. So has the minister ever—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is not under the research vote. This is nothing to do with research.

Mr. Ruston: This is under research—whether these things should be grown in Ontario or not. The minister bounced this off the other day. Does he want to bet? Do away with it. Slough it off. He is not interested in it. Why is he not interested in something that would create more employment for the farming industry here and now?

He sits back there and every time he gets a chance he gives a political speech in this Legislature instead of dealing with farm commodities that he should be dealing with. It is time somebody told him where to get off, because it is all he does. I know he is a good politician but he is not looking after the farming community when he is doing that.

Mr. Chairman: The item is research and services.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is not in this vote.

Mr. Ruston: It certainly is in this vote. Research is whether we can grow this stuff in Ontario or whether they can grow it in Portugal or Spain, and that is in research.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We know that.

Mr. Ruston: All right, where is the minister spending this \$8 million then? I want to know where some of that money goes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member does not need to get his blood pressure up.

Mr. Nixon: It would be hard not to.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I simply suggested, Mr. Chairman, that the matter of tariffs and trades and these kinds of things comes more properly under the food council vote that was passed.

Mr. Nixon: He wants to know whether we can grow a similar product.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We know that we cannot. That has already been determined. There is research going on now in Ontario at the Harrow stations—I understand at Vine-land as well—and I believe at the Simcoe station in a lesser way—to determine the type of tomatoes that are suitable for

mechanical harvesting. So we know that this can come about. There are a few mechanical tomato harvesters in Ontario right now. But for my hon. friend to ask, do I know anything about the Topcon research report, which I believe was something that was commissioned by the fruit and vegetable growers association itself. It is not available to us. To my knowledge, it has never been released for publication. I think it is something that they may have themselves. Maybe my hon. friend has a copy of it. I do not know if he has, but I know it has not been made available to our department in any way that I am aware of.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, I can tell the minister that there is a summary of the Topcon report and it is in the Can-Crop news letter dated, April, 1971, sent out by the Ontario Vegetable Growers Marketing Board.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If my hon. friend really wants to know how the money is being spent in agricultural economics, we have the annual report of the Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario which has been tabled in the House. I would direct his attention to page 187 which describes the agricultural economics, programme 25, department of agricultural economics. I would suggest that if he were to review this he would note that farm management and production economics involve farm data collection and analysis; farm production and management, which involves cash crops and livestock production; and farm finance and taxation.

There is another separate section devoted to agricultural marketing and policy, involving dairy marketing and policies; livestock feed-grain economy; the market appraisal and outlook for Ontario farm products; and the various types of active agricultural economic research projects for 1969-1970. These are on page 191 of the report which describes in detail these various programmes that are now in operation. I believe that report is continued on page 92.

There is quite a detailed summary of how the money is spent. It is co-ordinated by the Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario which is comprised not only of active farmers but agri-business people and professional people as well, to try to avoid research just for the sake of research. There is no point in spending money when answers have already been provided in other jurisdictions.

The purpose of establishing this research institute was to avoid the unnecessary spending of money in these areas.

If, in fact, we have learned that certain types of tomatoes, for instance, can be grown in the United States and harvested mechanically, it seems to me that much of our research has already been achieved in this regard. We should be able to make it available and know whether or not it is applicable in Ontario, and that is what is being done.

I would think that the value for the dollars provided by this province for agricultural research in this province, is very closely scrutinized by the people involved in the agricultural industry, both at production and agri-business level. We may have no fear that money is being in any way wasted.

Mr. Chairman: On item 3, the hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. Innes: Last year, the minister's specialists ran various field days throughout the province in conjunction with their particular fields of work, they picked out good farms throughout the area to hold their seminars in and I thought it was a very worthwhile project.

I wonder if they have given thought to a little more concentration on this effort and to use some of the good farmers as sources of experiments from time to time? I think it is most important, as was mentioned by the hon. member for Waterloo in respect to Fanshawe college. If they take these students out to farms that have been successful, the farmers have been able to give the boys a little bit of an education on the good management practices that they have utilized in their business. I feel that sometimes we lose sight of availing ourselves of the opportunities that are currently in the field when people would accept some direction if they were asked.

I think we could talk about the University of Guelph and the experimental farm at Elora. As you know, most of the civil servants are working an eight-hour day and sometimes they just do not work out the best that they might. Maybe the minister could expand these to some of the other areas?

Another thing that concerns me is the pollution as it affects the farmers. I do not know whether or not it comes under this vote, but I would think that some experimental research must be going on in this department to ascertain what the farmer can do and what he cannot. I got a call on the weekend intimating that one farmer was burning stumps. The air pollution control board from London came down and ordered him to call the fire department and put out

the fire, which he did. Apparently, it was still smouldering and they had to call it again. So he is faced with a bill of about \$200 to put out a fire.

So these are some of the problems that we in the farming enterprise today are encountering, and I wonder if some information is forthcoming from the research department: how they can burn stumps, for example, without being fined; how they can burn brush in the Niagara Peninsula without being fined. I understand that in some areas it has to be burned in an incinerator.

They also tell us that if they are in the small-animal business, such as hogs or chickens, if they have any animals that die, they have to provide a special type of incinerator with a two-combustion chamber of some description that is very costly. And yet they can almost throw a stone to Lake Erie, where great big ships are going past, spewing out smoke as if it was going out of style.

So these are things that are concerning some of the farmers, and rightly so. Another thing that is concerning me is in The Dead Animal Disposal Act. It mentions small animals being disposed of through this Act. I have had complaints indicating to me that the people who have these licences to remove large animals refuse to come and get small animals, and it has become quite a problem with hog farmers and chicken farmers. Now, there are a few problems I would ask you to consider and to which maybe you can reply.

Another one that I am concerned about is the incidence of IBR in the many livestock herds throughout the province and whether we are beginning to cope with it. It is one of the diseases that is related to the respiratory system of animals and, as such, has been causing considerable loss to many livestock people throughout the area. I just wonder if we are coming up with some serum that is getting on top of it, so to speak, or not.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks that have been made by my friend from Oxford. I think there is great concern regarding apparent red tape that can develop in the enforcement of some of these regulations that are designed for pollution control.

However, one of the large items of the Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario is this matter of pollution research control and I would again direct my hon. friend's attention to pages 62 and 63 of the report of the Agricultural Research Institute of On-

tario which does deal, Mr. Chairman, with pollution control and waste utilization in agriculture. Of course, much of this work has been done at Guelph in an on-going programme, involving the departments of microbiology, soil science, agricultural economics, nutrition, poultry science and the school of engineering.

With regard to my hon. friend's concern with the burning of stumps, and restrictions being placed on that burning, it is difficult to understand, because there have been numerous people throughout Ontario who have been required to dispose of diseased elm trees or old orchards and these kinds of things. I have made contact personally with the department, both at head-office level and at branch offices throughout the province and I have never found a time when they denied anyone a permit to burn this product. But there may be times when the wind is blowing in such a direction that it might adversely affect the people in a town or across a highway or an intersection, when they would have some reservations about burning at that particular time. I wonder if the circumstances dictating the extinguishing of the fire in this particular circumstance were due to those conditions.

I am not sure, but it does seem to me that if someone lit fire to a bunch of old stumps and it was not causing any particular harm to anybody, that it would be inappropriate to say: "You have got to put that fire out," just for the sake of putting it out in order to go and get a permit to light it the next day and continue to burn it. That does not quite make sense, and I hope this has not been the case.

In regard to small dead animal disposal, it is a problem. There is no question about this, since those who pick up dead animals find that it is simply of no profit to them whatever to pick up the smaller animals. It is a problem.

The association has discussed the proposal of levying a charge for picking up these small animals. Most farmers refuse to pay that. Many of them have advised me they are going to bury these animals rather than have them picked up and pay a charge for it. It is a difficult situation. I am sure my hon. friend does not want dead animals left lying around, no matter whether they are small pigs or poultry or calves or what have you. This is not in the best interests of health, neither human nor animal.

Mr. Innes: They will not let you bury them.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What do you mean they will not let you bury them? On your own farm?

Mr. Innes: Apparently you have to put them in a type of solid container now. That is what I understand.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is news to me, I must confess, but we will certainly look into that. That is the first I have ever heard of it, because I do not think that is included in The Dead Animal Disposal Act. As far as I know they are buried.

Mr. MacDonald: It is what is known as a coffin.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We will have a look at it anyway.

An hon. member: Pollution control.

Mr. Chairman: On item 3, the hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. Innes: I wanted to make another comment. Recently the minister was viewing a new building, a new concept of a building that was built at Thamesford by a man by the name of Reg Kendall, and—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is in your riding. You were not there.

Mr. Innes: I happened to be away on other business. I am like you—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You were rounding up the group for last night's school meeting.

An hon. member: Come on, get back down to earth. You are just being political again.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is what he was doing.

Mr. Innes: Are you finished?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Sure, I wanted to throw that little comment in.

Mr. Innes: Thank you, that is okay. I take it from where it comes.

This particular chap has inaugurated a new system of building farm buildings, and I think it is useful in other areas, too. The strange part of it is he asked the minister if he would impose on the then Minister of Trade and Development, Mr. Randall, and see if he could get a loan for him because this type of construction could be utilized in areas other than farming, but he found out that he did not have much success.

This man now has financial support from other sources and he is doing a really fine job and going ahead by leaps and bounds. What I am concerned about is why a person, by reason of being a farmer, could not get the ODC loan? Had he been in any other type of a business, it is likely he would have been able to get it.

I do hope that in this new legislation that is coming forth, the minister will put his right foot forward and say, "We have got to have some of ODC loans for farmers who can start up a new type of business that will be related to farming, not only in the production field, but also in the merchandising and processing field." I think he should really get up and make it known very forcefully.

Another thing that concerns me—reverting back a little bit to pollution again—he knows there are many dryers throughout the province which are drying all types of corn and soy beans and everything. The pollution people are very concerned with the elements that sometimes come off—they are very insignificant as far as I am concerned.

I would hope that his department would use its good offices to make sure that nothing will harm these operators who are trying to do the best they can and would be put out of business in a chain reaction across the province, because it could be very serious if this ever happened. There must be research provided by the large amount of money that we have in this vote that would help facilitate pollution control equipment that would help these people.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 3 carried?

Vote 105 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the study of the estimates of The Department of Agriculture and Food.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

REAL ESTATE AND BUSINESS BROKERS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 19, An Act to amend The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The former Attorney General does not get away with his bills quite that easy.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): It was a good try.

Mr. Lawlor: That was a trick move, if I may say so. I would have the Attorney General—as I have said to him in private and I would like to get it on to the record—review what was said about this bill in principle, inclusive of the loan and trust corporations; some rather, I thought, devastating criticism in October 30, 1969, in Hansard—a number of pages. I will not repeat the critique of that particular day but the very theory that it is embodied in this legislation comes up again under this head.

We all know that a number of loan and trust corporations are setting up corporate charters in Ontario at this time, moving in a grand and even grandiose way into the area of real estate practice by way of subsidiaries. I know there is a substantial disturbance in the real estate profession itself as to the inroads that are being made. Since real estate is precisely a service, it does not fall within the ambit of The Combines Act of the federal government. There is grave danger, as things presently stand in this particular area of the takeovers in a large way. The trust and loan corporations are hiring salesmen away from the smaller brokers. I am surprised and I must tell the minister I would like to know to what extent this legislation, which was introduced just a short time ago, has been circulated among the real estate people as to receiving representations and possibly objections from them under this head.

I know of one real estate man—and I do not think it is any breach of confidence in mentioning his name in this House—who has made overtures to the former minister, and possibly to the minister, by the name of Bruce Conklin. He is a private real estate operator in the Etobicoke area and has the severest type of reservations about this sort of thing.

The legislation, as it is presently set up, offers a fair range of possibilities. If some-

body who is a shareholder, a private individual—not, I take it at the moment, another company—holds shares in a corporation that is seeking a brokerage licence, 51 per cent of those individuals must themselves be brokers before that corporation will be accepted for registration under this Act and therefore permitted to trade in real estate.

That obviously cannot apply to the same extent with loan and trust corporations.

The loan and trust corporation no doubt will hold 100 or more shares in the subsidiary corporation that is set up precisely to trade in real estate; in turn, that corporation of course is held by a diversity of interests. It would be very difficult, I suspect, to find—or it would certainly perhaps be a bit ludicrous to seek to pull 51 per cent of the voting shares of the trust and loan corporation itself into a brokerage position.

But what I am a little worried about is that actually the section as redefined goes further. The corporation itself, which is a non-broker—such as a trust and loan corporation—can hold shares in corporation B, which is a brokerage corporation. But if it is a loan and trust corporation it need not make this type of disclosure or reveal the 51 per cent in order to qualify for the registration.

I am concerned about those other corporations, where corporation A seeks to hold any portion of corporation B, less than 50 per cent; apparently in that context neither loan or trust corporations nor any type of corporation is obliged to register under this Act, under those circumstances.

I am wondering therefore if this is not a hiatus in the section itself, and an oversight in providing for a kind of corporate control. If one or more persons hold a majority or a substantial interest in a loan or trust corporation, which in turn controls a real estate brokerage house, what is the position of those one or more persons holding such a substantial interest?

Secondly, can brokerage corporation B hold voting shares in any other non-real estate corporation operating in a diversity of other aspects?

In the previous legislation those who were operating in real estate were confined to real estate. There has been a precise exclusion of that again in this legislation touching loan and trust corporations.

I do not want to prolong this debate. There are a lot of intricate issues connected with it. I think I can get the main issues

out, if the hon. minister would consider sending the matter into the committee and all these nice questions can be investigated more closely. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, there is something that occurs to me. In recent months I have been hearing the expressions of certain concern from some members of the real estate profession, and I was wondering—this is more by way of a question than a speech on second reading—the extent to which the minister has been in consultation with the Real Estate Brokers' Association, because they have been expressing some very serious concerns about the way that the present legislation is affecting them.

Independent brokers, by and large who operate on their own and in an unincorporated fashion, have been very worried that certain things in the legislation are proving pretty onerous in relation to competition and so on. Perhaps leading from that I will have some further remarks that the minister could clarify.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to enter the debate before the minister replies? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I think I could answer both the hon. members who have spoken very briefly, and I will certainly endeavour to do so.

First of all, let me say that the legislation permitting loan corporations—what we call loan and trust corporations—to become real estate brokers was passed in Ottawa in 1969-1970. The hon. member can find that legislation in chapter 17, Statutes of Canada, 1969-1970.

They gave to the loan corporation, federally incorporated, the right to be a real estate broker. Last year, in this House, this Legislature passed legislation under our Loan and Trust Corporations Amendment Act. He will find that in 1970 Statutes of Ontario, chapter 1, 1970, chapters 1 to 9. This gave to the loan and trust corporation the right to hold a broker's licence, a real estate broker's licence. The difficulty then arose, although the principle was well established both federally and provincially in that our Real Estate and Business Brokers Act says that a corporation cannot hold a broker's licence unless its shareholders, holding at least 51 per cent of its shares, are themselves real estate brokers.

The principle of giving the loan corporation a real estate broker's licence was well established at Ottawa in 1969-1970, in this Legislature last year, and we need to make that slight change in The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act. The trust company has always been excepted from that 51 per cent rule. The loan company we have put on the same basis. Unless we do this, Mr. Speaker, our provincial corporations will flee to Ottawa for their incorporation, and in order to put everybody on an even footing it is necessary to adopt this amendment. I am quite prepared to have this go to committee, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The minister is pre-empting the children's hour.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Right.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. Singer: No, I think we should go to the standing committee.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister direct it to go to the standing committee?

Agreed to.

Mr. Singer: Will you notify the brokers' association about it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Singer: Because I know some of them are concerned.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, in rising to deal with the budget, I think I should preface my remarks by saying that it is the first time I have had the pleasure of sharing network coverage with Her Majesty the Queen, so it would be only right, I am sure, to express my respects for the monarchy on this occasion. I trust that this is a conciliatory enough opening for everyone in the House.

It was, Mr. Speaker, a memorable day last Monday when the darling of the Chatham Chamber of Commerce, the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), bulked himself up in his seat and

began to speak to the budget document, having reached almost the top rung—although not quite the top rung—of the political ladder in his party. There may indeed come another time, Mr. Speaker, and we wish him well after a long tenure in the opposition.

The Premier (Mr. Davis) looked proudly on at the young lad, the man who now plays Cromwell to William Davis' Henry. Mr. McKeough had that confident smile, that cherubic grin, that slightly dissonant french-horn voice as he began to read the budget.

The fantasy world was pricked early, you will recall Mr. Speaker, when the Treasurer said inadvertently that his uncle 18 years ago had read his first and only budget in this Legislature—one of those slips revealing a keen glimpse of the political future.

Then, the preliminaries over, the minister entered into an hour and a half from the document. After the first 15 minutes some were sedated, others were anxious, and many in fact, Mr. Speaker, were disappointed.

Yet again, if I may say, the Achilles heel of the government was revealed—this time on view before the public of Ontario—the tremendous gap between promise and performance; that dull thud between expectation and reality which harasses every move of this government.

We are all inclined to be generous in this House—particularly with a new Premier—but the budget statement Mr. Speaker, was found wanting in virtually every single aspect. A sense again of a party that knows not how to govern. But let me point out, Mr. Speaker, with the time at my disposal, that there is an alternative party on this side of the House. And I want to provide for those of us in the New Democratic Party a 10-point critique of the budget, a sense of what might have been, and what can be, for a party like ours which has its bearings and knows where it is going.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: Point number one, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The member knows the parties.

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer called it a full employment budget. It was supposed to be a novel term. In fact, it is used by Richard Nixon in the United States. Mr. Speaker, it comes from Eisenhower. Eisenhower to Nixon to Davis. A strong stream of historical continuity. This kind of import which was put by the provincial Treasurer might have had—

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Eisenhower was a great golfer.

Mr. Lewis:—some relevance if, in fact, the budget chose to achieve full employment. Naturally, Mr. Speaker, one would assume that when Ontario has 200,000 people unemployed in the province, when there is a desperate crisis around jobs, one would introduce a budget dealing dramatically with questions of economic growth and employment.

So there was the predictable clarion call. Let me remind the minister of page 10 of the budget, Mr. Speaker. It said:

The new government of Ontario has promised the people of the province that it will combat the current intolerable level of unemployment with every means at its command. . . . To achieve this target, 150,000 new jobs are needed in Ontario this year. . . . I come now—

said the Treasurer—

to the vital matter of tax policy—the key initiative in this budget to stimulate a revival of economic growth in job opportunities in Ontario. . . . I have, therefore, decided to concentrate our limited capacity to finance tax cuts on—

I note—

—a major move designed to produce a massive stimulus to business investment.

There is a speech writer with imagination run rampant, Mr. Speaker, for when the pages are closed, what have we? We have a five per cent tax credit on the purchase of machinery and equipment before March 31, 1973, in the Province of Ontario, and because the Treasurer anticipated a revenue loss of \$125 million, he obviously felt that there would be \$2.5 billion worth of machinery and equipment purchased. Twenty-four hours later, under scrutiny, what happened to this massive stimulus, this major move in the budget?

Ninety per cent of the machinery and equipment was destined to be purchased anyway in the Province of Ontario—no incentive at all required.

The corporation tax, as a percentage of provincial revenues, dropped as a result of the Treasurer's statement from 11 per cent in 1970-1971 to eight per cent in 1971-1972. Under questioning, the provincial Treasurer could not give us a single estimate of the number of jobs to be created. More than half of the machinery to be purchased will be

purchased outside Ontario and not applicable to this province. More than half the machinery purchased will be purchased by branch plant corporations which will continue to exercise their control over our economy with tax credits provided by this government. Some of the machinery will automate jobs, thereby being of no evident value at all, and it is as though the five per cent sales tax need not have been paid.

Mr. Speaker, the entire programme evaporated under scrutiny. There was no major move. There was no massive stimulus. There was no key initiative. It was a breathtaking deception.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: It was a \$125-million gift.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): That is typical of the Tories.

Mr. Lewis: It was a \$125 million gift to corporations in Ontario, courtesy of their friends and allies in the Progressive Conservative Party.

Some, who are unkind, would wish to ask how much might find its way back into the Tory party under the auspices of an election campaign. But we in this party, Mr. Speaker, are not unkind. We see no such relationship.

What would we have done to stimulate the economy and create employment in the Province of Ontario?

Mr. Speaker, if you want to increase consumer purchasing power, then we would have reduced the retail sales tax in this province by one full percentage point down from five to four per cent.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: It would have generated \$150 million by way of increased consumer purchasing power in the economy. It would have meant much for most of the people in this province, rather than simply for the corporation, Mr. Speaker. It would have been easy to administer, there would have been no problems with federal conflicts, it would have been one of those factors greatly contributing to economic growth and jobs.

More important, Mr. Speaker, or as important, we feel that we are far too soft in this province on the corporate sector. We feel that in Ontario this year there should have been an additional point added to the corporation tax, rather than giving them this extraordinary \$125 million handout. That addi-

tional point on the corporation tax would have brought us \$35 million additional revenue to underwrite major social and economic policies of our kind of government. Now that is the way we would have dealt with a massive stimulus to the economy.

Mr. Speaker, that brings me to the second point I want to make in this 10-point statement. Because of the fixation of this government with the private sector—it has become for the Premier almost an obsession, akin to nothing else he has been addicted to for some considerable time, and he has few addictions—the public sector, Mr. Speaker, is debunked as a way of helping to create full employment.

But, Mr. Speaker, with great respect, the private sector of Ontario has failed, failed rather forlornly, and one wonders what this great government is about. They managed to create 60,000 additional jobs in the year 1970. The year 1971 requires two and a half times that number by their very budget statement, and nowhere is there any suggestion that they will be created.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the single most important job-generating mechanism the government could have brought in was that of house-building—and then we look at the budget. Incredibly enough, the \$500 million plan indicated in the Throne Speech was not even mentioned in the budget, not once. I would be interested to see where it is laid out, because we have looked at it rather carefully.

More than that, Mr. Speaker, the money that the provincial Treasurer has allocated for private housing investment in the budget is totally contingent on banks, on mortgage companies, on trust companies, on the capacity of people to pay down payments. In the area of the Ontario Housing Corporation, extraordinary though it may seem, there has been a decline of \$1.2 million for the building of houses between 1970 and 1971. So much for your house building programme.

In other words, the extraordinary disappearance after the Throne Speech is borne out in the budget, and the hon. Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman) is confirmed as the master conjurer of them all, the Houdini of the cabinet. Not that he is svelte and supple. He is a man of some girth and prominence, but he has the capacity to have whole programmes disappear before the naked eye of this legislative assembly. With the minister's assumption of his portfolio, so went a massive house-building programme in the Province of Ontario.

What would we have done, Mr. Speaker? We would have sought to build, in the year 1971, 150,000 housing units in order to make up for the cumulative backlog of the last several years, as well as to meet current targets. And, as we indicated in the unemployment debate, as well as in this debate, for that end it is legitimate to borrow, because the return is immediate and the need is desperate.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me gently to the third point. In his budget the provincial Treasurer would dearly have loved to reduce taxes for low-income earners. There was a tear in his eye, I think some of us noticed, as he said he was unable to do so, and in the critical section of the budget document it read, page 24:

—the government of Ontario is convinced that the best way to achieve a powerful economic recovery is by reducing taxes... personal income taxes should be cut in order to bolster consumer purchasing power.

I am reading from the government statement.

Moreover, the only type of change we could make is a costly across-the-board decrease in rates. We cannot make the less costly selective reductions for low-income groups of the type we think are needed, and which would be in line with our long-run reform proposals.

That is a bit much to swallow with a straight face. The government would be wiser to admit that when in a crunch, it opts for a reduction in corporation taxes rather than giving a reduction in taxes to the people of Ontario generally.

We in this party are the first to concede, Mr. Speaker, that it is wrong to violate the fundamental programme of tax reform by a system of rebates and tax credits, but they have been handed out before. They have been handed out to groups which needed them desperately. The government has given money away by way of the basic shelter exemption. It has given a rebate to the farmers. It has given it to those on old age security.

Why was it not possible for the minister's government in this year to give a rebate to low-income earners in the Province of Ontario? Then the question becomes, what would we have done?

What would we have done?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): By means test? How would the hon. member have done it?

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer asks "on a means test?" Let me tell him how we would have handled it.

We would have introduced the tax rebate schedule to operate, just for this year, in advance of the Benson reform proposals and does the Treasurer know what we would have modelled it on? We would have modelled it on Ontario's tax reform proposals which he himself submitted a number of months ago. We would have embraced what he calls the Ontario low-income allowance, and what the government termed the Ontario refundable tax credit for people not paying income tax.

Both of those propositions seem to us viable. Both of those propositions seem to us legitimate. Both of those propositions seem to us urgent at this point in time, and we would have done it with pleasure and with resolution in advance of the Benson proposals because low-income earners in this province need it desperately.

Mr. MacDonald: The NDP government will.

Mr. Lewis: Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I am ready to admit that it would mean a loss in revenue overall of \$105 million, roughly tabulating the minister's material. I am surprised he never uses his own material, some of it is worth salvaging.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: How would the hon. member have done it?

Mr. Lewis: I am going to come to that in a moment as well. Some of the material is worth salvaging, Mr. Speaker, and this is one of those programmes. Because to generate an additional \$105 million worth of revenue—to pump prime the economy from the low-income earners that way in addition to a reduction in the retail sales tax—would have been a real economic stimulus worthy of the name, instead of this sham which the Treasurer introduced by way of budget.

One does it in one of two ways, Mr. Speaker. Either we negotiate with the federal government an additional line on the income tax form which results in the simple percentage return.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: So the hon. member could not have done it.

Mr. Lewis: How does the Treasurer know he could not have done it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The hon. member could not have done it.

Mr. Lewis: How does he know that we could not have done it?

Mr. MacDonald: It is tough sometimes.

Mr. Lewis: This government has not the imagination to try to negotiate certain things.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The hon. member could not have done it.

Mr. Lewis: We will deal in the later minutes, Mr. Speaker, with why this government has such trouble dealing with Ottawa because of its present character and the way in which it behaves. Beyond that, the Treasurer could have handled it much as he handles the farm rebate programme, much as he handles the old age security programme—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: How would the member have worked in the means test then?

Mr. Lewis:—and the Treasurer could have worked out a needs test and the tax rebate programme. It is all outlined in his own document.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member is on the side of the separate income tax.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, it is a simple tax credit rebate system. I commend the minister to read his own material in order to divine its contents. It is a matter of some embarrassment that we should understand it and he does not.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The mechanics are not available and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, that brings me to the fourth point that I would like to make.

The government has announced a new formula for payments to mining municipalities. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, who is here today with his ruddy complexion, has indicated that it would result in 400,000 additional dollars for municipalities and school boards throughout the province. This is allegedly the first step in the direction of equity in mining revenues.

Let it be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that it may mean some marginal relief, but it will not mean fundamental relief to the people across the province, especially in northern

Ontario. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, by insisting that the northern municipalities bring their budgets to the Treasurer for scrutiny before he even dispenses the additional revenue, he is eroding their autonomy in a way they have not experienced for some considerable time.

Oh, they are centralizers all of them, and that is rather surprising at times for a Tory government. The "big daddy" syndrome. It does not begin to compensate for the exploitation of the last several years.

The parental allusion unsettles the Premier? The Premier sits with that amiable smile through most speeches.

Mr. Speaker, one wonders if the government has looked at the net profits after taxes of Inco, which I think exceeded \$200 million in the year 1970. We wonder if they have looked at the net profits, after taxes, of Falconbridge and of Rio Algom and of Dennison Mines and of Texas Gulf. The same companies whom the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs allows exemptions to process, smelt and refine their ores abroad.

In 1966 in Canada, Mr. Speaker, the book profits of the mining companies were \$396 million, but the taxable profits were only \$15 million, or four per cent—

Mr. MacDonald: Shame! Shame!

Mr. Lewis:—compared to 56 per cent for all corporations. And the mining companies, Mr. Speaker, have experienced the highest rate of return on investment in any sector of the economy in 1968, the second highest rate of return in 1969 and a comparable position in 1970.

What is it with this government? Whence such charity that comes from it, that it is prepared to extract only another \$400,000 for northern Ontario and its mining municipalities?

We did not see people cavorting in the streets at the announcement. My colleagues from northern Ontario did not come back with reports of excitement stirring the north about the government's new policy.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what would we have done? We would have instituted a resource tax in this province, which amounts to an additional three per cent of the value of mineral production in Ontario. If that value is estimated at something in the vicinity of \$1.6 billion, it would have meant an additional \$48 million, with special relief to mining municipalities from those sums. Then resource taxation would be credible in Ontario.

In addition to that, of course, we would have had a full assessment in taxation of all mining property in Ontario.

You know, Mr. Speaker, while I am discussing mining revenues, perhaps I should talk of the north generally and what the government has done for the north. I suppose the most striking evidence in the document was the 11 cent reduction in the cost of a large case of beer in northern Ontario. We call it a policy of bottled tokenism in our party, Mr. Speaker.

You cannot buy northern Ontario for a fistful of hops, gentlemen, and that should be understood. Man does not live by beer alone, Mr. Speaker; there are other things with which northern Ontario is concerned. Lest none of the Tory backbenchers have yet noticed it, there is something called the price of fuel in northern Ontario. A spread of 10, 15, 20 cents from the south, depending on how far north one travels, without companies like Imperial or Shell or Gulf being called to this Legislature at any time, to justify their various expenditures and profits.

And what of the finished manufactured goods and the price spreads in northern Ontario, Mr. Speaker? And what of the freight rates, Mr. Speaker? How generous the government is to raise an additional \$8 million by way of brewery revenue in order to lower the price 11 cents in the north—to which we do not object.

I wonder how much time the Premier has recently devoted to a study of the balance sheets of the breweries, which will now receive from this government an additional \$2.5 million by virtue of this reform. This government's tax proposals have benefited the corporate world more than they would have believed possible with the coming to the throne of the Premier (Mr. Davis).

Look at the Ontario Development Corporation programme, Mr. Speaker, and the forgivable loans as a part of it. Until now, northern Ontario has received something like 13.7 per cent of the forgivable loans allocated. In this year's budget they will receive 14.6 per cent of the moneys allocated.

Mr. MacDonald: Breathtaking; breathtaking!

Mr. Lewis: That is the way the government views the north.

What of processing, Mr. Speaker? What of processing of the resources in northern Ontario to which there was a modest hint? The government will recall that the budget

endorsed the principles of the Toronto-centred region plan, and how does one of those principles read? Let me remind the government:

Because of the location within the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence megalopolis, the Toronto-centred region plan proposal can increase its economic role in processing resources which currently originate in northern Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Shame.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Shame!

Mr. Lewis: So much for the processing of the resources in northern Ontario.

What perverse political antagonism has this government against the north? Again, an unkind soul suggested that because all the northern delegates voted for Allan Lawrence in the leadership race, the Premier was wreaking some kind of quiet political toll as a result. Why is it that the north cannot capture the imagination of this government? Hewers of wood and drawers of water forever!

What would we have done, Mr. Speaker? We would have a prices review board before which all price differentials must be justified in the major commodities, transportation and fuel areas. We would have a public inquiry into the freight rates and the transportation costs. We would have a major loan programme for northern Ontario and we would have processing by law at home in Ontario, if necessary through Crown corporations, to achieve our purpose.

Mr. Speaker, that brings me to point five, which is the special pleasure the Treasurer got in imposing a five per cent wage ceiling on the civil service. It is called selective discrimination. The government is singling out one of the most vulnerable sectors of the work force to impose wage guidelines which are absolutely unconscionable and indefensible.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Shameful!

Mr. Lewis: This government has been in negotiation with the civil servants for a number of months, and never once during the course of the negotiations did the government have the civility to tell the civil servants that they would be subject to five per cent guidelines. Section 12 of The Ontario Labour Relations Act talks about good-faith bargaining. Where was the good faith of the government in bargaining with the civil servants? Mr. Speaker, the civil service of Ontario goes to arbitration, and the provincial

Treasurer says at a press conference that the government will not be governed by an arbitration award if it exceeds five per cent.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I said no such thing. I said no such thing.

Mr. Pilkey: He did so.

Mr. Lewis: What a unilateral piece of poppycock that was!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: They have been retreating with remarkable haste. Indeed the government has shown considerable capacity to retreat.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Do not mislead this House before a viewing audience.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Now the member is twisting words.

Mr. Lewis: I ask, Mr. Speaker, about the hospital workers whose take home pay often ranges between \$65 and \$75—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: He is twisting, distorting—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, oh. Have I touched a sensitive nerve in the provincial Treasurer?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member is twisting the truth.

Mr. Lewis: Have I touched a sensitive nerve?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: He is distorting the truth.

Mr. Lewis: Let us take the five per cent wage guidelines and apply it to certain of his cabinet colleagues, like the Prime Minister of Ontario, whose budget in his department went up from \$407,000 to \$684,000 over the one-year period. That is an increase not of five per cent but of 68 per cent. One wonders how many of the civil servants in the Premier's department were subject to the five per cent wage guidelines at the time of coming into employment.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I understand the need for additional civil servants in order to handle the Premier's affairs. After all, as Martin Goldfarb, the very expert public relations consultant, has pointed out in more newspapers than the minister would care to remember, it is necessary to sell the Premier as one sells a can of tomatoes.

After all, to transform the Premier into a can of tomatoes is a job which—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Better than a can of worms.

Mr. Lewis:—requires many civil servants, some of them highly paid. The transformation would be remarkable indeed. Think of the way in which one's physical anatomy would have to be altered—one's hair perhaps. But then, as has been pointed out in many papers, the Premier can always call in Mr. Ivan to give him a \$15 trim, off the top as it were, for the Premier's office.

A little embarrassing, what? The government of the \$15 primp—trim; either one will do. I, alas, am one of those old-fashioned types who still goes to a barber. In a sense, the Premier is old-fashioned too—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): How much does the hon. member's cost?

Mr. Lewis:—he has to have his civil servants call Mr. Ivan, unlike the leader of the Liberal Party who goes to the salon and enters the celebrities' room which is a privy that some of us have not yet ventured into.

What would we have done, Mr. Speaker? There would have been no imposition of unilateral ceilings on the civil service. They are free to negotiate in the best traditions of collective bargaining, and whatever the arbitrator settled—if arbitration was engaged in—would be acceptable to a New Democratic government in Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: This leads me, Mr. Speaker, to the sixth point of the 10 I wanted to make.

The budget makes only the slightest of passing references to a capital gains tax. It is as though the government has forgotten about this potential source of revenue, waiting totally on the federal decision, typically catering to privilege, excluding itself from a source of revenue that is extremely important in the Province of Ontario.

What would we have done, Mr. Speaker, to put it fairly succinctly? Regardless of the federal decision to be announced by Mr. Benson, which is likely to be a 25 per cent capital gains tax in Canada, we would tax capital gains at full income tax rates. We would ask the federal government to gather that money for us, additional to the 25 per cent that they tax themselves.

If they would not do it, then we will set up the administrative apparatus to do it for the Province of Ontario. But I have no doubt that in that instance they would indeed cooperate.

Mr. Speaker, I point out that the Carter report in its analysis of a buck for a buck, indicated that over a period of time—one assumes four to five years—a capital gains tax at full income tax rates in Ontario could yield as much as \$460 million if applied to 1971. The Treasurer nods his head in assent.

What right has the government of Ontario to exclude itself from such an important tax resource for so many years? The answer is: no right whatsoever. The possibilities of funding a number of programmes in Ontario are very great as we move to that eventual outcome, understanding, Mr. Speaker, as we do, that there must be a specific exemption for homes and for farms when applying the capital gains tax in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take another point about this budget—it is a little particular perhaps; but necessary. Nor would we in this party wish to exclude Ontario from the field of succession duty. We are not as sure as the government of Ontario and the official opposition that that makes any great sense.

The taxation of transfers of wealth between the generations, Mr. Speaker, is one of the principal means to move toward a more egalitarian society, provided of course, we look after the needs of widows, widowers and dependent children, and do not force the breakup of family farms and businesses.

Ontario is now receiving something in the nature of \$24 million over and above what it would receive by way of a 75 per cent return on the federal estate tax. We think that those levels are largely valid. We would even accept much of the budgetary increase in the succession duty levels which the Treasurer introduced, but we see no reason to exclude ourselves from a field of income which would range somewhere between \$12 million and \$24 million in Ontario at the very bottom.

Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that the present level of federal taxation of estates is extremely modest. It averaged 9.3 per cent of the net value of dutiable estates in 1969, and will likely be less when the 1968 federal amendments take full effect. In the field of capital gain and succession duties we would vary dramatically from the government.

Point seven: The government sounded a bold trumpet about bringing nursing home care into OHSIP and all of us applauded that extension of medical care coverage although much of what was said worried us greatly. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason in the world to delay the introduction of nursing home coverage until April

1, 1972. We have lost a full year during which time a great many people in this province will be excluded from that to which they are entitled.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, is it entirely clear to us why the government insists on imposing a \$3.50 deterrent fee for nursing home coverage under OHSIP. The fact of the matter is that when looked at in the context of, say, those who receive old age security, \$135 a month—even with the guaranteed income supplement—loses \$105 a month.

I suppose it is part of the Conservative maxim that you must suffer a little before you receive, but it makes questionable sense to us and we see no reason why those who are most vulnerable in the society are always subject to such reluctant and begrudging assistance.

This year, Mr. Speaker, with the highest premiums in Canada, the Province of Ontario is budgeting in its OHSIP accounts for a surplus of \$7.5 million. That is independent of any federal moneys. We do not use all the moneys coming to us federally for OHSIP, as the provincial Treasurer knows. Indeed, about 40 per cent of the money goes to something called the health resources fund, about which less and less is heard as more and more is allocated. The fact of the matter is that OHSIP is one of the most expensive programmes in this government. It is poorly administered; it is bureaucratic; it is inefficient. Indeed the organization of health care in Ontario is probably the least effective organization of any service to people in the province, with the possible exception of education itself.

Now Mr. Speaker, what would we have done in this area? We are pledged to provide a health care plan to the people of the Province of Ontario, at no more than \$5 a month per individual and \$10 a month per family, covering medical care, hospital, drugs and nursing homes. We would finance it, Mr. Speaker, largely by a shift from the regressive flat rate premium to an income tax based on ability to pay. Where this has been achieved, in the Province of Manitoba, it is worth noting that everybody in the province who receives an income of under \$11,800 a year pays less by way of income tax to cover health costs than they paid by way of premium. That seems to us to be a very compelling argument.

But it is more than that, Mr. Speaker, it is more than that. In the last several years, in Canada and in the Province of Ontario, it has become readily apparent that if we reorganize

the delivery of health services in the province, if we shift the focus from acute centred hospital treatment to community health services, like the Soo or St. Catharines, or what is proposed for Ottawa, or the Kaiser plan in California, or the health insurance plan in New York State, we can make enormous savings which can be transferred to bear the costs of health services generally.

Indeed the Ontario council of health—in a sense a creature of this government—analyzing the Kaiser plan in California indicated, Mr. Speaker, that a transferred saving for Ontario on a similar plan could amount to as much as \$280 million. I am not precisely sure, Mr. Speaker, what part of that can be applied totally to Ontario, but everyone is agreed that the savings would be enormous. It is from a redirection of the delivery of health care in Ontario that we would finance much of our health services system.

That brings me to item eight. The budget deals in astoundingly inadequate ways with the cost of education and the costs of local and regional government.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is as if we had no control over the juggernaut that was unleashed by the Premier when he was Minister of Education, and by the provincial Treasurer when he was Minister of Municipal Affairs. We have inherited the legacy of William Davis and Darcy McKeough, amiable gentlemen both.

The legacy is a system of costs of education which have moved astronomically upwards in certain areas—illegitimately—and which now that the guidelines have been imposed, intrude on the quality of education in some other areas. Why were the guidelines imposed at this point, albeit effectively in some areas? Because the whole system ran so much out of kilter while the Premier was Minister of Education, supervising its management.

The legacy to the people of Ontario is a lack of planning. To individual property owners and taxpayers it is an enormous burden. They are reeling under the fiscal blows, Mr. Speaker, and there is no relief to speak of. What did this budget do for the property owner and for the taxpayer in Ontario? It promises to assume 60 per cent of the costs of education, and that is all. The budget indicates it will not go further. It says it will pay an additional \$4.8 million towards regional government, and under analysis that turns out to be \$3.8 million for policing and \$1 million for the regional government of York for special programmes.

And that, Mr. Speaker, will be no substantial relief whatsoever. The truth is, as the chart on page 71 of the budget shows, that every single year—with the exception of 1968—a sizable, sometimes indefensible, increase in property tax rates has been experienced by the people of Ontario, whether municipal or educational, or both, and the same will be true in 1971 under this government.

Now what is the NDP alternative, Mr. Speaker, that to which we are already pledged? We would move to the assumption of 80 per cent of the costs of education by the year 1975, that is, in the life of our first term of office. We have indicated clearly and carefully in this Legislature that we would find it by way of corporation tax revenue, capital gains revenue, resource revenue, and a natural growth of the economy over that period of time. The details have been spelled out, I think, in reasonable and appropriate fashion.

Mr. J. Renwick: The Minister of Highways and Transport (Mr. MacNaughton) knows the member is right.

Mr. Lewis: We would introduce a municipal foundation programme, Mr. Speaker, providing equalization grants for regional municipalities across the province. It is profoundly wrong for the government to introduce regional government without giving it the fiscal strength to meet the new expectations which the people in the regional municipalities have.

Mr. J. Renwick: A tremendous mistake.

Mr. Lewis: That, Mr. Speaker, brings me to what I consider the most important point I want to make about this budget—point number 9.

The language of the budget, Mr. Speaker, provokes deliberate confrontation with Ottawa. The statesmanship of early times becomes the partisanship of today. Here we have a government—look at their active, vital features—here we have a government, Mr. Speaker, anxious, defensive, vulnerable, casting frantically about for an election issue, and it resorts to one of the most predictable political diversions, turning its guns when in trouble, on Ottawa.

So this document, this fashionable budget document, is full of strident, unlovely and provocative language. The government economists shed their clothes to become political propagandists. And they are no longer working for the government; they have been transformed into servants of the Progressive Conservative Party.

The attack on Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, apart from its irresponsibility and its reckless toying with federal provincial relationships—the provincial Treasurer will be known historically as the great balkanizer of confederation—the irresponsibility of the language in his attack on Ottawa simply will not wash.

Mr. Speaker, the reality is that during the period of Pierre Trudeau's most nefarious economic legislation—those things which offended all of us most, the unemployment levels, the Prices and Incomes Commission, the willingness to use inflation as an excuse for the refusal to plan the economy—what was this government doing during that entire period of time? I remember the former Premier standing in his place and talking about the problems of inflation in the economy and admitting that, perhaps, there were restraints needed in certain areas.

Just a couple of weeks ago we asked the Premier whether he would institute an appraisal of the price increases in the gasoline industry. He said to us, "I do not institute a prices review in the private sector."

If the government wants to make a substantial attack upon Ottawa then it will have to explain why, during the entire period of inflation, it refused to countenance any restraint of prices, of profits, of interest rates, of rents, or of other forms of income.

Mr. J. Renwick: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: All the government talked about was the possibility of restraining wages, and that is an insufficient basis on which to attack Ottawa today. It goes further than that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is not right.

Mr. Lewis: The government's attack on Ottawa would have been much more impressive if this budget had made every conceivable provision to buoy up the economy. If this budget had, in fact, created major employment. If this budget had, in fact, stimulated economic growth.

But the budget is doing none of that. The budget is an unsubstantial document. The budget has failed in terms of accelerating the economy and therefore, even though none of us in this party would apologize for a moment for the policies of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, the Prime Minister's own position is profoundly vulnerable.

Mr. Pilkey: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: The only party that apologizes for Pierre Elliott Trudeau in this Legislature

is the Liberal Party, and one can understand that. They have a consciousness of foreign control that others have not yet experienced.

Mr. Speaker, if the budget were just—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: I am sorry. I should have said colonial dependency, or something of the kind.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): The Leader of the Opposition is blushing.

Mr. Lewis: The angry rhetoric of the budget, Mr. Speaker, if that were all, would not concern us. It is too transparent. We would bring you right back to the provincial battleground when the election is called. The divisionary tactics with Ottawa would not suffice.

But it all led to a section of the budget which we in this caucus, find the most disturbing part of all in this document. Let me read it to remind the government. The Treasurer says:

I wish to state now our clear intention to assume complete responsibility for the established shared-cost programmes in exchange for fiscal equivalence and to resist rigorously the establishment of new shared-cost programmes. In the long run, this solution will serve all governments better.

Mr. Speaker, in those words lies a greater threat to Confederation than all the other angry rhetoric of the document.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Nonsense.

Mr. Lewis: What are you prepared to do—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Listen.

Mr. Lewis: —is to pull out from your fiscal commitments to Canada. Let me take the provincial Treasurer back to more glorious days when he was a gladiator in combat at Maple Leaf Gardens and that famous night when all the young men seeking the golden fleece spoke to the assembled throng and the Treasurer had to show where his troops would go the next day. Would it be to William Davis or would it be to Allan Lawrence?

And it became pretty clear, did it not, when he read from the podium at Maple Leaf Gardens the following statement—it was thunderous, and it was effective, and even though he called some of us sham statesmen, I could not help but think, "Nicely done, Darcy, nicely done."

The municipal affairs minister told the delegates: We have heard some blustering talk in this leadership campaign about tough negotiations with Ottawa, about demanding a fuller accounting of federal assistance going to other parts of the country. I too will stand up for Ontario—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: —he said, pulling himself to his full height.

Well now I feel better. The members opposite are alive, Mr. Speaker. I was concerned for a little while.

Mr. MacDonald: They have finally woken up.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Why do you not joint us?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): You must admit, it is an effort today.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: I thought maybe everyone was comatose.

“I too will stand up for Ontario,” said Darcy McKeough, “but I will not pawn the Robarts mantle of statesmanship and reconciliation for a bigger fistful from the federal till.”

Mr. Pilkey: Now what is the hon. Treasurer and Minister of Economics going to say?

Mr. Lewis: How do those words sit in the mouth today, provincial Treasurer? How do they sit in the mouth today? Well, there may be some anxiety on the part of the government, but all of them know what they are about.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We sure do.

Mr. Lewis: The government are skilled tacticians; they are worthy politicians. They know what they are about when they enter into federal-provincial discussions.

And what exactly is Ontario saying? It is saying that it is going to take post-secondary education, medical care insurance, the Canada Assistance Plan, hospital insurance—programmes equalling \$1 billion in cost-sharing—and Ontario is going to opt out. What the government wants instead are the income tax points; what they are asking for, by way of tabulation, is 54.5 points on the income tax, rather than the 28 points they now receive. That is how it works out.

Quebec did it. But it was more a matter of symbolic bookkeeping, because the arrangement between the federal government and Quebec meant that Quebec did not get any more than they would otherwise have received by way of grants. But that is not what Ontario intends. What Ontario intends is to receive the income tax points, which continue to expand from year to year, and bring more and more money into the coffers of Ontario and undermine the fiscal core of this country.

It will destroy the fiscal basis of Confederation. The government has run around uttering that the federal government takes out between \$1.4 billion and \$2 billion more than it puts into Ontario, but it has no evidence for the statements. The documents that government has produced are hollow documents. Many of the journalists and people in the media have exposed them as hollow on countless occasions.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: One; Harold Greer!

Mr. Lewis: Well, I will read Harold Greer on this occasion.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Many! Harold is not many. That is interesting.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is Lewisonian policy.

Mr. Lewis: Not only Harold Greer, but the research economists of the New Democratic Party—and that is good enough for me.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Now we know who writes the stories.

Mr. Lewis: And you know, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Who is it that does his research?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I too should have the humble right of rallying the troops on occasion. We do not make as much noise when we are rallying.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They have not got that many.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, let me point out that, as every member opposite knows, even though the head offices of corporations that are taxable are in the province of Ontario, the sales run right across Canada. The former Premier said on innumerable instances that

this province should pay to maintain Confederation. What did he say recently? "Ontario does not object to paying a price for Confederation." He says that. And: "Our equalization payments to other parts of Canada are part of Ontario's profound responsibility toward the health of the Canadian federation."

Where is that spirit now?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Dried out.

Mr. Lewis: What distorted ends are served by this destructive political logic on which the Tories now embark? Look at what happens. The government destroys national standards. That is evident. The possibility of a guaranteed annual income will be very difficult to achieve. The government will undermine the exchange of information among provinces; the regional disparity in the Maritimes and in the West would be more pronounced. Any federal fiscal policy that might be exercised in a positive way will be undermined. The assertion in the budget statement is so bald and categorical that they have left themselves insufficient room for manoeuvring. Their position is defiant and wrong-headed.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): They are going to destroy the country.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, what would we have done? We know that the federal government is in no sense angelic concerning fiscal relationships. We recognize the degree of inflexibility. But instead of going to Victoria or anywhere else, saying that we are committed to opting out, we would have gone to Victoria and said, "We are determined to make the cost-sharing arrangement work so that the country can work."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: If one treats Confederation in that spirit, Mr. Speaker, in precisely the same way that one uses the strength of Ontario to keep Quebec in Confederation, then indeed there would have been a role for this government. Unlike the Tories, we have not yet lost faith in the capacity of the country to function as a country, rather than as 10 dismembered units.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: That leads me, curiously enough, to the last point I want to make: The Conservative Party in Ontario similarly lacks faith in the capacity of our own province to govern our own economic affairs free from foreign control.

The sole gesture in terms of economic nationalism in this budget, to cope with the influence exerted by foreign investment in Ontario, is that if one Canadian company purchases another, interest on the takeover is deductible. The entire imaginative process of government was exhausted with that heroic economic policy. I think the government opposite knows what we would have done.

We would have instituted a takeover review board, Mr. Speaker. We would have transferred funds by law—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Nationalized!

Mr. Lewis: —into bonds of the Ontario Development Corporation for reinvesting in Ontario, with Ontario's money, a policy that Mr. Eric Kierans has given some substance to in the last few days. We would have made provisions to purchase equity in branch plants of multi-national corporations by individuals and by government.

In short, Mr. Speaker, we would have begun the process of repatriating our economy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Within that context—

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): You will never have the chance.

Mr. Lewis: —take another look at the glorious budget. It is a pretentious document. It is not substantial. It is no instrument of economic planning. It has no grand sense of fiscal or monetary policy. It is just the old style of balancing the books—no new design, just a series of old gasps. What a balance the government has struck.

Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker—no tax relief for people, just for corporations. Little, if any, change in the property tax burden. No serious promotion of jobs or economic growth. OHSIP premiums as high as ever. Northern Ontario still a client state for southern Ontario. Diversionary trench warfare with Ottawa. Not a very impressive roll call for a new, or allegedly new, government.

With the same approximate deficit—because we accept that a deficit of that level, as the Smith committee on taxation pointed out, is well within reason and within limits—we would have reversed the priorities. We would have provided tax relief. We would have stimulated the economy. We would have exploited new revenue from new sources—no Utopia, just a great deal more intelligent and common-sense economic planning.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: And so, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the critic for our party of Treasury and Economics, the member for York South, that the amendment to the motion of the Treasurer be amended by adding after the words "In advance of any such negotiations" the following:

Further, this House regrets the failure of the government to reduce the retail sales tax by one percentage point in order to stimulate purchasing power and to increase employment;

The failure to reverse the diminishing contribution of corporations to provincial revenues by a one point increase in the rate of tax;

The failure to implement the recommendation of the Ontario Proposals for Tax Reform, 1970, for tax rebates to low income earners;

The failure to commit Ontario to taxation of capital gains at full income tax rates as an extension of a federal capital gains tax;

The failure to derive much greater revenues from Ontario resource industries and to channel a larger proportion of these revenues to meet the needs of mining municipalities;

The failure to recognize that the imposition of the five per cent ceiling on civil service salaries is destructive of good faith collective bargaining and will be grossly unfair to many public servants;

The failure to commit the province to the assumption of a full 80 per cent of the cost of elementary and secondary education;

The failure to reduce the present regressive flat rate hospital and medical premiums to not more than a combined premium of \$5 a month for single persons and \$10 per month for families, additional cost to be financed from income taxes and the dollar savings from a significant extension of Ontario's preventive health services;

The failure to introduce the principles of a municipal foundation plan into the system of unconditional grants for regional municipalities, and above all;

The failure to adhere to Ontario's past role of supporting cost-sharing programmes which have made possible new initiatives in social and economic policies, and the development of national standards of service, which remain essential to the preservation of the Canadian confederation.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. MacDonald, that the amendment to the motion of the Treasurer be amended by adding after the words "In advance of any such negotiations" the following:

Further, this House regrets the failure of the government to reduce the retail sales tax by one percentage point in order to stimulate purchasing power and to increase employment; to reverse the diminishing contribution of corporations to provincial revenues by a one point increase in the rate of tax;

To implement the recommendation of the Ontario Proposals for Tax Reform, 1970, for tax rebates for low income persons; to commit Ontario to taxation of capital gains at income tax rates as an extension of a federal capital gains tax; to derive much greater revenues from Ontario resource industries and to channel a large proportion of these revenues to meet the needs of mining municipalities; to recognize that imposition of the five per cent ceiling on civil servants salaries is destructive of good faith collective bargaining and would be grossly unfair to many public servants; to commit the province to assumption of a full 80 per cent of the cost of elementary and secondary education; to reduce the present regressive flat-rate hospital and medical premiums to not more than a combined premium of \$5 per month for single persons and \$10 per month for families, additional costs to be financed from income taxes and the dollar savings from a significant extension of Ontario's preventive health services; to introduce the principles of a municipal foundation plan into the system of unconditional grants for regional municipalities; to adhere to Ontario's past role of supporting cost-sharing programmes which have made possible new initiatives in social and economic policies and the development of national standards of service which remain essential to the preservation of the Canadian federation.

I am not at all certain whether we are going to continue with this debate—

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: We will continue then at 8:30 p.m.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, just before the motion is put, would the House leader tell us whether we return to Lands and Forests estimates tonight in the assembly?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Yes, it is expected to go to the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): If we do not have some second or third readings or committee, or something like that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Just so the hon. member will not be too surprised, we might have a second reading.

Mr. Singer: Thank you very much.

It being 5:30 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Correspondence with Ottawa re agenda for Victoria constitutional conference, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis	1179
Conference on Economic and Cultural Nationalism, statement by Mr. Davis	1179
Conference on Economic and Cultural Nationalism, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	1179
Eviction from Humbervale Apartments of OHTA president, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Trotter, Mr. MacDonald	1181
Appeal on OMB decision to allow Metro to proceed with Spadina Expressway, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Trotter	1181
Review of present status of regional government re St. Catharines action, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	1182
Death of Elijah Sanderson of Rideau regional hospital, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon	1182
Speakers representing interest groups at conference on foreign investment, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Pitman	1182
Cabinet position on funding community health centres, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Lewis	1182
Additional staff members approved for Ontario Hospitals and hospital schools, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Lewis	1183
Collection of damages resulting from extra police costs at rock festival, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Singer	1184
Children being given and taking drugs in elementary schools, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Deans	1184

Chattels and furniture in ministers' offices, questions to Mr. Auld, Mr. Sopha	1184
Assisting municipalities with fund shortages due to heavy welfare rolls, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Trotter	1185
Physiotherapists excepted for payment under health services, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Breithaupt	1185
Charges laid re survey of cottages on Muskoka and Kawartha Lakes, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Pitman	1186
Future use of large vehicle in front of garage re HOME programme, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Worton	1186
Provision for additional chronic care facilities in Essex County, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. B. Newman	1187
Present situation re no-fault insurance legislation, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Lawlor	1187
Cost and operation of Port Dover lift bridge, question to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Gaunt	1187
OSC findings re Osler firm and possible charges against Mr. McDermott, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Shulman	1187
Caravan of US army engineers travelling eastward from Essex and Kent counties, question to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Paterson	1187
Ontario representation at Supreme Court of Canada hearing on Manitoba marketing legislation, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Sopha, Mr. Singer	1188
Courses for teachers qualified to teach trainable retarded children, question to Mr. Welch, Mr. Stokes	1188
Cutting off funds to community college adjuncts in Woodstock and Simcoe, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	1188
Use of inexpensive non-mechanical artificial kidney device, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Burr	1189
Reason why certain married university students cannot get rent rebates, question to Mr. White, Mr. Good	1189
Reliance by wineries on purchases by alcoholics, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Peacock	1189
People arrested for drunkenness taken to detoxification centres, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Trotter	1189
Faulty construction of library of new OISE building, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Shulman	1190
Details of ODC loans to service industries, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Ruston	1190
Information centre in Cornwall largely unable to give information in French, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. MacDonald	1190
Tabling list of Toronto industries polluting Toronto air, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Singer	1190
Buying land in Windsor for E. C. Row expressway, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Burr	1190
Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, Mr. De Monte, first reading	1191
Estimates, Department of Agriculture and Food, Mr. Stewart, concluded	1191
Real Estate and Business Brokers Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	1209
Resumption of the debate on the budget, Mr. Lewis	1210
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Wishart, agreed to	1222
Recess, 5:30 o'clock	1223



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, May 4, 1971
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1971

The House resumed at 8:30 o'clock, p.m.

MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 35, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, this is perhaps one of the series of annual bills that the government presents for regional councils, interestingly enough departing from the established precedent of the House in relation to having the council present its own bill and letting the bill wend its way through the private bills committee with public advertising and allowing certain persons to come before the committee and make representations. There is not really a great deal at stake here, except for the interesting provision that we are going to allow the sale of spirituous liquors in parks. It is very fascinating that the government has embarked on this brave adventure.

Notwithstanding the fact that my colleague from Owen Sound (Mr. Sargent) has talked about an interesting lounge that has been constructed at substantial public expense, completely outfitted with all kinds of facilities and trained staff in uniforms—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): The member is out of order.

Mr. Singer: —who are standing by—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The member is right in order.

Mr. Singer: —ready and willing to go—

Mr. Sargent: The minister is the one who is out of order.

Mr. Singer: —to serve spirituous liquors within the confines of this august building. Now, I have no objection to the widening of the very curious and archaic restrictions as contained in The Liquor Licence Act. It seems a strange place, however, to include

such reform in An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act. One would have thought reasonably that if the government was going to embark on a brave new programme to take the Victorian restrictions away from the concern that has surrounded our liquor laws in this province for a long time, one would have done it in the appropriate liquor legislation and not hide it within a specific Act.

As I say, I, and I am sure my colleagues, have no quarrel with the specific section that is in this bill. But one wonders about the hypocrisy of government which tucks this away in an apparently innocuous bill when they have not got the courage to even recognize that within the confines of this building there is an unrecognized and unlicensed bar, just up there—and I point to a place within a very few feet of us—of whose existence Mr. Frost not too many years ago said he was not aware, and that there are facilities constructed by government, at substantial expense to the taxpayer, which the government again refuses to recognize.

So substantially, Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. minister who brings forward this bill, which we are not going to oppose, what is the philosophy of the cabinet in allowing this bill? What is the philosophy of the Tory caucus in bringing this bill forward without really recognizing the archaic nature of all of our liquor laws?

Why is it important, at this moment, to allow the sale of liquor in metropolitan parks in Metropolitan Toronto only? There are metropolitan parks, I suppose, in the new metropolitan regions in the Lakehead, in Niagara, which might have an equal claim to this kind of privilege. Is it a privilege or is it a right? Why is it not done for all of the municipalities in Ontario?

Why are all of the liquor laws not amended in reasonable fashion and brought before us so that we can logically and sensibly discuss them? What particular prejudice is the government setting aside when it brings in this section to this Act at this time? Why does the government not have a policy? Are they always going to nibble? Where is the new wave that they talked about at their

convention? Are they going to have a policy for Metro in a park but not in the legislative assembly? Are they not going to have the same policy in Kitchener? Where is the new wave? Where is the government's imagination?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Right here.

Mr. Singer: The rest of it, Mr. Speaker, is really not very much. If Metropolitan Toronto wants to spend \$50,000 for entertainment, I would think—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why does the member not move a motion that the Legislature ask for it? The member will want to move for that.

Mr. Singer:—that this makes some reasonable sense. I wonder about the limit. The councillors in Metropolitan Toronto are elected in the initial instance by the various boroughs and surely one can count on their judgement to govern their expenses and make them reasonable. They are elected as we are elected.

There are no statutes that I am aware of that limit my friend, the Minister of Trade and Development as to how much he can spend on entertainment. I do not know about him, but his predecessor was one of the great spenders of all time. I do not know about this man, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I never pick up the tab. I never spend on entertainment.

Mr. Singer: All right. His predecessor was certainly one of the great spenders of all time, and while we have no statute here that limited his predecessor perhaps the present minister has greater discretion than his predecessor had.

Why should there be a limit on the councillors of Metropolitan Toronto as to how much they can spend? The press watches them very closely, as they watch us. Why should there be a limit at all? Why can you not trust the discretion of the elected municipal councillor?

There can be a mall on Yonge Street—that is fine. This seems to be a good idea. But why should you exempt people from damage actions? This is something that bothers me, Mr. Speaker, if, notwithstanding any of the provisions of any general or special Act, no person should be entitled to recover any damages from the exercise by the metropolitan corporation of its actions under this section. That bothers me—no matter how bad they are, no matter how negligent they are.

One would expect again that the metropolitan corporation of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto is going to exercise its powers with care and discretion and in a manner that is not going to damage anybody. Why does the minister need a saving clause? If they are negligent, if they hurt somebody, if they hurt a merchant there, if they hurt an individual there, why should they not be subject to an action for damages?

Why do we not trust our courts to determine whether or not in fact they have been negligent; in fact, they have hurt somebody? If the courts in their wisdom come to the conclusion that someone has suffered damages, why then should that right of action be removed by legislation?

As I say, I have no objection to there being a mall on Yonge Street. I think that is a very good idea but I concern myself very seriously, Mr. Speaker, about a clause that takes these things out of the courts. For those reasons, I have some substantial reservations about the merits of this bill that the Minister of Municipal Affairs brings before us.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But the member will vote for it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Yes, thank you. Much of what can be said about the bill, of course, has been said by the member for Downsview. I want to start at the back rather than the front because, in regard to the closing of this street, I cannot help wondering why we have to go through such an elaborate procedure as we have had to in this instance.

Why do we have to hold such tight rein on the municipal council, particularly municipal councils the size of this one? It does not make much sense to me to talk on the one hand of autonomy and giving the municipalities some freedom to exercise some of the powers which they actually were elected to exercise, and then for us to have to pass laws to deal with each individual instance that comes before them that deviates in any way from the norm.

I think that it would be very useful if we were to grant municipalities the powers to do these kinds of things across the board; in any municipality; to take whatever steps they want to take to meet the demands of their particular electorates and citizens. I worry about having to stand in the Legislature and having to sit for that matter and pass legislation dealing with such matters as this.

As far as the closing of Yonge Street or any other street is concerned, I think that this is something that the individual municipality—it could be in any city or any town—has to come to grips with. I think that if they decide they want to do this sort of thing, they should be able to do it by right, not by special legislation, but by general legislation.

On the whole matter of the power to sell liquor and spirits, fermented or intoxicating, within metropolitan parks, like the member for Downsview, I think that if we are going to extend this right, it should be extended to all municipalities. It should be once again the right of the municipality to determine what it wants to do within its boundaries. If we feel it is right to do it in Metropolitan Toronto, then surely other municipalities across the province have similar rights and we should pass enabling legislation for all municipalities to do these kinds of things, I would hope.

I want to ask the minister if he would tell me why this change was brought about; why it was changed in this particular Act, and whether there is any reason to believe that this kind of legislation could not be made available to municipalities to use as they see fit in keeping with their own particular feelings and responsibilities to their own citizens? Surely, it would make more sense to do it in that area. Other than that, the same is true all the way through. The same is true of the expenditure of funds for entertaining. All the bill says to me, as I read it, is that it ought to have been contained in the general legislation that affects all municipalities and that the permission to do these kinds of things should be permission extended to everyone operating within the province at a municipal level.

That is the kind of authority that we should be giving out. I do not think we should be meting it out piecemeal. I do not think we should be giving it to one without the other. I think that if it is good for Toronto, it is good for anyone. In terms of this kind of legislation, if the elected officials are doing the job properly, then we have nothing to fear. If they are not, then we are not answerable for them; they are answerable for themselves. I suggest to the minister that perhaps he could tell me why it is not general legislation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): How did the UAW get into this?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the only observation that I might have on this, although it is permissive legislation, I think that it only further points out the complete hypocrisy of this party—

Mr. G. Demers (Nickel Belt): Oh, come on.

Mr. Sargent: —in its whole approach.

Mr. J. R. Simonett (Frontenac-Addington): The member should smile when he says that.

Mr. Sargent: Over the years, every one of us here—

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): What about the member's hotel?

Mr. Sargent: Over the years we have, every one of us here, in our daily lives been exposed to booze. It is a fact of life that there is booze in this province. No matter where we go, it is part of everything the government does and every department here. Talk about a \$50,000 limit. Removing the limit—you fellows—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Not my department.

Mr. Sargent: The government has had millions of dollars a year in entertainment and booze and the fact—

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): He is underestimating—

Mr. Sargent: We go through these travelling expense votes in the estimates. We have changed these things now from travelling expenses. The government does not call them travelling expenses any more. It calls them communication and transportation. Look in the estimates, from here on now, members will see no more travelling expenses. It is communication and transportation we are talking about now in the estimates. That is how the government is further hiding it from the public. Now in the estimates every one of us will see untold thousands and thousands amounting to about, I would say, \$1 million a year in booze that the government spends here.

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): No wonder the people cannot take the Liberal Party seriously today.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Booze is not our problem. It is the government's problem.

Mr. Singer: It is all right in Toronto parks but not in London parks.

Mr. Sargent: We have further hypocrisy in the lounge my friend was talking about. I hope that the fourth estate will not be too concerned if I talk about that for a moment. We have every Prime Minister up there with his picture with all his buddies in the lounge. The minister has never been in it, I guess—no?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where is that?

Mr. Sargent: The lounge here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Press lounge? Does the member mean to say they have booze there?

Mr. Sargent: You see, that is just what goes on.

Mr. B. Newman: He is so out of tune with the times.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How would the member know that?

Mr. Pilkey: The minister is shocked.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My God.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): He is stunned as usual.

Mr. Sargent: They tell the people that they are in favour of playing it down; that they do not touch the stuff. The government is not in favour of booze, but it makes it about—

Mr. J. R. Smith: Is the member?

Mr. Sargent: I think it has its place, yes.

Mr. Singer: We are not objecting to that.

Mr. Sargent: The only reason, I think, maybe, that they are playing down the bar downstairs is that they cannot talk to a few of the press here and make good fellows of themselves.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no beer downstairs.

Mr. Sargent: Is the government going to allow the press in the bar downstairs? I do not know what is going to happen there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Sargent: I can take the minister down and open up, unlock the cupboard and show him that it is full of beer, full of booze in all the cupboards down there.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Can we get back to the bill, please?

Mr. Sargent: This is not Lands and Forests. I am glad the minister dropped in. This is not Lands and Forests. We are on second reading.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Maybe we could get back to the principle of this bill.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker we have such things in this province known as local option areas.

Mr. Pilkey: The member knows all about that.

Mr. Sargent: We have local option as a law in this province. So local option is a law in this province. So here we have some legislation, Mr. Speaker—I know this is painful to you, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry. I wish you would not have that look on your face. Yet we have this legislation which is permissive to serve liquor in parks—

Mr. Singer: In Metro Toronto only.

Mr. Sargent: —In Metro only. Now what happens to the park in the local option area? What happens?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Subject to local option!

Mr. Sargent: This supersedes the local option.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Oh, no.

Mr. Sargent: It does not? It does not say that here.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): The member will have the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) on the hook there. High Park is going to be—

Mr. Sargent: We are nibbling at this liquor business all the way down the line. Last year we brought in legislation for giving licences to resort areas—which is very important to me in my part of the province—putting booze on wheels, as it were. We have yet to find out how many of these licences have been issued.

It is good talk. The Minister of Revenue and I are concerned in our area for having these people up there who cater to the travelling public tourist. Yet the resort licences are not effective. We are not getting them through.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We solved it all.

Mr. Simonett: How do you get a drink up there?

Mr. Sargent: After the next election it is going to be wide open. People are going to have it on a merit system. And you have got to be able to perform to get a licence, not be part of the Tory party and pay the right lawyer \$10,000.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): How about a means test?

Mr. Sargent: I am talking on the booze factor.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Ask the Minister of Education what vote we are on and he will tell you.

Mr. B. Newman: We are not on Lands and Forests.

Hon. R. Welch (Minister of Education): Second reading, Metro Bill. How's that?

Mr. Sargent: As far as this legislation is concerned we have the Bill Davis bottle club downstairs; we have this permissive legislation to serve liquor in parks; we have the resort area programme, which is not working yet to my knowledge.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Sure is; entirely wrong!

Mr. Sargent: There are not too many up our way. That was the motivation for it.

An hon. member: Give him a trailer.

Mr. Sargent: In this one thing I think the Prime Minister—now that he is here—should tell the House exactly what his position is in regard to the \$100,000 bar downstairs? Is he going to tell the public there is no such thing down there, when the pictures have been in the press that—

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I really do not believe that there is a bar until the licence is issued. So there is no bar, wherever it is.

Mr. Singer: Stop quibbling. Stop quibbling.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the member for Grey-Bruce want a beer? Is that what he is saying?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why does the member not get up and make a motion that—

Mr. Sargent: The booze is down there.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Let us go down and get into it.

Mr. Sargent: I cannot now.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sargent: Now, Mr. Speaker, very seriously, this is getting beyond a joke. We have every area of our economy in our part of the riding, the business is resort and tourism. And we have these local options—a patchwork quilt where in five minutes you can be—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What about that ad—the million dollars for—

Mr. Sargent: He is out of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we could return to some level of parliamentary debate through the Chair?

Mr. Sargent: In summary, Mr. Speaker, I want to get across that the Premier and his predecessor have been kidding the troops a long time in the issue. Now to show how this government operates—this should go in Hansard—the fact that many of you do not know that up in Artemesia township the people had a vote there and they voted 317 against having a licence in that area and 15 votes for it—so the people were against it. But three months later a friend of the Prime Minister opened up the operation there with a licence, even though the people voted against it. This is the way these people over here operate.

Hon. Mr. Welch: What has that got to do with this bill though?

Mr. Sargent: We are talking about giving licences to sell liquor in trucks in Toronto here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: That is permissive legislation.

An hon. member: Without a vote.

Mr. Sargent: Here we have people who voted against a licence, but the government says "We will forget about your vote. We will put a licence in there anyway."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, the member is wrong.

Mr. Sargent: I give the minister my word that this is actually what happened. It is a fact of life. It happened. Now we have local option, Mr. Prime Minister, in this province and we have our city which is geared to the resort business. We cannot handle the tourists. They have got to go 10 miles outside the city to get a drink.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): The deer and the wolves voted for it in the park.

Mr. Sargent: That is right.

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: The deer and the wolves are voting for it in the park.

This pinpoints the hypocrisy of the minister's whole approach to the area of business in our economy up there.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: We are going to vote against it, at least I am.

An hon. member: No, we are not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the member want to bet?

Mr. Sargent: We will try it and see what happens.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the hon. member going to vote against it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I guess the member for Downsview will give us a fair—

Mr. Singer: I will be here.

Mr. Sargent: This bill removes the limitation of \$50,000 on the city of Toronto for entertainment. I am in favour of that.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: It is permissive legislation with regard to the city of Toronto. But I am against the fact that the consistency of policy of this government is ridiculous in this local option and liquor policy.

Mr. Singer: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sargent: Vote 4, section 2.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Vote 4?

Mr. Singer: Section 4, subsection 2.

Mr. Sargent: Section 4, subsection 2 says that "notwithstanding the provisions of any

general or special Act, no person shall be entitled to recover any damages or compensation of any nature whatsoever from the Metropolitan Corporation of Toronto."

Mr. B. Newman: That is taking away the person's right.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to have the minister tell me why this is in there. I do not think it is intelligent insofar as any person who breaks a leg through these promenades or who loses a lot of money in business, because there is no recourse against the city. This is not fair. It is not right.

I think that the minister should say why this is in there, other than the fact that—and I force it down—the Premier has a right to the facts of life with regard to his policy on issuing licences for resort areas—in my area—and local option.

Mr. Singer: Attaboy!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oshawa.

Mr. Pilkey: Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite obvious why the government wants to take the \$50,000 limit off. With liquor in the park, obviously they are going to need more money. Does the hon. minister understand that?

Mr. Singer: Okay, the hon. member scored on that one.

Hon. Mr. Bales: The hon. member is missing the point there.

Mr. Pilkey: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to make a comment, too, on this question of damages. Surely, I suppose, if we are going to put in a promenade that the municipality of Metro Toronto needs some protection against damages that may accrue as a result of loss of business, and so on. I understand that.

But what I do not understand is that the individual, it seems to me, is not given the type of protection that is necessary. Obviously because the minister eliminates the north-south traffic he will not be eliminating the east-west traffic as far as this bill is concerned.

There could be people who are seriously injured in some fashion in this specific area and it may be that it is a result of negligence of Metropolitan Toronto. It appears to me that the individual should have some protection as far as the negligence of that municipality is concerned.

I just do not think that they should be completely exempted from all damages because the minister is trying to protect the interest of the city against the larger operations that may be adjacent to this promenade. I just do not think that it is fair to the individual in that respect.

I appreciate that this is permissive legislation for the municipality to put spirits and other things in parks, but it seems to me that—and I am not talking about the ghosts now, I am talking about fermented spirits—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member had me confused for a minute.

Mr. Pilkey: But, in any event, it seems to me that the government is abrogating some of its powers to the council of Metropolitan Toronto. I suppose that is not bad, except why are other municipalities not put in the same favourable position, if it is a favourable position, to make the same determination in their respective municipalities?

I appreciate that this would have to come about as a result of an amendment, I suppose, to The Liquor Licence Act, and it should apply to all municipalities, if it is going to apply to Metropolitan Toronto. I just think the government is treating the other municipalities as second-class citizens in this province as opposed to Metro Toronto. I appreciate that the government wants to be favourable to Metropolitan Toronto, but what is the matter with Oshawa, for example?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Great city.

Mr. Pilkey: Right. Why does the council there not have the same permissive powers?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All it has to do is ask.

Mr. Pilkey: Why should it have to ask? What this government is continually saying is that if we provide this permissive legislation, it looks as though we are forcing it on the municipalities. We do not want to force anything on to the municipalities, but if they ask we will legislate it. It seems to me that this is not taking any leadership in this area and it is typical of a Tory government in any event. Let them come to us, and we will respond. We will not act; we will respond. It seems to me that this is all the Tory government ever does. They respond to everything but they never act and until—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Local autonomy!

Mr. Pilkey: Why does the government not give a little leadership in some of these areas?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is an authoritarian approach.

Mr. Pilkey: Is that an authoritarian approach? The government could make it permissive so that every municipality has the same right as Metropolitan Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We do not want to dictate. I thought that was what the members opposite wanted.

Mr. Pilkey: It seems to me that this would be in keeping with good government, giving every municipality in the Province of Ontario an equal opportunity.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Complete chaos. Local autonomy in local school boards—that was local autonomy gone mad.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a few comments on this, too, because it does seem strange to me why the government has to introduce such legislation for a specific municipality. Why would they not come along and encompass that in some other fashion so that it would be permissive in any municipality in the Province of Ontario? I can recall not too long ago that exactly what is mentioned in here was being done in my own community. In the days when they had a freedom festival—I should not say freedom festival, but emancipation day—in the city of Windsor liquor and beer were available in parks at that time. So it seems inconsistent that today, when they could have been doing it exactly the same way as before, now they are introducing legislation for one specific municipality. I can understand we are dealing solely with The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act and that is why it is in here, but there should be general legislation if the government agrees with the sale of intoxicating beverages in a park.

I wonder, while I look at this, whether this means the sale of beverages in an enclosed area, in a tented-over area, or in a confined space by putting up a snow fence, or is it going to mean that the individual may buy alcoholic beverages and walk through the park drinking it at his leisure as we do see in some of the jurisdictions to the south of us.

The other part of the bill that I would like to make comment on is section 2, or clause 4 section 2 of that clause, in which the individual's rights are being taken away by preventing him from suing in case of personal injury. I think that this would be contrary to the McRuer report. I think you are taking an individual's rights away when you deny him

the privilege of suing as a result of the incompetence, possibly, of some municipal employee in setting up a promenade or a mall.

My own community did have a mall last year and it was, in my estimation, quite a successful undertaking. It took vehicles off the main street and it permitted the individual to walk freely in the downtown area. I think it was a forward step in spite of the fact that it was opposed by certain businessmen in the community. I do not recall at all, when they set up the mall in the city of Windsor, that they denied anyone who may have been injured the right to sue the municipality as a result of the injury sustained. I certainly would like the minister to reconsider clause 4, subsection 2, in the light of the McRuer report.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Sargent: With your permission, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: A question I—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister will reply to all the members who asked questions.

Mr. Sargent: I wish to qualify the question to him, though, by saying this, Mr. Speaker, with your permission. Would the minister or the Premier, if the city council of Owen Sound requested the same legislation, give them the same right they have given the city of Toronto?

Mr. Speaker: This question has been asked. The hon. member will—

Mr. Sargent: No, I have not asked the question.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

That specific question has been directed to the minister by previous speakers. I am sure he will reply to it in his reply. The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): There is good sense, Mr. Speaker, in what has just been said with respect to this clause which is a reduplication, curiously enough, of a similar clause to which we took considerable exception and even grave umbrage in a bill that came before us, through the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), I believe, last week. It is the business of stripping human beings of their rights and lifting the

liability from a corporation under this head, and not in any restrictive area, which I could see some justification for.

For instance, with respect to the loss of business by bringing in a pedestrian mall. I would think it would add to most businesses, but maybe some enterprises along Yonge Street or in the vicinity might be hurt. But this bill covers too wide an area. Suppose that in construction of the thing, negligent construction takes place with respect of the mall itself and somebody trips and damages himself severely and wishes to take legal action.

Surely negligence arising out of civic employees in that particular regard—such as slipping on snow or banana peels left negligently about by employees—is just ground for suit. Suppose they break watermains, flood basements, or do any other kind of thing? An enormous range of tort liability could be destroyed in instituting such a thing as this and what do you do? The legislation itself sets up carte blanche freedom from liability or from compensation of any nature.

Surely that is a questionable principle on which to work. Surely the draftsmen of the legislation and the minister, under whose supervision it is done, can have slightly more finesse than this sort of broad brush stroke approach to the civil rights of individuals.

The member is perfectly right when he insists that this sort of thing runs counter to the McRuer recommendations. If you cannot do better in your drafting and introduce nicer distinctions than this kind of legislation, which without discrimination, lifts the whole thing holus-bolus into the void of no redress—

Mr. Sargent: The minister had better take it back and do it over again.

Mr. Lawlor: Certainly! What we are getting before us is a considerable amount of legislation hastily drafted, thrown at us, and obnoxiously pursued.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to enter the debate before the minister replies? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, dealing with the bill and the principle of the bill in various sections. Under the first or section 2, it deals with the matter of permitting applications for the sale of liquor in parks. It does not authorize the sale of liquor or other matters in parks on its own. It is all subject to the provisions of The Liquor Licence Act. Under the provisions of The Public Parks Act there is a prohibition against the sale of refreshments of spirituous, fermented or intoxicating liquors

in parks and, unless that is removed, the metropolitan parks are subject to the provisions of The Public Parks Act.

Mr. Singer: I wonder if the minister would permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Bales: In just a minute I will, yes. All this would permit would be the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto to pass a bylaw, which would then permit an applicant to make the normal application to the Liquor Licence Board to have an application considered with the normal provisions for the sale of liquor.

Now, the hon. member for Downsview has a question?

Mr. Singer: I wonder if the minister could advise us why, if it makes sense for Metropolitan Toronto, should it not apply to London, or Owen Sound, or Hamilton, or Kingston or any other municipality in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I would think that that, in due course, makes sense.

At the moment, there has been an application from Metropolitan Toronto. If other municipalities wanted to make that type of application, then fine. I think if there were a reasonable number, I would certainly consider general legislation. On the other hand, I do not think, at the moment, that we should bring in general legislation—

Mr. Sargent: The minister is not saying anything at all.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Bales: —until there is some request from the municipalities, because a number of municipalities do not want this type of legislation.

Mr. Deans: But they do not have to pass the bylaw.

Mr. Singer: They do not have to pass the bylaw if they do not want to.

Hon. Mr. Bales: That is right. If they do not, they can deal with it that way.

Mr. Sargent: Would the minister accept a question?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Would the member rather deal with it in Committee of the Whole later on? But if it is a specific question and if you wish to deal with it now in principle, I would be glad to hear it.

Mr. Sargent: I would just like to pinpoint, Mr. Speaker, that the minister says that he is

getting this legislation approved now for the city of Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Bales: That is right.

Mr. Sargent: How can the minister draw the line with any other municipality, then? If it would be automatically followed, they would get it on request.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Not automatically, but it is the type of legislation that if a municipality, by resolution, passed that kind of a request I would want to give very careful consideration to it.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. minister any further comments?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Yes. In reference to the second section there is a limitation at the present time as to the amount that may be spent for these various purposes. Where the population is not less than 500,000, the amount is limited to \$50,000. Under the provisions of this amendment, three quarters of the council voting in favour of a larger expenditure may do so.

The matter of the mall on Yonge Street: this is a request from the council of Metropolitan Toronto. They want to establish it for a one-week period and they do have, at the present time, power to establish such a mall. Any municipality does. But, the limitations on claims are not included in the general legislation, and I would not want to make that general across the province, that is, freeing those claims. They have asked for this for a one-week period. I think that it is a good thing to permit it. They have specifically pointed out that they need that kind of protection against claims for loss of business in case any would arise, and yet, they assure me, the merchants in the area have approved this operation for the one-week period. Giving it that way, we will see how this operates and, as I said before, under section 379—

Mr. Sargent: How can the minister draw a mall up and see no recovery?

Hon. Mr. Bales: —they do have authority at the present time and I pointed that out to them. They have requested additional protection for this limited period of time and, on that basis, I think that is reasonable.

Mr. Sargent: It certainly is not reasonable.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Other areas have received this kind of protection for malls in the future for specific locations. On that basis, on that limitation, I think that it is reasonable to

grant. On the points made by the hon. member for Lakeshore, I recognize the validity of them. That is the reason we have not wanted to simply include that exemption in the general legislation.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for second reading of Bill 35.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, I just came into the House. I was down in the other committee.

Mr. Speaker: The bill has been concluded. The minister has replied. The motion is for second reading of Bill 35.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading or committee?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Committee of the Whole House.

Agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The third order—House in Committee of the Whole: Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

House in committee on Bill 35, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 35, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act. Are there any questions, comments or amendments to section 1?

On section 1.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman: I have a question on section 1. Is it the intention of the minister to carry this forward as rapidly as possibly and give it royal assent, and if so, what is the pressure on the government to give authority for the actions in this bill?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, the mall is to be established—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Section 1 is not the mall; that is the liquor.

Hon. Mr. Bales: We are dealing with the bill itself. It is all part of the whole bill. The municipality wishes to establish that mall for

the period of, I believe, May 30 to June 5, and they have been anxious to have this legislation dealt with fairly quickly because they have to meet in metropolitan council and pass the necessary bylaws once this legislation has been authorized. That is the only reason we are bringing it forward and dealing with it as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Nixon: I just draw to the minister's attention that we were scheduled to discuss Lands and Forests tonight. There are a number of officials here prepared to do so. We are going to have at least one amendment to the bill and it may take some time for the discussion. I am glad to know the reasons why the minister is putting it forward in advance of the ordinary business that had been scheduled.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 1 carry?

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): I would just like to ask the minister one or two questions that come under general legislation on section 1. Am I to assume then that the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto have discussed and have passed a resolution for this bill to be passed by this Legislature, and it will then go back to the municipality of the city of Toronto?

I am trying to straighten out the steps that are being taken here. Am I to assume that a resolution has been passed in the city of Toronto asking that the Legislature pass this legislation? Then will they, in turn, pass a bylaw after this legislation has been put through? Could I ask the minister has he assured himself that the businessmen in Toronto who are going to be affected by this legislation have been fully consulted? Have there been public meetings? Has there been a sufficient degree of dialogue, at least in the minister's mind, with these men? Because I can say to the minister that he and the municipalities may find themselves in a real fighting war, after this is over next fall, if indeed it turns out to be a bit of a bomb.

I can tell him that in my own particular city we did put in a mall a couple of years ago and it bombed, and there was a tremendous row about it. They closed off the centre of the city and there was another route, through The Department of Highways, and it was given proper approval, I assume because it was a highway going through the centre of town. The point was that it had a great deal of very negative reaction. A number of businessmen were hurt: they believe they were hurt badly by it. I am just wondering if the minister is assured in his own mind

that there has been sufficient dialogue with the businessmen who are in that specific area.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, this mall is for a limited period of time, seven days, the period May 30 to June 5. The matter, I am assured and I have discussed this—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have lost the context of this debate because section 4 deals with the mall.

Mr. Pitman: I am trying to get at what is happening to the bill.

Mr. Singer: That was on second reading. We are now doing it section by section. If we are dealing with subsection 1, we are dealing with liquor in parks; subsection 2 is liquor in parks and section 4 is the mall. If we can get into some order, Mr. Chairman, it would be easier to follow.

Mr. Chairman: Actually, it was indicated to me that it was just a quick, brief question and we allowed it, but it is really out of order. Section 1 then is carried.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Humber was on his feet a moment or two ago.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to apologize for missing most of the debate, but I was down discussing waste management. This is one of the shortcomings of this system; one has to run back and forth and therefore misses the words of wisdom that were passed in this House by previous speakers.

If I repeat anything that was already said, I apologize.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): The hon. member would have no effect anyway.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The hon. member heard what his deputy leader said a moment ago about second readings?

Mr. Ben: I heard no part of the debate.

Mr. Lawlor: He was playing a little game.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Lawlor: Why not tell him to keep his mouth shut sometime?

An hon. member: Could we have a little order?

Mr. Ben: Oh, I am patient.

Mr. Singer: Listen to them nattering away again. They do not even know what they are nattering about, but they are nattering.

Mr. Pitman: The member's deputy leader had some very succinct comments about how we should deal with the bill.

Mr. Singer: That was on second reading.

Mr. Chairman: The discussion is on section 2.

Mr. Singer: Give the member for Humber a chance.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Could we have some order?

An hon. member: Go ahead.

Mr. J. Renwick: Is he speaking as an individual or as a member of the party?

Mr. Singer: The member for Riverdale is suffering from his usual complaint again—obnoxiousness.

An hon. member: Is the hon. member waiting for some explanation to come down from on high?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Sock it to them! Come on, give it to them.

Mr. Ben: I am quite patient, Mr. Chairman. I can stand here just as long as the next man, and I intend to stay here until I do get silence.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: I will just wait here—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Order! There are too many side comments. Let us hear from the member for Humber.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pitman: We are trying to direct the member for Humber.

Mr. Chairman: Not really.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Come on, let's go.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Get hold of yourself there.

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William): Try again.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Go ahead.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I am just letting all this be recorded in the annals of Hansard so that the people can see who is wasting the taxpayer's money.

Mr. Sargent: Give the Hansard girl a chance.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. Renwick: All the people who read Hansard will know who is wasting time.

Mr. Ben: Everybody was anxious to hear the Speech from the Throne—

Mr. J. Renwick: Try to keep to the point.

Mr. Ben: —and then the budget to determine whether there would be any goodies predicted which would cause people to say this was an election Throne Speech or an election budget. And when the budget came down, most people said, "We are not going to have an election right way—"

Mr. J. Renwick: Keep the hon. member on the topic, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Ben: "—because there are not that many goodies in it." But now when one starts to analyse the situation, he will discover that the goodies were not blatantly displayed—

Mr. J. Renwick: This is not the budget debate.

Mr. Ben: —for the average man on the street—

Mr. Pilkey: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. Ben: —but were neatly hidden away for the benefit of big business and the booze barons.

Mr. Chariman: On section 2, please.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: We have already seen—

Mr. Stokes: Would the member for Downsview call his colleague to order, please?

Mr. Ben: We have already seen how people buying capital equipment are not only going to get a five per cent rebate—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Ben: —but if they are using that money for pollution control equipment it is going to be 10 per cent.

Mr. Lawlor: We knew in advance that the member was not going to stick to the point.

Mr. Ben: We have seen—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): The member for Humber is out of order.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Ben: We have seen—

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): What has the hon. member seen?

Mr. Chairman: We had second reading. We passed second reading. If the member was not here, this cannot be helped. We are really discussing section 2 of this Act only—the sale of spirituous liquors.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what I am discussing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Section 2.

Mr. Ben: When, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Singer: Serves him right for calling second reading.

Mr. Ben: —the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) introduced his budget, he made it appear that the price of beer in Ontario was going to be equalized by raising slightly the price of beer in southern Ontario and lowering it in northern Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: What has that got to do with section 2?

Mr. Ben: It is on section 2. Does the hon. member mind if I get to it my way?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, we do.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Come on.

Mr. Ben: It transpired, Mr. Chairman, that the brewery industry was getting a bonus of some \$2.5 million.

An hon. member: How much?

Mr. Ben: Two and one half million dollars—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Ben: Section 2, Mr. Chairman—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: —is for the brewery industry. You can see how they tried to soft-pedal this, Mr. Chairman, when they even got you to the point that you would try to hush opposition members who try to make this public.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, come on!

Mr. Ben: That in essence is what this section is—another subterfuge for expanding the brewery industry. Parks at one time—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. As you know I enjoy this sort of dialogue up to a point—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Monologue.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but with great respect, the member for Humber is completely out of order. His leader has supported the principle of the bill. The only issue in debate is the wording in section 2, which has nothing to do with the cost of liquid refreshment whether it be in the form of beer or otherwise, and the observations being made by the member for Humber now are completely out of order, and, Mr. Chairman, I think he should be so told.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman is in agreement.

Mr. Jessiman: And we from northern Ontario are very much—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! Unless the member gets to section 2 now we will have to call him out of order and call in the next speaker.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I would inform you that under the rules of this House I take instructions from the Chairman, and not from the Prime Minister. I do not belong to his party.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can rise on a point of order if I want to.

Mr. Ben: If I take instructions from anybody other than the Chairman, it is my own leader.

Mr. Chairman: And we are discussing section 2.

Mr. Ben: We are discussing section 2, and I want to point out to you that I really hurt the Prime Minister over there—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member's own leader supported the present bill.

Mr. Ben: —because the truth of why this section is in here has come out and it has stung him. Parks are supposed to be for children, parks are supposed to be for people.

An hon. member: For promenading, for playing in.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a conspiracy for the breweries.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! That was the principle of the bill which was discussed some time ago. We are discussing in Committee of the Whole House the wording and the meaning of section 2, not the principle.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for Downsview is embarrassed and is leaving.

Mr. Stokes: That is something.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I am going to move that this section be struck out and I am entitled to state my reasons for so doing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: For goodness' sake; one would think they had lost their brains.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! I might point out that you do not strike it out, you may vote against it.

Mr. Ben: Fine, I am just going to say that at least I can give the reasons why I will vote against it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Against what?

Mr. Ben: Against this particular section.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It cannot be struck from the bill.

Mr. Ben: There is the Prime Minister giving direction again. The Chairman just pointed out that I can vote against it but not move to strike it out.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the member not agree with the Chairman?

Mr. Ben: Well, the Premier instructs the Chairman what he wants him to do for him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I agree with him.

Mr. Chairman: I would point out again we are discussing the principle.

Mr. Ben: We are not discussing the principle, we are discussing section 2—now smarten up, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do not tell the Chairman what to do!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: We are discussing whether or not we should support this section, and I was saying why we ought not to support it.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): There is no discipline in that party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: What does he know about Parliament? The biggest boob that this government ever pulled was appointing him.

Anyway, as I say, parks are for children, not for drunks.

Mr. Pilkey: Is this a Liberal policy.

Mr. Ben: We have enough trouble with people being drunk in parks and we do not even sell any liquor in parks.

This House is supposed to safeguard the interests of the municipalities. When city council asked this Legislature to approve the extension of Maple Leaf Gardens over College Street, the Legislature would not grant such approval and they stopped the expansion. There was no question on that occasion of whether it was asked for or not; the city asked for it and this Legislature saw fit to deny it.

So this is garbage and nonsense that is spewed here, that it is the city that is asking for it, or it is Metro that is asking for it. We have already set a precedent in this House, that it is not enough that a municipality even be it the city of Toronto or Metro Toronto, ask for legislation; we must concern ourselves with the propriety of the bill and the decency and the morals behind it. All of a sudden we have got to the point where we are supposed to pass anything because somebody asks for it. That is this government's attitude and the attitude of the Prime Minister, and they are trying to hush people who oppose that kind of principle.

Mr. J. Renwick: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Ben: Oh, you and your points of order.

Mr. J. Renwick: —the bill has been approved in principle.

Mr. Ben: The bill has been approved in principle, and please remind him, Mr. Chairman, that we are now discussing section 2, whether it should carry or not. And Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the inclusion of this section.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We came to that conclusion a short while ago.

Mr. Ben: One of the biggest Metro parks in Toronto is High Park and it happens to border my riding. High Park is there for youngsters to go in winter to toboggan; it is there in the summer for them to sail, to fish, or to walk along the nature trails. They even have a nature school there. Now this section will permit the establishment of liquor outlets in that park.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Bales: Could I help the hon. member? High Park is not a metropolitan park.

Mr. J. Renwick: Thank you.

Mr. Pilkey: Very good. He did not know that.

Mr. Pitman: Why did the minister not say that in the beginning? That is what it was all about to begin with.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: Maybe, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs finds that the Islands—which are Metro parks—are not used for the same purposes as High Park.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What does the member mean?

Mr. Ben: Maybe in his view it is justifiable to have outlets on the Islands, because the Islands indeed are the responsibility of Metro.

Mr. Pilkey: They are used for people, the same as High Park.

Mr. Ben: They are used for people. And people have the right to take their children—

Mr. J. Renwick: Except Bill Temple is in High Park.

Mr. Ben: —into an atmosphere such as presently exists in Metro parks and not have to concern themselves—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: With what?

Mr. Ben: —with being offended and their children being offended by the people who are inebriated.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who said anything about being inebriated? The member's colleagues—

Mr. Ben: This is not going to bring it about? We have over 100,000 alcoholics in the Province of Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who is being hypocritical now?

Mr. Ben: —and extending liquor outlets is not going to create any more? The hon. Minister of Trade and Development cannot forget that he was one time the chief booze purveyor for this province, and he still has an alcoholic mentality. I do not think he has ever sobered up.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! We are on section 2 in Committee of the Whole House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I never sobered up? I never got drunk tonight either!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Ben: I will tell you now I just ate and ran.

Mr. J. Renwick: I have a question.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): This is a new high for the Liberals.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, simply because something originates from the city or from Metro does not justify its passage by this Legislature.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! That principle was decided on second reading. Now as I say it is out of order, please. If the hon. member was not here we cannot help that; we cannot hold up the business of the House for that reason. We passed the principle of this whole bill, including section 2, a few moments ago so I rule the hon. member out of order. The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Ben: What you are saying is that I cannot speak against any section of the bill, because it was all passed in principle, is that right?

Mr. Chairman: We passed the principle of this bill a few moments ago. The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister if, in a few concise words, he would explain to us the limitation imposed

in this section by the words "subject to The Liquor Licence Act"?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of the section, metropolitan council may pass a bylaw authorizing sale of liquor within a metropolitan park through the normal application to the Liquor Licence Board. The application there would have to meet all the requirements for a liquor licence.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Which would also eliminate High Park.

Hon. Mr. Bales: In other words it would have to meet whatever their provisions are as to the establishment or type of establishment, the surroundings, and so on. This does not authorize the use of liquor anywhere in parks under any conditions whatsoever. It is limited to the normal situation wherein you make an application and conduct your affairs accordingly.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, that is precisely the point I would like to spend just two or three minutes elucidating with the minister. One of my colleagues informed me —because I am not familiar, of course, with the requirements of the Liquor Licence Board —that, for example, in the city of Toronto at the present time, unless you are above the ground floor, it is extremely difficult, with the minor exceptions which have just been made, to have a drink of spirituous beverage in view of other people.

Is it intended that there be special regulations published by the Liquor Licence Board governing the sale of spirituous beverages within these parks in Toronto or are the existing regulations to apply?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I understand the existing regulations will apply.

Mr. J. Renwick: I take that to mean that the minister does not have any knowledge of any special regulations which may be published by the Liquor Licence Board for the purpose of dealing with this departure in arrangements?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That is correct.

Mr. J. Renwick: Am I also to take it, Mr. Chairman, that there have been no discussions between the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the members of the Liquor Licence Board about this question?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That is correct.

Mr. J. Renwick: There have been no discussions of any kind?

Hon. Mr. Bales: My discussions have been entirely with the officials of Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would it not have been perhaps wise if the minister had spoken with the members of the Liquor Licence Board to determine whether or not this type of legislation would require some modification, however minor, in the rules which are applied by the Liquor Licence Board in other circumstances—bearing in mind that, I think all of us would agree to an extent, this is a departure by the provincial government from the enunciated policy with respect to the sale of spirituous liquors in the province?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with that. I think in this instance it is an application, as I anticipated, for sale of liquor in a regular restaurant, I presume in a park, if there is one.

Mr. Sargent: Why does the minister not tell us the background of the whole thing?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That is it.

Mr. Sargent: What is the motivation for it—case in point?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Metropolitan Toronto has entered into an agreement with a restaurant on the Islands, and I presume the restaurant is open and operating at the present time although I have not been there. They may wish to permit that restaurant to make an application to the Liquor Licence Board. If so, and if it is heard in the normal way, and if it is granted, then the liquor can be sold there. The metropolitan council can consider that type of situation for any of their metropolitan parks if they so wish, if this legislation is passed.

Mr. Ben: Ontario Place?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if I may just follow up the same particular point, if the member for Sudbury would let me. Are we speaking about the fact that something called sidewalk cafes in the city of Toronto will be part of the licensing arrangements within the Metropolitan Toronto parks? Or are we speaking simply about the traditional form of enclosed restaurant or lounge where a licence might be granted in a particular metropolitan park?

Hon. Mr. Bales: This legislation does not restrict the type of outlet it might be. That is subject to the provisions of The Liquor

Licence Act and their regulations. But, on inquiry, I was advised that the only establishment that they had in mind at the moment was a regular restaurant which is on the Island.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, may I just pursue this point? I really do not want to be technical about the problem and I approve of the principle of it, but I do not quite understand it because this particular section says that we are going to grant the council power to let from year to year, not any premises on which a particular restaurant may now be established so that restaurant could make an application to the Liquor Licence Board, what we are agreeing here to do is to lease the right to sell spirituous liquors.

Now, I would therefore understand it to mean that if the metropolitan council is going to lease the right to sell spirituous liquors, that the applicant for the licence will have to therefore be the metropolitan council to the Liquor Licence Board because they must get the licence to sell before they can then lease it. I again say to the minister I am not trying for one moment to be technical or obtuse about the problem but the section as drafted says that in addition to whatever other powers may be exercised, the council has the power to let for up to 10 years the right to sell, subject to The Liquor Licence Act, spirituous liquors. So, what we are in fact saying, it seems to me, is that the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto will make the application to the Liquor Licence Board to get a licence to sell spirituous beverages in a metropolitan park, and having obtained that licence they will then sublease the right to sell liquor to someone else.

Now my concern is about where the profit falls in the operation which we are being asked to confirm here at this time. I can quite understand that it may well be that there is some prohibition against an existing restaurant on the Toronto Island which leases premises from Metropolitan Toronto in an ordinary restaurant capacity feeling there was some inhibition somewhere in the statute against them applying directly to the Liquor Licence Board for a licence, and that this was to remove that problem and you would have an ordinary liquor-serving operation on the Toronto Island.

That seems to me to be entirely different to this Legislature granting to the Metropolitan Toronto council the right, as I take it in legal language, to sublease the right to sell. Because if Metropolitan Toronto obtains the

licence which permits them to sell spirituous liquors in, for example, municipal metropolitan-council-operated restaurants, and they then purport to sublease that particular right, it does seem to me that the element of profit-making comes in very prominently insofar as who can bid for that licence, how many people can bid and what are the terms and conditions under which the sublease of the licence would be granted.

I again emphasize that it raises in my mind a very substantial question as to what exactly we are doing by this bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may—

Mr. Sopha: If you listen to me first, you might reply to both of us.

Hon. Mr. Bales: All right!

Mr. Sopha: The member for Riverdale has of course the most highly developed capacity in the House to make sound tortuous and complex, a problem that is fairly simple.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Maybe it is to you, just to you!

Mr. Sopha: I cannot tell from the language, in what I concede to be a very badly worded section, what the last two lines refer to "under such regulations as council may prescribe." I cannot tell whether that refers to the letting of the premises referred to in the first two, or whether it refers to the conditions under which alcoholic beverages will be dispensed. I think that ought to be clarified.

Let me deal with the second first. I thought that under the laws of this domain, alcoholic beverages were dispensed throughout Ontario under the jurisdiction of the Liquor Licence Board and that they passed regulations there-to. If that is so, if that last derivative phrase refers to the dispensation of the beverages, I am unwilling to accord that power to the metropolitan council. There is a limit to setting up Alsaces in Ontario.

I say nothing about the principle of the bill—I am glad it is confined to Metropolitan Toronto—but I want to make this point, that there should be no jurisdiction whatsoever in the metropolitan council to govern in any way how the beverages are dispensed. That should be under the Liquor Licence Board. The danger of course is that if the regulations under The Liquor Licence Act are silent, they might turn to this section and begin to make regulations because of the silence of the other statute.

Now it is perfectly proper, of course, that if this passes, the council shall have power to prescribe the regulations for the letting. Then the point of the member for Riverdale becomes very apposite, and we would want to exercise control in that sector because we do not want any trafficking in licences or anything of that nature.

So I would plead with the minister to have his legislative draftsmen have a look at this section and see if the language cannot be clarified, to see whether or not it cannot be sharpened, because I assume the minister is a man who means what he says and wants to say what he means. This section simply does not do it. It is obscure in the extreme and we have adequate time in managing the affairs of the province to put down in words to convey that notion that we want to convey from a legislative point of view.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, the power given to the municipality here when it passes bylaws is to enter into an agreement with some person for permitting the sale of liquor in an establishment in a park, subject to the provisions of The Liquor Licence Act. The Liquor Licence Act must govern in reference to the application for the right to sell on those premises. They would have to comply with all of the regulations under the board, as to the dispensation and the method and so on.

Mr. Sopha: Let us move the last eight words up. Let us move them up to about "i.e., before—"

Hon. Mr. Bales: I think that we considered the point the member is making. I think it is quite clear that you have got to be subject to The Liquor Licence Act. It is quite clear in there that that right to sell is subject to The Liquor Licence Act. I think those words should be where they are; it would make it very clear that the right to sell is subject to that other board.

Mr. Chairman: Can section 2 stand as part of the bill?

Mr. Ben: What if there happens to be a vacuum in The Liquor Control Act—

Mr. Singer: The Liquor Licence Act.

Mr. Ben: The Liquor Licence Act! What if there happens to be a vacuum in The Liquor Licence Act to cover a particular situation? The wording of this section would permit Metro to fill that vacuum.

Hon. Mr. Bales: If their application for licence does not fall within the provision of The Liquor Licence Act and its regulations, they will not get a licence.

Mr. Ben: Perhaps the minister does not understand. The word that the hon. member for Sudbury was referring to was "regulations." In other words, the section as worded now empowers Metro to pass regulations governing the sale of the liquor after the licence has been granted. I suggest respectfully this is what it says and it would specially hold if there was a vacuum where the point was not covered in The Liquor Licence Act. I am not saying that they would govern whether or not a person had a licence. I am saying that they could set down regulations on how that licence was used after it was granted.

Hon. G. Carton (Minister of Labour): They would still be subject to the Act.

Mr. Ben: That is what it says, "Under such regulations as the council may prescribe." Tell us what those words mean if they do not mean—

Hon. Mr. Carton: They are subject to the Act.

Mr. Sopha: They should come after the word "sell."

Mr. Ben: —prescribing regulations. The minister put them there for some reason, I trust.

Mr. Sopha: They should come after the word "sell."

Hon. Mr. Bales: They can sell that—the right to sell—but the selling is subject to the provisions of the Act. The other regulations would pertain to the rest of the operation of the establishment.

Mr. Sopha: The minister does not even use—forgive me, if he even uses the words "Subject to The Liquor Licence Act and its regulations" that would clarify it; so that—

An hon. member: He does not have to.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I would take no objection to that.

Mr. Sopha: —a court might not look at it and say, "The Legislature did not intend the regulations of The Liquor Licence Act to apply, but they intended the regulations of the metro council to apply."

Mr. Lawlor: This is becoming a pettifogging debate and I am shortly going to leave if—

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I think that is quite a reasonable amendment and I will accept it.

Mr. Sopha: All right, I will so move it.

Mr. Lawlor: He is in no ordinary mood, carping, casuistic.

Mr. Sopha: Legal boondoggling.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I will agree to that and I will move that we put it in.

Mr. Chairman: We have heard the amendment. Is it clear? Is the amendment clear?

Mr. J. Renwick: No. What is the amendment?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The amended Act, if I may, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sopha: And its regulations.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I think we should oppose that.

Hon. Mr. Bales: —would then read—

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Hon. Mr. Bales: It would read:

In addition to the powers that may be exercised under subsection 1, the council has the power to let from year to year or for any time not exceeding 10 years, the right to sell, subject to The Liquor Licence Act and its regulations, spirituous, fermented or intoxicating liquors within the metropolitan parks under such regulations as the council may prescribe.

I will move that amendment.

Mr. Ben: The minister misses the point if he wants the words "under such regulations as the council may prescribe" to remain in there.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I have abandoned that.

Mr. Ben: The member has abandoned that. It still permits them to change The Liquor Licence Act regulations.

Mr. Sopha: I settled for wider things in this, the 12th year.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That does not sound like the member for Sudbury.

Mr. Ben: They can still make their own regulations within the scope of The Liquor Licence Act?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, they cannot.

Mr. Ben: The minister is giving them the power to pass regulations on how it may be dispensed—that is the size of it? Yes! Because at the present time The Liquor Licence Act does not prescribe the size of glasses. That section was repealed.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Tell these lawyers to quit.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. We will place the amendment. Any discussion on the amendment?

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes. I would like to discuss the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: We think that it is lousy draftsmanship to include it—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Who is “we”?

Mr. Lewis: All of us. Unanimously.

Mr. J. Renwick: —because it is quite clear that a reference to The Liquor Licence Act connotes within that term any regulations made pursuant to that authority—

Mr. Pitman: Exactly.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, having demolished the amendment, but having agreed to support it in principle, I would like now to return to the substance of the argument in my own tortuous way.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. Renwick: I assume, Mr. Chairman, that there is a restaurant on the Toronto Island at the present time. I assume that that restaurant does not have the right to sell spirituous beverages at the present time. I assume that the restaurant is there by reason of a lease, entered into between Metropolitan Toronto and the particular company that operates that restaurant. I also assume that there is some prohibition, at the present time, against that company which operates that restaurant making independently an application to The Liquor Licence Board for a licence to sell spirituous beverages within the

restaurant in the normal way that a restaurant on Yonge Street would make such an application. I assume that to be the situation.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Because it is in a public park.

Mr. J. Renwick: Right, because it is in a public park!

I assume, therefore, that what we are endeavouring therefore to do, is remove that block against a company, which by reason of a lease from the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, presently operates a restaurant, to make a direct application to the Liquor Licence Board, for a licence to sell liquor in accordance with the usual provisions of the Liquor Licence Board. That is, either within a self-contained restaurant, in a lounge facility, or within the relatively restricted limitation which now applies to something called sidewalk cafes:

Now, if those assumptions are correct, and I take it to be so, because the minister nodded, then I am simply saying to him that why are we granting to the metropolitan council the right, in some way or other, to put up for sale the right to sell liquor in those premises?

Because it does seem to me, if I may take the phrase—the short phrase of the member for Sudbury—it does seem to me to permit metropolitan council to put up for tender the right to sell liquor. Because what you are saying in this section is that “the metropolitan council will have power to—” and you use the word “let”. The word lease is a little bit more significant, as “power to lease the right to sell”, and I do not think that metropolitan council can lease the right to sell liquor under The Liquor Licence Act, unless the metropolitan council itself makes the application for the licence.

Now, if that is the case, I think it is a point—

Mr. Singer: He was right, rather tortuous.

Mr. J. Renwick: —which deserves clarification. Either the bill is amended, or the minister should explain to us under what terms and conditions—having regard to the last part of the clause, where it says “under such regulations as the council may prescribe”—what are the terms and conditions under which there is going to be either a bidding for, or a trafficking in, the right to sell liquor in the metropolitan parks. Because I am fully, as our party has said, in agreement with the proposition that the Liquor Licence Board, to bona fide licensees or to the metropolitan

council if it wants to run restaurants itself, should be able to make the application.

Mr. Sargent: The member is repeating himself.

Mr. J. Renwick: But I am very much concerned about the proposition that in some way or other, the actual right to sell would be the subject of some kind of trafficking in that operation. Now, surely that deserves a direct and straightforward reply from the minister.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, if the municipality does pass a bylaw, authorizing or permitting the sale of liquor within a metropolitan park, then if it wants more restaurants established it either puts them up for tender or it can have a restaurant of its own and make the application. But one way or the other Metropolitan Toronto will not be making the application—that is my appreciation of it—except when they themselves operate the restaurant.

They would be deciding whatever number of restaurants are required in a particular park, and if the bylaw has been passed for that then they can make whatever regulations or arrangements they wish in entering into those agreements, or establishing their own restaurants.

Mr. Chairman: Section 2. We have an amendment we had better place.

Hon. Mr. Bales moves that the words “and its regulations” be inserted after the words “The Liquor Licence Act.” Shall the amendment carry?

Amendment agreed to.

Section 2, as amended, agreed to.

Section 3 agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am going to conclude my remarks by moving an amendment to section 4, that subsection 2 be deleted from that section.

We addressed ourselves to that subsection on second reading and I think the comments made at that time by myself and by many other hon. members are most pertinent. There is no reason whatsoever, Mr. Chairman, that the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto should have exculpating legislation which

would excuse them, at the expense of the citizen, from their negligence.

If in construction of the mall, which we believe is a good idea, either the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto or the city of Toronto is negligent—for example, supposing a barricade collapses and seriously injures an individual and the barricade has been erected by servants of either municipality. This section would eliminate the right of that citizen who was using the mall in good faith from resort to the courts to have his rights determined.

I can understand, perhaps, a section that would say, “No merchant could sue for loss of business by reason of the creation of the mall”; but why the section should be so broad and so all-embracing that you are taking away from the citizens who use that mall their ordinary right of resort to the courts against what may be the negligence of either the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto or the city of Toronto, or any of their servants, is absolutely inexcusable.

I can see no basis, Mr. Chairman, on which that subsection 2 as it is presently worded should stand as a part of our legislation. Therefore, sir, I move that section 4 be amended by deleting therefrom subsection 2.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Singer moves that section 4 be amended by deleting subsection 2 therefrom.

The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I support my colleague from Downsview because, although I know this is a housekeeping bill, I know the time factor is not a longer time. But there is an old saying in business that if anything can go wrong it will. And regardless of the good intent of the minister in getting it through to enable this project to go ahead, I say that the fact that no person shall be entitled, it says, to recover any damages or compensation of any nature either from Metro or from the city of Toronto arising from this exercise or this gamble, as it were, or this caper, any way you want to put it, I say, Mr. Chairman, in supporting this amendment that this is completely unacceptable.

It is unprecedented, and it is definitely discriminatory in that you would allow any group of people to have a project like this and bar anybody from recovery. I think that any fair businessman in the House would not want to see this thing go on the books.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on this motion? The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, surely the minister can, with his advisers, come up with some adequate limitation to cover the problem which his advisers have—

Mr. Singer: Created for him.

Mr. J. Renwick: —encompassed in this bill without drawing it in such a way as to invite the kind of deletion proposed by the member for Downsview? One can just simply by extrapolation think of situations where Metropolitan Toronto should in fact, by reason of the exercise of the power granted by this Legislature, not be open to suit.

But even the minister, I would think, and his advisers would agree that this is drawn so broadly that he leaves a party such as ours, that always wants to be reasonable in this kind of a situation, little alternative but to support with great regret the amendment proposed by the member for Downsview. Is there not some limitation that comes to the mind of the minister that would make this—which is reasonable in intention but very poor in the terms in which it is drawn—acceptable to the assembly?

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, just a brief word. As Mr. Chairman knows, I am an idolator at the altar of succinctness, and having set forth my initial remarks on second reading on this very point, the member for Downsview being even more succinct than I was on the point—though not nearly as charming—a little more acerbic but succinct nonetheless—and that is what I am after. I will be even more succinct and sit down.

Mr. Chairman: Any further comment on this amendment? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the points that have been made but I think under the circumstances, this section, as it is drafted now, is adequate. The point is that if it were to be in general legislation we would not want to grant it. Under the circumstances—

Mr. Sargent: It is a blank cheque you have given them.

Hon. Mr. Bales: No. No. Just be careful.

Mr. Singer: If you hurt just one citizen of Toronto, whether it is in general or particular legislation, you are to be condemned.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Each citizen is very important. This is for a limited period of time and I recognize—

Mr. Sargent: It is wrong. The principle is wrong.

Hon. Mr. Bales: —that difficulties may occur. But there is protection here and there can be protection—

Mr. Singer: Where?

Hon. Mr. Bales: —inserted if there is a pre-existing condition that has nothing to do with it. Under the circumstances, I believe—

Mr. Sargent: How could a lawyer draw that up?

Hon. Mr. Bales: —that this section should remain.

Mr. Chairman: Those in favour of Mr. Singer's amendment will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

I declare the amendment lost.

Call in the members.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, we have given careful consideration to the points that we want. We want to make sure that there is not even any remotest possibility of anybody being unfairly damaged or injured. I move an amendment to subsection 2 of section 4, that the words in the third line of the subsection "of any nature whatsoever" be deleted, and in the fourth line after the words "city of Toronto" that the words "for loss of business or for loss of access to Yonge Street" should be added.

Mr. Singer: Good amendment.

Mr. J. Renwick: Terrific amendment.

Mr. Chairman: You have all heard the minister's amendment. Shall the amendment carry?

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Sargent: It is an admission of sloppy drafting of law.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! Shall the section, as amended carry then, or stand as part of the bill?

Section 4, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Any other comment, question or amendment to any other section of this bill? If not, shall the bill, as amended, be reported?

Bill 35, as amended, reported.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report one bill with certain amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Two amendments in one bill?

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill 35, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Going to get the Lieutenant Governor?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Under the old standing order, the hon. member would be quite correct. However, under the new standing orders, that rule does not apply.

Mr. Sargent: We were close.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, before the House adjourns, perhaps the House leader can advise us as to what the business of the House will be on Thursday.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): It will be the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests in the House and The Department of Energy and Resources Management in committee.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I assume there will be no second readings.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The member does not assume anything, not with this government.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I think I must reserve some latitude.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I shall try to give the members as much notice as possible.

Mr. Singer: Is it all right to watch the hockey game now?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): But do not get yourself paged.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.25 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading	1227
Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, reported	1236
Third reading	1248
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to	1248



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, May 6, 1971
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 6, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests today in the east gallery are students from the Malden Central Public School of Amherstburg and from the Copper Cliff High School of Copper Cliff. In the west gallery there are students from the Port Credit Secondary School of Port Credit, from the James Culmann Separate School of Toronto and from the Holy Cross School in Port Colborne.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) is in the city of Peterborough this afternoon addressing the annual conference of the Ontario Municipal Recreation Association.

He has asked me, in his absence, to bring to the members' attention the report of the study commission on recreation services in Ontario, a copy of which has been placed on the members' desks.

This government recognizes that society is rapidly changing, and as technological changes advance leisure time for our citizens will increase. The study committee, appointed in 1969, was asked to consider the ways in which community recreation services should be made available to the citizens of this province, and to suggest strategies for the further development of community recreation and leisure time programmes.

The report offers recommendations for the development of recreation systems at the local, regional and provincial levels of government, so that these services and these programmes may be relevant to the interests of those they serve and provide enjoyment and satisfaction to the participants.

The comments of The Department of Education on the recommendations are to be found adjacent to the recommendation.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, as announced in

the Speech from the Throne, the policies of the Ontario Development Corporation will be broadened to give preference to Canadian-owned companies requiring financial assistance.

In his recent budget address the hon. Treasurer of Ontario (Mr. McKeough) announced a five per cent tax credit for investment in machinery and equipment as an incentive to companies in Ontario. The measures that I am announcing today will further encourage Canadian enterprise and ownership.

The incentives under the Equalization of Industrial Opportunity programme will be amended to provide increased aid to Canadian-owned industry establishing new plants or expanding. Canadian companies that qualify and are in slow-growth areas will be eligible for performance loans of 50 per cent of the cost of new plant and equipment.

Presently loans are provided on the basis of 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent of the first \$250,000 and 25 per cent of the balance. In effect the new policy will provide an incentive bonus of from 50 per cent to 84 per cent to Canadian-owned companies, depending on size of investment, over what will be available to non-Canadian companies.

For example, where the cost of new buildings and equipment is \$250,000, the performance loan for a Canadian company under the existing programme is calculated as follows: thirty-three and a third per cent of \$250,000, which is \$83,333. Performance loan for Canadian company under proposed new programme: 50 per cent of \$250,000, which is \$125,000; bonus for Canadian company in the performance loan, \$41,667; percentage increase over the performance loan under the existing programme, 50 per cent.

A foreign-owned company would continue to be eligible for the present performance loan of \$83,333.

Another example of how Canadian companies will benefit under this plan is as follows: If the cost of new buildings and equipment is \$1 million, the performance loan under the existing programme for Canadian companies is calculated as follows: thirty-three and a third per cent of \$250,000, which

is, \$83,333; 25 per cent of the balance of \$750,000, which is \$187,500; therefore the performance loan under the existing programme is \$270,833.

The performance loan for the Canadian company under the proposed new programme is 50 per cent of \$1 million or \$500,000.

Therefore the bonus for a Canadian company in the performance loan is \$229,167 and the percentage increase over the performance loan under the existing programme is 84.6 per cent.

A foreign-owned company would continue to be eligible for a performance loan of \$270,833.

A new small business loans programme will be introduced as well. The aim is to assist small companies to expand, to create employment, to establish or increase exports, to replace imports and generally to stimulate economic growth in Ontario. As a general guideline, a small business will be defined as one in which the owners' investment does not exceed \$300,000. Preference will be given to labour intensive industries.

Whereas term loans under the existing programme are confined to the slow growth areas, this new programme will ensure that small businesses located anywhere in the province will also be eligible. Thus small Canadian-owned industries, regardless of their location within the province, will be considered for term loans of up to \$50,000. Such loans may run for as long as ten years at ODC's prevailing rate of interest.

The types of companies eligible will be broadened to include not only manufacturing concerns, but also some segments of service industries which are closely allied to manufacturing, such as canning industries and other segments of the food processing industry, machine shops, printing and allied trades.

A Venture Capital for Canadians Fund will also be established. This risk capital will be available to small Canadian-owned businesses with good growth potential in Ontario.

The fund is intended to assist companies capable of introducing new technology and products that will diversify our economy. ODC will work in close co-operation with the Ontario Research Foundation and other scientific organizations for this purpose.

The fund will also be available to small Canadian businesses to establish or increase markets abroad. Canadian companies wishing to enter into joint ventures with foreign manufacturers and needing risk capital to match the capital available from their pros-

pective partners will likewise be eligible. All companies seeking this venture capital will have to demonstrate that they have had difficulties in obtaining this risk capital elsewhere in Canada. Normally venture capital investment by ODC in any one company under this programme will be up to \$100,000. Mr. Speaker, we recognize the risks involved in this kind of financing but we know that by expressing such tangible confidence in Canadian ventures we will be providing opportunities for skilled Canadians to develop the Ontario industries of the future and to enter world markets.

Also this should make such companies less susceptible to foreign acquisition. A new section will be set up in ODC to administer the Venture Capital for Canadians Fund.

This fund, like the other forms of expanded financial assistance offered under the new programmes for economic development will foster Canadian growth and enterprise.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Would the minister advise—

Mr. Speaker: I think the questions on this particular statement could be brought up under oral questions. The hon. member may have an opportunity under oral questions.

Mr. Sargent: There is nothing to say that under a ministerial statement you cannot ask for verifications.

Mr. Speaker: Under the oral question period.

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William): The member should go back and retire.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, could I at this time answer a question that was asked previously in the House?

Mr. Speaker: No, we will enter upon the oral question period and at the appropriate time I will call the hon. minister.

Oral questions.

VENTURE CAPITAL FOR CANADIANS

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, further to the statement made by the minister a moment ago, can he tell us the total amounts allocated to the various sections of the programme as he has announced it?

For example, how much is it intended that the government will put into the so-called venture programme, and how much would go into the redesigned EIO programme?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, there is a figure in the estimates at this present time at \$7.5 million. That can be used for any of these programmes and if, as, and when more money is required, we will be welcoming any company which can qualify under these terms and we hope there will be many of them. If more money is available, whenever it is needed we will go to Treasury and/or the Legislature where necessary.

Mr. Nixon: Is the programme in essence in any way different from that which was inaugurated under the minister's predecessor Mr. Macaulay which I think drew to a close in 1966, under which circumstances \$100 million was available for the venture fund?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have not studied that, Mr. Speaker. I could not tell the hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary question: Would it be possible for those industries which were turned down in their applications in recent months to reapply? I am thinking particularly of the canning industry, which was not covered under the recent regulations. If so, what would the applicable date for reapplication be?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We hope to receive applications at any time, beginning this moment.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Can they reapply?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, everyone can always reapply, and of course they would be welcome.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. Leader of the Opposition any further supplementary questions?

Mr. Nixon: No.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary questions. The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I would like to ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, if as a result of the announcement made today any additional funds will be made available to the Northwestern Ontario Development Corporation; and will the terms of reference be broadened to include primary industry, such as mining and forest products industry?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the funds will be available in NODC the same way as they are available to ODC, under the same terms; and there will be—

Mr. Nixon: The same people run it?

Mr. Stokes: No additional funds?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): No additional grants?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There will be additional funds, but there is no intention to expand them beyond those industries which I have mentioned.

Mr. Stokes: As another supplementary, is there anything in this announcement made by the hon. minister today to indicate that it will enhance the possibilities of further development of secondary industries in northern Ontario?

Mr. Jessiman: One hundred per cent.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, there is Mr. Speaker, and that will become apparent very shortly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview on a supplementary.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister can tell us whether any forecast has been done by his department as to how many jobs this is likely to supply in the next six-month period?

Mr. Nixon: Some extra jobs!

Mr. Stokes: Tell him it is under review.

An hon. member: No jobs; that is the answer.

Another hon. member: It is a silly question.

An hon. member: Certainly, it is a silly question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no.

An hon. member: No jobs, no jobs.

Mr. Singer: All right. Can the minister tell us what he meant by saying that after the \$7.5 million has been spent, "If there is more money available, we will supply it?" What exactly does that mean?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If that is what I said, I certainly gave the wrong impression. It is if any more is needed.

Mr. Singer: If any more is needed, what is going to happen? Is it going to be available?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I said it would be made available. We will go to Treasury and/or the Legislature, depending upon the time when the money is required.

Hon. E. Dunlop (Minister without Portfolio): If this House votes it—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the member unhappy about this?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I just want to find out how it is going to work; that is all.

Mr. Jessiman: Does the member not want more jobs?

Mr. Singer: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the minister could indicate where in the budget the amount of over \$7.5 million can be found.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not recall saying, Mr. Speaker, that there was an amount over \$7.5 million, but that there was a figure in there, I believe, of \$7.5 million.

Mr. Singer: Then where is the extra money going to come from?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh; I have just finished saying that twice.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Brantford on a supplementary.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister indicate whether the redesigned EIO loans will go into other than presently designated slow-growth areas? In other words, has he expanded the slow-growth areas in the province?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not at this time.

Mr. Makarchuk: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Is the minister aware that the industries that could benefit from this action, at least 95 per cent of them, are located in non-slow growth areas of the province at the moment?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that is possible, although the hon. member apparently does not appreciate the aid to small businesses which I have just announced and which will cover the entire province, and with debenture capital, I should say.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce on a supplementary.

Mr. Sargent: Would the hon. minister agree that this is patching the leaky boat of the Treasurer? And would he tell me why in the small businessmen's loan section there is not a forgiveness factor the same as there is for big business? There is no forgiveness factor at all. And secondly—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I answer that one first, Mr. Speaker? It is obvious that if we are going to spread this across the whole of the province there must be some incentive—

Mr. Sargent: That \$7.5 million would not last a week.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the member talking about the amount now or is he talking about the programme?

Mr. Sargent: Everything.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, one thing at a time.

Mr. Sargent: Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The reason that the EIO programme does not cover the whole of the province is that there must be some incentive for industry to go outside of the large areas, otherwise all of the money we could make available would not be enough for those industries which would want to establish in Toronto, Hamilton, London and places of that nature. It is designed to give additional incentive to go out to slow growth areas.

Mr. Sargent: How does the minister relate giving forgiveness loans to large American industry, and to small businessmen's loans there is no forgiveness factor?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I just went to a great extent to give examples how it would be more helpful for Canadian industry than it would for non-Canadian industry.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I do not believe the minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Does the hon. member have a question?

Mr. Sargent: A further supplementary. In the venture capital loan programmes, what is the term of the venture loan?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Generally, about 10 years.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question. The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): A supplementary question: Would the minister be prepared to make available to the House the conditions that are attached to the receipt of the loans that are made? And also, what changes have been made to safeguard the workers in the areas to ensure that there will be an overall employment increase as a result of the government action in this field?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, this is done under our present programmes. I know what the hon. member is referring to—he is referring to a specific instance which he mentioned in his speech the other day. He was totally wrong and I will bring him the facts shortly on that. I had it all ready today but I did not want to keep the members listening to me for two hours. He will be advised eventually.

Mr. Deans: I was not even referring to that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, we do it now.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East on a supplementary.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell us whether or not small Canadian-owned book publishing companies in Ontario will be eligible for any of these loans?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Any company which will qualify under the terms which I have just mentioned.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question: Do the terms which the minister has outlined include Canadian-owned book publishing companies or do the terms not include them?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have just answered that. If a particular firm would come under some of these terms, we will take it into consideration.

Mr. Sargent: Does the minister not know?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I must point out that there is no fixed formula. What we have to do is treat each case on its individual merits. We will help any Canadian-owned company which it is possible to help if it helps the economy any place in this province.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: May I ask the minister why was the farming industry not included in this redesigned programme?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would think that canning industries, which are part of the food processing industry, would be helpful to the farming community. If the hon. member could come up with some formula by which we could be of any further assistance, in addition to the assistance given to the farming community at this moment, we would be very pleased to hear it.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister going to continue the habit of granting loans even under the redesigned programme to communities and areas which violate the principles of his government's Design for Development as has been the case hitherto?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I thought I had made that clear when the same line of questioning was followed some time ago, I think last week. The fact remains we would be very happy if we could deal with these individual cases within the framework of the Design for Development. The fact is, particularly at this time, there are many thousands of people, some 200,000 people, out of work in Ontario and our first job is to get them employed regardless of any of these overall plans.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I have talked to some members of the NDP caucus and some members of the Liberal caucus, as well as members of our own caucus on the basis of some of the applications they have made and some of the pleadings they have made to bring some industry into their areas. Their requests in many instances are quite reasonable and we have not turned them down on the basis that they do not fit into some general overall policy of the government. At this time we have got to put people to work first.

Mr. Sargent: We will see how many the minister puts in in Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary: Accepting the bravado of the minister, he can then show the House, I am sure, into which areas some of these loans will now be going and how many jobs will be created? He will be able to tell us that, I take it, because he answered so heatedly.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Accepting the pessimism and the unhappiness of the leader of the NDP, I could tell him that anyone who is interested in the economy of Ontario will be happy with the result of this programme.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! We have now taken up almost a third of the question period with supplementaries on this one. It has been an important statement and I felt that there should be sufficient supplementaries. I will permit one more supplementary.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister, if I am to take it that he is prepared under this programme to consider farmers who are incorporated?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, this government is prepared to consider any industry, any company, which needs help, provided we can help it in a practical manner and continue it as a viable, or make it a viable, industry. If the hon. member has some suggestions to add to this, we would be very glad to receive them.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

SITE OF NEW TORONTO AIRPORT

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask the Premier if he has any further announcement on his negotiations with the government of Canada having to do with the establishment of a new airport. Most specifically, has a decision been taken by his government to freeze the sale of certain properties in areas of the province?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there is nothing further to report to the members of the House since the last time I was asked about this matter, I believe on Monday.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question; News reports that the government ministries concerned had taken action to freeze properties as of Tuesday of this week are therefore incorrect?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge there has been no action taken by this government to freeze properties.

EFFECT OF MARK REVALUATION ON ONTARIO LOANS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Treasurer: Can he inform the House as to what the threat of the revaluation of the German mark would be in the light of loan position in deutschmarks, which I now think is \$138 million?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Between ourselves and Hydro it is closer to \$200 million. I do not think it is correct to describe it as a threat, Mr. Speaker. The member can read the papers—

Mr. Nixon: The threat that the costs may increase, I should say!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That the costs may increase? Alternatively, a year from now the costs may decrease.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): How did he get to be Treasurer?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, have the minister's economists reported to him the additional financial undertakings that a revaluation of 10 to 12 per cent might impose on the province?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, first it depends on when the loan happens to be due. Some of the money is due in three or four years; some of it is not due for 15 years. What we are concerned about, of course, is what the cost of money, of our money vis-à-vis other money, will be 15 years from now and that is rather difficult to figure out.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question. Was the Treasurer correctly reported or not when he said that our costs had already increased by 20 per cent?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It would be fair to say that on the last revaluation our cost of the deutsch mark was revalued by about nine per cent. By the same token the value of the Canadian dollar, vis-à-vis the American dollar—which is what we are really talking about—has risen by some seven or eight per cent, so we are really in effect right where we were when we borrowed the money.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister inform us whether the loans are payable in deutsch marks, Canadian dollars or US dollars?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Deutsch marks I think. Yes, in deutsch marks, except the Euro-bond loan, which is payable in US dollars.

Mr. T. Reid: Would the Treasurer not state that it would have been a wise move to hedge against exchange rate fluctuations by having half the loans payable in deutsch marks and the other half payable in Canadian or perhaps US dollars?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I think you have to look at the total borrowings of the province and Hydro which are in the range of some \$3 billion. Of that amount, something less than \$200 million is payable in deutsch marks; something over \$1 billion is payable in American dollars. I should point out to my hon. friend that of course, one of the main reasons Ontario moved into the European market in 1968 was because of the availability of funds. Funds were not available in this country, at that time, at a suitable rate. I may say that when we did move into the European market to establish that market, which we have found to be very beneficial since, both to ourselves and to Ontario Hydro, we did so following the lead of the government of Canada and at their urging.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce, with a supplementary.

Mr. Sargent: The minister refers to the German loan programme, but does the minister agree that in retrospect any future borrowings—due to the fact that we spend \$100 million to keep an army over there, or troops over there—does he think it is smart for us to be borrowing money from them and trying to keep troops over there too?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I do not think that is supplementary, but again I would have to reiterate the concern of this government that we do not be associated with the narrow-minded parochial attitude of the member for Grey-Bruce about world affairs.

Mr. Sargent: If the minister thinks that burning him in effigy was hot, I think the hot seat he is going to be on is going to be great!

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have a further question?

POSSIBLE AID FOR DENTURISTS

Mr. Nixon: Yes I do, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Health. Is he preparing a review, or perhaps an approach

to regulation, if not statute, that would assist the denturists in the province in their efforts to have a distinct position in the provision of their services; and second, how was that OPP raid on a denturist in North York authorized? Surely such a raid should have been undertaken by the Metropolitan Police?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): As to that second question, I think that should be addressed to the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence). I myself have no knowledge of the background insofar as the jurisdiction, investigation, or the raid itself are concerned.

With regard to the first part, all the health disciplines in Ontario are being reviewed at this moment, specifically in an effort to define their scopes of practice and define the nature of their professions or calling. The denturist is one of that whole group.

This arises, as the Leader of the Opposition will recall, from the report of the committee on the healing arts and the statement of principles that was developed from that. So we are at the stage, to put it another way, of beginning our preliminary draft in developing new legislation for all of the health disciplines individually.

QUEBEC LEGISLATION ON ONTARIO FARM PRODUCE

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Agriculture and Food has returned to his place, I have a question of him. Has he seen a draft of the legislation before the National Assembly of Quebec concerning the control of the importation of eggs and other farm produce from Ontario; and second, has he any special information about the border control inspection offices that evidently the government of Quebec has decided to set up on the road boundaries with this province?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the legislation, nor have I heard anything about those reported checkpoints.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I would like to defer my right to ask the first question to the hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

PHYSICIANS' BILLINGS TO OHSIP

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have several questions of the Minister of Health. In his recent studies of the results of the OHSIP computer, has he found that there have been physicians who have been billing at a rate in excess of one third of a million dollars annually?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the figures that are coming out are statistics that are incomplete at the moment. As my friend will understand they relate only to the OHSIP figures and not to those physicians billing through the designated agents.

As to gross amounts, I hesitate to give the figures that I have seen because they are gross. They do not explain to what extent the particular doctor is billing in or out, or has been billing in or out, of the OHSIP plan. They do not give any figures in relation to his overhead, nor do they explain the extent or nature of his staff for supportive services.

I think it is fair to say that I have seen figures which would suggest that the gross payment out of OHSIP—I am not dealing here with the doctor's income—that the payment out of OHSIP under the name of at least one doctor has gone into the six-figure range, as I recall it—not quite a third of a million, but in the six-figure range.

Mr. Shulman: And is it correct, that this would represent only a portion of his income, because in addition to this he will be receiving money through OHSIP from the various insurance companies?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: That would vary from case to case, Mr. Speaker. It is possible that when one looks at the raw figures that the printout shows, one does not know whether it is a doctor who is by practice billing 100 per cent or 95 per cent or 50 per cent in relation to OHSIP or outside the plan. It is impossible to tell from the raw figures.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the question I am asking is not the amount he is billing outside the plan. Is it not correct that the computer just shows the amount of billing that goes to OHSIP itself in contradistinction to the amount that goes through OHSIP to the various insurance companies? The computer has not yet brought in the various insurance companies, has it?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, the point the member is making is quite correct.

Mr. Shulman: The second question I would like to ask: Is it correct that the figures from the computer show that the number of certain procedures, such as tonsillectomy, has gone up by some five times in the past two years?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I cannot recall, Mr. Speaker, with any accuracy, which procedures have gone up how much.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Question period was never meant to be this. I was on the committee.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: But I do not know that tonsillectomy is among those groups which have shown a marked increase.

Mr. Shulman: As a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, may I ask, is it correct that a large number of procedures, not just tonsillectomies, have shown massive increases in this period of time?

Mr. Sopha: One of the biggest grievances around here; the member never gives anyone else a chance to ask a question.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept the term "large number." Some procedures have shown a significant increase which obviously warrants investigation by the department.

Mr. Shulman: My final supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: As a result of the minister's preliminary studies and that of his officials, have certain officials in his department come to the conclusion that there is gross overcharging through OHSIP which may amount to as high as \$100 million annually?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think anyone has categorically come to an analytical answer as to what overcharging may be or its percentage. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, and I have said it before this, is if there be \$1 overcharged insofar as the taxpayer's money is concerned, it really is as significantly, from this department's point of view and from the government's point of view, as if there was \$1 million. I do see evidence, Mr. Speaker, of laxness in particular cases. I hope, within the next weeks and perhaps within the next months, to be able to give the House and the public generally a total profile on where we have problems with OHSIP in general and in particular with regard to billing.

Mr. Shulman: If I may, Mr. Speaker, would the minister make available to the House

the print out of the gross that he has from the computer?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Under the legislation, Mr. Speaker, I am limited. As I recall it, under the Act, and I was reading it recently, I can only do statistical analyses for the House. I am not permitted under the legislation to deal with particular doctors, or particular patients, or both.

Mr. Shulman: Without names?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I shall address myself, Mr. Speaker, to making a statistical report to the House as soon as I am capable of doing so.

Mr. Shulman: One last question, if I may?

Mr. Speaker: I think there are sufficient supplementaries on this particular question.

Mr. Lewis: Let Mr. Speaker begin the rotation now.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): The member has got his answer. Why does he not sit down?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker can begin the rotation now.

Mr. Speaker: Right!

At this particular point, the hon. Minister of Trade and Development has the answer to a question previously asked.

Mr. Sopha: That is funny. I was just about to ask a question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury is now about to get an answer.

Interjections by hon. members.

TERMINATION OF OHC TENANT'S LEASE

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, on May 4 I undertook to report back to the Legislature with respect to an OHC tenant, one Mr. Michael Carson.

As in so often the case, some of the hon. members in the opposition have possibly received incorrect information. First of all, I would inform the House that Mr. Carson will not be required to vacate his premises before May 11, 1971.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is nothing generous about it at all.

Further, following the usual practice of OHC for tenant families who are ordered to vacate, the corporation is making arrangements with local agencies to assist the Carson family in finding alternate accommodation. The decision to terminate Mr. Carson's lease was taken by OHC's board of directors approximately one year ago, only after several tenants complained about his behaviour, which in one case caused the court to bind him over to keep the peace.

Mr. Carson was given a month's notice to vacate the premises. When the notice was disregarded by Mr. Carson—

An hon. member: Mr. Carson was getting mad.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —the corporation applied for a court order of possession on September 21, 1970. The lease was on a monthly basis.

The application was not allowed to proceed on the grounds that it did not reveal the reasons for terminating the lease. The case was submitted to the court of appeal of the Supreme Court of Ontario and the Chief Justice of the province and two of his colleagues reversed this decision and granted an order for writ of possession to the corporation.

Following the Supreme Court decision, Mr. Carson and his solicitor indicated to the corporation that he would be applying to legal aid for further assistance in appealing the case to the Supreme Court of Canada. It should be noted that legal aid paid for his costs to that time.

To allow time for appeal, the corporation took no action to obtain vacant possession, since last November.

Mr. Bullbrook: The government does not publish that information.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The corporation was notified by Mr. Carson's solicitor more than a month ago, that funds for an appeal were not available. Mr. Carson was aware of the decision of the court but gave no indication that he would be moving from the premises. So, at the end of April, the corporation acted on the order of the court and Mr. Carson was notified by the sheriff that he would have to vacate.

Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed all of the pertinent information concerning this case.

In my view, the public interest would not be served if I were to intercede in this instance.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, is not the real reason why Mr. Carson is being evicted because he is president of the Ontario Housing Tenants' Association and has annoyed the employees of Ontario Housing Corporation?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: For the information of the hon. member for Parkdale, that would be reflecting on the courts.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Housing Corporation works in a very co-operative fashion with many tenants' associations involved in their housing.

Mr. Trotter: Is this for all of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As a matter of fact, I have looked into this very thoroughly. The corporation has been in the process, over a period of time, of encouraging such tenants' associations.

Mr. Trotter: Then why has the government thrown out the Carson family?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because that has nothing to do with this man's eviction notice. I have read out to the hon. member that there were complaints against this man by other of the tenants in the housing development in which he was involved. There were many complaints. They did not want to live with him. He was, as a matter of fact—and I pointed it out—bound over to keep the peace because of it. It is one of those situations where the man is better living someplace else.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Any excuse would suffice!

Mr. Trotter: By way of a further supplementary question: If he is still unpopular with other tenants, how is it that he is elected president for all the Ontario Housing tenants?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: This man is elected president. How come?

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: We wonder how the member got elected too. Did the majority elect him?

Another hon. member: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not speak of how many tenants and I did not speak of his popularity or lack of popularity.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon member for Parkdale is very vulnerable on that question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are tenants in the development in which he lived—as a matter of fact, if he was so popular why did they have to go to court a couple of times and have him bound over to keep the peace?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN SUDBURY

Mr. Sopha: I have a question of the Minister of Health which is in two parts.

Is the minister aware that one of the gravest social problems in the Sudbury basin is the physical condition of St. Joseph's Hospital, which in effect is not only an environment of physical danger to the patient but which in its characteristics posits something comparable to the surroundings Florence Nightingale must have practised her nursing art in?

Secondly, if the minister is aware of this, may I ask him what steps he personally is taking to stimulate the Ontario Hospital Services Commission into making the necessary decisions and instituting the action that will see an early start on the building of the new Laurentian Hospital to furnish facilities for the hospital care of people in the Sudbury basin?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I know, Mr. Speaker, that as of yesterday I was discussing this with the chairman of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission. He did not suggest to me that there was any misunderstanding or holdup or bureaucratic problem with regard to the development of Laurentian, or indeed any of the hospitals up there.

I have a general concern with the Sudbury hospital situation, and I am going up there to look around myself late next week or at the beginning of the week after.

Mr. Sopha: A supplementary question: Is the minister aware that there is acceptance of the fact, in the Sudbury basin, that some \$7 million will have to be raised locally for the building of Laurentian Hospital? If he is

aware of that, is he aware that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales), in his unveiling of the proposal for regional government, did not even include a section dealing with hospital expansion?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I do not really see the relationship between the two, because it is a broad and total provincial policy to balance between—

Mr. Sopha: Seven million dollars will have to be raised locally.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The formula that would be applied, whether it be in a city or in a region or otherwise, as I recall it, will be the same. In other words, the responsibility for local fund-raising will be the same in Sudbury or in relation to Laurentian as it would be with any other hospital in the province.

I myself, at the moment, cannot follow the distinction between the municipal structuring and the burden on the local citizen.

Mr. Sopha: A further supplementary: Surely the minister must be aware that the intention of financing the local portion was through the tax levied against assessment? Was he aware that that was how the \$7 million was going to be raised?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of that.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. minister is better informed today.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Middlesex South.

ARVA LIFT SYSTEMS

Mr. K. C. Bolton (Middlesex South): Mr. Speaker, I have a threefold question of the Minister of Trade and Development.

1. Has the minister been informed that Arva Lift Systems will shortly lay off 48 employees from the London area?

2. Has he been informed that Arva Lift Systems plans to sell its patent rights and operations to American interests?

3. Is the minister aware that the reason given by the executive vice-president for these drastic decisions is the failure of the ODC to deal efficiently with their request for financial support?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first question, "Have I been informed that they will lay off 48 employees?" I should advise the hon. member the first time we heard of this was when the official of the company came in this morning and threatened to do this unless the government advance them money.

Also, in answer to question 2, the answer is the same. He threatened that they will sell it to American interests unless we come forward with some funds.

Mr. Nixon: How much did the hon. minister give them?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And as to the reason that they give—that we fail to deal efficiently with their request for financial support—that is, of course, a matter of opinion. It is going before the full ODC board, next Monday I believe, and it will be dealt with at that time. But it was only since I received the short notice from the hon. member—for which I thank him very much—that I made the inquiry and found out these threats were made this morning.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests has an answer to a question asked by the member for Huron-Bruce.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: There are five minutes left in the question period. Order.

ABOLITION OF FISHING LICENCES

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: On Tuesday, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Huron-Bruce asked me a question about the refund of fees for angling licences. In reply to the question of the hon. member regarding prosecutions for angling without a licence prior to April 26, 1971, the Interpretation Act makes it clear that in respect to liability and prosecution for an offence, a change in the law does not affect previous offences and that previous offences are to be prosecuted in accordance with the law in effect on the date that the offence took place.

While it is the government's intent to refund licence fees, it is not the government's intent to legalize breaches of the law prior to the announcement. Accordingly, there will be no refunds of fines paid or withdrawal of pending charges.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

WATER POLLUTION IN OTTAWA AREA

Mr. H. MacKenzie (Ottawa Centre): I have a question of the Premier: Is the Premier aware of the existing differences of opinion between the OWRC and the Ottawa-Carleton medical officer of health as regards the level of pollution at the beaches on both the Rideau and the Ottawa Rivers in the Ottawa area? In view of the Minister of Health some time ago saying he would support the medical officer of health, would the Premier endeavour to quickly resolve the problems arising and issue a statement?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I shall certainly attempt to do so.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

HARBOUR CITY PROJECT

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Trade and Development: Why did the special projects branch of the department refuse to send a representative of the minister to discuss Harbour City at the public meeting called by the Toronto Planning Board last night?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, they did not refuse to go; they acted on my instructions. We should not get into a public debate on this at this time because I had just met, just a few weeks ago, with the executive of Metro. We discussed certain matters, as a result of which I asked for a complete report and study on what has gone on up until this time, because obviously I need to be briefed—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, shame. Well, according to the member for Don Mills (Mr. Randall) everything is hunky-dory.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not say it was not hunky-dory. I said, as the Minister I want to be briefed before I give any opinions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Until such time as I meet again with Metro, I do not think we ought to be getting into a public cat-and-dog fight over it. We want to discuss it in a

proper fashion. I will meet with Metro and we will discuss it in the way I think two governments should get together and discuss these matters. If, as and when as a result of those discussions we come to some conclusion at that time, of course the public and this House are entitled to know.

Mr. Peacock: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Why is the public or the planning board not entitled to share in the information that the minister has left with the Toronto executive committee as to whether he will set up a Crown corporation and other matters?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that was one of the things which concerned me. I wanted to know why the planning board is not privy to all of these discussions and—

Mr. Peacock: What did the minister find out?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I want to find out precisely what the relationship is between the planning board and Metro and our government in this matter—

Mr. Lewis: He probably wants to review it all. Just a little review.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —because before this government comes to any conclusion it wants to know the facts, and I want to know the facts.

Mr. Lewis: I thought the conclusion was obvious.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well that is all right, but I am responsible for it now and I want to make sure I understand what I am responsible for.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I should say there should not be any complaints from any other source, because so far only this government has put its money where its mouth is. We are the only ones putting money into it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! Does the hon. member have a supplementary? Perhaps he would say so, so I would know.

Mr. Trotter: I did. There was too much noise.

By way of supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, am I to understand by the minister's remarks that his department is no longer in favour of Harbour City?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He cannot come to any such conclusion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Trotter: Is the minister in favour or is he not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I have given the House the information that I have been able to give it to date. I am not saying I am not in favour; I am not saying I am in favour.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So far we have not been able to get the city to say they are in favour of it either.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: Has the minister finished? Sit down for a while.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have carried out the only constructive action on this so far.

Mr. Lewis: What a reversal this is.

An hon. member: Is this in your riding?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would like to know that the other partners involved are interested in going ahead in a constructive fashion at the same time.

Mr. Speaker: I think there have been sufficient supplementaries. The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Lewis: No. No.

PENALTIES UNDER THE LIQUOR LICENCE ACT

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Provincial Secretary.

An hon. member: The question period has now expired.

Mr. Bullbrook: He is getting a question for a change. Can he hold out any hope for the people of Ontario that he might amend The Liquor Licence Act to do away with those stupid iniquitous penalties of \$5,000 for not serving a hotdog on Sunday or permitting drunkenness? Could he help us in this respect; and if he cannot, can he persuade the

Attorney General to direct the OPP to stop the vendetta against the licensees under that Act?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Order! Order!

Mr. Lewis: He is now a cabinet minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. Bullbrook: The \$5,000 to \$25,000—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pilkey: It is a good question.

Mr. Speaker: I think the question as phrased—

Mr. Bullbrook: When will the government come into the twentieth century? We are here—

An hon. member: But he might not find the member there.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! I think the question as phrased was hardly a proper question, but the hon. minister may answer if he wishes. He need not, if he is not inclined to.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I will reply to the question—the matter is under review.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Renfrew South.

OHSIP COMPUTER EQUIPMENT

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Health.

Mr. Sopha: They have just rearranged the furniture.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Yakabuski: In view of the fact that the Key Edit system developed by a Canadian company, Consolidated Computer, is used extensively for processing of health insurance claims by insurance organizations in Canada, the United States, England and Germany, why has this company not been successful in selling or having OHSIP use its product instead of the American-built equipment they use today?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that that question go on the order paper.

Mr. Pilkey: Yes, I guess so.

Mr. Nixon: I would say so.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): My question, Mr. Speaker, is of the provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Sopha: Do not give up.

Mr. Pilkey: No sir, stay right with it.

FINANCIAL AID TO MUNICIPAL TRANSPORT FACILITIES

Mr. Gisborn: Would the minister inform the House of a definition of the reference in the Throne Speech to financial assistance to municipal transportation facilities?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I have no doubt that my colleague, the Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) will be giving that information to the House in due course.

Mr. Gaunt: We have lots of time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin.

An hon. member: They have not said where they stand on the Spadina Expressway yet.

Another hon. member: Right in the middle of road.

DELAY PROCESSING ODC LOANS

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development, relating again to his earlier statement.

Would the minister agree that much more important than more dollars for additional plans or additional loan funds is the need to do away with the interminable delays in processing of applications for loans, usually winding up in refusals, at least, in northern Ontario—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): More appropriately, where does the member's party stand?

Mr. Singer: The minister knows where I stand.

Mr. Farquhar:—and is he taking any action with respect to the curing of this ailment in the branch?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I do not necessarily agree with the hon. member's contention that this is a very difficult problem in our department, in ODC. However, the branch is being reorganized. There is more staff going into it because of the additional programmes we have just announced today. So far as I am concerned, money is still the major factor involved.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has now expired.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I may.

Before you proceed, may I ask Your Honour to define as soon as you can to this House the extent to which hypothetical questions soliciting opinions—questions that are totally provocative in character, and are asked for no other purpose—may be asked; and when, Mr. Speaker, the questions soliciting answers on matters of urgent public importance are going to be the rule of this House?

Mr. Sargent: Who is the Minister to make the rules?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am not trying to make the rules of this House on this same point. I am asking the Speaker to indicate whether he will or not.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: The minister could not run the Treasury. How can he run the Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Sopha: At the same time that you are considering those weighty and profound matters raised by the Minister of Highways and Transport, would you also consider whether his objection was stimulated by a consciousness among the ministry that they are going down the drain?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member has just proved the minister's point.

Mr. Speaker: I will certainly take both the point of order and the comment under consideration.

I might say that the standing orders of this House do clearly indicate that questions shall

have some degree of urgency and shall have some degree of general public importance. I think, too, the standing orders indicate quite clearly that no facts should be stated in putting those questions, but to try to keep the oral question period strictly within the confines of the standing orders would be a very difficult thing, to say the least.

I believe the practice in the House in the past has been to permit a fairly great degree of laxity, shall we say, and latitude in putting the questions orally before these various ministers.

The hon. members themselves know full well it is their time—the three-quarters of an hour—that is being consumed if they are going to waste the time of the House with certain questions which are not proper.

I might say to the ministry that they also at the same time have the privilege of refusing to answer those questions if they think they are not proper.

I will take the entire matter under consideration and make a definite ruling at a later date.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson, from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr8, An Act respecting Brock University.

Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Bill Pr21, An Act respecting Triangle Swine Enterprises Limited.

Bill Pr24, An Act respecting the City of Sudbury.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with a certain amendment:

Bill Pr26, An Act respecting the City of Guelph.

Your committee would recommend that the following bill be not reported:

Bill Pr12, An Act respecting the Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake.

Your committee would recommend that the fee, less the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill Pr8, An Act respecting Brock University.

Your committee would recommend that the following bill, having been withdrawn, be not reported and the fees be remitted:

Bill Pr5, An Act respecting the Town of St. Marys.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko presented the 1969-1970 annual report of The Ontario Department of Labour; the 1970 annual report of the Ontario Cancer Institute incorporating the Princess Margaret Hospital and the 11th annual report of the Ontario Energy Board for the year ending December 31, 1970.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I would draw to the attention of the hon. members of the House, in the event that they have not noticed it, that on their desks are three examples of the work of the community services programme as outlined in the estimate, including the important "English as a Second Language" classes within our citizenship branch: a study outlining the community information services programme and of course the expenditure relating to the Indian community projects for the year ending March 31, 1971.

Hon. Mr. Wishart, on behalf of hon. Mr. Welch, tabled the report of the study committee on recreational services of Ontario, 1970.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

USED CAR DEALERS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Used Car Dealers Act, 1968-1969.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The purpose of this bill is to extend the provisions of The Used Car Dealers Act of 1968-1969 to include new car dealers. As a result consumers will be in a position to seek assistance from The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs in new car transactions regardless of whether or not a used car is involved. And I might point out to the hon. members of the House that in almost every case a used car is involved.

CROWN TIMBER ACT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Crown Timber Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading the bill.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to bring Crown timber on private land into Crown management units, to permit the direction of forest product cuts on licensed areas to needy industries and to add flexibility to the regulations.

ADMINISTERING OF LIE DETECTOR TESTS

Mr. Trotter moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to control the Administering of Lie Detector Tests.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, before you call the orders of the day, I would inform the House that the Lieutenant Governor is waiting to give assent to a bill.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the throne.

Hon. W. Ross Macdonald (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed certain bills to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 1, An Act to amend The Wills Act.

Bill 3, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Bill 4, An Act to amend The Crown Witnesses Act.

Bill 6, An Act to amend The Justices of the Peace Act.

Bill 35, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves second reading of Bill 26, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, considerable has already been said about the principle of Bill 26 in the budget debate up until this time, and on a number of occasions apparently outside of the House when the Treasurer has attempted to defend the most important inclusion in the principle of this bill, which in fact would grant a tax credit on the basis of the corporation tax of five per cent to those corporations making investments in new machinery after the initial date. In these discussions it has become apparent that the amount of new employment that will be based on this so-called full employment budget concept would be negligible, if in fact it can be counted at all.

The commitment of \$126 million that is to be infused into the corporate structure is based, really, on the philosophy of Herbert Hoover who was valiantly attempting to have the economy of the United States "turn the corner"—I believe that was the phrase—"turn the corner toward prosperity" back in 1931 and 1932. His idea at that time was to make the corporations of the United States healthy, so their prosperity would trickle down to the man in the street who was suffering so severely from the Depression.

We can thank God that our present levels of unemployment and economic underdevelopment are not nearly as severe, they tell me, as those which were experienced in those years of the "hungry Thirties." But still, the concept of trying to improve the economic circumstances by infusing special tax credit money into the corporate structure is as futile now and as misdirected now, as it was so many decades ago.

The government opposite has made much of the fact that the hon. Eric Keirans has left the federal administration on the basis that federal policy is designed to aid the corporations and not make employment for the working people in the country. I think probably the criticism, valid as it might be federally, is specifically valid to this particular section of the budget and as it is enacted in section 4 of Bill 26. This is specifically designed to invest public funds in machinery and not in employment.

Our experience in recent months and years has been that corporations are all too willing to replace their labour force—their working staff—with machines. Usually these machines are of a type that is imported from outside Canada in the first place, so that even the labour associated with the development and

production of the machines themselves does not accrue to our benefit.

There is substantial detriment, as well, to the fact that making this a corporation tax credit means that other businesses do not have the advantage of the five per cent rebate if in fact they are not corporations. We were treated to an announcement today by the Minister of Trade and Development of a special fund to improve the situation of small businesses that are going to share, along with the standard EIO programme and another special venture fund, in a commitment of only \$7 million.

It appears, then, that the government concern for small business, while it does appear both in the budget and in the programmes announced today, is a minimal one indeed. It amounts substantially to window dressing that in the relief associated with this five per cent tax credit, non-incorporated businesses evidently will have no share of it whatsoever.

There is also the point that in standard business practice, even in the corporations which will benefit from this five per cent credit, a review of their capital budgets normally takes place in the fall of the year, as they look toward the market prospects in the year following. This means then that decisions, while they might be speeded up by the availability of this five per cent credit, will in many cases be postponed well beyond the situation of unemployment which has concerned the government opposite and all members of the House so extensively.

The Premier himself, in the Throne Speech that was read to us by His Honour at the opening of the session, indicated how important he felt the unemployment situation was in this province. We await with a great deal of interest the Premier's own contribution to that debate, if in fact we ever return to it, although it has now been on the order paper, without debate, for many weeks.

We in the Liberal Party feel that it is a wise move for the government to make a substantial commitment in dollars to the improvement of the economy of Ontario, but we are convinced that the machinery that is brought forward in Bill 26, which will channel the \$126 million into the corporate structure, is inadequate. It does not follow, let us say, the experience of this jurisdiction and other jurisdictions over the years where public policy has been designed to improve employment and economic prospects.

We feel that the commitment of these funds will not be in the best interests of the taxpayers or the citizens—the residents of

this province. We intend to vote against the principle of the bill for that reason.

We think that the government opposite is using this large commitment of public funds in a way that is not going to even approach the solution of the problems which they themselves have delineated in their budget statements and in the speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that this figure of five per cent in connection with production machinery has occurred in debates in this House over the last four years. The sales tax itself, imposed many years ago, was for a considerable length of time not applied to production machinery because it was felt that this additional tax would impede the kind of economic and industrial expansion that we would all hope for in a growing economy in this province.

As a result of some of these pressures, there was a short period when the five per cent tax was removed. I remember the fanfare of this removal, and it was supported on all sides. But it was only for a few months before the then Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) decided that the five per cent sales tax would be reimposed, even on the types of production machinery that were designed to control pollution. There has since been a number of programmes that were designed to assist industry in purchasing and establishing the antipollution machinery that must go along with an industrialized community that is also very concerned about the quality of its environment.

The tax credit, of course, is associated only with capital expenditures, and if this bill is to be approved and accepted by the House, even though we in this party are opposed to it in principle, it may therefore have the effect of decreasing, rather than increasing, the number of jobs available, as industries convert to a more capital intensive approach to their production operations.

If there was ever a programme designed to assist those corporations which realize that it is to their benefit to get away from a labour intensive situation, this is obviously it. This is surely a misdirection of funds that should be made available by the budget that we have been debating over the last few days. The direction of these funds should be toward the improvement of the employment circumstance.

It is a shame that government policy, based on Conservative philosophy, is going to result in the rather tragic loss of the impact

of this large sum of money, which is estimated will be fed into the corporate structure if this bill becomes the law of the land.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the government opposite will regret proceeding with the specifics of the bill. I think they are going to find themselves, if it does pass the House, that after it has been in force for a year it is not going to meet the goals they have set themselves. They are ill-advised and mis-directed in moving forward with this approach which was enunciated in the budget.

Mr. Speaker, there are other provisions in the bill that can be discussed on other occasions, and since we are discussing it in principle I will not refer to specific sections. There is one other aspect of the bill, however, that is designed to improve the opportunities that corporations would have to buy out other corporations without the control of these corporations being lost to foreign interests. That is the provision which would permit corporations to deduct the costs of these transactions from their corporate tax.

It has been pointed out by the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) and others that this sort of a provision is standard in American corporation tax law, and that it is time that Canadians had the same advantage.

I believe it should be made abundantly clear, in the statute itself, that these provisions apply only to those corporations that are under Canadian ownership and management. I do not feel that it is clear enough in the bill that is presented to us, that this sort of an advantage for Canadian corporations will be inherent in the law which eventually we expect will be proclaimed in the province.

The government opposite has said that its aim is to provide special assistance for Canadian corporations. And in this we agree, and are prepared to support it. But surely the provisions in the actual clauses of the bill should be more specific and clear in enunciating that concept so that there will not be the additional special relief for corporations that do not fall into the category of Canadian ownership and control.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, while we have considered some alternatives, such as reference of this bill for second reading, we feel that our best approach is simply to state our disapproval of its principle and its concept and to vote against it when given that opportunity following the conclusion of the debate in the House.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It would be inappropriate for me to belabour our position on this bill further than that which we have indicated at the time of the budget reaction and subsequently in the budget speech.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that we too will oppose the bill in principle as must have become evident over the last number of days and that we will want to see the House physically divide on the bill. We think there is a matter of some considerable principle at stake: namely the willingness of the government to grant \$125 million, unexpectedly and almost gratuitously, to the corporate sector which does not need that money to do that which it is already committed to do.

It is a very peculiar behaviour of government that this Tory regime is willing to give away—and that is simply what it is: an outright gift—such an astonishing amount of money to one small, unrepresentative sector of society, and at the same time to deny to the rest of the citizens of this province the tax rebates or tax credits or redistribution of wealth which might conceivably have created jobs or spurred economic growth.

In other words, of all the major reforms which the government pretended the budget contained, this was the only one which might be called major. This is the one which is also found most seriously wanting and it is one with which we cannot possibly agree.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition to it consists of many counts. I will not go into them in further detail. They are firmly on the record. But let me remind the minister, who was not a part of the extraordinary game-playing that occurred, of what followed the introduction of the budget.

The Treasurer introduced this item of the budget in a way which would have led the House to believe that \$2.5 million worth of additional machinery and equipment would be stimulated by this reform. It was then discovered, on the day the budget was handed down, that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics had put out a report no more than three or four weeks ago on the extent of investment in the public and private sector which demonstrated that the purchase of machinery and equipment in Ontario, over the year 1971, would total \$2,891 million.

From that we then subtracted the government and institutional categories, which amounted to \$157.6 million, and on the

urging of some of the government spokesmen frantically searching for an explanation, we eliminated that portion covering utilities, which amounted to \$782 million, and came to a remaining figure of \$1,951 million.

To that, however, we had to add in certain kinds of utilities. Having exempted Ontario Hydro, we had to add in Consumers' Gas, Union Gas and Bell Canada, all of which are corporations paying taxes in Ontario specifically designated as eligible by the government in its budget. And we had to add certain major repairs which are depreciable. Putting it all together we came up with a figure of \$2,250 million worth of machinery and equipment which would have been purchased anyway. When faced with this figure, the economists on the part of the government—not the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Revenue, but the civil servants—admitted that that amount of machinery and equipment was guaranteed and that what we were really talking of was an additional \$125 million tax rebate to stimulate the purchase of an additional \$250 million worth of machinery and equipment. That is a dollar for a dollar.

A more generous concession to the corporate world can hardly be imagined. And when asked, as the government was frequently asked, whether this could possibly create a single additional job or whether it would be in any sense stimulating to the economy in a significant way, the government was unable to give us any information at all. In other words, the tax rebate venture was like so many other parts of the government budget—an 11th-hour decision.

It was thought at the time to be imaginative and spectacular. It turned out to be hollow and disastrous and it is obviously something which cannot possibly win the support of opposition parties in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I go further. It should not even win the support of a number of sensitive, thinking, feeling, concerned back-benchers, like the member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. R. G. Hodgson), who fits that description impeccably. It should not command the support of any of those back-benchers, Mr. Speaker, because it must surely offend some of them that the government would give away \$125 million to the managerial elite, if I may use that term, in Ontario, when there are seven to seven and a half million other people seeking some benefit from this government. We therefore oppose it in principle on second reading.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Humber.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to rise to speak on this particular matter because I thought that my leader had expressed what had to be said about it. But a phrase used by the hon. member who just sat down induced me to stand up and try to add my few words to our position.

The phrase that he used was "an outright gift" and Mr. Speaker, indeed, that is exactly what the government's action amounts to—an outright gift. The point I wish to stress in this debate is the government's false philosophy or attitude that one stimulates the economy through the increase of the purchasing power of the consumer by giving money, not to the consumer, but to big business at the top.

Somehow, they have the fallacious idea that through those means some money will finally trickle down to the little man on the street, and he will then spend this money to buy consumer goods and thereby create a market for the manufacture of more goods. Getting money into the hands of the ultimate consumer through this trickling down method, Mr. Speaker, is akin to delivering ice cubes from Algeria to Cairo by passing them hand to hand across the Sahara Desert.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener) There is really something.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Is that original?

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, somehow these economists must have at one time, having been brought up in the age of the establishment in its full bloom, preached that the way to stimulate an economy was to give to the haves, so that a little bit could trickle down to the have-nots. In an era, Mr. Speaker, when all the wealth was divided between the have-alls and the have-nothings, there was a chance of it trickling down because there were no people in between with savings. But nowadays, in times of financial difficulty, simply putting money into people's hands, putting money into the hands of all the people, does not guarantee that they are going to spend that money. Some of them are going to exercise their right to do without and save that money, especially during times of Conservative rule when they can justifiably expect conditions to be still worse.

There is no guarantee the government is going to stimulate purchases by putting money into the hands of the people. Furthermore, putting money into the hands of corporations is not always a guarantee that they

are going to spend it. The hon. member who preceded me, the member for Scarborough West, has already pointed out that even though the government is making this magnificent gift to big business, they will be buying no more machinery than they would have bought under normal circumstances. They are therefore getting a gift.

What guarantee is there that they will spend any of that gift? They can keep that money in the treasury as undistributed profits, or they can declare a dividend to the shareholders. If the second alternative occurs we have no guarantee that the shareholders are going to spend that money. In fact, because they are shareholders, one can logically believe that they do not have to spend the money. They have enough money for their present needs and they have money to invest.

The market being as it is these days, nobody is very anxious to invest. In all probability, that dividend cheque will just be added to the amount they already have in the bank. They will not be buying any more consumer goods.

Furthermore, being in a position to be shareholders, and having enough wealth so to do, is a pretty good indication that they certainly would not have to buy any white goods—any refrigerators, stoves, or such—because they already have those items. So there again there is no guarantee that spending will be stimulated or that purchases will be stimulated.

If the government wants to stimulate the economy by injecting money into it, the only guarantee that money will be used to do things that one can find these days is by having the government undertake a programme of public works—a programme of construction. When the government does it itself, then it knows that something is being done, but it just cannot rely on the private sector to undertake a programme of construction just to help the government get out of a financial bind.

The only way the government can ensure that the people who need spending money get spending money is to place it directly in their hands and not give it to somebody way on high, on some distant, unreachable pinnacle in the hope that, as the provincial Treasurer said, it will trickle down and then everybody will get a piece of the action. I do not buy that philosophy, Mr. Speaker. I do not care how many great and prominent economists present or past suggested that to be the solution. In this day and age, in the kind of economy we live under, it just does not hold water.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): No great economist ever did, not in the past, nor in the present, nor ever conceivably in the future.

Mr. Ben: I think, as the leader of the NDP said, it is nothing but an outright pre-election, vote-getting gift to big business in the full knowledge that the money will not trickle down to the man on the street but flow in copious quantities into the coffers of the Conservative Party in Ontario. For that reason we on this side at least will be opposing in principle this bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have to keep my remarks brief. I will try to present them in point form and say that the bill is a dismal reflection of the claims made by the Treasurer in his budget for the major tax reduction that he heralded to us in this House last week.

In the budget statement of the Treasurer he described this bill as the key initiative in the budget to stimulate revival of economic growth. He went on to describe it as a major move. He called it a massive stimulus to business investment, he said it would relieve inflationary bottlenecks and, finally, he called it a major new incentive. The effect of the bill is to reduce taxation of corporations in the province by an estimated \$125 million.

One of the other things the Treasurer went on to give great stress to in his budget paper A, in which he discusses economic policy management, was what he calls the tax drag on the Ontario economy imposed by the federal government, and I quote that section:

The federal government continually runs a full-employment surplus in Ontario. Since 1962 the federal surplus has increased rapidly. It has also grown relatively faster than potential gross provincial product. By 1969 it had increased to \$1.5 billion or 4.5 per cent of potential gross provincial product.

And all of that buildup in the Treasurer's statement which was read in this House—the statement which precedes budget paper A in the budget book—was designed and described to us as a major offset of that federal tax drag. What we have, therefore, by way of contrast in the figures at least, is a \$1.5-billion federal drag on the economy of Ontario offset by a puny \$125 million. I do not necessarily accept the analysis that

is set out in budget paper A, but the government at least has done very little to counter or offset what they describe as one of the major holdbacks to expansion in the Ontario economy.

The Economic Council of Canada, in its latest report, its seventh annual review released last fall, pointed out that the goods-producing industries—these are the industries which invest in machinery for which the tax-credit is most likely to be given—have experienced no change whatever in unemployment in the past 20 years, at least insofar as its share of total employment in Canada is concerned. About one-third of employment in the country 20 years ago was accounted for by the goods-producing industries, and at the end of the period being examined by the Economic Council that proportion was still about one-third.

In the mining field, in which there is a great deal of investment in machinery and equipment, the Economic Council pointed out that there was extremely rapid growth in production but there was no increase in employment up to 1968, although investment per person employed had risen four times; employment in the decade of the Seventies was not expected to increase in mining at all.

So that in terms of being a stimulus to employment, the tax reduction provided in this bill in a large sector of the economy—mining—will be of little effect; and in the most employment-active part of the manufacturing sector, the goods-producing industries, it is not likely to prove of much benefit either. For most of those persons who risk unemployment there is little likelihood that jobs will be opened up for them by these measures, Mr. Speaker.

The Dominion Bureau of Statistics labour force survey for the beginning of this year showed that across Canada young persons 14 to 24 years of age accounted for 45 per cent of the total unemployed, and 43 per cent in the year before. So their proportion of the total unemployed in this country has been rising, and it has been rising faster than the overall increase in unemployment in recent months.

It is this same group, Mr. Speaker, that will have the least opportunity for employment in the goods-producing industries. Probably the opportunities for employment for these young people lie more in the service-producing industries than in manufacturing, because as we have stressed several times in this debate, and the leader of the New Democratic Party has stressed in his budget

address, large amounts of investment are being made these days, but are opening up very few jobs.

One particularly striking instance that comes to my mind from a visit I made to the town of Fort Frances some weeks ago is that when when the Boise Cascade Kraft mill is completed, at a cost of \$45 million, there will be approximately some 67 new jobs created for that \$45 million investment. Some of those 67 new jobs are going to be jobs transferred from another division of the company, the Ontario-Minnesota Paper Company in Fort Frances, where, because of other investments in modernization, jobs will be lost.

So, as an employment stimulating measure, the bill before us, Mr. Speaker, will fail. It would have been much better had the same amount approximately, of tax loss been put on the consumption side of the provincial balance sheet rather than on the investment side. The result would have been more certain and it would have been more immediate.

For these reasons, also, Mr. Speaker, we will oppose the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, nowhere will this bill be greeted with greater enthusiasm than in the mining industry. In vigorously opposing this bill, one is entitled to wonder aloud just what the quantum of the contribution, which will be made in the election campaign by the International Nickel Company to the Conservative Party, will be.

One would wonder how much those Texas millionaires that control and operate Falconbridge Nickel Mines, how much their largess will be translated into coin of the realm. In respect of Inco, I would be surprised if they give less than \$100,000. I would think they would be pikers if the Conservative war chest got less than \$100,000 from the International Nickel Company of Canada. That is a guess, but it is a fairly shrewd one.

Falconbridge, the little brother, which in the Sudbury basin is usually related as one is to four—it is one-quarter of the size of Inco—would probably give one-quarter of that amount.

It is amazing, as one contemplates the world about one, how solicitous, how grandiosely solicitous governments are for the captains of industry. You can have royal commissions report by the scores and most of them will gather dust on the back shelves of some cellar, in some legislative archive

somewhere. But let there be a royal commission on the banks, as there was headed by a former Chief Justice of Ontario, and government members break their necks and catapult over one another in a great frenzy to get the recommendations translated into legislative form.

So it was with the ceiling on bank interest. The historian Brebner said, in a phrase of such delicacy that I always relish his words, that the poor very seldom get into the office of a Prime Minister but his office is always open to the president of the CPR. So has been the syndrome of the history of this country. Once again this minister, in initiating this piece of legislation, gives a bonanza to those who scarcely need it.

Eric Kierans last Sunday night on television pointed out that in the mining industry only 16 per cent of the profits are liable to taxation. I almost weep when I file my own income tax returns and I see the bite that they take out of me; I weep against the knowledge of the wide-ranging tax concessions that we give to the mining industry: depletion allowances, capital costs allowance, write-offs of every nature. And yet the Financial Post and the Globe and Mail—which is the same thing; the Financial Post and the Globe and Mail is the same publication—they use the rhetoric of 52 per cent corporation taxes, and say: "Is it not horrendous, it is not terrible, 52 per cent of our profit."

I am a student of corporate reports. I have yet to pick up a corporate report which shows the provision for taxes to come anywhere near 52 per cent. The human being of course, has not got the depletion allowance though his body is wasting as he leaves the middle years, as he gets on the north side of 50. He has no such provision. He has not got the capital cost allowances, he has not even got the travel expenses. He has not got all these garnishments that the corporate structure have in order to lessen their tax liability.

Ultimately it has been said, and very accurately, that the corporate structure pays no taxes at all. If you think about it for a moment you see the validity of that proposition. They do not pay any taxes. Human beings and only human beings pay taxes.

The corporate structure is a tax-gathering arm of the corporate state. It is an agent of the state, to gather taxes from the consumers of the product and the price of the product is a reflection of the tax burden, and in that sense they do not pay any taxes at all.

Well, I have looked at Inco's annual report; let us see if I can summon up the figures. They made something like \$900 million after all their expenses. They paid something like \$40 million in taxes. Somebody can work out that percentage. Then, of course, in the annual report they list all the allowances that they have.

So does Inco, one of the giants, one of the great, one of the most intelligent corporations, does it need the lousy five per cent that this government is offering them?

On another and more important side, of course, nowhere will greater anxiety be created than among those who work in the mines, those who toil in the ground in order to create Inco's vast profits. The United Steelworkers of America in Sudbury have been conscious for a long time that automation is overtaking them, that there is a viable threat to their jobs, the jobs of those for whom they are the stewards, as a result of the employment of sophisticated technology underground. Is that the kind of thing that this government wants to foster? Does it want less people working in the extraction of that wonderful resource that a bountiful providence has endowed upon the people of this province?

Is that the government's intention?

I represent perhaps the only community in Ontario where presently, today, there is full employment. I can think of none other. We do not have those anxieties, the stresses that inflict themselves upon other communities where the breadwinner is without work. Is it the intention to reduce that level of employment?

They have adapted a drill that is four feet wide and can drill a manhole through the hardest rock in the world; They have elaborate mucking machines; they have all sorts of aids in the extraction of the ores. Do they need an additional five per cent, that aggressive company that has had the midas touch, that has been able to turn out millions of dollars of profit with great skill and dexterity? It is very questionable to me whether that type of economic reform, so-called stimulus, is appropriate to the climate of our times.

Yet one must stand back in admiration of the gall of the barons of the mighty industry. One must admire them. They realize the extent of the tax concessions they get in this country. They are mindful of them.

They know if Falconbridge stock sells at \$150 a share, if you want a share, Mr. Speaker, give your broker \$155 and he would

probably want 10 on the top for the privilege of buying it for you.

There is Inco now, with 80 million shares plus in the hands of the public; it sells at something around \$42. The vast dividends; oh, vast dividends that they paid out over the years!

Dome Mines—let me pause for a minute—Dome Mines, there is a tremendous example. Some day I am going to look up and see, since its initiation, how much in dividends Dome Mines of Timmins has paid out. It is in the tens of millions of dollars. It must be something of upwards of \$50 millions in dividends it has paid out. Yet until the inauguration of the Canada Pension Plan, it did not even have a pension for its employees.

In the whole of Ontario, until the inauguration of the Canada Pension Plan only two mining companies had pensions—Inco and Falconbridge. After 35 or 40 years of work, getting the sweat and energy of the workers, they tossed them out on the scrap heap.

Ten years from now, I predict, our young will look back on these decades of the twentieth century and they will wonder if the society was rational. They will wonder if we were kooky. With the vast wealth from our great natural resources that we put in the hands of a few, whether we had our wits about us. That is vital to the principle of this bill.

What moral right, I ask in this, the most important place in Ontario, what moral right has Stephen Roman to sequester to himself upwards of \$40 million from our uranium resources and for him to say: "That is mine. The rest of you stay away." What moral right has Joe Hirshhorn got to hold up the American Congress to build him a monument next to the Lincoln Memorial to house his \$25 million art collection which he summoned to his side out of our uranium resources? Joe Hirshhorn, who probably does not know a Rembrandt from the south end of a bull going north. What right has he got?

Look at the list of them. The Hollingers, the Timmins', Harry Oakes, the Bickells, W. H. Wright, who bought the Globe and Mail and gave it to George McCullagh out of our gold resources in northern Ontario. Of all the egotism—not a strong enough word—egotism, self-indulgence, unbridled and unrestrained, that the few could come along to our resources and say, because of the management skills, of the expertise, of the organization of the capital, "They belong to us. They are ours."

Now if you took all those things together—all those management skills—if you took them all together and you wanted to come to a fair figure to pay them for their efforts, if you gave them a million dollars they would be overpaid. They would be overpaid for a lifetime of work.

And yet this bill, unmindful of the fact that the mining industry is already satiated with tax concessions, such as the force-fed geese the Bourbon kings used to rear for their own appetite, this bill wants to give them yet another one. You have to admire their gall.

Comes to my desk just this morning the report of the directors of the Ontario Mining Association for 1970-1971—just this morning—where they say this:

The Ontario Mining Association continues in the belief expressed in a brief to the Prime Minister of Ontario respecting the anticipated effects on Ontario's economy of implementation of the white paper proposals. It was stated:

"The white paper provisions are not likely to cause an early cessation of mining, nor even an ostensible drastic change in the operation of mines. The effect, in all probability, will not be apparent for five to 10 years, when the lack of incentives will have curtailed exploration that is needed to maintain sources of mineral supply, which will not have been found. It is to be sincerely hoped that that anticipated tax legislation will neither penalize nor discourage the risk-taking inherent in the mining industry to the detriment of Canada's economic future."

You have to admire their gall!

As the Duke of Wellington said to the man who said to him, "Good morning, Mr. Smith"; "If you can believe that, you can believe anything."

They say there is a danger—you see the basis they put it on—there is a danger that the tax programme will affect incentive in the exploitation of our natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that the greedy jaws of that American eagle to the south of us, the greedy guts of the American eagle, will ensure the continued exploitation of our mineral resources for two major reasons. One, they need it in their elaborate manufacturing system. The other reason is it is handy. We are next door, where our mineral resources in the raw state may be readily transported to feed the insatiable appetite of their manufacturing economy.

The mining association need have no fear of any diminution in the exploitation of mineral resources in this country. And yet, the same mining association, of course, every year they publish a brochure which, unhappily and depressingly, comes to my desk where they are falling over themselves with joy that we manage to export \$4 billion of minerals in the raw state each year—\$4 billion. They think that is a mark of achievement. I happen to think that it is the gloomier and seamier side of the organization of our economy and, as Mr. Kierans aptly pointed out Sunday, the continued exploitation and sale of mineral resources in the raw state ensures that there will be a diminishing labour content in the future.

So I ask, do they need a tax concession such as this will give them? Certainly not, they are already surfeited with tax allowances.

As for the poor mines, the poorer mines, the exploitation of gold bearing deposits, the moral value of which is questionable—fortunately the hon. member from Timmins, the member for Cochrane South, is absent. One wonders why we still mine gold. But for them the federal government has an independent programme called the EMGA, which again was a great concession.

I said before in the House—there may be some newcomers who did not hear me say it; it might bear repeating—that there is one group, the Little Longlac group, that managed to accumulate over the years \$13 million from EMGA—Emergency Gold Mine Assessments. They attempted to use the \$13 million to buy a gas company, Northern Ontario Natural Gas. So apart from the assistance to them in continuing mining development for gold, they felt the Canadian people owed them the bonus of a natural gas company. They were forestalled in that by Power Corporation and United Accumulative Fund.

Well Mr. Speaker, that has been a syndrome of our life in the seven decades of the twentieth century—the giving of wealth to the few. The rich get richer and the poor get poorer. But the poor have no spokesman. They are inarticulate. They have recently been deserted by our friends to the left in their striving to become respectable. They are all working like corporate executives now. You look at that fellow McDermott of the United Auto Workers and he might be taken as a vice-president of IBM, unless he showed you his card. It is a mad scramble for respectability in which they are engaged.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): He is doing a hell of a lot more for people than the Liberal Party is doing.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): I thought the hon. member was over picketing in Detroit.

Mr. Sopha: I say to my friend, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Wishart), it was the only convention ever held in the history of Canada—

Mr. Pilkey: They are doing a lot more for people than the Liberals who created unemployment.

Mr. Sopha: —where they had to call the police to keep order. Laxer was lucky to escape with his life.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Is that right? Does the hon. member believe in capital punishment?

Mr. Sopha: The fact is that the poor are inarticulate. There are never any briefs for them. They have no spokesman.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): We are the only ones who speak for them.

Mr. Sopha: They have no highly paid lawyers. They are not at the sessions where these things are ordained. And of course to state that fact means to herald what is going to happen in this decade, because governments can no longer get away with this. Out there on the street corners, in the country stores of this nation, there is a growing consciousness that this type of concession, this unjustified gift to the few, no longer suits the temper of the times.

So I say, for those two major reasons and especially for the reason that I would betray the stewardship of the people I represent here if I did not take the opportunity to call to the attention of the House that this type of legislation poses a great and present threat to the continued prosperity of the Sudbury basin and that it might very well mean a diminution in the number of jobs that are available.

I also point out to this minister that whereas he thinks it is great largess against the ringing praises of the Treasurer as he introduced it—you will recall some of them, “surrounding a syndrome of stimulus to employment” and that type of thing—there is another and grave side of the picture to this, whereas the attempted cure might prove worse than the disease it is attempting to effect a remedy for. For those reasons and

for the rest of the reasons, I put, I find that to be responsible at all I must be in my place at the time the division bells ring in order to vote against this statute. We cannot get a crowd. We cannot get the ear of the Treasurer, the man responsible for the initiation—we cannot get his ear. The Premier, of course—that is another thing; I am going to do a study some day soon of why the Premier leaves at the end of question period. We just cannot get his presence.

But we are going to get them all in here when the division bells ring. We will get them in then. They will have to stand in their place in order to justify to the people they represent in their own consciences why they would support this legislation. They will come in like the sheep that they are—oblivious, unmindful, with a consummate mindlessness about the nature of the debate. Some of those backbenchers, they would not need a brain at all; all they need is a pair of legs to walk in. They will come in and the party whip, the member for Victoria-Haliburton, will tell them we are voting for this.

An hon. member: The former whip!

Mr. Sopha: I meant the former whip.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I am no longer the whip. I have not been for well over a year and a half.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Is there one?

Mr. Breithaupt: He does not want to take any blame.

Mr. Sopha: I was not surprised at that, and a lot of other things that are going to happen to the member for his support of the Attorney General and Minister of Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence). That is only the beginning.

Hon. E. Dunlop (Minister without Portfolio): He had not been for a year and a half, he said.

Mr. Sopha: All right. I resume my seat in saying that I am one of those residents of this country. I am one who is developing an increasing ire against this type of thing and this obscenecy of this place and its government and the people who wield power in this province to those that inhabit those tall buildings on Bay and University, and the granting of concessions to them. I have said many times, many times, and it has never been disputed, that those buildings downtown are a reflection in physical form of the wealth that we produce in northern Ontario. That is

how they were created and that is how they were paid for. There is nothing in this budget for the low-income earner—two sentences about the development of northern Ontario, two sentences and nothing else. Yet with indecent haste the new Minister of Revenue comes in here in order to persuade this place to adopt its usual stance of subservience to those in the corporate world that wield the real power in the economy.

Mr. Breithaupt: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Brantford.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker, I must admit personally I enjoyed the last talk as the member for Sudbury railed against the corporate sector. For a while, I thought he was running for the leadership of the Waffle group within our party.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Elmer the Waffler! There is a departure.

Mr. Makarchuk: However, in reality, Mr. Speaker, I notice that with regard to the people he was railing against, the people sitting on the other side, in Manitoba they are joining hands. Even in Brant county, where we have a by-election, we had a Tory candidate phone me Saturday morning. He is—shall we say, in the character of George Grant—and he says: "I am going to run because a local Tory candidate was anointed. The federal vote is going to go to the Liberal candidate and, then when the provincial election comes, we are going to switch to the Tory candidate."

Incidentally, it is in the leader of the Liberal Party's own wigwam where this is happening.

Mr. Sopha: The member knows the Tory party will not be back.

Mr. Makarchuk: I may add that with the great concern expressed about International Nickel and Falconbridge, Mr. Speaker, I am sure they will make contributions to the Liberal Party as well as the Conservatives. So on the one hand, it is nice to hear this but, on the other there is the reality, and it has no relation to what is being said over here.

To the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker, that we can provide jobs in Ontario, there are things that certainly can be done but it is not going to be done by the handing over of \$125 million to the industry, to the corporate sector.

If the minister was really concerned about it, he could have insisted on giving \$125 million in either direct or indirect grants, or loans, to the service industry, to the tourist industry. These are the industries that have a high labour content. As it is, the minister gives the tourist industry a promise that he is going to hand out \$1 million, whereas the other industries get \$125 million.

Now I am sure the multiplier effect in the service industry, or the amount of money or the amount of jobs that would have been generated if that money went into either the tourist industries or the service industries or even into the public sector, as an example in the expansion of the facilities of the hospital at Orillia or building another similar institution in Orillia, the government would have created many more jobs with a greater benefit to the people of Ontario than what it is doing now.

If the government is going to give it, and it is going to give it to the industrial sector, perhaps it could have insisted that it goes only to secondary industries or industries that are involved in manufacturing, and not into the primary industries. These, of course, have a higher job content and this is what the concern is all about.

The government could have put the \$125 million into housing itself. In looking at it in terms excluding the land costs, it is found that \$125 million will build something roughly like 8,000 housing units which would provide—using the government's own multiplier effect—roughly 32,000 jobs. There is a definite way in which this money could have been spent to ensure or reduce the level of unemployment in the province.

It was available to the government. They could have done it and they refused to act because it goes against some kind of principle, some kind of grain. I am not sure. Basically, the matter is that the government is not really concerned about those people out there right now who do not have work. It does not really have any empathy for them.

The government should bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that just about every civilized western nation, with the exclusion of Canada and the United States, has managed to cope with the problem of unemployment. We hear great complaints about the mismanagement in Britain, about the great problems in Britain, and yet if one looks at their unemployment they see it is 3 per cent.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Look at Scotland!

Mr. Makarchuk: Yes. Look at Scotland.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): The member must not get pushy.

Mr. Makarchuk: This is a depressed area, Mr. Chairman. I am glad the member brought it up. In the depressed areas of Britain, unemployment has reached the level of 4.7 per cent. But the point is they are not even sitting there and the national average is below 3 per cent. Look at Sweden? Look at Germany? Look at Holland and Denmark or Switzerland where they have an over-employment problem. Now, they are using certain economic techniques that are available to us here in Ontario and we could use them too.

Furthermore, we should bear in mind that most of these countries do not have the natural resources or the power available to them that we have here. We have numerous advantages. Again, it is a matter of economics. It is a matter of government planning. It is a matter of government intervention into the functioning of private enterprise and the government is not prepared to do this thing.

They are prepared to let those people be out of work, and what they are doing is sort of paying lip service. They are looking for headlines in the press and hopefully, through deception, they hope to get themselves re-elected. Well, they are wrong there, because the people are not buying that kind of garbage any more.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I was interested, first of all, in looking at and reviewing the comments that were made in the budget speech by the provincial Treasurer, when he said on page 25: "This tax credit approach to stimulating investment, economic growth and job opportunities in Ontario, has major advantages over alternative measures." I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this approach will do neither one, nor any one of the three things which the provincial Treasurer said it would do.

It seems apparent that we have here a provision in the granting of this five per cent investment tax credit that is nothing more than a political football. We saw the retail sales tax imposed on production machinery and equipment. We were told that this was going to be in order to make sure that this government was covering all the areas available to it equitably, but the end result was that after a year the reasons why the tax

did not work that were pointed out in the debate on that bill, proved, in fact, to be true.

The tax was taken off initially. It was then reimposed, and of course finally we are back to the same situation as we were then. We have a government that is unable to plan in advance the results of the taxes which it does choose to impose.

This tax credit does nothing for unincorporated businesses and I think that that should be made apparent to the perhaps some 21 government members who are over there now.

You know it was interesting to me this afternoon, during this debate to watch the government benches fill up so rapidly. There are three times as many as there were at the start of the debate because only seven were in their places, seven out of 68. Seven persons who are involved, at least, in listening to the reasons why this is bad legislation.

When the division bells ring, the back-benchers will come in and pound their desks like trained seals as soon as the magic words 'small business' may be heard. Indeed, their response, as they yelp and almost salivate to those words, would delight the mind and work of Pavlov himself.

So of these members who mouth a certain interest in small business, we have in effect seen the real background of the government that they supposedly support. That government is prepared to grant in this tax credit situation a benefit not to the unincorporated small businessman, not to the individual taxpayer but rather in an archaic view of economic policies, this government is prepared to let these benefits trickle down supposedly, so that eventually persons other than their immediate friends will receive some benefits.

We are well aware, Mr. Speaker, that most of the corporations do not review their capital budgets until the fall of the year. The decisions to acquire new machinery and equipment are not going to be made until that time so the effects of this credit are not going to be felt until 1972.

The provincial Treasurer in his earlier comments gave us some idea as to what really was behind the kind of window-dressing that this bill represents. He admitted under certain questioning that in fact most of the equipment that was going to be purchased and for which these rebates were planned, was going to be purchased anyway. We were giving a benefit to people who did not need it for something they were already prepared to do.

We were giving a benefit to people who, as has been pointed out, might well choose to make political contributions when, in fact, they did not really need that additional credit.

They were going to spend this money. They were going to invest these \$5 billion over the next two years, and this whole abeyance of tax, of up to \$125 million for each of these two years, was in fact a gift. A gift perhaps with strings attached. Only time will tell that.

To make the benefits of this kind of incentive available to unincorporated as well as incorporated businesses, would have been an intelligent thing to do. It obviously has not happened and the government ought to remove the retail sales tax from production machinery, rather than give this kind of a credit approach.

I was interested in looking at the budget paper A, dealing with economic policy management and when it appears as appendix B to the budget, I would point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that it refers generally to the outlook for 1971, and if you look with me at page 161 of this budget, this is what it says:

Almost 100,000 new jobs must be created in 1971 to absorb the normal increase in the labour force. However, to reduce the unemployment rate to three per cent or less will require the creation of 150,000 new jobs.

Well these are the government's own figures. These are the figures that they see are going to be required in order to take care, not only of problems of economic growth, but also of problems of seasonal and technological unemployment.

But what in fact does this piece of legislation do? Admissions have been made in this House, not only by the provincial Treasurer, that in fact there is no real knowledge as to how many individual jobs may be created by this legislation. The credit extends to equipment which has to be in place and in use by March 31, 1973. This deadline is going to be too late and is certainly going to result in the fires of inflation being further fuelled, as inflation may well be the problem in the next fiscal year.

What this government could have done was to have stimulated the construction industry, which is relatively labour intensive. The government could have, and indeed should have, removed the retail sales tax from building materials—and I might add should have encouraged the federal government to do the same.

The credit of five per cent will not help smaller companies who cannot rely on internal sources of financing from their returned earnings. These are the companies that have to go to financial institutions with rates of eight or nine or 10 per cent. These are the institutions which are going to be requiring additional benefits and guarantees, additional burdens and participations, and five per cent here and there; and these are the institutions which are in fact not going to be giving the kind of credit financing which is necessary to allow smaller industries, whether they are incorporated or not, to grow as they should.

Well the tax credit is one for capital expenditures. I think that this tax credit is going to have an actual affect of decreasing, rather than increasing, the number of jobs available.

We have seen industries converting to more capital intensive and less labour intensive methods. The member for Sudbury has pointed out his own personal experience and knowledge in the development of mining equipment. We have been told about the various other kinds of labour-saving devices, as they are called, and these kinds of devices which this particular bill is going to favour are not going to be providing the additional jobs which this budget says are necessary within the province. We require more assistance of course, to industry. But the industry that we must be assisting is labour-intensive industry.

There are four good reasons why this is a bad bill. The first one is that it is only granting benefits to incorporated organizations—corporations. It is not giving anything to the small businessmen this government says it favours.

Secondly, it is providing a benefit as a tax allowance to people who already were prepared to spend this money and develop these kinds of programmes over the next two years. It is, therefore, a free gift of the taxpayers' funds, and is not needed in any way to effectively stimulate the economy.

Thirdly, we are seeing machinery being purchased and in place over this two-year term, but there is no requirement that this machinery have any particular Canadian content. We are not seeing in any way Canadian manufacturers being positively stimulated to develop their own kinds of programmes and growth, so that in effect they can give benefits to other Canadians who are purchasing equipment.

And fourth, and indeed by far the most important, the failure is clear here that jobs

which are badly needed within our provincial economy will not be provided by this bill. There is no point in pretending otherwise. The press have seen through the fiasco of job development that was called for in the housing promises in the Throne debate. The public have seen through it, too, and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the press and the public as well will see through this kind of an approach which is an ineffective and foolish way to attempt to stimulate the economy. I have given the minister four reasons why this is a bad bill. I believe every one of them is valid and because of every one of them I will oppose the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As was said by my leader, we will oppose the bill and I do not think it comes as any surprise to the minister. I am sure he recognized on the day that the budget was brought down, that the measures which he was proposing were not acceptable to us; that we felt that if it was the opinion and desire of the government to stimulate the economy that this ought to have been done by other, what we consider to be more constructive, measures, the likes of which might have been the reduction of the sales tax.

We feel, quite frankly, in looking at the measures that are being taken by the government, and I mentioned it to the Treasurer some time ago, that it is a disturbing fact that the Province of Ontario is relying less and less on corporation tax as a major source of tax revenue. This year, they have reduced from 11 to eight per cent that portion of the total tax revenue of the province which will be required to be paid by corporations, while at the same time increasing the individual income tax by one percentage point in the total tax revenue. It is further disturbing that corporation tax has sunk to such a level that we now raise more money in this province from medical-care premiums than we raise from the corporate sector as its share of the total cost of operating in the province of Ontario. It is a statement for all to see in the Ontario budget, that in the year 1970-1971 corporation tax accounted for \$414 million; this year it is projected that corporation tax will account for \$290 million.

It strikes me as odd that the minister should decide at this point to remove the five per cent tax on machinery, which is the equivalent of \$125 million, which just happens to be the exact similar amount that the corporations sector will not be expected to

pay this year, which shows to me that the government has very little faith in the growth of the Province of Ontario. If you take a look at the two figures you find that the difference between what we raised in corporation tax last year and what is projected to be raised this year is \$124 million. It shows pretty clearly that this government does not believe that this supposed stimulus of \$125 million is going to produce one penny more in total profit to the corporations of the Province of Ontario, because if it were, we would then have shown, as a result of that, additional taxes via corporation tax. It is quite obvious that this is then, simply, a handout.

Now, it could be argued, or it might have been argued, or it might even have been supposed by some, that the reason for having done this was a decline in corporation profit to a level where this particular refund was necessary.

I want to say to the minister that in the year 1967 we derived something in the order of approximately \$200 million from the corporation tax, and in the year 1967 corporation profits, before taxes—this is a total national figure, so I cannot be entirely sure how much of it is applicable to Ontario, but I suspect a considerable portion—in the year 1967 corporation profits, before taxes, was \$6,774 million. In that year we in the Province of Ontario received slightly less than \$200 million from corporation tax.

This last year, 1970, corporation profits in Canada—and I again suspect similar profits would show in the Province of Ontario—were \$7,364 million and in this year we are going to receive an amount similar to the amount we received in 1967. It is not because of the inability of the corporations to pay, therefore, that the government is in the process of reducing the amount that they must be, by tax, forced to contribute to the overall economy of this province; and if it is not for that reason, then it must simply be because of favour, because there can be no other.

The two obvious things to look for are an indication that this expenditure by the people of the province will derive some return—and there is no indication in the budget projections of that; or that the corporation profits have so diminished that it is necessary for us to take these steps—and there is no indication of that.

Now if we had, as a province, wanted to take some steps to preserve and to ensure the people of this province some opportunity of increased purchasing power, then we could

have used this \$125 million to subsidize the incomes of the aged, to bring them into line with at least a reasonable standard of living; but no, no, we do not do those things; that is unacceptable to this government. We might have reduced the retail sales tax by a percentage point or two in some way and use all of this and perhaps even more to reduce that and to allow people to have more money to spend and stimulate the economy; but that is unacceptable to the government. I seriously wonder, in reading over the budget paper, the philosophy behind this particular taxing move and the intent that was expressed by this government as to what this was intended to do, whether it was very clearly thought out.

I can see no earthly reason why the individual taxpayers of this province should be expected to contribute additional moneys to the operation of this province when the corporate sector is going to get a rebate of about 30 or better than 30 per cent of what they previously paid, and I suggest to the minister that this is not acceptable to the people of this province and not acceptable to this party.

It is time that we took a realistic approach to the providing of funds for the operation of this province and it is time that we insisted that every sector of the province contribute in accordance with its ability. It is perfectly clear from the statistics available that the corporate sector is able at this time to continue to contribute at least at the level that it previously contributed and perhaps even more.

It is also perfectly clear at this time, if you care to look at the increasing tax burden on the individual in the Province of Ontario, that the individual can no longer absorb additional costs and what I say to you is this: that at some point after the forthcoming election, I feel sure that if the Conservative government were to be returned to office, they would feel it necessary to recover that \$125 million and more from the economy and that this would not be done by increasing the burden on the corporate sector but rather would be transferred to the individual taxpayer, to the retail sales tax, to the gasoline tax, to the medical care premiums and to the liquor taxes. And I suggest to the minister that the people of this province and the people in this party are not going to abide by this. This is not how one deals with the difficulty of putting money into the economy. If you want to have people living a reasonable existence, if you want to have them with sufficient expendable incomes, then you have

to meet the problems of the everyday man in the street rather than the problem of the corporate magnate, and that is exactly what is being done and we will oppose this legislation.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, there are a few points I would like to make in rising to oppose this bill. First of all, I think we should remember in the discussion of this bill that the Treasurer's statement was that he and his government are interested in the production of the industries of this province, and that the need to make Ontario competitive on the foreign markets was one of the basic reasons he gave for using this type of tax credit to stimulate the economy. Well, this is perhaps a noble intention and indeed, we do not have to hesitate in saying that we are all interested in developing good export markets.

However, I think we must look at some of the statistics and some of the figures over the past year to see, indeed, where the problem exactly is.

The gross provincial product in Ontario rose from \$32.5 billion to \$35 billion in 1969 to 1970, an increase of 7.8 per cent. So our productivity has gone up by 7.8 per cent. Increased production is where the Treasurer put his emphasis at the time this was introduced. In my view, the production capability in the Province of Ontario is already here. There are many plants working on short hours at the present time. Some have not called back all the people whom they have laid off in the last six months and consequently we find that short-shifts are the order of the day in many production plants.

If people are working on shorter hours, the production capability is not being used to its full potential. Indeed, there is need for some stimulation so that these people can work full lengths of hours. So let us look at our export markets in the past year. In 1969, the exports from the Province of Ontario were \$6.85 billion. They rose in 1970 to \$7.7 billion, so our export market actually increased by 13 per cent as our unemployment rate went up, in Ontario, from 3.1 per cent to something over four per cent of unemployment—4.3 per cent.

In my view, the problem is not in the need for increased production for the export market but in the inability of the con-

sumer to have the money at his disposal to buy consumer products here in the Province of Ontario.

I think a very good example of where the problem really is was in the explanation given to the members who visited north-western Ontario in the legislative tour a few years ago. It was in a sawmill operation, I believe, Kimberly-Clark's operation at Sioux Lookout. There, the manager of the operation told us that his operation, presently, was very marginal. The profit was not up to company expectations. They employed 100 people at that particular sawmill. He told us that as soon as the money was available and it was economically feasible, they must automate the production and they could then run the plant with 25 employees instead of 100 employees. The other alternative was to close it down completely and put 100 people out of work.

As long as the operation is marginal and showing a small profit, they are keeping the 100 employees. Now, this device put forth by the government here may well be the straw which will allow them to automate that operation and reduce their employees from 100 to 25. This is not, in my view, the type of stimulation that this government should be giving to big industry.

The problem, of course, is that the labour force increased by 99,000 last year when only 60,000 new jobs were available. So we have 39,000 people who are without work because of the fact that the labour content in all types of manufacturing in particular is going down and down while the capital content is going up. So it would seem most reasonable that anyone thinking of this situation in terms of production and labour content in production realizes that the temporary measure that is needed to get the economy going is increased consumer purchasing power, not increased production power. The potential production is already there.

What we need is a short-term measure of increased purchasing power by the public. This, as has been stated by others on this side, would well have been accomplished through stimulating the economy basically—first, I would say, in the field of housing.

Housing is a high-labour content proposition and would have created many jobs as well as eliminating one of the great social needs in our province.

Mr. Speaker, I just cannot understand the reasoning behind this government other than that one can surmise that the people who

are very pleased with this type of legislation are the corporate citizens in our huge corporations, the Bay Street gang and basically the entrenched, staunch Tory voter in this province think this is great. Here is their chance to buy a new machine and it is only going to cost 95 cents on the dollar. I am certain that the people of Ontario will not benefit from this within the next short term interval when it is needed so greatly. Consequently, I also oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: This government is in the process of stripping itself of numerous tax fields, imposing no taxes in fields where it would be viable and worthwhile, such as gift tax and in the area of capital gains. It has historically seen fit, whereas in the old days even municipalities had the right to personal income tax, it latterly turned over its power, and bound its hands and feet too in the process of turning over to the federal government its full implementation and the power of personal taxation.

It has always jealously guarded one area of taxation over against all the rest and that was corporation tax, and I think it is wise that it should do so. But it has apparently only guarded it, not stripped itself of it, in order only to diminish its impact and its role in this particular area. Rather than have the federal government phase it out, it is phasing it out gradually itself.

History was presented in figures given the other night. It is down to eight per cent of the total budget picture, whereas it played a significant part—as a matter of fact it was probably the single most important tax in this economy not very many years ago. The tax is being used as housing had been used by the federal government under this particular legislation, by way of a roller coaster effect touching the imposition, withdrawal and reimposition, played over against the production and machinery tax, which we argued against, and as the then minister (Mr. White) argued against in the teeth.

Any authority and every man who knows anything about the impositions of these forms of taxation insisted in effect what you are doing here, sir, at least to a considerable point, is cancelling out through this legislation the very thing that you imposed. As I say in the teeth of all common sense, right reason and scientific authority, a year or so ago. In other words, there is an internal division inside the government here, an in-

ability to rationalize, an inability not to contradict itself, an inability to bring some kind of logic and intelligence to the tax structure of the province.

This move, in the direction which it has taken, and the alleviation to the corporations of this five per cent break bespeaks this particular kind of illogicality. It goes further, I have heard government members boast about the tax and accept it in terms of, for instance, pollution control. They say that the five per cent production machinery alleviation of a year or so ago is now being given a greater scope under the terms of this taxation.

I doubt first of all whether that is true. Secondly, the original tax and the alleviation to industry in this particular regard was deemed sufficient unto the day and that the need was met, having given the particular tax relief under earlier legislation with respect to waste management and with respect to putting in anti-pollution equipment. This is a gratuity, a complete gratuity over and above, which will not filter down to the total population but would be really lost.

In sitting down, Mr. Speaker, may I say in final plea, does the Minister of Revenue, in his wisdom and having explored and analysed the full impact of taxation, with all that it means in terms of garnering in the loot, do not he and his government wish that they had been half as imaginative and half as decent in terms of equity as the tax proposals made over on this side of the House the other day? Are they not sorry they did not think about those things?

There is where they would have had immediate and definite and beneficial impact on the economy, not by this circuitous, back-handed and rather stupid way of handling taxation matters.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I have not studied the statistical ramifications of this government action, but I believe we have to admit that the action of the government in bringing forward this bill is tied in with the complete importance of this session of this parliament, bringing about an increased stimulus to our economy to find jobs for the unemployed. That is the name of the game in a government's responsibilities.

It seems to me that the priorities given by the government in this action, bringing this bill forward, and the fact that at this

point there has not been a government cabinet minister or a member of that government party rise in defence of this action but have sat there in total silence in this most important measure—

Mr. Lawlor: Well they look quite ashamed. Even the minister looks a little ashamed.

Mr. Gisborn: When this budgetary measure—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Not a bit.

Mr. Lawlor: Thanks a lot.

Mr. Gisborn: —was introduced, the first reaction from the chambers of commerces were dances of glee. Mr. Oakah Jones—the president, I believe, of Consumer Gas—said it was like having Christmas come every three months and hoped that the federal government would move in a likewise direction. Which indicates to me, without studying in depth the statistical ramifications of this bill, that there are some natural instincts that proved to us that it was the wrong way to approach the situation.

There is no doubt that the priorities given to the business corporations in this measure outweighed and relegated some of the important needs in this province. One, the problem of the municipalities in trying to meet their financial demands. Nothing, to this date, in that direction. The Throne Speech mentioned, very briefly, that this government would be giving financial assistance to municipalities' transportation problems. We have not as yet had a definition of that measure.

We have not yet had an indication from the government, The Department of Social and Family Services, that it will move to protect the income of the people receiving family and social benefits in relation to the federal government's increase of the supplement to the spouse being on old age pension.

How do we relate these two things? I have had four letters in the last three days showing me the response of The Department of Social and Family Services to one of the folks who are receiving social and family benefits, where their allowances have been decreased by the exact amount that the spouse, who was on the old age pension with a supplement has been increased. They are frustrated and worried about the fact that at last they had expected to have some increase in income. That is the area that should have been given priorities by this government instead of the \$125 million handout to the corporations.

I hope that when the responsible minister answers in defence of this bill, he will give us some idea of how they arrived at the conclusion that this was going to spur the economy to the point of making and finding jobs. I wonder if he will tell us what research and information the government has obtained as to the percentage of industrial machinery that is produced in Ontario or in Canada in fact. We know from past experience and statistics about the tool machinery industry almost being depleted in Ontario, which in turn depleted the building of heavy industrial machinery.

I wonder if he will be able to tell us what information the government has obtained with regard to the advanced degree of American research into technological improvements and automation and which will be the kind of machinery they are developing to sell to Ontario, if the corporations or the industries use this measure. Because if this is the case, they are going to be buying machinery that will deplete jobs instead of making jobs. We have got to have some of this information.

This action heaps a serious indictment upon this government's shoulders in the false attempt to create jobs in this province. It is a shame that such an important action has taken place this afternoon. I repeat there has not been a representative of the government rise in defense of this bill with some solid information. It is not enough that we wait and then have the Minister of Revenue defend this bill. Because it is not just his bill, it relates to his department only in the sense of its revenue-making action.

Mr. Lawlor: If the minister of Highways were still Treasurer they would never agree to this.

Mr. Gisborn: But there are other members, the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) and the Minister of the Treasury (Mr. McKeough)—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It is not revenue-producing. It is giving it out.

Mr. Gisborn: —who should be here, responsible to explain to this House how this measure is going to bring about the ways and means that is implied in its principles.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Briefly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to put my spoke in the wheel here in this very important legislation—

the government calls it important. I believe the motivation was to be the end-all to cure unemployment. I do not think they could have picked any other vehicle which would have done less for the economy than the one we have before us today. We could talk for hours on the fruitless way they are approaching this search to give jobs.

I have, in my mind, given the answer to this House but the day I had the answer for it the House was empty, and the government did not buy my answer.

Mr. Pilkey: There is not a hell of a big improvement today.

Mr. Sargent: But if they knew what I was going to say the galleries would be filled, I imagine.

Mr. Pilkey: I understand that, but they do not.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): The member has to run the risk of finding out.

Mr. Sargent: It has been established pretty well, to the Minister of Highways, by an economist much more knowledgeable than myself or he—who was engaged in financial nightmares and had to be demoted, I guess as it were; that is an aside remark. It has been established pretty well that the American corporations have taken over our economy, controlling about \$38 billion of our corporate wealth now.

It has been said by the economists that we have not only given them the opportunity to buy out our economy but we have supplied the money, too. They have taken their profits from their operations in Canada to do a complete takeover in most markets and most business therein. We have, on top of that, given them forgiveness loans—non-payable; they do not have to pay back over the years—of many millions of dollars in this province. Now we have this bill in front of us which does not say that the American corporations cannot take part in this deduction of five per cent from their earnings which will allow them to buy more of our economy.

Without flogging the matter any further, I want to say for the record that this is one more case of the government being in bed with the American corporations and big business. If I had my way, I would have taken the five per cent and deducted it from the building trade which would have had a very marked effect in solving the unemployment situation.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Hear, hear!

Mr. Sargent: I say for the records again that if this government wants to solve the unemployment situation, it could do it very simply. It could take the millions of square feet in the plants which are vacant across this province and inculcate into them a modular housing programme. The money is available from every source in our economy to build this housing and we are at the point, Mr. Speaker, where we can never fill the need for housing. The market will always exceed the supply.

We have an end-product need there. We have the money here to do it. We have the manpower to do it. We have the modus operandi of modular housing as the answer to solve all of our needs—to solve the unemployment needs; to build modular housing in the empty plants which will never be filled again unless we have a crash programme on the part of the government to fill this need for housing. To have a modular programme for housing will cost less than \$10,000—which has been proved—and solve everything at once, the housing programme and unemployment, using these vacant plants.

Here we are now compounding the error by telling the American corporations that they can have not only forgiveness loans but there is a further five per cent reduction on machinery, which they have to pay in income tax.

I say, Mr. Speaker, very briefly, another case of the government not caring about the real source of our problem is the building trade, because when the housing business is good, everything is healthy. Every segment of the economy benefits when the building business is good. This government seems to forget that the five per cent tax on building supplies would solve this need a long way.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oshawa.

Mr. Pilkey: Mr. Speaker, the catalyst for this whole budget, the 1971 Ontario budget, was the question of tax credits to the tune of \$125 million. It was to create full employment in the Province of Ontario. Yet I recall when the provincial Treasurer was asked to relate the number of jobs that would be created as a result of this windfall to the corporations in this province he could not tell this House in any precise terms as to how many jobs would be created as a result of this \$125 million tax credit.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, and I know a number of speakers have made this

point, the new machinery and equipment obviously will be a part of this whole technological change in industry and I want to suggest that it will create no jobs, or very limited number of jobs.

If the minister had said that the machinery and equipment had to be produced in Canada, I suppose that would have created some employment. But when the question was put to the provincial Treasurer, he made it abundantly clear that it was not necessary that this machinery be produced in Canada.

I also wanted to make the observation, as my colleague from Lakeshore did, that when we raised with the former provincial Treasurer the question about the five per cent sales tax on production machinery and equipment—that this would put industry in the Province of Ontario in a very uncompetitive position and may even cost us jobs in the Province of Ontario—it fell on deaf ears. The government were not changing their position. They were going ahead with the five per cent sales tax. But somewhere along the line, since 1969 to 1971, all of a sudden they have become enlightened and they are going to eliminate, in effect, the five per cent sales tax because this is going to create employment.

We told them at the time that this was going to create unemployment in the Province of Ontario by putting many industries in a very invidious position in terms of competing with their American counterparts. In addition to that, obviously what was needed in the Province of Ontario instead of a capital intensive programme was a labour incentive programme and the government found little credence in that proposition and obviously opted for a capital incentive programme.

While I am on that point, I want to make this observation. The member for Sudbury did talk about the leader of the UAW, Mr. McDermott—and he was inferring this in terms of many leaders, whether of the auto workers, the steel workers, the rubber workers—that you could not tell these people from the corporate elite in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: They are bourgeois.

Mr. Pilkey: I want to tell this House, Mr. Speaker, that the McDermotts and the other trade union leaders in this province have made a major contribution to the affluence and the progress of this province, despite the Tory government. They have made this kind of progress for workers and the Liberals ought to understand that.

Mr. Sargent: That should give you about five or ten votes there.

Mr. J. Renwick: They are always attacking the working man.

Mr. Pilkey: That is right. They are always on the attack in terms of the trade union leaders who have made a major contribution, when they ought to be attacking those people on the other side of the House.

I want also to say, Mr. Speaker, that this—

Mr. Sopha: Strictly anti-waffle; anti-waffle.

Mr. Pilkey:—bill and this programme of the government was to create employment in the Province of Ontario, and I want to suggest it was a cruel hoax. There are many, many workers in this province who are unemployed—in excess of 200,000—who are looking for the government to take some positive action in creating employment here in this province.

When they make these announcements, as they did during the Throne debate, and as they did during this budget debate, and then in a very short period of time the jobs totally disappear, I want to suggest that it is a cruel hoax that this government is playing on the workers of this province by introducing these kind of programmes that mean very little in terms of full employment in this province.

What is really necessary, I do not think—

Mr. J. Renwick: We cannot waste any more time.

Mr. J. R. Simonett (Frontenac-Addington): Not too many people agree with the member over there.

Mr. Sargent: I agree with him.

Mr. Simonett: The member for Grey-Bruce would agree with anybody. Is he moving out?

Mr. Pilkey: If the government is going to stimulate the economy—and one does not need to be a master economist and know the whole ramification of economics—it seems to me what is necessary is that the government has to put the purchasing power in the hands of the people. If that kind of a job is done, then the economy is stimulated.

Mr. J. Renwick: Money power!

Mr. Pilkey: How much idle capacity have we got in this province now? I want to suggest to the government that at least 30 per cent of the capacity to produce in this

province is idle. How does the government stimulate the economy? How does it get it moving forward? I want to suggest that it put the purchasing power in the hands of the people, so they can buy the products that are produced in the province. It is that simple.

Mr. Sargent: Where else would the member rather be?

Mr. Pilkey: Here we find the government does not relate to that proposition at all. It does not give anything to the working people in the whole budget. The budget is designed for the corporations and the people that really do not need it. I thought that the member for Sudbury did make an excellent point when he pointed out that we have a 52 per cent corporation tax in this province, but on careful examination, and particularly of the big corporations, it works out to about a 22 per cent corporation tax, because of depletion and everything else that goes along with it. They have a tax advantage, and yet the government makes an additional advantage to the corporations through the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He would tax the very industry which provides him employment.

Mr. Pilkey: I do not know about taxing the—

Mr. Deans: The government taxes the people who employ me now.

Mr. Pilkey: I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that if this government really wants to make a contribution—and I do not want to say either that the federal government should be exonerated on this whole question of employment or full employment, unemployment—I am sorry, this whole question of unemployment—if the provincial government is really going to do anything in a meaningful way, it is going to have to provide the resources for the people that are going to spend it. When my colleague the other day made the proposition that we ought to cut the sales tax by one per cent, then this would give a stimulus of \$150 million to the people that are going to spend it. It is that kind of a programme that we have to take on. We have got to do more in the public sector.

Mr. Sargent: The province is bankrupt now. Where are they going to get the money? They are budgeting for a half million dollars.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is absurd, and the hon. member for Grey-Bruce knows it.

Mr. Sargent: It is not for a half million dollars?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is an absurd statement.

Mr. Pilkey: We are going to have to do more in the public sector to put that purchasing power in the hands of the people who are going to buy.

Mr. Speaker, I recall when the provincial Treasurer concluded his speech, he said, in the last sentence:

I am confident that under the bold fiscal programme outlined in this budget, Ontario will realize an even more dynamic and productive future.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pilkey: I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, if that is all the government has to offer and, as I said, this is the catalyst to full employment, this \$125 million tax rebate—if that is all that they have to offer, then the productive future of Ontario is rather dim.

Mr. Sargent: Right!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks that I do not think have been covered by previous speakers, and I want to suggest to this government that this legislation is bad legislation as it may or may not affect the resource industries, upon which the economy of northern Ontario is based.

Much of the machinery that goes into exploitation of our resources in the north, whether it be mining or the forest products industry, as my friends from Kenora (Mr. Bernier) and Fort William (Mr. Jessiman) know, they are highly capital intensive. Indeed, the member for Fort William, a few short weeks ago was lamenting the fact that the city of Thunder Bay had lost several hundred jobs as a result of an economic slowdown in the pulp and paper industry.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is becoming very repetitive, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stokes: He does know that due to automation at several of the pulp and paper mills in northwestern Ontario, they are doing away with jobs—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Not through automation!

Mr. Stokes:—even though the production is much higher. They are doing away with jobs by automation in the plants. They are doing away with jobs by automation in the harvesting of our wood products in the woodlands.

The same holds true of the mining industry, where in the last eight years in north-western Ontario we have lost 800 jobs. The amount of wealth coming out of the north in those two resource industries is increasing by leaps and bounds—\$1.6 billion in the mining industry during the fiscal year 1970—and yet—

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): The member is pulling figures out of the air.

Mr. Stokes: I am not. I am not lifting those figures out of the air at all. As a matter of fact, it is the very minister who objects to the remarks that I am making right now who tabled the report in this Legislature, indicating that \$1.6 billion of new wealth was created in 1970 as a result of the activities in the mining industry. But he neglected to tell us how many jobs had been done away with as a result of automation in that same industry.

His own colleague, the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle), in information he made available to the research geographers and economists who compiled all of the information upon which the Design for Development was used, stated that there was enough unused allowable cut in the forest industries to provide an additional 4,000 to 5,000 jobs over the next 20 years. But that is not going to happen.

All we have to do is look at the statistics of the number of people who have been employed, say, over the past 10 to 15 years in the forest products industries: it has decreased by one-third with all of the automation that has taken place. And the industry threatens that this figure will increase by another 30 per cent or 40 per cent over the next five to 10 years.

All I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that this kind of legislation is not going to solve the problem of creating jobs in the north. It is a straight handout to the big corporations. As a matter of fact, anybody over there that votes for this legislation is voting for socialism—socialism for the rich—and we are opposed to it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I presume that no one other than the minister on the government side is going to join this debate. If there is another government member to speak I will gladly yield my place, because I hope to wind up the debate for this party.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Go ahead; it is all the member's!

Mr. Singer: That assumption being correct, Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be of some interest to inquire as to the whereabouts of the provincial Treasurer. After all we are debating today Darcy's Folly and Darcy should be here to defend his folly.

I have some sympathy towards the Minister of Revenue. He is a newcomer to this cabinet who, within a few weeks of taking office, is now called upon to be the sole vocal defender of one of the most backward steps this government has ever taken. He will try, and he will have the votes after the bells ring, and what he is going to say will be supported by the democratic vote of this Legislature.

But it is very disappointing, Mr. Speaker, that the bold new wave, influenced as it is by the hon. member from Chatham, has not seen fit to keep the hon. member from Chatham at least in his seat, and indicate that he should have some very major participation in the defense of this statute. To my mind this statute is almost indefensible, unless you begin to examine the Conservative philosophy.

What did they think of when they sat in cabinet council and tried to work out the budget?

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Where is the former Treasurer?

Mr. Singer: What did they think of, Mr. Speaker, other than: "Can we draw a smoke-screen across the affairs of the Province of Ontario? At the same time can we help our corporate friends? And at the same time can we create the delusion"—and I use the word delusion purposely—"to create the delusion that we in fact are going to do something?"

"This is an unemployment budget. This is a budget that is going to solve our serious job problem," thunders the hon. member for Chatham-Kent. That was his message, and that was the message that was at least reflected on budget day. But when you look

at it, Mr. Speaker, and when you try to get some intelligent answers from the hon. provincial Treasurer they just are not forthcoming.

Where was the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman)? Where is he this afternoon, because his role in the economy of the province is a very major one? Where was he when these matters were being discussed in the formulation of the budget? Perhaps, most important of all, where was the Premier (Mr. Davis)? Because this is smiling Billy's most influential hour. This was supposed to be the symbol of the new wave.

Where is the Premier? Why is he not here to defend this cornerstone of his budget? As I say, my sympathy extends to the hon. minister from Grey South who has a thankless job. But he went into the cabinet and I guess he has to take many thankless jobs and the one this afternoon is one of them.

Mr. Speaker, what really was the philosophy in this budget? They play, unfortunately, on the misery of the people in Canada and the misery of the people in Ontario who are not able at the present time to find jobs for themselves. And when you begin to look at the figures, what real promise did they make?

In the budget the Treasurer said, "We are going to reduce Ontario's rate of unemployment from 4.9 per cent to three per cent." Those were based on figures just a month ago, because if you look at the more recent figures the unemployment figure in Ontario is less than 4.9 per cent. And it would be reasonable to anticipate that if they had done no more than they purport to do in this legislation, and in the other abortive moves announced in the budget, that those figures over the months of April, May, June and July would adjust themselves in any event to 3 per cent.

What we were looking for, Mr. Speaker, was not a government that was going to launch a substantial attack on the party in Ottawa, we were looking for a government that was going to begin to chart the course of Ontario into providing more jobs for Ontario and more prosperity for all of the people of Canada. And that is exactly what we did not get Mr. Speaker.

What did we get? We got a \$125 million gift to the corporations, to the wealthy corporations carrying on business in the Province of Ontario; not the corporations that are in need; not the corporations that are going to

undertake to provide more jobs in Ontario by reason of buying their equipment in Ontario; not the corporations, Mr. Speaker, that are going to guarantee that they are going to put more people to work; not even the comparatively ineffective but at least somewhat purposeful tests that the former Minister of Trade and Development used to apply in his forgiveness loans are in the legislation.

Even the present Minister of Trade and Development, when he made his announcement this afternoon, and talked about a very small figure—\$7.5 million—outlined to us in his statement the fact that there were going to be certain tests applied before people were able to participate in sharing this \$7.5 million fund.

Now what tests are there here? None. The only test, Mr. Speaker, that is contained in this statute is that you have to be a corporation which has bought some capital equipment. And what is capital equipment? Well, they exclude automobiles—and they exclude Ontario Development Corporation—and trucks, and any of the inventory in which a loan has been made.

But they do not exclude typewriters; they do not exclude refurbishing of buildings, they do not attempt to limit in any way the broad, general application of this corporate-favouring legislation—and that is the only word for it. They do not take into consideration, Mr. Speaker, the problems that the individual who has not created a company, who has not created a limited corporation, has to face. He gets no benefit from this.

The person who has to buy capital equipment. Perhaps every farmer—is this the message that they want to send out?—every farmer should make himself a personal corporation and he can get this kind of benefit when he has to go out and buy farm machinery? Perhaps every professional man should do the same thing? Perhaps my colleague here, from Sudbury, should form himself into a management company that manages his office and then he is going to get this kind of benefit?

Mr. Speaker, they have lost sight of the fact that the corporate community of this province—albeit that it is important—really is no representative of all of the seven million people who live in Ontario. It is representative, and it is the benefactor, of only a very small number.

I was listening the other evening to the comments of a certain gentleman who has recently retired from his cabinet position in the federal government, and he was critical

of some of the benefits that have been extended in the past to corporations, by the federal government.

By implication and by obvious innuendo, his criticism has to be so applicable to this newest effort of the Ontario government to favour the big corporations. His impression was that governments do so much to favour corporations that he would go into business and invest all his money in capital equipment and to heck with labour, because that was where he would have to pay almost no tax.

My colleague from Sudbury and others pointed out that in the resource industry you pay tax in relation to perhaps 20 per cent or 18 per cent of your income. In other industries, larger amounts, but still less than the government employee, for instance, who earns \$30,000—and that figure is there—he gets no kind of benefits like this. He has no kind of adjustment that he can make in relation to certain taxes. He has no five per cent that he can knock off if he does certain things. He pays tax on the full amount.

But take the very wealthy people in our community, the people who own the substantial shares in these corporations and these people are able to take every advantage. Are we running a charitable year for the Texas Gulfs and the General Motors and the Fords and the Chryslers and the IBMs and so on? Is that what have in mind, Mr. Speaker? If so, if that is what the government has in mind, they have done well by their corporate friends.

But it is more than strange that the Treasurer—not only is he not here and not able to indicate it today, but he was not able to indicate in the questioning that followed the budget what jobs were going to be created, what new impetus was going to be given to industry or what new encouragement was going to be given to improve the economy of this province.

A second gift in this Act—in section 2 of the Act—is the allowance of the deduction of borrowed money for the purpose of purchasing shares of a corporation. That is something, Mr. Speaker, that certainly affects the day-to-day lives of—how many people in the Province of Ontario? Perhaps the Minister of Revenue can tell us when he gets up.

Mr. Stokes: Seven and a half million.

Mr. Singer: Well, the benefit of that is again going to this tiny select group. Mr. Oakah Jones, a fine gentleman and the head of Consumers' Gas, recently advised his com-

pany—and they followed his advice and they took over the controlling interest in Home Oil. A very fine effort for Ontario, for Canada and for the broad community. But he had negotiated that deal well in advance of the budget. And now Consumers' Gas is getting an extra bonus—why? Consumers' Gas, their shareholders, their directors, their president, all thought this was a good and a reasonable business venture, and they went into it without this kind of an encouragement.

Why now is the government trying to encourage, and why now is it so concerned about the welfare of the very wealthy corporation? To what extent, even in the small personally owned corporations, is this going to benefit our community? To the small corporation that earns a modest profit to what extent really is the purchase of another \$200 or \$300 machine and knocking five per cent off that? To what extent is that going to benefit anyone else in the Province of Ontario? It is going to benefit the large companies, the ones who buy million-dollar machines—the large automobile companies, the large resource companies, the large business machine companies, the telephone company and that sort of thing.

But why, at the expense of all the people of Ontario, do we make this the cornerstone of the budget? It passes all understanding. The only logical explanation is that, notwithstanding what happened at the convention, we emerge not with a leader but with a perpetual smiler who takes his orders from the energetic and flamboyant member for Chatham-Kent who has not, as I say—I repeat, and I am going to keep on repeating—who has not even the integrity to be here this afternoon to protect the folly that he brought forward.

Mr. Sargent: After last night he is burnt out.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, what possible reason has this government for proceeding in this method at this time?

My colleague from Grey-Bruce talked about the housing industry. Housing is something that is paid passing reference to several times. The Minister of Trade and Development talked about that. He had a great scheme that was announced in the Throne Speech, but he did not know how many houses it was going to produce. The Minister of Trade and Development talked about it this afternoon; the budget makes passing reference to it.

As we analyse the category of people in Ontario who are unemployed we find that proportions are highly slanted in favour of young people and in favour of people without academic and mechanical skills. There are many people who just want to work on jobs requiring the least academic qualification and the least training in practical techniques.

Are we going to put any of those people to work by this \$125-million gift to the wealthy corporations? Why not do something in the housing field? Why not take that five per cent off building equipment and give a spur to the housing industry? Could there be anything as obvious as we walk the streets of this metropolitan area, that the people who are seeking jobs are people who might at this time of the year be expecting jobs in the construction industry? And that industry needs a push. It consists of a lot of ordinary people, both the people who build houses from the top level and the people who construct them on the labouring level. There is where the government could have made some sense. There is where it could have made a mark.

But no, the pallid excuse given by the hon. Treasurer was that it was too complicated to figure out. No other excuse has been offered. Well, Mr. Speaker, by their deeds we shall know them and by their folly they shall be destroyed. Anyone who has thought about this at all must recognize with us in the opposition that this bill is a complete, utter and absolute sell-out to the people of wealth in the community at the expense of all the rest of the people in the Province of Ontario and is without doubt, Mr. Speaker, absolutely indefensible.

Mr. Speaker: Do other members wish to participate in the debate? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree that I have sat back patiently and listened to the contributions that were made and to the criticism of the bill that is before us. I listened to some of the alternative proposals that were put forth and I must say that I will restrain my enthusiasm in regard to answering them individually. I must say that some of them, indeed, were provocative.

Mr. Stokes: The minister cannot even get enthusiastic about this legislation.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Now when the member tells me that there are divisions of socialism in this country, I think he should examine

what he believes in, my friend. That is what I believe. He said it today. He said another thing the other night that will come back to him one of these days.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Give it all to the corporations, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Makarchuk: Does the minister mean the hon. member for Thunder Bay said something like that?

Mr. Lawlor: Are there two kinds of Toryism?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, there is some urgency on the passage of the legislation because we do in fact want the people who are interested in this legislation to have the regulations before them.

Mr. Lewis: To get those benefits before the election.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will tell the member for Grey-Bruce that if he sat in my office, which he never will, to listen to the enthusiasm of the calls I have got since the day the budget came down, he would change his mind. I think if he kept his mouth shut a little more in this chamber he would do his party and his constituency a little more good. There is no question about that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have received a tremendous number of calls.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: How much did they offer to pay the Tories in the next election?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If there are any, I would like to see them for a change because I am one of those people who have not seen any in my lifetime and I ran quite a few elections, let me tell the House that.

Mr. Speaker: We should discontinue these debates across the floor of the House and direct the remarks through the Chair, please.

Mr. Sargent: You tell that to the minister.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, will you ask him how much goes into the Tory party?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I apologize for the indiscretion of the opposition, but let me say to the House that the inquiries that have come to my attention in my office

have all been favourable. Some of them have come from the area of Grey-Bruce for the information of my colleague from Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sopha: Some of them can send their cheques certified.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am anxious that the bill will become incorporated in the statutes. As a result of that suggestion, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you call the division.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not think you, as Speaker of the House upholding the general rights of this House, should permit a minister of the Crown to say absolutely nothing about a significant tax alteration which he has introduced in his name.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: It is such a pathetic performance—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Order! The hon. member certainly—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member will resume his seat while the Speaker is on his feet. There is no point of order; absolutely no point of order. The hon. minister need not reply. He may contribute what he wants to.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The minister should resign.

Mr. Speaker: There is nothing in the rules requiring him to reply in any way.

The motion is for second reading of Bill 26.

The House divided on the motion for second reading of Bill 26, which was approved on the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Allan	Ben
Apps	Braithwaite
Auld	Breithaupt
Bales	Bullbrook
Belanger	Burr
Bernier	Davison
Boyer	Deacon
Brunelle	Deans
Carruthers	DeMonte
Carton	Edighoffer

AYES	NAYS
Connell	Farquhar
Davis	Gaunt
Demers	Gisborn
Downer	Good
Dunlop	Haggerty
Evans	Lawlor
Guindon	Lewis
Hamilton	MacKenzie
Haskett	Makarchuk
Henderson	Martel
Hodgson	Newman
(Victoria-Haliburton)	(Windsor-Walkerville)
Hodgson	Nixon
(York North)	Paterson
Jessiman	Peacock
Johnston	Pilkey
(Parry Sound)	Reid
Johnston	(Rainy River)
(St. Catharines)	Renwick (Mrs.)
Johnston	(Scarborough Centre)
(Carleton)	Ruston
Kennedy	Sargent
Kerr	Singer
Lawrence	Smith
(Carleton East)	(Nipissing)
Lawrence	Sopha
(St. George)	Spence
MacNaughton	Stokes
Morrow	Trotter
McKeough	Worton
Newman	Young—37.
(Ontario South)	
Potter	
Price	
Pritchard (Mrs.)	
Reilly	
Robarts	
Rollins	
Rowe	
Rowntree	
Simonett	
Smith	
(Hamilton Mountain)	
Snow	
Stewart	
Villeneuve	
Welch	
Wells	
White	
Whitney	
Winkler	
Wishart	
Yakabuski—54.	

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 54, the "nays" are 37.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading? In the absence of unanimous consent, the minister may direct it to committee.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we move to the committee of the House.

Mr. Speaker: The Committee of the Whole House?

The bill stands directed to the Committee of the Whole House.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Report, study commission on recreation services, statement by Mr. Wishart	1253
ODC to give preference to Canadian-owned companies requiring assistance, statement by Mr. Grossman	1253
Government assistance amounts for venture programme and EIO programme, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Singer, Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Deans, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Gaunt	1254
Negotiations with Ottawa re airport and freezing sale of properties, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	1258
Revaluation of German mark and effect on our loan position, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Nixon, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Sargent	1258
Possible Health Department assistance to denturists, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon	1259
Quebec control of importation of eggs and other produce, question to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Nixon	1259
OHSIP computer findings re billings by certain physicians, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Shulman	1260
Eviction from Humbervale Apartments of OHTA president, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Trotter	1261
Condition of St. Joseph's Hospital, Sudbury and building of Laurentian Hospital, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Sopha	1262
Impending layoffs at ARVA Lift Systems, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Bolton	1263
Refund of angling licences, and prosecutions before April 26, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Gaunt	1263
Pollution of beaches on Rideau and Ottawa Rivers, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. MacKenzie	1264
No representative at public meeting to discuss Harbour City, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Peacock, Mr. Trotter	1264
Doing away with certain penalties under Liquor Licence Act, question to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Bullbrook	1265
Use of Key Edit Computer System in processing OHSIP claims, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Yakabuski	1265
Financial assistance to municipal transportation facilities, question to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Gisborn	1266
Delays in processing applications for ODC loans, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Farquhar	1266
Presenting report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. R. G. Hodgson	1267

Presenting annual reports, Department of Labour, Cancer Institute incorporating Princess Margaret Hospital, and Ontario Energy Board, Mr. Yaremko	1267
Presenting studies, community service programme, Mr. Yaremko	1267
Tabling report, study committee on recreational services, Mr. Wishart	1267
Used Car Dealers Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	1267
Crown Timber Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, first reading	1267
Administering of Lie Detector Tests bill to control, Mr. Trotter, first reading	1268
Royal Assent to certain bills, the honourable the Lieutenant Governor	1268
Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Winkler, second reading	1268
Recess, 6 o'clock	1293



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, May 6, 1971
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

**(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 6, 1971

The House resumed at 8 o'clock p.m.

SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves second reading of Bill 27, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it has always been part of the political philosophy that I learned over the years that death duties are one of the fairest means of distributing and redistributing the wealth of the community. I should say that as I open my brief remarks on Bill 27, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act of this province. The budget gives fair warning to some of the higher income groups in the House, including the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman).

Mr. Speaker, the income from this source over the last year has been approximately \$70 million and to that should be added an additional \$25 million to \$28 million that is our provincial share of the federal estate tax. So we have this combination, this overlapping of responsibility, that seems to be characteristic of so many of the methods whereby we have established our revenue base in Ontario.

This bill calls for a reduction, or at least an easement, in certain aspects of the provincial succession duties which in the ensuing year will mean a reduction in income of approximately \$6 million. And according to the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), when all of the reductions come into full play, there will be a net loss in revenue from this source alone of about double that amount, \$12 million; a significant amount certainly.

Nevertheless, we intend to support the bill. We feel, however, that the government should take up the position which was enunciated two years ago by the former Treasurer, and get out of the direct succession duty imposition entirely. We agree with the positions that have been stated by the government in the past that there should be only one level of death-duty collection and that it is most reasonable to assume that that would be the federal level.

Negotiations have taken place in the past, based on the assumption that if there were just one level of collection, the federal level, that 75 per cent of the revenues from that federal tax would revert to the provinces and the calculations indicate that that would mean a small loss to us in this province. Well, I feel that the negotiations—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Two million bucks, eh? A small loss.

Mr. Nixon:—should be established in such a way that there would be no loss whatsoever, and that the estate tax base at the federal level be also agreed to on the basis of close consultation among the provinces with the federal Minister of Finance—or the federal Minister of Revenue, I presume it would be.

I can never understand why the government has had so much difficulty in negotiating this transference. As I understand it, there have been no negotiations other than the flat offer from the federal side on the 75 per cent abatement or rebate of the federal income.

I do not believe that we should give up this tax unless, to begin with, we get as much from the agreement as we would if we continued with the present succession duty tax base. And second, we should not give up the right to our provincial succession duties unless we can, in the agreement, have access to the estate tax base and a clear understanding—as there is presently with the personal income tax collection agreement—that we can set the rate at whatever we choose in this Legislature.

Now, surely this is not too much to ask. It would simply mean that we would eliminate the overlapping, that we would have one level of collection, and surely this is to the best interests of the taxpayers. I think that this is the direction the policy should take, that it would not mean that the province was abandoning this source of revenue, and that we would, in fact, not be accepting a reduction in the revenue if the agreement with the government of Canada were as I have described it, and as I am confident could be negotiated.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we will support the bill since it is, in the words of the Treasurer, a transition towards a rationalization of death duties among the provinces and with the government of Canada. When the government moves in that direction, we will support it as long as the net revenues are not reduced and we have access through negotiation to the base and control of the rate that is applied in this province.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member for Lakeshore would just hold his remarks for a moment.

I should like to indicate to the House that we have some special visitors with us this evening. In the west gallery, we have members of the 273rd Cub Pack and the 273rd Scout Group of Toronto.

The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: And further as a gesture to the House and as to the general tenor of events, may I introduce you to my wife and the youngest daughter sitting in the gallery. She was complaining that not a single member of the New Democratic Party appeared outside the buildings here a few moments ago with respect to women's liberation.

An hon. member: They all came in the back door.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, we all came in the back door this time.

Mr. Speaker, we do not agree that succession duties should be removed from the portfolio of taxes that are leviable by the Province of Ontario. If the hon. minister will take time out to take a look at the second volume of Smith's report where, purblind and reactionary as he may be, he gave considerable credence to succession duties. He explained the rationale and meaning and purpose of succession duties, and he affirmed it. He said death taxes were a most beneficial tax.

What is happening with this government is that they are phasing out—as they are phasing out of most things—they are phasing out of succession duties and turning it over to the federal government. It is a mistake.

Any tax system, Mr. Speaker, must have two features in connection with it which give it scope. The first feature is flexibility. All the tax bundle must be a flexible tax bundle. The government must be able to turn to this area of taxation and lay its emphasis there depending upon the economic circumstances. What the government is doing, as I said earlier this afternoon, is stripping itself gradually

of its area of manoeuvre. The government cannot move any more. When they complain about the federal government in Ottawa, they are sacrificing the very means whereby they can seek some kind of self-determination, some role where they can make the economy of Ontario viable and where they can place their finger on the pipes and tunes of the Ontario economy. The government is throwing it all away. Not only that, we need taxes that are elastic.

The second thing is elasticity in the taxing. Certain taxes are inelastic. The personal income tax is the most elastic of taxes; it expands as the ratio of the incomes goes up in the province.

This tax is fairly inelastic, but it is the kind of tax the government should be able to turn to in certain contingencies and according to certain economic circumstances.

Let us just for a moment, Mr. Speaker, discuss the philosophy of succession duties and estate taxes. The whole theory is that, as between husband and wife and between husband and children and between the on-going generation, the tax ought not to be too heavy, but that as it goes into future generations accumulations of wealth have always proved a bane to every economy which ever permitted it.

It happened in medieval England, and they had to bring in a whole host of statutes which ride us, like homunculae, on the back to this day. I mean the whole business of mortmain, the whole business of the dead hand reaching out of the grave, trying to control wealth, and it is quite an impossible thing to do. And if it is done, as it was done for generations and centuries before our time—the wealth fell down into the pools and grew larger and larger—it did mean, and it still means in an economy of relative scarcity such as we have, that the people are going to be deprived of the money. And people who have done nothing, not a hand's turn, derive considerable amounts of disposable wealth, simply by the accident of birth, through no energetic use.

The Conservatives are always talking about free enterprise, saying that we are self made men; that we have ground out our destiny with our teeth, so to speak; that we are brighter than other people—which means they are just a little bit sharper in financial practice—that we have more energy; that we are not laggards or slackards or parasites upon the republic. All this nonsense and mythology we hear from them all the time.

Even their own succession duty policy they never follow. They allow, they permit, and

they are permitting tonight, in this legislation, ever-wider areas whereby the cascades and the rivulets of wealth may descend into future generations without any control.

The whole purpose of succession duties was to redistribute wealth. When somebody died, when they had accumulated money, that money ought to be redistributed to the whole population. Let the new generations make their way in life, let them be the masters that their fathers pretended to be.

An hon. member: The minister is very serious.

Mr. Lawlor: If the government is not serious about this then they are not free enterprisers. The free-enterprise philosophy teaches self-endurance. It teaches overreaching of the other fellow. It teaches doing things on your own hook and not depending upon anybody else, including the old man.

Where does the government practise what it preaches? Where does it begin to practise? In its succession-duty legislation it is gradually eroding the whole base of this province and instead of redistributing the wealth, even in a minuscule way, even beginning to do so, it is opening the floodgates to the accumulations of large family fortunes and perpetuating them, knowing it is detrimental to the whole population.

But the government seems, of recent date, in the last month or so, to have completely lost its head on monetary policy. We spent all afternoon pointing out how the government rewarded and visited benefits upon the heads of corporations. It does not get any votes from corporations. It may derive all its election funds from the corporations but corporations have not got votes.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): If we do, I never see it.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): It shows how objective we are.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister should speak to the bagmen in his party.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): He usually turns a blind eye though.

Mr. Lawlor: That is right. And the Prime Minister always says he never sees it, neither. He does not want to see it. It is deliberate that they should not see it. It might somehow constrict his conscience as to how they carry on.

The same thing exists in this particular kind of legislation on both these points. If you want a just society, if the term "just society" means anything to anybody, then it must mean that there must be a redistribution of wealth in the community from time to time. The way in which it is chiefly done must be through death taxes and through succession duties. And out goes the baby and out goes the bath in this particular piece of business that the government is bringing forth.

Why does it double the figure? Just two years ago, in line with the Smith report the Treasurer recommended that estates passing between husband and wife jump from a \$50,000 to a \$75,000 to \$85,000 exemption.

Then we went and we gave assent to this in the House. At the time we agreed to it—to \$125,000. We thought that was just, as passing between spouses. Now the government is jumping it to \$250,000. In the process of doing so it is diminishing its tax return in this particular field—which is already almost insignificant—virtually to nothing, so it may as well get out of the field.

The position is that if Ontario withdrew from the succession duty field and took 75 per cent of what the federal estate tax would yield in Ontario—which most of the provinces are doing—the government would obtain, in 1971-1972, \$84 million.

With its present Succession Duty Act, before this proposed tax change, Ontario would get from inheritance \$76 million collected in this province, plus \$28 million—that is the 25 per cent bit—from Ottawa in 1971-1972, which is \$104 million.

The difference between the two is \$24 million, which means that after the government's tax changes come into effect, it is virtually suffering a \$24 million loss in revenue under this particular head. No one pretends that the present succession duties are onerous. The thing is riddled with exemptions. Let us make it *a fortiori* worse. Let us shift the whole thing over to the federal government.

The federal government's is basically a flat rate tax. That is what it comes down to. No one pretends that in the federal Estate Tax Act there is any putative or any desired redistribution of wealth. No longer do they even pretend to do that.

Where, oh where, is the just society in that context? The whole federal scheme has been moved away from that. In the federal scheme it goes this far—and this is the game that the

government is playing and the plated pot into which it throws its little contribution: If a widow, as between husband and wife—of course, there is no estate tax at all in the federal government's scheme—if a husband dies with many millions and transfers it to his wife, it goes tax free. And if that wife moves out of this country she may take every dime with her and we would not garner a cent.

That is the sort of federal scheme that this government places itself in accordance with and proposes to throw Ontario's future into that particular context.

I think, and I insist, and we in this party insist, that we must obtain and retain in our own possession as many tax weapons—if you will, instruments—as we possibly can in order to give us a suave movement and flexibility, and that we can turn from one to the other as the public needs and as the common good requires.

The government, on its side, is throwing things away. First of all, the government chafes and makes cantankerous noises at the federal government for what it does, and at the same time this government plays directly into Ottawa's hands by sacrificing the important field of taxation without any substantial redress because of the loopholes, and because of the rate structure, and because of the whole structure of the federal Estate Tax Act.

Is that what the government proposes to do? I think it is a sell-out.

I do not think this government has any sense of social responsibility in that context at all. I think it has run directly counter to every nostrum of its own philosophy, and its own position. But nevertheless, in our teeth, we have to listen to the government bring this kind of measure forward year after year. It runs directly counter to the Smith committee, which addressed it, and I did not see its own internal committee taking exception to this at all.

This is a kind of visitation from above, something in no consistency with the government's established position. There is no background to it. The reason that the minister, Mr. Speaker, did not stand up, did not have the fortitude as a new minister of the Crown to defend his own legislation, and possibly will not even attempt to defend this before dinner, or after dinner for that matter tonight, is precisely that he knows of the internal ambiguities and inconsistencies in his own policy, and finds it quite intellectually indefensible, but he is pandering to whatever interests, I cannot imagine, in this

particular regard, to some nebulous notion that runs counter to his own fundamental ways of thought.

I think that, as far as we are concerned, we will vote against it. We have not decided as yet. We will force it to a vote. As far as I am concerned, it should very probably be done.

I wish the minister would have the gumption, if he can, to stand up and defend his own legislation on these occasions. It will only bring discredit upon his own government if he finds himself incapable or unwilling to do so.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other hon. members wish to participate in the debate? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the contributions of the two members who have spoken in regard to Bill 27. I think that probably the thinking of our party and the Leader of the Opposition is not very far apart.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Not very often far apart.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think that I can agree with him.—

Mr. Lawlor: No, there was a wonderful identity with the minister.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I ask the member to wait. I will deal with him in a minute, if he will give me time.

Mr. Deans: The minister cannot deal with him. Greater men have tried and failed.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think that we can agree that it is very clear to the both of us that we should not abandon this deal until we have a clear indication from the federal government that, in fact, the return to the province on a continuing basis will be equal to that—

Mr. Lawlor: Why would the minister want to abandon it all?

Hon. Mr. Winkler:—this Act produced for the Province of Ontario in the past, and it will be on an increasing basis in the future.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): How much does the minister want?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Quite a bit.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think that the Treasurer—

An hon. member: That is too high.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —made it quite clear in his budget speech.

Mr. Singer: Is the Treasurer here tonight?

Mr. Nixon: No. He is not concerning himself with this legislation.

Mr. Singer: No. The Treasurer cannot lower himself to join in the debate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The opposition is being rude.

Mr. Singer: We sympathize with the minister.

An hon. member: Slap them down.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think the amount of money which is going to return to us in the course of years is going to be equal to the amount which we might appear to be losing in this particular move. But I must say to the House that, in complete agreement with the Leader of the Opposition, we are not going to abandon the field until we have that understanding with Ottawa and until we have the—

Mr. Singer: Oh, the minister is using it as blackmail?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: There is no blackmail.

Mr. Singer: Sure the minister is. The Treasurer admitted it, but the minister is not co-operating.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It is a very queer thing that at one time we were ruining Confederation by taking a stand against Ottawa and then, when we co-operate with Ottawa, then we are blackmailing.

I do not undersand the hon. member's thinking from time to time—as a matter of fact, most of the time.

Mr. Singer: The government is doubling the civil service—doubling it—twice the administrative expense.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: However, to get back to what inevitably is going to happen—we know this through discussions with the federal people—as the capital gains tax is instituted, there will be further developments and communication and agreements between the federal government and Ontario—

Mr. Lawlor: Capital gains tax has nothing to do with succession duties.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —and we believe that we will emerge—it will have when we are finished with it—we believe that we will emerge and be at least in an equal position to that which we are in right now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the remarks of the hon. member for Lakeshore. He did not seem to know exactly what they were going to do, although it had been intimated before that they were going to take a position against the bill, and for that we do not sell him short. We would expect that he would do that.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): It is very difficult to tell him at any time.

Mr. Nixon: Even looks like him a little bit.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, there is no question we are against this bill.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: And the hon. member said that we are losing a field that will not give us any room in which to move, and that we are losing an opportunity in the re-distribution of wealth. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the words that were spoken by the hon. member for Lakeshore, that that is not quite the case.

I think, that when the negotiations begin between this government and the federal government, on a very amicable basis, they will develop to the benefit of the people of Ontario and that we will gain as a result. But there is a much more important reason for doing this at this time.

You may or may not know, Mr. Speaker, that small businesses, family-owned businesses, are suffering as a result of succession duties, maybe not as much necessarily by the application of the provincial tax as by the federal tax. The hon. member may be aware that farmers who are creating for themselves—and this is what bothers me about the hon. member's position. He loses some very favourable positions with the farmers, where the farmers are—

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): The minister is choking himself on those words.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —building themselves estates now, that are becoming—

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): He should not have to answer for the policies of the Treasurer.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister is considering the repayment into that money owed. Easier for family businesses.

Hon. Mr. Winkler:—quite substantial. And we have cases in point—I listened to the hon. member. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give me the opportunity to explain to him, maybe in due course I can convert him to my point of view, but I doubt that.

Mr. Lawlor: How was the minister's chow mein?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I believe that there are enough people living on farms today who are reaching this particular point, who have been assessed by the authorities in Ottawa. And we know some cases very pointedly where the assets of either the farm or the company in question have had to be sold, and in some cases sold to American interests, which the members opposite do not really like, do they?

Mr. Pilkey: Wonderful. Does the minister?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: And we want to see that this inequity is taken out of the present situation under which those people exist. We believe this is a move in the right direction and I would certainly, Mr. Speaker, invite the member for Lakeshore to change his view because he did waffle a little at the conclusion of his words and join us in what we believe—

Mr. Lawlor: Waffle. Do not use that awful word, please.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Oh, sorry. That is a misinterpretation on the member's part. I did not mean it that way.

I believe this is a substantial move in the right direction. I am grateful for the support of the Leader of the Opposition and his party.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the minister a question?

Does the minister believe that, in view of the position taken, there is any logical justification for maintaining two civil services, one in Ottawa and one at Queen's Park to do exactly the same thing? And double the expenses and double the fees to lawyers, double the cost to—

Hon. Mr. Davis: If Ottawa wants to quit, that is fine.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I suppose the lawyers made more money out of it than anybody else. On the other hand we are moving away from it, so it should please the hon. member

even though it does not please his friends on his left.

Mr. Singer: Why does the minister not answer the question?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: With that explanation, I hope that I have satisfied the questions that were raised and I would ask Mr. Speaker that the vote be called.

Mr. Lawlor: This is a great improvement over that before dinner, I can tell the minister.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Thank you very much.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Certainly I will.

Mr. Nixon: The minister will be sorry.

Mr. Peacock: As the collector of the revenues under this Act, does the minister feel that he should answer for the budgetary policies of the Treasurer?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I should not. I am the administrator of the department.

Mr. Peacock: Right. That is why the Treasurer should be speaking.

Mr. Pilkey: Would the hon. minister permit another question?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I have some very good friends on the other side of the House and for the member for Oshawa, I would allow a question.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: House in Committee of the Whole; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

House in committee on Bill 26, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 26, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act. Do we have any questions, comments or amendments on the

five sections here, on any of these sections and if so, which section?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): On section 1, Mr. Chairman, the definition. Could the minister outline to us what exactly he means in the first amendment when he purports to define what machinery and equipment means? Would it mean, for instance, a typewriter? Would it mean, for instance, an adding machine? To what extent is he prepared to go on this?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons is, of course, as I indicated this afternoon, that I am rather interested in getting this legislation through so that we can produce the regulations and they will all be clearly defined there.

Mr. Singer: That is a very interesting comment, Mr. Chairman, that the minister says everything will be clearly defined in the regulations. Has he got some draft of the regulations that he would care to inform us about now, so that we would have a better idea whether we could have any confidence in them or not?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I do not have that draft with me.

Mr. Singer: Why not, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will make it available to the member.

Mr. Singer: Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, one of my concerns is that the government perpetually, and again tonight in this bill, goes for almost blank-cheque legislation. And the government having considered this—this was the Treasurer's great theory; he overrode the Premier until we went along with it. The Treasurer said: "This is going to save the world, so give us a blank cheque."

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Just Canada. The world we really have not looked at yet.

Mr. Singer: They have 68 votes over there that are going to give them the blank cheque. But, for goodness' sake, Mr. Chairman, surely one would expect the poor joker who is charged with pushing this through the House tonight would have some detail for us. Surely it is reasonable to anticipate—

An hon. member: Poor joker parliament.

Mr. Singer:—that the Minister of Revenue would be able to give us some rough outline of the regulations he is going to introduce.

An hon. member: Right.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you will understand I do not need the sympathy of the hon. member, and the regulations will be drawn exactly to fit—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): He can have our sympathy if he wants.

Hon. Mr. Winkler:—the federal Act that is parallel to this.

Mr. Singer: But, Mr. Chairman, that is not a sufficient answer. If the government has any idea in its mind as to what it contemplates, the Minister of Revenue should have had the courtesy and the decency to make available to us a draft regulation if by any event this section carries. And if the minister is unable to do that for us, then surely one must conclude—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): He can at least be specific.

Mr. Singer:—that all he wants is a blank cheque. They do not know what they are doing. They ask us for a blank cheque and they have not any idea really where they are going. Maybe the minister should bring the civil servants with him and tell us what they have in mind here.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I do not know what my legal responsibility in the House is to the hon. member, but I can assure him that immediately the bill is passed—

Mr. Sargent: The minister should know.

Hon. Mr. Winkler:—I will supply him with the regulations.

Mr. Singer: We would have much more confidence, Mr. Chairman, if he would give it to us in advance of when the bill is passed. He is asking for a blank cheque. We would like to know what he is trying to—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member does not have any confidence anyway.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Order.

Mr. Singer: The Minister of Agriculture asks for order, and of all the people in this House who want to know about legal niceties, the Minister of Agriculture—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: No, I am pointing at the minister; I am not pointing to anyone else. The Minister of Agriculture, who has created a trade war that is breaking up Canada, should be the last person in the world who should worry.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): We know why he is getting upset.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Yes, the hon. minister is in big trouble.

Now let me turn my attention to the somewhat more reasonable Minister of Revenue.

Mr. Chairman: Please do.

Mr. Singer: I would ask the Minister of Revenue if he has any real idea in his mind as to what he wants in his regulations? I think that is logical and reasonable, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Nixon: What could be more reasonable?

Mr. Singer: I would ask the Minister of Revenue to tell us what kind of regulations he is going to bring in to support this section.

Mr. Nixon: What could be more reasonable?

Mr. Sargent: The hon. minister does not know.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I have given him the commitment that I will supply him with that information once the bill is concluded, and I am ready to do that. He has taken me into his confidence on other matters and I assure him that I will be just as honest and sincere with this one, despite his doubts this evening.

Mr. Sargent: We cannot pass the bill until we know.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 1 stand as part of the bill? The member for Oshawa.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, I just want to continue that point, because a number of bills are passed in this House and the media takes a certain interpretation from the bills that are passed, and then the government—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, would you tell the Minister of Agriculture that the hockey game started at 9 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We will know when the hon. member leaves.

Mr. Pilkey: —at some point in time applies the regulations to that bill—that legislation—and with the meaning and the interpretation that we and the media take from it, it becomes redundant. It just seems to me that is true.

Take Bill 96, the one on the question of notice for employees who are going to be laid off. The government got great fanfare headlines in the paper across this province and everything else. But when it brought the regulations down, it made most of the bill redundant in terms of what it means for the workers of this province.

In nearly every case it is that way. It seems to me that this House ought to know what the regulations are going to be before we adopt the bill. On the face of it, it appears to me that the government is going to give corporations a \$125 million windfall.

By the time the government brings out those regulations, it may be \$200 million before we are through with it. It just seems to me that we ought to know that, before we pass the bill through this House. At least, in a verbal way, the minister ought to tell us what the regulations are under this bill.

Mr. Singer: Absolutely.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If \$200 million would put the economy of Ontario back to full employment, I am sure the government would consider it this evening.

Mr. Pilkey: Well, this \$125 million is doing nothing. It is not going to do anything.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Just a minute. I do not think that I have any obligation to supply the hon. member with the regulations before the thing is passed.

Mr. Pilkey: Oh, that is typical.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would be prepared to submit them to the committee for consideration. One other commitment I will give the hon. member for Oshawa is that I will pass as many regulations as necessary to make this bill work.

Mr. Pilkey: Oh, I am sure of that.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, it is within the competence of this Legislature to know what the base of the tax is to be. We do not know what that base is,

except by the exclusions that have been enumerated, principally by the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) in his examination of the Treasurer's budget in his speech last Thursday, that there are three.

Exemptions are those items of machinery and equipment put in place by this government and other governments of the Province of Ontario, by utilities which do not pay tax, and by non-profit corporations. That is the extent of our knowledge as to the base of this exemption. It will not do for the minister to tell us we have no right to know what the regulation contains.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, he did not say that.

Mr. Pilkey: He said that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He did not. He did not say there was no right to know.

Mr. Peacock: If the regulation is not now promulgated—Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister has taken my words another step beyond what I said.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, that was the import of what the hon. member said.

Mr. Peacock: The import of what I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is this: The regulation is part of the legislation. A regulation which establishes a tax base is not a proper regulation. No regulation made outside this House by the executive council should prescribe what should be taxed. The statute itself should prescribe that.

The minister should be able to say to us tonight exactly what is comprehended by the definition in section 1. We have had on many occasions, Mr. Chairman, amendments put before the committee of the Whole House by members of the opposition which endeavoured to define the base for the tax. To my memory, on each of those occasions the Chair has ruled that any alteration of the base of the tax, the items to be taxed, was in effect an interference with the right of the Crown to initiate taxation.

Tonight the Minister of Revenue is telling us that he cannot inform us this evening as to what items are to be excluded from the definition in section 1. I just find that just unacceptable—completely unacceptable, Mr. Chairman, that the Legislature cannot pass upon what is to be taxed. That is a fundamental right of the House to know what is to be taxed and to know in considerably more detail and greater precision than is afforded us here in the bill or by anything that

the Minister of Revenue has informed us of this evening.

The machinery and equipment on which the five per cent retail sales tax was placed in the 1969 budget, I believe it was, accounted for about four-elevenths of all the machinery and equipment in commercial transactions in the province, according to the former Minister of Revenue, the member for London South (Mr. White). He, at that time, tried to play down the impact of the extension of the sales tax to production machinery and equipment. He went to great lengths to bring to this House calculations as to the very small amount of increase in the price of the commodity as a result of the extension of the retail sales tax. He wound up by telling us that on every million dollars of sales of production machinery and equipment, the final purchaser would have to pay another \$190 some-odd.

If the Minister of Revenue who is in his place tonight is proposing in this legislation to relieve from taxation, or to give a credit, which is a deduction from taxation, on this same base as the retail sales tax was extended to by the former Minister of Revenue in 1969, then it must be a base which is far far smaller than that even allowed by the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) in his budget statement. It would be a very small base indeed which is to be affected by this tax, if it is the same one as described by the former Treasurer, a mere four-elevenths of the total transactions in machinery and equipment as calculated by the former Minister of Revenue. So I say, Mr. Chairman, before this bill passes from committee this evening, the Minister of Revenue is going to have to give us more information than he is now able to do.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would just like to answer that, Mr. Chairman. In the legislative sense, I do not think I had any legal authority to produce regulations until a bill is in force, or is enacted, and I think the same applies to any other Act.

Mr. Pilkey: This is supposed to be a big, important bill.

Mr. Peacock: Surely, Mr. Chairman, the intention that will be described in the regulation can be made known to us tonight?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The intent is there.

Mr. Peacock: The regulations cannot be promulgated until after the Act has been entered in the statutes or the bill has been

given royal assent. That is clear; the members of the Legislature know that.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I can assure the hon. member that the intention is to grant this rebate on anything that will, in our judgement, produce employment. Now, if the member does not want to take that for what it is worth, I am afraid that he will have to wait until the regulations are available and the ordinary course of procedure prevents me from doing that.

Mr. Pilkey: How can the minister buy that?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I want to move an amendment, but before I do so, I want to spend a moment to discuss it with the minister.

I have in my riding an equipment manufacturer. They manufacture equipment that is usable in the glass industry and they have difficulties. The difficulties they have are simply the difficulties of becoming known within the industry. There is no particular reason for the industry to look toward them because in the United States there are any number of very large manufacturers. Because they are small, the opportunity of providing a sales force, and the like to make themselves known is extremely difficult. They cannot get any assistance through the Ontario Development Corporation and therefore they are faced with the problem that they have a quality product and are having difficult times putting it on the market. I suspect it is not an isolated case. I think that throughout Canada, throughout Ontario in particular, there are many instances of this sort of a situation that we could put our finger on. I think we could find any number in almost any riding. Because of that, I want to move an amendment.

I move that in section 1, subsection 4a(1)(a)—and the wording is perhaps a little obscure—that after the word “equipment” in the second line the words “manufactured within Canada” be added. Therefore, it would read “‘machinery and equipment’ means machinery and equipment manufactured within Canada prescribed by the regulations,” and so on. I will wait until it has been moved and we will talk about it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Deans moves that section 1 shall be amended in subsection 4a,

clause (1)(a), so that after the word “equipment” in the second line the words “manufactured within Canada” be added.

Mr. Deans: The reason is fairly simple. I feel that there are two sides to this. I do not agree with what the minister has done in the first place. I suspect there is no way to reach the final resolution.

Mr. Sargent: That is a good starting point.

Mr. Deans: But my basic disagreement with the government is that this is not how to stimulate the economy. But, facing the fact that in a vote in this House we will lose, I want them to have the best bill that I think is possible to benefit all of the people in Ontario and all of the people of Canada.

I believe that if we, at least, ensure—that we make it necessary that those purchasers in Ontario look within the Dominion of Canada first—then there is the possibility that we might in some way affect beneficially the manufacturers of equipment that operate within this Dominion, and in so doing we may well create employment and we may well salvage some of the intent of the bill. But if we follow through with it as it is presently written, my feeling and knowledge of the industry, having worked in the equipment industry, is that it will inevitably mean that the manufacture will be outside of this province and outside of this country, and that most of the work and the manufacturing of the equipment itself will be done in another country, and that the benefit in terms of employment and increased productivity will, out of necessity, then accrue to another country. I believe that in this country, if we are going to abate a certain portion of the costs, we should do so to those people who can best provide employment opportunities and they are located right here. I ask the minister to consider that particular argument.

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear. Well done.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we can approach the thing from a different point of view, or simply reword it. We are anxious, I think, over here to learn to what extent—this is one small question—does this legislation act as offsetting legislation against the imposition of the sales tax upon production equipment and machinery.

To what extent is it overlapping between the two statutes? To what extent do you seek to eliminate the impact of what we

thought—and we argued bitterly on that occasion as I remember—was a repressive deflationary tax, a tax that was designed in effect to slow down the economy and not to increase the overall employment, life and vitality?

It was basically a kind of anti-inflationary thing, and to that extent co-extensive with what Ottawa was doing. We felt that it was a mistake. Therefore, I know that this has a wider impact on the total economy—it will have and was meant to have—than the production machinery tax. But to what extent does one coincide with the other or overlap the other? To what extent will this legislation be an alleviation from the detrimental effects, as we then argued and still argue, of the production machinery.

To what extent, in other words, has the government grown repentant of its own past sins in the area of taxation policy? What my colleague had to say with respect to directing upon this economy and not upon any other economy the benefits, such as they are, however much a modicum they may be, to stimulate again life in this present economy with 200,000 people out of work, to direct it upon the purchase of machinery in Canada, might give us a little fillip, an extra lift, and give some validity to the present legislation which it presently lacks completely. Maybe my colleague can rescue the minister from his own toils, from his own inability to think through these matters to reach conclusions economically, that would be of immediate benefit to the people of this country.

I would ask the minister to take it under serious advisement tonight and to bend. However obtuse and obstructive the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) is, if you remember, as it got close to the deadline the other night, he bent in the wind. I have never seen him do it before. It may be even that some of the hon. ministers are becoming human.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): No, no, that is not true.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I compliment the members of the NDP for supporting the suggestion that we originally put to the provincial Treasurer, who has been notable by his absence throughout this debate. We support this amendment unreservedly.

Mr. Sargent: Where is the Treasurer tonight?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Very close at hand.

Mr. Singer: We raised the question with the provincial Treasurer as to whether or not his great revelation was going to indicate that there would be the purchase in Ontario, or even in Canada, of production equipment. The minister flew off at his usual tangent and said: "What difference does it make as long as people are buying?" That is what he said.

It is a pity. Tonight we have the benefit of the Premier, who has not yet joined in. We do not have the benefit of the Treasurer. His folly is not being defended. Even the Premier is not defending him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not need to, I assure you.

Mr. Singer: The poor Minister of Revenue is tagged with the job of defending an indefensible budget.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The hon. member does not have to worry about me.

Mr. Singer: I would like to hear a definitive statement from at least the Premier, who is here tonight—he is supposed to be the boss; whether he is or not we have some doubts—about whether or not he really believes that he is going to promote something in Canada or in Ontario. That was the thrust of our questions, and that is the thrust of this amendment which we will support. We are interested in jobs for Canadians and nothing else. We are not interested in your favoritism to big corporations.

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear.

Mr. Singer: And if he is meaningful in his budget philosophy, the Premier will take over the debate tonight from the unfortunate Minister of Revenue—

Mr. Sargent: Yes, deal him out.

Mr. Singer: —who is charged with the indefensible job of defending the illogical, and say: "I will change government policy." He is the only man who can do it. I wonder if he has the courage?

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment and, of course, along with others would hope that the Minister of Revenue would give the amendment some consideration.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am going to wait until 9 and see if the member does.

Mr. Singer: If I can be assured that the Prime Minister is going to stay—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The member for Hamilton East has the floor.

Mr. Singer: All the Prime Minister is going to do is sit and smile.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is better than a can of worms.

An hon. member: Let the member turn the Prime Minister into a tomato.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Let us hear the member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Singer: The members heard what the former Prime Minister said: "Davis for better or worse."

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): What has this government got the hon. member for?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, when one looks at a bill of this nature, and likely to any bill, he looks to the end to see what is entailed in the coming into force. We are told by section 4—is it?—that this bill is deemed to come into effect on April 26, 1971, past.

I wondered if the minister or the government, in arriving at their ways and means of stirring the economy, have considered what effect it is going to have in Ontario? What is taking place now? Let us take the construction that is going on in Stelco. They are in the throes, and have been for the past eight months, of one of their major expansion programmes. That is, the development of number three blooming and billet mill.

I daresay that they have plans for all the machinery to go into that mill. They likely have some of it ordered already. This would have taken place without this incentive. We have the Dominion Foundries and Steel, who have had a continuing expansion programme on for the last five years, reaching their peak about this time of this year in new development and expansion. They would have been doing that without any incentive.

Has the government investigated the kind of development that is going on now in industry and that would have been going on

without this incentive? And what percentage that would be of the total in Ontario? Because if you take the expansion in Stelco, and in Dominion Foundries, and the proposed development in Nanticoke by Stelco, you might find that about 50 per cent of the potential in this province is already under way and would have been effective without this incentive. It might have been effective by only applying after a certain date this year where we could have saved the taxpayers half of the \$125 million.

Has the minister any idea if this kind of research has taken place? If not, it seems fair to say that even with the additions made by Stelco, who in any sense do not need this kind of incentive, Dominion Foundries, who in any sense do not need this kind of incentive, may account for 50 per cent of the development in this field in this year. And if we go back to April 26 as the Act provides, when it is deemed to have gone into force, they can maybe fall into this type of tax credit and if that is the case it is nothing less than a shame, because if Dominion Foundries and Stelco need this kind of a credit there is something wrong with their thinking.

I would like the minister to tell me whether or not the government in planning this bill, this measure, has taken any account of what has been happening in the last few months in this province as far as the programme for expansion in industry

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Are you calling for a vote under section 1, because I have an amendment to section 2.

Mr. Chairman: We are not that far yet. This is on subsection—

Interjection by an hon member.

Mr. Bullbrook: If I wanted to ask the member, I would ask him. I asked the Chairman and I want to have his ruling. Okay?

Mr. Deans: One would think that after 3½ years, he would know.

Mr. Bullbrook: The member and I have been here since 1967; he cannot pontificate to me.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in supporting the amendment of the member for—

Mr. Lawlor: He is riding a palomino to-night.

Mr. Pilkey: Something happened in Sarnia?

Mr. Lawlor: Did Dow Chemical—

Mr. Bullbrook: I wanted to buy his mobile home and he would not sell it.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this party supports the amendment of the member for Wentworth insofar as the motivation behind this whole bill has been to solve the unemployment situation. Anyone can see a minister of the Crown bringing in a bill of such magnitude, to use their words, to generate \$125 million of Ontario's money to solve the unemployment situation. Turn it into jobs.

The majority of these funds, I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, could well be, as suggested by my colleague from Waterloo North (Mr. Good), that these funds could generate automation that would result in people in corporate positions buying machinery that would displace people. So in effect this whole legislation could be to lose jobs for people by the effect of this minister's submission. He has the audacity to come into this House and in his first submission to this House—and I can say this kindly, as a member he is good; but as a minister he lacks the sagacity, the intelligence, the knowledge to describe the exemptions.

Mr. Chairman: We are discussing the amendment.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, I know. I am discussing the amendment, and then my colleague from Wentworth—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Talk about the amendment.

Mr. Sargent: All right. He is asking this House to give him a blank cheque—

Hon. Mr. Davis: To whom are we making out this cheque? That is the question.

Mr. Sargent: That is a hell of a good question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is no cheque.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier can answer that.

Mr. Sargent: The leader of the New Democratic Party said the government is making out the cheque to its corporate friends.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No way.

Mr. Lewis: That is right.

Mr. Sargent: Believe me, and the Premier knows it is true.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Never.

Mr. Lewis: Remember, they are getting a five per cent rebate on what this government gives to them.

Mr. Sargent: Listen, I have been in this business a long time. I know the business of policy, and you are trying to con the public. You do not con me a bit. I know that you are playing ball with your corporate friends. I am fully aware of it.

Mr. Chairman: Back to the amendment and you will address the Chair.

Mr. Sargent: I am saying to the minister that he comes into this House, Mr. Chairman, and he does not have the facts; he does not know what he is talking about. He cannot delineate the facts of the bill. This bill is a key platform of this government in its budget speech. They hang their hat on this one.

Mr. Pilkey: Pretty weak.

Mr. Sargent: They hang their hat on this bill. It is going to solve the unemployment situation. Baloney. I say baloney.

Mr. Lawlor: Get mad.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He is getting a little overworked, is he not?

Mr. Sargent: The minister must admit that he does not know, but he supplies us the information after the bill is passed. What a bunch of nonsense! Even the most inept county or village councillor would not pull that on his reeve or his council. He is trying to sell us this bill of goods. I have been in this business a long time and they do not kid me a bit; I do not buy this malarkey. The smiling Premier can bring the most important thing into this House—he sits there smiling; he is going to solve unemployment, and he has got to quit smiling, because people are getting fed up with this nonsense. I will not buy that bill and I support my colleague from Wentworth.

Mr. Lewis: You know what that smile masks, do you not?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Before the hon. minister, I just want to express a personal point of view with respect to the amendment, in that the—

Mr. Peacock: How many personal points of view can a Prime Minister have?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I am entitled to a personal point of view.

Mr. Lewis: Such humility!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I only regret that the member for Downsview has absented himself—obviously to watch the hockey game.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I must say, Mr. Chairman, that any fixation I have with respect to absence was partially related to observations from the member for Scarborough West in his contribution of questionable character in the Throne debate.

Mr. Lewis: I am not of questionable character. I am of very good character.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no. I said the contribution was—not you personally. I would never question your personal character; certainly not here; I mean, I might elsewhere. But I would hope the member for Grey-Bruce—no, he is here; he is back. The member for Downsview—

Mr. Singer: It is good to come back.

Mr. Lewis: It is like coming down the aisle at O'Keefe Centre.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the member for Scarborough West says the member for Downsview has just returned from the O'Keefe Centre. Was that—

Mr. Lewis: Like coming down the aisle.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, like coming down the aisle at the O'Keefe Centre.

Mr. Singer: But my conscience disturbs me about the way you run the province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I am delighted the member for Downsview's conscience is stirred on occasion. I have yet to see it really happen here in this House, but tonight I am delighted to hear it.

Mr. Singer: You are at your less than best tonight.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would only observe that my less than best, I hope, is somewhat superior to the best of the member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: It is not very good.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the member for Downsview will give me an opportunity, shall we say, to rationalize the fallacy of his argument—to me one of the most questionable contributions that he has made in some years in this House—as it relates to the support of the amendment from the member for Wentworth.

Mr. Chairman, the bill has two effects. Let us put all the cards on the table. There are two effects. One is the probable effect as it relates to the development of the equipment and machinery industry of all kinds in this province. The other relates to the fact that the installation of machinery and equipment from whatever source will create capital expansion by way of plant facilities and job opportunities as a result.

For the member for Downsview to support in any sort of sophisticated way the amendment from the member for Wentworth, which would restrict any form of machinery placement or equipment placement in our plants to Canadian-produced material only, would have a completely inhibiting effect on this.

Mr. Deans: It would develop equipment manufacturing in Canada.

Mr. Pilkey: At least there would be more jobs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There most certainly would. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of industries where—

Mr. Chairman: Point of order?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, I understand I was supporting the amendment of the hon. member for Wentworth, which said, "manufactured within Canada."

Hon. Mr. Davis: All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that it is the height of stupidity to say in this day and age that any machinery and equipment placed in any plant in this province should be confined to Canadian-made equipment.

Mr. Bullbrook: We are not saying that.

Mr. Deans: We are not saying that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The members are.

Mr. Gisborn: We are only saying it will apply.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But, Mr. Chairman, there are pieces of equipment where the component parts can come from some other jurisdiction.

Mr. Lewis: That is right. Then they do not get their rebate. A ridiculous proposition.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But then, if they do not get the rebate, there will not be any incentive to place the machinery.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is the point.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not. Listen, even Bobby Orr watches are not made in Canada; they are all from Switzerland.

Mr. Sargent: The Premier got his for nothing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No I did not. It was my son who got it, not me.

Mr. Chairman, I have to point out to the hon. member for Downsview, it is ridiculous to put this inhibiting amendment and restrict the kind of equipment that can be utilized in the development of further capital plant expansion. It makes no sense whatsoever. To oppose the bill in principle—that is the position of the opposition parties. But when we are trying to make it work—recognizing there is a great sense of urgency in this province to move the economy forward—to inhibit it where the amendment suggests, to me is totally ridiculous.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): So why does the Premier use such feeble methods to do it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is. It is totally ridiculous, and I would think that the hon. members opposite, particularly in the Liberal Party, would have enough sense to recognize that supporting this amendment would have not only an inhibiting effect, it would substantially restrict the impact of this legislation—

Mr. Sargent: Such a lot of nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —so that the industries and the manufacturing concerns can move ahead immediately with this kind of expansion.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is not right.

Mr. Sargent: The Premier does not believe that himself.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is the whole intent behind the bill.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: I am very happy, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier has deigned to dignify this debate with his presence and with his

comments. I am very sorry to have to say that the Premier is left on his own without the able advice of his noisy Treasurer. However, I think, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Davis: If your amendment were included it would be total disaster.

Mr. Singer: The substantial point, Mr. Chairman, in this debate relates to the lack of understanding of the Premier about what is in fact at issue. How he got sold a bill of goods to include this item as the cornerstone of his budget speech, or his minister's budget speech, escapes my understanding completely. How he is able to stand up tonight and espouse the theory that it really does not matter who gets the benefit of our \$125 million bribe—because that is what it is—directed to the wealthy corporations, again escapes my understanding.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What wealthy corporations?

Mr. Singer: Why it does not appeal to the Premier that it makes some reasonable sense that if we are going to infuse into our economy an investment to the extent of \$125 million that that should not be directed to Ontario manufacturers of equipment, or at least to Canadian manufacturers of equipment, leaves me completely without any understanding.

Why the Premier is not able to grasp the simple fact of what he is doing just escapes all understanding. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Wentworth makes abundant good sense, and it is in complete line with the questions that we addressed to the Premier and his Treasurer. The Minister of Revenue was very quiet at that point. He did not have to answer and he did not have to embarrass himself, shortly after the budget was introduced.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The minister did not embarrass himself at all.

Mr. Singer: The point was, Mr. Chairman, that if we are going to take \$125 million out of our potential provincial revenue there should be some quid pro quo—there should be something coming back. Where it is going to come back from if we buy machinery in Germany, or in Texas, or in Austria? That is fine. What particular benefit is that going to be to Ontario and employment? The most chauvinistic group that has ever descended upon the people of Ontario is this government and chauvinistically they proceed—

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the hon. member does not see that, I give up. There is no hope for him.

Mr. Singer: They are so integrated that the people of Quebec are now erecting barriers to inspect our eggs as they might cross the border.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No.

Mr. Singer: Surely, Mr. Chairman, it makes basic common sense that when this kind of measure is introduced to us there should be at least some beginning of an effort to indicate that it is going to benefit the Canadian economy, the Ontario economy! But this minister does not care. The Premier does not care. As long as it benefits the economy of his wealthy corporation friends, that, in fact, is sufficient. That is where he stops.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Who said it does?

Mr. Singer: Even his Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman) this afternoon, when he introduced his new programme for spending \$7.5 million to encourage industry by way of a variety of loans which he outlined in his remarks, said, "There will be conditions to make sure it is of benefit." Not here. This is \$7.5 million where the Minister of Trade and Development, having been substantially embarrassed on three occasions previously, at least, has now decided there must be conditions. But not tonight. Tonight, we are giving away \$125 million without any conditions at all and the Premier has the cheek, the nerve, to stand in his place and say, "This is good and do not ask any questions." It is on the same parallel—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I said nothing about asking any questions.

Mr. Singer: —as his now Minister of University Affairs (Mr. White) who says, "You have no right to know. Trust us and everything will be fine."

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member has not got it right.

Mr. Singer: Frankly, Mr. Chairman, we do not trust the Premier. We do not trust his absent Treasurer. We feel sorry for the Minister of Revenue who is unable to explain what this is trying to do. We think, Mr. Chairman, that reasonable restrictions directed to Canadian benefit are logical and sensible and we shall support this amendment.

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member for Downsview is all wrong.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, it is pretty obvious that there has been a major split develop here as to what is best for Ontario and Canada. I think, surely, the Prime Minister must realize—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Where is the split now?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I thought it was obvious several years ago.

Mr. Deans: It was obvious several years ago, but in this particular bill it comes home. Surely the Prime Minister must realize that the purchase of equipment is not necessarily job-producing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No; but, by and large it is; the member knows it and so does everybody else.

Mr. Deans: The question is that it is not necessarily job-producing. And the Prime Minister agrees.

Hon. Mr. Davis: By and large it is, and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. Deans: Again we go back. The purchase of equipment is not necessarily job-producing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the concern of the member about producing equipment that is not employment-producing?

Mr. Deans: In fact, modern technology dictates, and any industry that you care to go into will show, that the purchase of new equipment, generally speaking, means that fewer people are required to operate it.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deans: That is modern technology. Now, if we are going to benefit from this kind of taxing legislation, then surely we have to ensure that someone in Canada reaps the benefit, that someone in Canada goes to work as the result of what we are doing. The Treasurer said in the budget paper that this was a full employment budget and this was one of the cornerstones.

You agree with me that it is not necessarily so, that equipment purchase will create employment. But it is necessarily so that equipment manufacturers will create employment. It is absolutely necessarily so that

equipment being manufactured creates employment.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No one argues that.

Mr. Deans: Fine. Then surely it makes some sense, as the responsible government in Ontario, responsible not only for Ontario but for a major portion of Canada, that we should try to ensure, by the legislation that we pass, that the people of Canada benefit. Surely we, as a government, have the requirement upon us that we take every precaution necessary to guarantee that any money that we spend that rightfully belongs to the taxpayer—and that \$125 million the government is talking about is taxpayers' money at the moment—that any money that we spend that rightfully belongs to the taxpayers—

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is a very specious argument. If the tax is not there, it is not the taxpayers' money, for heaven's sake!

Mr. Peacock: The Prime Minister could not have been listening to the debate on second reading.

Mr. Deans: He should have listened to the earlier debate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What I am saying is that it is a specious argument.

Mr. Deans: He should have listened to the earlier debate. Aside from that—we will deal with that—he is obviously not with it. The whole point of the thing—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say the member is not with it.

Mr. Deans: What in heaven's name does the government see as its responsibility—to guarantee that the major manufacturers are going to receive some kind of a monetary rebate from this government or to try to find jobs for people in Canada?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Right.

Mr. Deans: Which?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The latter.

Mr. Deans: Right, the latter. Then, assuming that the government is going after the latter, the easiest way to do it by use of this terrible legislation is to at least guarantee that the employment that is derived from the effects of this legislation is derived in Canada. There are manufacturers—and if you want me to name them I will tell you—there are manufacturers of equipment in Canada who are

finding it very difficult to compete with the equipment manufacturers in the United States. Very, very difficult. And this kind of an incentive may just provide the additional impetus required—may just provide it.

Surely as a government it is your primary function to ensure that right here in Ontario and in Canada there are jobs provided for people? I do not care whether they are working in New York State, or Washington, or down in California. I could not care less. My only concern is the people who are living in Ontario and who live in Canada, and I want to see the money we spend, spent to benefit them.

If the minister can prove to me in this House that somehow or other it is proper that we make available to people in other parts of the world an opportunity to improve their employment picture at the expense of the people of Ontario, then do it, but do it to the people of Ontario who are unemployed.

It is ridiculous. Your measure at this time is wrong in the first instance, and the fact that you will not at least inhibit it to the Canadian market to try and ensure that the—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I like your choice of word, "inhibit."

Mr. Deans: That is right, inhibit. That is what I mean, too. I mean inhibit.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You really do not care about the unemployed. You really do not want them to have job opportunities.

Mr. Deans: What I am saying in this, and you agreed with me, that every piece of equipment manufactured in Canada provides employment—every piece. What I am saying to you, and I have said it before and perhaps for the last—

Mr. Chairman: We are becoming very repetitive in our arguments now.

Mr. Deans: I am going to tell you. You may as well put up with it because I am going to be here until midnight if I have to because I am not giving up.

Mr. Chairman: No, there is a rule against repetition.

Mr. Deans: Well, then, that is fine. We will change to another way of approaching it.

Mr. Chairman: It may still be repetitious.

Mr. Deans: There is an opportunity for us, in many ways—

Mr. Sargent: Get after the real one.

Mr. Deans: —to support the machinery manufacturers in Ontario and in Canada.

Mr. Singer: Is the Treasurer here? Good, good.

Mr. Sargent: He came out of the wood-work.

Mr. Deans: There is an opportunity through this legislation for us to support the home-front manufacturer, and I say to you that if you fail to take this opportunity you are neglecting the very basic needs of this economy at this time and you are not fit to govern.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Chairman, I would like to have your consideration, because I believe that, having carried the principle of this bill in its broad implications, this motion is restrictive and therefore changes the principle greatly.

Mr. Deans: Nonsense.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I will stick to the amendment and I am pleased that the Prime Minister has opted to defend the bill—

Mr. Singer: Are you asking for a ruling?

Mr. Gisborn: —because we were disappointed it was not defended in principle.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. In my opinion that amendment is in order.

The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Singer: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gisborn: I am pleased that the Prime Minister has decided to defend the bill, even if it is in these late stages of the House in committee, because there are questions to be raised. We are hoping for the answers that we could not get on the principle of the bill and, that is, in the sense that we are going to have to depend on regulations.

I raise the question of what research the government does in relation to this measure, taking into account the industries in Ontario that are now under major plant expansion programmes? I mentioned Stelco that may now have ordered machinery, or is in the throes of ordering machinery. Would it have done it, if the Prime Minister had put a tax on?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I ask the member for Downsview not to leave.

Mr. Singer: I am still here.

Mr. Gisborn: Would Dominion Foundries have done it? You can be assured that whatever the cost is in the Stelco expansion and Dofasco expansion, it will be a great percentage of the total in this province, the jobs they have on now. These have been made retroactive to April 26. What impetus is that going to be to new jobs? It is just handing them clear money. Will the minister answer this position?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I think I can deal with that question very readily. I have to say, first of all, in answer to some of the other questions, and I say for the second or third time, that I certainly do not need any sympathy from the member for Downsview. I will look after myself.

Mr. Sargent: The minister has not done so to date.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: As far as the member for Grey-Bruce is concerned, his stupid arrogance is not necessary as far as I am concerned at all.

Mr. Sargent: Come on. Get off it. Why does the minister not grow up?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I covered his points before and in his whole speech he said not one word about the amendment—not one word until he was called to time.

An hon. member: He does not understand.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, let me deal with the situation—

Mr. Sargent: The minister is sick.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If there is anybody sick around here, it is the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Lewis: One would sense a certain rivalry between the minister and the member.

Mr. Sargent: There is a wee bit. He is doing himself a disservice. He is not that bad a guy.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Let me deal with the situation the member from Hamilton has raised.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think that is a very fair question to ask, but I think if the mem-

ber looks at the entire terms of our legislation, he will see that even if there is a company such as the one that he refers to which has a programme of production and of acquisition—

Mr. Sargent: Will the minister speak into the microphone. We cannot hear him.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —we are endeavouring in this legislation to expedite its programme so that we can deal with the situation we are trying to solve in the Province of Ontario right now. I believe that that is the thrust of what the government is endeavouring to do and if, perchance, some of that equipment might fall within the terms of our legislation, we are prepared to support that as well, no matter who they may be.

In dealing with the terms of the amendment, I certainly must agree that the Prime Minister has dealt with it very thoroughly—

Mr. Sargent: I would think the Prime Minister has not.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —and I would have said precisely the same thing that he has said, “That we would not—”

Mr. Sargent: The minister did not know the answer before he said it. Why did he not say it before now?

Mr. Lewis: Not so much eloquence.

Mr. Bullbrook: If the minister would not put up his arms, he would be like Leslie Frost.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Let us go over on to the next page, page 2 of the bill—

Mr. Sargent: We are still on the first clause.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —and it will explain more fully—we will deal with it when we get there—that the entire thrust of the programme is in the Province of Ontario. All the machinery must be placed and used in the Province of Ontario. Surely the member for Wentworth—listen, give me a chance to finish; I listened to you.

Mr. Deans: I did not say a word.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member was about to.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think he is right.

Mr. Deans: Is that not imputing motive?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am quite sure, Mr. Chairman, that he would not want to inhibit or restrict any jobs in the Province of Ontario

by saying, you cannot buy this piece of machinery somewhere in the United States or any other country.

Mr. Sargent: Let them pay the tax on it. That is all we ask.

Mr. Gisborn: The minister is taking the question to the lowest common denominator.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If in fact, when it is brought back to Canada, placed in position and into function, it does, in fact, produce jobs in the Province of Ontario, that is what we are trying to do and that is why I will ask my supporters to vote against the amendment.

Mr. Deans: Nonsense.

Mr. Lewis: This is just too much.

Mr. Deans: It is wrong.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, a question. The minister's reply is so weak that we should just regard the amendment. The man we should talk to is the Treasurer. He is the man who is the “villain of the piece here.” I ask myself, and I ask the Chairman and I ask the House; “Would you buy a used car from that man?”

Hon. Mr. Davis: Indeed.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I sure would not buy one from the member.

Mr. Sargent: If the minister begged for things he could not buy, I would give them to him. He begged for them before. I would give them to him.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That will be the day the hon. member would give away anything.

Mr. Sargent: But the thing is, these two operators over there, the smiling Premier and the Treasurer—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Back to the amendment. The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William): Do not be jealous.

Mr. Sargent: They remind me of two one-legged men trying to walk. It is a sick situation and no one knows where they are going. They pass the buck down to the Treasurer there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We do? It is too bad the member cannot follow us.

Mr. Sargent: Well, they are both going different directions. That is all I know.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, we go the same way all the time. It is so different from over there. Does the member remember the lecture he had the other night from the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha)? Does he remember that?

Mr. Sargent: That is understandable, because I say what I think.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is the member's mistake. If he would think first before he says anything he would be in much better shape. Even the member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton) agrees with me. I can tell by the smile.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce on the amendment, please.

Mr. Sargent: That is a matter of opinion about Ottawa. My people there like to know what I think about certain things and I tell them what I think. I do not go behind anything to say these things. I say them out in front. But I want to say that we have the support of this amendment from the member for Wentworth, and I think that in this first section where the key point is—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please; order, please! We are being repetitious again.

Mr. Sargent: Here we are again. That fact it says here that, "machinery and equipment means machinery and equipment," and his amendment is, "manufactured in Canada." And then you go on further in your motion where it says, "It does not include automobiles and trucks and—"

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes it does.

Mr. Sargent: "—any property that is described in the corporation inventory or that part of any property in respect of which a loan is made under the Ontario Development Corporation or the Northern Ontario Development Corporation."

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): He can read!

Mr. Sargent: You name me very few properties. There are a few manufacturing operations in the Province of Ontario that do not have a loan with ODC and who in the hell are we talking about then?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Several thousand! May I ask the hon. member for Downsview who is winning?

Mr. Sargent: The point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that we have an omnibus operation here that says, "Any person who is not—

Mr. Singer: Two-to-one for Montreal—the first period over.

Mr. Sargent: Please, will you please hold off? You are taking the government off the hook here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Elmer to a "T."

Mr. Jessiman: Put on your pointed cap.

Mr. Sargent: We are saying that we are going to exempt anybody who is going to buy automobiles or trucks and any corporation that has a loan with the ODC or the NODC—

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is logical.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, that is pretty logical. I think it is good business to do that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Good.

Mr. Sargent: But who do you talk to then? Because most corporations—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): The Downtowner Hotel.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, come on, hold on. Now you should know better than this. You should know better than this. Most American corporations in the Province of Ontario—most big corporations—have a loan with the ODC or the NODC and who else are they going to talk to in big business then? Who are you talking to—

Mr. Pilkey: And they all have a truck.

Mr. Sargent: —that you can loan money to under this deal here? You name me 10 firms in Ontario that have not got an operational loan—GE, Westinghouse, Union Carbide—the whole bit have got deals with the ODC and who are we talking about? You are kidding the troops.

Mr. I. Haskett (Ottawa South): Mr. Chairman, I move the question be now put.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I do not.

Mr. Pilkey: You are not going to support it?

Mr. Sargent: I certainly am not. That is phoney.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! I now put the question without further debate. I now put the question.

Mr. Deans: When did we start that?

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here patiently all day—

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry, I am sorry!
The question—order, please. The motion was put that the question be now put.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Singer: You are not going to muzzle the debate, surely?

Mr. Lawlor: What is this—closure?

Mr. Deans: No, you cannot do that.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. Dean's amendment. Oh, I am sorry. All those in favour of Mr. Haskett's motion, please say "aye."

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Chairman, if that is a motion, that is debatable.

Mr. Chairman: No, not this one.

Mr. Singer: That the motion be now put? Well, all right, whether it is debatable or not, it is muzzling.

Mr. Chairman: This motion is not debatable.

Those in favour of Mr. Haskett's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, point of order. On a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Call in the members.

Mr. Sargent: The member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Bukator) has been trying to speak for half an hour.

Mr. Singer: Vote whether or not we be muzzled. Okay. There is your big chance, Bill.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Mr. Haskett had moved that the question be now put. Those in favour of the motion will please rise.

Those opposed will please rise.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I think we could take it for granted that the motion is lost.

Mr. Singer: Let the debate continue.

Mr. Chairman: The debate on the amendment will continue. The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: What a great new wave.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, at least we cannot accuse the new Prime Minister of cutting anybody off. Congratulations.

Mr. Gisborn: They reversed their coat. They said yes first of all.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not hear them.

Mr. Bukator: May I comment on Bill 26?

Mr. Chairman: Just on this amendment.

Mr. Bukator: The amendment that is for the Canadian-made machinery only. I do not care whether it is Canadian-made or otherwise—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: There is an honest man.

Mr. Bukator: —but I would like to speak on the amendment. I would not want the Prime Minister to leave because I think this makes sense.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Okay. I will wait.

Mr. Bukator: If you are concerned about making jobs with this bill, if you believe that this bill would do the job for you in the fashion that was described by the provincial Treasurer, would you not have thought at that time that taking five per cent off building materials for housing would have done a better job for you? Do you not believe that more people would have gone to work through that effort? Would you not believe that by going to Ottawa—I do not know whether they will accept the provincial Treasurer there now—but would you not believe that by taking the 11 per cent off material there—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think, they would welcome him.

Mr. Bukator: —Ottawa sales tax and the five per cent of the province would have created the jobs that are necessary. This would have been the better approach rather than use this method or this vehicle to try to bring about the jobs. I am the first one in this House to say to this government that if it is possible to create jobs through this bill, I would be the first to vote for it. As you know I have done this before and I will do it again if I believe you are right. But I think you have taken the wrong course in

this instance. I do not believe this bill with or without the amendment will accomplish what you want and, therefore, you are not rendering the service to the public that you think you are going to in this province. So I say to you, as forcibly and as sincerely as I know how, that if you would have thought this through—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! You are really discussing the principle of the bill which has been passed. We are now discussing the amendment.

Mr. Bukator: I was coming to the amendment. I wanted to have a bit of a preamble to put this particular debate that I have heard for the last couple of hours at least on an even keel to make something intelligent out of the chaos.

Mr. Chairman: Just on the amendment.

Mr. Boyer: It is about time.

Mr. Bukator: You see, I even have government members agreeing with me.

Mr. Pilkey: They are not right too often.

Mr. Bukator: Since we are talking about the amendment to this bill, we have no other choice but to support it. We have to look at some semblance of organization and common sense and reasoning and this is a step—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member just said he did not care whether it was made in Canada or elsewhere.

Mr. Bukator: No; to put the record straight, I said—the hon. Prime Minister, being a lawyer, is quite an intelligent individual. That is why they made him Prime Minister.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is a non sequitur, if I ever heard one.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I accept it.

Mr. Bukator: I said I did not care, but yet I think that if we are going to take some steps to assist some people and work is what we are trying to create, this bill is not going to bring this about. Therefore, we have no other choice but to support the amendment. At least let the public know that you have taken a wrong course to bring about employment which we are all interested in. Therefore we have to support the amendment, it is as simple as that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not quite but—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Brantford.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, on the same point: In a recent publication of the Treasury Department you stated you had econometric models of the Province of Ontario, various inputs and outputs that can be juggled into the province to give you an idea of what the outputs would be in terms of jobs, gross provincial growth and so on.

The question has been put to the Treasurer. He in no way indicated, nor did he try to indicate, nor can he indicate for that matter, just exactly where the province is going or in which way the \$125 million is going to provide jobs. This is a very sad reflection on the state of your department. Just what are you guys doing down there? You have four or five, how many economists? How many econometricians do you have? What kind of studies are you doing to find out just exactly what is going on? Just exactly where will this money be spent? In what industry?

Which industries in Canada will possibly stand to gain from the orders that may possibly be produced by that kind of a five per cent rebate you are going to give? You cannot give those figures and yet you are supposed to have the staff, and you are supposed to have the, shall we say, economic expertise to know what you are talking about.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Order. We are on the definition section—

Mr. Makarchuk: Yes I know.

Mr. Chairman: —not the principle of the bill.

Mr. Makarchuk: Absolutely. This is what—

Mr. Chairman: This is the definition of machinery and equipment.

Mr. Makarchuk: Right. That is it exactly. I must say, in terms of econometrics—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, in terms of econometrics, the Treasurer could have indicated to us that he was asked this question—if he allows a—

Mr. Chairman: No. That is not what we are—

Mr. Makarchuk: —five per cent rebate if we are to produce jobs in Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order, please. This is not the topic under discussion.

Mr. Makarchuk: Well we are getting to it. As the member for Niagara Falls said—

Mr. Chairman: No. Order, please.

Mr. Pilkey: That is just the preamble.

Mr. Makarchuk: It is a preamble and this is what we are trying to—

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: Has the right—

Mr. Chairman: May I just point out again that we are discussing the amendment in the definition section having to do with machinery and equipment. The business of five per cent has nothing—

Mr. Makarchuk: Manufacturers—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The Chairman is speaking.

Mr. Makarchuk: I thought you were finished.

Mr. Chairman: No I was not. I was right in the middle of a sentence.

Mr. Makarchuk: Well do not hesitate too long next time.

Mr. Chairman: We will take our time. The definition section is what we are discussing at this time and any other discussion will be ruled completely out of order. If the member has anything else to say on this, he may carry on.

Mr. Makarchuk: The amendment is dealing with the fact that the purchases should be made in Canada, and again the tool industry in Canada is not a highly developed industry, it is not a very viable industry. Most of the tools going into the manufacturing or into production in our plants, are purchased outside. I do not have the exact figures right now but the purchases by Canadian manufacturers of tools are quite high in comparison to the number of tools that are developed in Canada, that are produced in Canada.

The other point is the fact that manufacturing or making production tools, machine tools or equipment, is a very high labour-intensive industry. If you are producing production equipment you employ a lot of people. Also you employ rather highly skilled people, technical people, again, people

who do not have employment at the moment. There is not enough work for them.

The amendment in itself is a very reasonable amendment, and all we are asking is to ensure that if this money is going to be spent, let it be spent in Canada. In the first place it makes the Canadian tool industry a more economically viable industry.

In the second place it will produce jobs. It will produce jobs for that particular segment of the Canadian working force that, at the moment, cannot find jobs. There are the draftsmen, designers, engineers and so on who are involved in the design and the eventual manufacture of tool-producing equipment.

It is a very valuable industry in Canada. Every other country concentrates more on the brainpower available in comparison to the hewers of wood and drawers of water concept of our existence, and this is one method that we could possibly move into that particular area and we are not doing this.

I would suggest that the government opposite take a very reasonable look at this thing and insist that this money be spent in Canada, because we do have a tool industry that is in trouble and has economic problems. One of the ways that you can ensure that it grows and develops is if you are going to give \$125 million away, at least make sure you give it away to the people in Canada so they can gather some benefit from this.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister of Correctional Services.

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): I just do not quite understand how the member can support that amendment, because as far as I can see it is not going to prevent companies in Canada from buying Canadian machinery. They are going to do that.

What the bill is doing is expanding the opportunity to many Canadian industries that would not be able to take advantage of it. There are many industries in this province that, for good or bad, have machinery that is made in the States. They cannot get it here. If they want to expand, or if they want to replace their machinery, then in order to take advantage of this they have to go and buy it in the States.

As far as the amendment is concerned, they are preventing those businesses—and many of them are small, and mine will be one of them. I could not take advantage of

it. The machinery that we use comes from the States.

Do you mean to say that by this amendment industries such as mine would not be able to take advantage of this because you would confine it to Canadian machinery?

Mr. Lewis: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Apps: I cannot go along with this, because first of all you are going to confine us to Canadian machinery.

Mr. Deans: We did not think you would.

Hon. Mr. Apps: First of all, all you are doing is preventing certain industries that are just as legitimate and just as Canadian as anyone else—

Mr. Sargent: A point of order.

Hon. Mr. Apps: —from taking advantage of this.

Mr. Sargent: A point of order. The minister—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Oh, sit down, you little pipsqueak!

Mr. Sargent: —is probably right, but he must realize the fact that 90 per cent—

Mr. Chairman: Order. That is not a point of order. Will the member take his seat. The hon. minister.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, let me expand this further. There are a great many industries in this province that have tried, over the years, to buy their machinery and their parts in Canada. They simply cannot. They have to buy it in the United States or in Great Britain.

Mr. Lewis: Right, and we agree with that.

Hon. Mr. Apps: And the very fact that you are going to prevent those industries—

Mr. Makarchuk: You are not preventing them.

Hon. Mr. Apps: You would prevent them, prevent those industries, because they cannot get the machinery anywhere else except some—

Mr. Lewis: The hon. minister does not understand the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Apps: I understand the amendment. You are going to confine it to Canadian machinery.

Mr. Lewis: No, just the rebates.

Hon. Mr. Apps: All right, just the rebates.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Then why should an industry that has to use foreign equipment be prevented from getting those rebates?

Mr. Lewis: Because your minister this afternoon introduced a programme specifically favouring Canadian companies.

Hon. Mr. Apps: I do not think the hon. member knows what he is talking about.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Apps: I think that those industries that have to use foreign equipment should be just as entitled to get that rebate as those who use Canadian equipment.

For that reason, and for a very practical standpoint as far as I am concerned, I will certainly vote against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre has the floor.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Wentworth. I support it, particularly because I think the incentive to develop processes in Canada is necessary.

I think perhaps there could be some refinement, similar to one that I believe Ottawa has, where, if there is definitely no other equipment available, nor possible to be made available, in Canada, then it might apply to production machinery that is imported.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Those are tariffs.

Mr. Deacon: It may be that the minister considers any proposal which gives an incentive to Canadian industry as a tariff. And yet his colleague, the Minister of Trade and Development, is suggesting that through the ODC there is going to be encouragement and special consideration for Canadian-controlled companies, and that they in principle support that. Is it a form of tariff? It is a support to Canadian industry, and should we be ashamed of that? I do not think we should be ashamed at all.

Hon. Mr. Apps: The idea is to promote jobs.

Mr. Deacon: And the most important thing is to be sure—

Mr. Lewis: Now the minister is changing.

Hon. Mr. Apps: I am not. I am expanding it.

Mr. Deacon: —that every possible incentive for machinery and equipment to be produced in Canada is given. And yet we have a situation that under this Act there is no special incentive for new equipment to be developed and produced in Canada. I think that is a very important source of jobs.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It could not possibly develop in 23 months.

Mr. Deacon: I cannot hear the minister's comments.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It could not possibly develop in 23 months and you must know that.

Mr. Deacon: I am surprised that the minister states it could not be developed in 23 months' time. To begin with, it should have been an elimination of the sales tax effective immediately, rather than in 23 months' time. But if he is going to go through this protracted method, and difficult method and complicated method of providing the incentive, there is plenty of equipment that could be developed and produced in Canada by the ingenious manufacturers and producers that we have in this country who could be given an advantage.

If it could not be, then the tax exemption would still apply if we made an amendment to embrace equipment that would not be available in Canada. There is a federal list that is available, it is kept up to date and could be used. I suggest that this amendment is far better than leaving the Act wide open as it now is and giving no real incentive to production of equipment here in Canada.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in the remarks made by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands. I have sat with him on committees and I have heard him describe himself on many occasions as a small businessman who is very concerned with the future of his, I think it is his brickworks, in Kingston.

Mr. Sargent: He is still a great guy.

Mr. Singer: I would have been much more impressed with his argument had he said that the proposal made in the budget debate by the great economic seer of Ontario, the Treasurer, would have meant that in my business we were going to save X dollars, and in my business, my business, the Minister of Correctional Services' business, we were going to put to work five or six or eight or 10 people.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Let us get to the amendment, please.

Mr. Singer: I am talking exactly to the amendment and I am answering—

Mr. Chairman: Just a minute. Order. You are out of order on several points. To save time, we are discussing the definition section, machinery and equipment, not personalities—

Mr. Singer: Absolutely.

Mr. Chairman: —not personalities and across-the-floor talk.

Mr. Singer: Oh, not personalities.

Mr. Chairman: Please keep to the amendment.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, if I have infringed the rules by talking about personalities, let me phrase it this way. If the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands had indicated to us that in an industry that he is familiar with, the new proposal by the government of Ontario would have resulted in the preservation in Canada of X dollars in profit, and in the employment of Y number of Canadians who are not presently working, I would have been much more impressed, but the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands drew on his own personal experience as a result of his knowledge of small businesses, saying this may be good for small businesses. I would like the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands to expand on that theory that he enunciated.

For instance, Mr. Chairman, what would the member for Kingston and the Islands say would be the saving from this section 1 of this Act to an industry with which he is familiar, whether it is his own or somebody else's who has a reasonable, nominal profit—not a millionaire industry, a small industry in dollars. How many more people is the member for Kingston and the Islands satisfied would be employed, would be provided jobs? How much more to the national product of Ontario and of Canada would this

section produce in contradistinction to the restriction that the machinery be bought in Canada, if it is available, and only under circumstances where it is not available that it be bought elsewhere?

Would the member for Kingston and the Islands, for instance, argue, Mr. Chairman, that—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! We are not discussing what the member for Kingston and the Islands—

Mr. Singer: Oh, I think we are. I think this is most pertinent.

Mr. Chairman: No, we are discussing this amendment, not what the member for—

Mr. Deans: The member is discussing the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! We are not debating what the hon. minister from Kingston and the Islands has said, we are talking about this particular amendment.

Mr. Singer: Most germane.

Mr. Chairman: No, let us talk about this amendment.

Mr. Singer: With respect, Mr. Chairman, we are discussing section 1 which defines machinery and equipment and it delineates the benefits which can accrue to people who buy—

Mr. Chairman: We are discussing the amendment.

Mr. Singer: All right now. I am just trying to explain, Mr. Chairman, because I do not think you are with me, the benefits that will accrue to people who buy machinery within a fixed time period.

The member for Kingston and the Islands, in opposition to the NDP amendment, said it makes no sense to limit that purchase within Canada. I am replying in support of the amendment, which I support, and I am asking the member for Kingston and the Islands if that amendment is not carried.

Mr. Chairman: Order. We are not debating what the member for Kingston and the Islands—

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Chairman, with respect, you are absolutely wrong! You are absolutely wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I am entitled to reply to the argument that he has put forward because

he has argued against the amendment. In the event that you choose to rule me out of order, sir, I disagree with you, and I challenge your ruling. I would ask you to summon the Speaker to rule on your ruling.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman's ruling has been challenged. All those in favour of the challenge?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Singer: You are going to muzzle us tonight.

Mr. Chairman: No, we are just voting on the Chairman's order, that is all.

Mr. Lewis: I am on a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Singer: Go ahead. I could not succeed, let us see if you can succeed.

Mr. Lewis: I am appealing to the Chairman to rephrase his objection to the member for Downsview's position, which is surely legitimate in the context of a debate, so that we can avoid yet another 15-minute ringing of the bell and delay of this struggle tonight. Can it be possible somehow to accommodate the view of the members on this side without forcing it to a vote?

Mr. Chairman: All right. The member's argument is quite reasonable. There has been a very wide latitude here tonight; we have strayed far, far away from what we should be discussing. I am willing to allow the member for Downsview to continue, provided he keeps on the amendment. We are not really debating what any one member is discussing here tonight; we are debating this particular amendment to this section here. If the member wishes to continue and try to keep in order, he may.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, if I can make myself any more explicit, perhaps it is my inability to be reasonably lucid in explaining. Let me try again.

The amendment moved by the member for the NDP was to the effect that section 1 be limited—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We know what the amendment says.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This is ridiculous.

Mr. Sargent: It is ridiculous legislation. That is why it is ridiculous.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member is ridiculous.

Mr. Sargent: The minister always was. I will be okay tomorrow morning but he will still be ridiculous.

Mr. Chairman: We are not debating what one member says. We are debating the section of the bill.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I just fail to understand within the context of the section, within the context of the amendment and within the context of the remarks made by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands how I can possibly be out of order. The member for Kingston and the Islands and I may not agree, but surely, Mr. Chairman, it is germane in this debate and I can argue with him about his opinion. That is all I am trying to do. In fact, what the member for Kingston and the Islands said was that it makes no sense to adopt this amendment. He says he is opposed to the amendment. I say I am in favour of the amendment. And he advanced certain arguments.

I posed the question to the member for Kingston and the Islands to say, in relation to businesses with which he is familiar, in the event that this kind of restriction that the amendment deals with is not applicable, could he indicate to us, not in relation to IBM or Stelco or Texas Gulf Sulphur or Bell Telephone or General Motors but in relation to the ordinary small businesses with which the member for Kingston and the Islands is familiar, how many more Canadians this kind of a scheme is going to put to work?

My suspicion, Mr. Chairman, is that he has no idea. It will be of very small benefit to the kind of industry the member for Kingston and the Islands is familiar with, and maybe from his experience he could indicate to us, from that group of small industries with which he is familiar, how many jobs it is going to benefit them by.

The suggestion we have made during the course of this debate is going to benefit the big industries. The reason that we support the amendment is that we believe that the benefit should be directed to Canadians and directed where it is going to do the most good and directed where it is going to provide the most jobs.

So in simple language, Mr. Chairman, I ask the member for Kingston and the Islands to tell us how many dollars a small industry with which he is familiar is going to save and how many more Canadians it is going to put to work?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to try and answer that. As a matter of fact, he talked so long about it I almost forgot the answer I was going to give him when he first rose.

Mr. Singer: Well, I had trouble with the Chairman, I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to point out is this: the object of this bill is to try and create more jobs for Canadians. All right. So in doing that we are going to give certain benefits to manufacturers if they buy more machinery—

Mr. Sargent: How many more men will they employ by the end of it?

Hon. Mr. Apps: All right, just a minute. Wait until I get to it. To buy more machinery, whether it is from Canada or the United States, in the hope that by doing this they will be able to expand their production, make it more efficient and so sell more of the things they manufacture and create more jobs. All right.

So the members opposite say, "we only want to go half way on this. We do not want to provide jobs for all the people who could conceivably have jobs, we just want to provide jobs that will be provided by the machinery that we could get from Canada." I agree with that—

Mr. Deans: We want to provide additional jobs.

Hon. Mr. Apps: —up to a point. But I say why stop there? Why not go and provide more jobs in those industries that can become more efficient and do a better job if they use machinery bought from outside Canada? And the percentage of machinery they could get that they now buy from outside Canada would be very, very minimal, because you can rest assured that they are always trying to purchase that machinery they are presently buying outside of Canada within Canada.

Mr. Deans: They are not.

Hon. Mr. Apps: They sure do.

Mr. Deans: They are not.

Hon. Mr. Apps: They try to do that, but they have not been able to.

What you are saying is, "Well, that is too bad, fellows. We are not going to give you this advantage because you would have to buy machinery outside Canada." I do not think that is right. I think we should make every job available we can.

Sure, they should buy the machinery in Canada if they can. But if they cannot—and there are many times when they cannot—then why not expand that and give them the same advantage so they can also give more employment to more Canadians?

The member asked me how many more people could be employed. Well, that depends on the machinery which is bought. You cannot just say it is going to be 10 per cent, or 20 per cent, or 30 per cent, or no per cent. It depends on the industry; it depends on the machinery it is going to get. But we are very hopeful that by being able to update its machinery that industry is going to produce more efficiently and make more jobs.

Mr. Lewis: No.

Mr. Deans: No.

Hon. Mr. Apps: All right, the members say no. They have not produced a thing in their lives.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Not one in their whole tribe.

Mr. Pilkey: But at least we worked in a business and we saw it happening. The minister has not.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Apps: The only thing I am trying to say is this, that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Apps: —that as far as the members' method is concerned they are going half way only, and because of that they are going to prevent some other people in this province from getting a job, and I do not agree with it for that reason.

Mr. Singer: That is right. Can I ask the hon. minister a question?

An hon. member: Is it a quick question?

Mr. Singer: No, it does not have to be really very quick because we are in com-

mittee and surely this debate can go on as long as the members want to debate it.

My question to the minister is, would he accept the kind of restrictions that his colleague the Minister of Trade and Development attempted to attach to the \$7.5 million loan programme that he enunciated in his statement today? And if he would accept that—and apparently he did as a member of the cabinet—why should it not apply equally here?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, of course, the point that has just been made—and it has been made previously in this debate—is the key point. You have accepted legislation and programmes discriminating in favour of Canadians and Canadian employment opportunities in other areas. The government refuses to do it in this case—

Hon. Mr. Apps: No, no.

Mr. Lewis: —because there is a qualitative difference. In this case, it is giving a gift to corporate allies and, in the other case, it was not. What is the difference then? That is the difference.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Lewis: Is the minister on a point of order, because if he is not, he should sit down.

Mr. Singer: Answer it when he is free.

Mr. Lewis: I have as much respect for the minister's legendary hockey activity as he does for my job-creating capacity. Suppose he sit down.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Apps: No, I am not on a point of order.

Mr. Deans: Why do they not give him a course in parliamentary proceedings.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: The second point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that I think I am going to engage in the unseemly activity tonight of trying to involve the Minister of Revenue in a discussion of his legislation. Since every other cabinet minister has tentatively tried to rescue him, I am sure he would wish to rescue himself.

Mr. Sargent: That is unfair. He does not know.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Unlike the member's colleagues, he does not need rescuing.

Mr. Lewis: It was very kind of the Premier to step in, and of the Treasurer to echo, and of the Minister of Correctional Services to be here—

Mr. Singer: What is the point of order?

Mr. Lewis: Only the Provincial Secretary was not here to bail us all out.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Can I ask the Minister of Revenue this question, based on the amendment to this clause: how much additional machinery and equipment inside or outside Canada does he expect this programme to stimulate, this incentive programme?

Mr. Pilkey: That is a good question.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I do not think anyone can answer that question, but we are willing to support the programme to create jobs. Who can possibly guess—

Mr. Sargent: The Treasurer knew.

Mr. Gisborn: The member is repetitive. He said that 20 times.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I can tell members from the reaction that I have had it will be substantial.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Then okay, Mr. Chairman. I know it is difficult for the minister to guess at that, but on page 61 of the budget appendix B, a guess is made. Not just a guess, a learned, authorized estimate is made under the aegis of the provincial Treasurer. What it says there is that private and public investment, machinery and equipment in 1970 totalled \$2.8 billion, and with the government's programme in 1971 it will total \$2.9 billion.

All right, so in the government's own accompanying paper, it concedes that this tax rebate system will stimulate the economy of Ontario to the extent of another \$100 million. The answer, therefore, of the Minister of Correctional Services to people on this side of the House was exactly the answer of the provincial Treasurer outside the House after he tabled the budget: He conceded and the government conceded that this is a productivity-producing budget; it is not, in fact, a job-creating budget.

All right, now suppose the government stimulates the economy to the extent of \$100 million, or let us be more generous. Let us say the government stimulates the economy to the extent of \$200 or \$250 million. What are they talking about in fact? What they are talking about is five per cent of one of those figures. If it is of \$100 million, they are talking of \$5 million; if it is of \$250 million, they are talking of \$12.5 million. That is all the effective new money they are talking about in terms of stimulating additional productivity. That is all. Because here in the Treasurer's own figures is an indication that last year without his incentive, we purchased \$2.8 billion in machinery and equipment. This year with his—

Hon. Mr. Apps: On a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Point of order.

Hon. Mr. Apps: We are talking about the amendment, are we not?

Mr. Lewis: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Apps: I do not think the member is talking about the amendment at all.

Mr. Lewis: I will come right to the point.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Well, come to the point.

Mr. Lewis: The point is that the additional \$100 million which the government feel they can generate—which is of such inconsequence generally—we feel should at least be generated within Ontario or within Canada. If they are stimulating it only to the extent of \$5 million to \$12.5 million at least they can do it in this country.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is no guarantee that the amount would have to remain the same.

Mr. Lewis: The guarantee—I would be very interested to know what guarantee the Premier has that—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member is using those figures without—

Mr. Sargent: They are the government's figures. They are in the book.

Mr. Lewis: You have to be careful about impugning my figures. They are your documents.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is the interpretation you are giving them.

Mr. Lewis: The interpretation is pretty clear from your document, page 61: \$2.5 billion in 1969; \$2.8 billion in 1970; \$2.9 billion in 1971. Now it is, admittedly, a—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: It is admittedly, Mr. Chairman, I say to the Minister of Revenue, a projected estimate not a guaranteed estimate. I can see that, but I do not see why we should be spending any less in 1971 than we spent in 1970. The gross provincial product of this province continues to accelerate but—and I come back to this second point I wanted to make—the—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: A very decreased basis.

Mr. Lewis: —employment does not continue to accelerate. Again according to your own budget papers, last year you created an additional 103,000 jobs in Ontario; 43,000 jobs apparently came by virtue of natural growth, 60,000 were new in the sense that they were created. But you are not able to give us under this programme the guarantee of a single additional job.

I do not know why the Premier writes off the matter of the dangers of decreasing employment. If the dominant part of your machinery is in capital-intensive primary industry, if it is in forestry or in mining, you may well reduce employment in Ontario. There is no guarantee at all. Your entire experience suggests a reduction in employment.

Mr. Chairman: Let us keep closer to the amendment.

Mr. Lewis: All we are asking you to concede to the opposition is that, given most of the money would be spent anyway, given that it is productivity-producing rather than job-creating, given that the amount of money we are talking about is a five per cent rebate on a much reduced figure, given that all the other commitments were made in the full recognition that the companies would have to spend the five per cent retail sales tax anyway—all of these machinery and equipment purchasers understand that they were committed to doing that—given all of those things, the least you can do is to guarantee that the benefits will accrue to Ontario or Canada. That is what this amendment does.

Mr. Chairman: Are we ready for the question?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We want to do exactly that. We recognize that the trend has been a diminishing trend, and you will recognize that it is fairly short-term legislation. We want this reaction to happen quickly and with an impact on the economy of the Province of Ontario and we do not want any inhibiting features such as suggested by the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Are we ready for the question?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the whole summation of this whole thing is that the minister has inherited this thing from the Treasurer and so he is trying to sell a bill of goods. The amendment is the fact that machinery manufactured in Canada—and I say to you very sincerely, Mr. Chairman, the only people this can effect are the people who do not have Ontario Development Corporation loans or an NODC loan for automobiles or trucks.

Now you name me 10 or 20 industries in this whole province who can qualify to get this and I will buy you a new hat. All of you. You name them. You are just flying a red herring. It is a lot of nonsense and you know it is nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not fly red herrings.

Mr. Sargent: Okay, you know yourself that this applies to no one and you are only kidding the troops.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I have a very brief reference to what the hon. member has said. The Liberal Party is going to be embarrassed over supporting this amendment, because this is part of federal legislation that is presently in effect.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): We can take care of ourselves. What is your worry?

Mr. Chairman: Any further questions? Those in favour—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Those in favour of Mr. Deans' amendment will please say "aye."

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Chairman, before you put the motion I—

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister without Portfolio): Sit down.

Mr. Singer: I will not sit down, and anyone who suggests I should is completely out of order. I will stand here and debate on this as long as I feel it is proper.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please; it is now 10:30. We have no right to continue—

Mr. Singer: All right, if you want to move the adjournment, I will carry on the debate the next time this order is called.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the Whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, we will be in the item of business No. 15, supply, and we will deal with the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests. Following that, when

we complete those, we will deal with the office of the Provincial Secretary, and hopefully will get into The Department of Correctional Services.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, is it reasonable to assume that tomorrow we will not deal with the continuing debate on this particular bill in the Committee of the Whole House?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Not necessarily.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Well, it is reasonable to assume.

Mr. Singer: Is that a commitment from the government?

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): What difference does it make?

Mr. Singer: It would be interesting to know.

Mr. Speaker: I think the House leader has indicated his intentions for tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:35 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Succession Duty Act, bill to amend, Mr. Winkler, second reading	1299
Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Winkler, in committee	1304
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	1329



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, May 7, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

**(Daily index of proceedings appears at back
of this issue.)**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MAY 7, 1971

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are very pleased to welcome as special guests to the Legislature today a delegation from the Parliament of Finland, which is on a visit to Canada.

In the Speaker's gallery are Mr. Rafael Paasio, the Speaker of the Parliament of Finland; Mr. Paavo Aitio, of the People's Democratic League; Mr. Esko Niskanen, leader of the Social Democratic Group; Mr. Pentti Sillantaus, of the National Coalition Party; Mr. Aaro Lintila, of the Centre Party; Mr. Matti Asunmaa, of the Rural Party; and Mr. Jaakko Hissa, secretary to the delegation.

Also with the delegation are the Ambassador of Finland, His Excellency Holger Sumelius, and the Canadian staff, Lieutenant-Colonel T. G. Bowie, of the House of Commons, and Mrs. Silja Lindgren, who is acting as interpreter.

In the east gallery, our guests are students from Barton Secondary School, Hamilton; and in the west gallery, students from Woodlands Centennial School in Dunbarton, and York Humber High School, Toronto.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

FANSHAWE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer. Has the Treasury Board reconsidered its decision to remove financial support from the Fanshawe agricultural school this support having been announced to cease as of May 15?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): It would be more correct to say that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council had reconsidered the decision of the Treasury Board.

POLICE RAID ON DENTURISTS

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask a question of the Attorney General. Can he explain to

the House the circumstances under which the Ontario Provincial Police have carried out a series of raids on denturists?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I just received a report, as a matter of fact, from the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police. I know it is a very danerous thing to do but maybe we should read it together.

First of all, I think I should point out that this was not a raid. It was the execution of a search warrant issued by a justice of the peace under The Summary Convictions Act to search for evidence of an alleged offence. This was not issued through our office at all. The Ontario Provincial Police were contacted in the first instance by the legal adviser to the Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) in The Department of Health, who requested the assistance of the police in obtaining this type of evidence.

Mr. Nixon: Does the minister mean the instigation of the search was at the behest of the provincial Department of Health and not on a complaint from any other source?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am assuming that and I would suggest that the Leader of the Opposition ask the Minister of Health.

Mr. Nixon: I did and he said he knew nothing about it and said I should ask the Minister of Justice.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Well, I would assume that the initiation of the request—in other words, the allegation that an offence was taking place or had taken place—would reside in the dentistry profession somewhere, presumably in the association itself.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary: Can the minister explain why it is the Metropolitan Toronto Police force was not at least a part of this operation? Why would it be entirely Provincial Police?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I gather the Metro Toronto Police were contacted and the answer was that there was a shortage of men available to do this type of work.

Mr. Nixon: To carry out all the raids at once?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is right. Therefore the Ontario Provincial Police, because they had been contacted earlier through The Department of Health, felt that they could do it and perhaps had a responsibility to do it.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary: Would the minister explain why it would not be more appropriate for charges to be laid either by or on behalf of those who would have a complaint and that the people concerned be called in the usual way before the court with the information that the courts would require, rather than carrying out this rather unusual procedure?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I have asked my officials for that explanation, and I am told that it is on the way, but it has not reached me yet. I will take that as notice.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): By way of a further supplementary, could the Attorney General advise us the extent, if any, of policy within his department to enforce such Acts as The Dentistry Act, The Medical Act, or The Law Society Act? Is it not most unusual that a department of government would take this kind of initiative?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I had better take that as notice as well. I am not that conversant with these matters. There are certainly explanations of it; I am not too sure I have all of the explanations at hand myself.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. minister aware of the very wide, almost incredibly wide powers reposed in a private organization, I believe, under The Dental Technicians Act, of search and seizure, and the initiatory powers that these people have and ought not to have?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Well, I also point out to my hon. friend that The Dentistry Act, unlike some of the professional Acts but like some of the professional Acts—

Mr. Singer: Is that not a provincial Act?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It is a general public Act; it is not a private Act of this Legislature.

Mr. Singer: No, it is a Law Society Act.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is right. And when allegations are made that an offense has

been committed and they are serious allegations, and they come from responsible people, then certainly it is the duty of the law enforcement agencies of this province to act on those matters. I see nothing wrong with that. I would imagine we would be under even more serious criticism from my friends opposite, Mr. Speaker, if that responsibility was not acted upon.

Mr. Lawlor: The government imposes too much power with the courts by way of seizure.

Mr. Singer: By way of a supplementary, is the minister not a little amazed at the widespread and arbitrary powers that are contained in The Dentistry Act?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Oh, I am surprised sometimes by some of the Acts of this Legislature approved by my hon. friends opposite, as well as by others. There is no question about that.

Mr. Singer: That was passed before I was born.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: But these are public general Acts of this Legislature.

Mr. Singer: Is the Attorney General going to do anything about that?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

WELFARE SERVICES FOR IMMIGRANTS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services. Can he tell me what time limits are necessary to be fulfilled before a person coming into this country from another country would be eligible to apply for welfare services? Do they have the right to apply immediately they enter or is there some waiting period?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that if they are in need, they have the right to be looked after practically right away, but I will have to check that. I have my people preparing a report on it. I read the comments of the judge in British Columbia a couple of days ago and I wanted the whole matter checked out. Of course, it is a very difficult area. If someone does arrive here and is in absolute need, it is an impossibility to leave him starving in the streets. Something has to be done to assist him.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Would the minister not agree, however, that in cases where immigrants or people without even landed immigrant status have come over from the United States, there should be some responsibility on the part of The Department of Social and Family Services as well as the federal Department of Manpower and Immigration to see that they are not coming in here from the United States unless they have the wherewithal to look after themselves for at least a few weeks?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, I would agree with the hon. member on that, Mr. Speaker. That is what I want to find out and that is why I am asking for this complete report on it.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member for Lakeshore speaking, or directing questions, on behalf of his party?

Mr. Lawlor: This morning, yes. As the leading front-bench man, I shall yield to my colleague from High Park.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

COMPENSATION OF FRANCOETTIE

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I have a question of the Attorney General.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General: In view of the fact that Mr. Reford Francottie was found not guilty at his trial yesterday, is there any way that the Attorney General or the government can extend some compensation to this man for the 10 days which he served in jail?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, not that I am aware of, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shulman: Would the Attorney General agree that there should perhaps be a change in policy so that this type of case will be compensated in future?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I am not willing to agree to a blanket general endorsement such as that.

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry the Attorney General does not feel that people who are punished unfairly should be compensated.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

COMPENSATION FOR MONEY EMBEZZLED BY LAWYERS

Mr. Shulman: I have a question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, A new question. What steps is the department or the government taking about those persons who have lost large sums of money as a result of embezzlement by lawyers? I am referring specifically to the Sidney Caplan case where \$556,000 was embezzled, and in which the Law Society is unable to make compensation because its regulations allow compensation only to a maximum of \$50,000 per lawyer?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I will have to take that as notice, but may I do so on my understanding at the moment that we are doing nothing about that and, if there is any change, I will certainly take it as notice and report back to the House.

Mr. Shulman: As a supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker, would the Attorney General agree with me that in future the government should change its policy so that this type of case will be compensated in future?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I would not agree to that.

Mr. Shulman: I have a question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member for High Park taking the questions for the New Democratic Party this morning?

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Yes, by unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker: Very good.

REOPENING OF TORONTO DETOXIFICATION CENTRE

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker: In view of the many requests from the police of Toronto that the detoxification centre which was shut by the Conservative government be opened up again, what steps is the Attorney General's department taking to make sure that this is done?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: If the hon. member had been here earlier this week, he would have heard that I indicated that this matter is under very active consideration.

Mr. Shulman: I am delighted, Mr. Speaker. What is being done?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I indicated that it is being very actively considered and policy will be announced here in due course at the proper time.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): In the fullness of time!

NORTH BAY INQUEST

Mr. Shulman: I have a further question of the Attorney General—my final question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Attorney General decided to order a new inquest in the North Bay case in which the coroner permitted his brother to act for one of the interested parties?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No.

Mr. Shulman: Is that the policy of the Attorney General?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is the policy in this case, yes.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Obviously, yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

PERSONS AWAITING TRIAL IN ONTARIO INSTITUTIONS

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Would the Attorney General know or would he undertake to furnish to the House the number of inmates of Ontario jails and institutions awaiting trial? The reason for this is that in the United States 50 per cent of people in the institutions down there are awaiting trials.

Mr. Speaker: The question has been directed.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I am not too sure that this is under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General. If not, it is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Correctional Services, or whatever the name is. I can undertake to the hon. member that if he would be good enough to put it on the order paper, it will certainly be answered.

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary: Would the minister know, then, the backlog in the courts? That is what I am trying to find out.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: My understanding is that the situation of two or three years ago where there was a very serious backlog in many areas in the courts of this province, has now been—I was going to say completely rectified, but I should not be that definite.

The only situation that causes me grave concern here at the moment is the backlog in drug prosecutions in Metro Toronto at the moment. This is a very serious matter. Other than that, unless my friend has some other very general area that he would like to bring to my attention, which I would be glad to speak to him about, I really, honestly, do not know of any serious abuses in respect of backlogs of cases before the courts of Ontario.

Mr. Sargent: Will the hon. minister tell the House? Will he find out and tell the House?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I said, if the hon. member would be good enough to put his question on the order paper, which I think really does require some statistical review, the ministry will obtain that information and publish it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

TEACHERS EMPLOYED AS JUNIOR FOREST RANGERS

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests—I am asking this question, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague from Timiskaming (Mr. Jackson).

What is the governmental policy with respect to high-school teachers in Kirkland Lake taking over the jobs as junior forest rangers previously held by people trained in the area, but not already unemployed?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, we must have the same contacts as the hon. member. I was informed of this situation about two days ago and I am looking into it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

SALES TAX LOSSES

Mr. Deacon: A question of the Minister of Revenue: What steps has the minister taken, since my question of a few weeks ago, to eliminate the problem of loss of a large volume of business which has faced Ontario.

brokers through the sales tax avoidance measures that Ontario residents and others have taken to avoid the sales tax on commission business in the province?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, I have investigated the matter as presented. Initially I found no evidence to substantiate the question that has been placed before me. If the hon. member would like to discuss the matter with me and inform me of the area with which he is concerned, I will certainly take the necessary action.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Brantford.

FIVE PER CENT SALARY INCREASE GUIDELINES

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): A question of the Treasurer. In view of the fact that 80 per cent of the civil servants in the province have decided to go on strike as a result of the minister's five per cent guidelines, will the minister consider removing those guidelines completely and entering into negotiations in good faith?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I was not aware that 80 per cent of the civil servants had decided to go on strike.

Mr. Makarchuk: By way of supplementary, now that the minister is aware that 80 per cent of the civil servants have voted to go on strike, will the minister take this into account and remove the guidelines?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I do not accept that my awareness has been perceptibly enriched by the comments of the member for Brantford.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

DENTISTRY ACT

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney General would tell us whether he thinks that such clauses as those contained in The Dentistry Act, relating to it being prima facie evidence of carrying on dental practice merely because dental tools are in somebody's place of business or home, and allowing any agent to get a search warrant, are appropriate sections to have in a statute of the Province of Ontario?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The hon. member is asking for a personal judgement on a matter such as that?

Mr. Singer: No, no. I am asking that the Attorney General—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, no, the hon. member is asking for the appropriateness of it. Right? I do not think the appropriateness of it is an appropriate type of question to ask in respect of a legal opinion of the Attorney General.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The hon. minister is the chief law officer of the province.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, is the Attorney General going to take any steps to remove from the statutes those unusual, unwarranted and arbitrary powers which infringe on the civil rights of the citizens of Ontario?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, there are 117 extremely privileged individuals who sit in this House, and my hon. friend happens to be one of them. We are extremely privileged in that we have the power here to initiate public legislation in this province and we are a very favoured group to do it. My answer to my hon. friend is that if he does not like it, he is one of the few people in this province who has the power to initiate steps to change it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, will the Attorney General and Minister of Justice, as the chief law officer of the Crown, exercise his privilege which will probably bring with it the approval of his caucus, to change this legislation, which is arbitrary, unfair and inequitable?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Number one, Mr. Speaker, my friend is assuming things that he should not assume, in relation to my powers over caucus, and number two, if he wants to change it he has the power himself to attempt to try it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

THE DEPARTMENTS OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL AND FAMILY SERVICES

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, a question of the hon. Minister of Social and Family Services: Does the speech of the Minister

without Portfolio (Mr. Potter) to the Ontario Welfare Council yesterday reflect the government's intention to amalgamate The Departments of Health and Social and Family Services?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if the hon. member read the account in the paper this morning the hon. member who made that speech indicated that these were his personal opinions.

Mr. Peacock: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the Minister of Social and Family Services accept the contention of the Minister without Portfolio that between branches of the same department there is little communication in regard to the matters he was talking about?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is impossible to generalize in this area. I guess I as the only member in this House who has had both the portfolios of Health and Social and Family Services, can say that there is a great degree of co-operation and co-ordination between departments in these areas. There is co-ordination in regard to our programmes for the mentally retarded. There is great co-ordination in regard to our programmes for the emotionally disturbed.

Saying that, as I have said many times, we have not reached the ultimate and the perfect. Saying we do have co-ordination does not mean that there cannot be better co-ordination and we are always working toward this.

Mr. Peacock: We still know who should have been Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

MINING REVENUE FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. Sopha: I should like to ask the provincial Secretary, in order to germinate a seed in this the growing season, whether, when the Sudbury basin achieves a system of viable regional government, that will mean a surcease of the mining revenue payments as a means of financing local government, and the adoption of a system whereby the mining industry makes direct payments by taxes to the local government like any other industry does in the province?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I would think not.

Mr. Sopha: A supplementary question. As he knows the mining industry will then be liable for taxation across the basin. What part then will mining revenue payments pay as an aspect of financing local government?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Of course, the one great difference between the mining industry and, I suppose, any other industry is that you have a certain number of people working in an area which is not taxable—that is, what essentially goes on below ground or in an open pit, for that matter. There are still arguments and I suppose will continue to be about what is above ground and what is not—that is, the head frame, and so on—but basically that is the difference.

Therefore, the people in a mining community, or the tax revenues in a mining community will never be as buoyant as they would be in my town of Chatham, for example, because we are taxing industry fully where people work in my town of Chatham. I think there will always be a place for something over and above the normal revenues of the municipality and real estate taxation such as mining revenue payments. Of course, in the formula which my colleague brought in this year, he has adopted—this is off the top of my head—an assessment of \$10,000 per worker. It may well be that—

Mr. Sopha: But there is nothing for Sudbury in his formula?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Sudbury has always done so well through the efforts of the member and others that—

Mr. Sopha: That is the measure of our disagreement. I think I will replace the minister in the next cabinet.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We are trying to—I am sure it was the feeling on this side of the House and shared by many others in the north—we should try to let the rest of the north catch up with Sudbury.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Has the member for Sudbury given up on the Attorney General's job?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Attorney General has the answers to two questions previously asked.

EXTRA POLICE COSTS FOR ROCK FESTIVAL

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on May 4 the hon. member for Downsview asked me the following question:

Could the Attorney General tell us what success, if any, the government has had in collecting the sum of \$87,856.70 from Orange Productions Limited, being a firm that carried on a rock festival in Mulmur township late last summer and against whom the government passed an order-in-council, forcing them to enter into an agreement to put up this kind of a bond, and the former Attorney General indicated that they should pay this sum of money to the government for damages resulting from extra police costs?

Mr. Speaker, I took the question as notice. I have now had an opportunity to review the matter and it is certainly true that the company refused to enter into the agreement that was required by the designation and the order-in-council. Therefore, as a result of that we feel we have a cause of action for the costs in an amount that would be decided by the court. We are now considering the institution of such an action but I must bear in mind, of course, all of the equities of the situation including the possibility that the judgement might not be recoverable if the defendant was not able to pay it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, does the Attorney General not think it is a bit late in the day to now contemplate going to court?

FARM MARKETING LEGISLATION

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I have another question, Mr. Speaker, from the hon. member for Downsview. I believe he inquired of me in relation to the reference to the Supreme Court.

Mr. Sopha: That was me.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am sorry, it was the hon. member for Sudbury. Both of them? Okay. Two questions then! First, who is going to represent the government? Our agent, at least on the record, will be Mr. John D. Hilton, QC. This is in relation to the Supreme Court on the marketing question. Second, what are the instructions from the government to Mr. Hilton? The instructions will be to support the position that the Manitoba legislation is *intra vires* the province.

Mr. Sopha: The government is going to lose—remember I said that on Friday, May 7. It is going to lose.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I have another answer to a question from the hon. member

for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman) but he is not in the House, Mr. Speaker. Do you want me to delay that?

Mr. Speaker: Do the members of the New Democratic Party agree that the answer should now be given?

Mr. Sopha: Have a one minute caucus.

RENT REVIEW BOARD

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: On May 3, the question was directed to me by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman), inquiring as to how many municipalities have set up review boards on the basis of the legislation which was passed in this Legislature a couple of years ago, The Landlord and Tenant Act.

Rent review boards have not been established by any municipality, due to the fact that The Landlord and Tenant Act 1968-1969 does not provide for the establishment of rent review boards. The legislation does provide that a council in a municipality may, by bylaw, establish a landlord and tenant advisory bureau. There is a difference.

The functions of the landlord and tenant advisory bureaus are: to advise landlords and tenants in tenancy matters; to receive complaints and to seek to mediate disputes between landlords and tenants; to disseminate information for the purpose of educating and advising landlords and tenants concerning rental practices, their rights and their remedies; and to receive and investigate complaints of conduct in contravention of legislation governing tenancies.

At this time the municipalities of Brantford, of Brantford, of Burlington, of Hamilton, of Ottawa, of Sudbury and of Toronto have established such bureaus. There are other programmes to carry out the intent of this legislation in Kitchener and Kingston, although the structure of those particular programmes is not strictly within the confines of The Landlord and Tenant Act.

It would appear, sir, that the landlord and tenant advisory bureaus, or other related programmes, have been initiated in those municipalities where a need for such services has been indicated by the citizens of those particular communities.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a supplementary question? Is the minister going to do anything in relation to

the recent request from Metropolitan Toronto and others that the tenant advisory bureaus be given additional powers which could at least compel the attendance of the parties concerned in a potential dispute and provide for the production of documents?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The matter is under consideration by the government.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

SCHOOL FURNACE EXPLOSION

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General regarding the furnace explosion at St. Daniel's School in Ottawa on February 23: Is the fire marshal's report now complete? And, in connection with the soot buildup which was attributed as the cause of the fire, has it been determined when the furnace was last cleaned?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, may I take that question as notice?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South.

TWO-MAN POLICE PATROLS

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): A question of the Attorney General and Minister of Justice: Is the minister aware that, because a police officer of the Dunnville police department was brutally beaten while performing his duties, two youths have been charged with attempted murder? Will the minister initiate the necessary regulations to make it mandatory that a police officer on patrol, especially on night duty, shall not perform his duties unless in company with another officer?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I will certainly take that matter under consideration, but I know the Ontario Police Commission has reviewed those situations in the past. I will be glad to obtain a further report and report back to the House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: I lost my minister.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Brantford was attempting to gain the floor.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask a question of the Minister of Correctional Services but, seeing he has stepped out, I will refer the question to the Treasurer again and perhaps we can try to penetrate the insensitivity.

In view of the fact that the guards in Ontario reform institutions are talking about walking off their jobs because of the five per cent guidelines, is the minister prepared to do anything about them now?

Mr. Speaker: I think that question has been answered in substance previously and the hon. minister has replied. I therefore think the question is out of order.

Mr. Makarchuk: By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The question is out of order; there can be no supplementary. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: A question of the—

Mr. Makarchuk: A new question, Mr. Speaker: Since the last one was out of order, I—

Mr. Speaker: All right, I will permit the hon. member to ask a question.

WAGE DEMANDS BY GUARDS IN REFORM INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Makarchuk: What action will the provincial Treasurer take to satisfy the wage demands of the guards at the Ontario reform institutions?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, it is not to my knowledge that the wage demands—if that is the correct term—of the guards at the correctional institutions are presently under review. These matters are all on a two-year cyclical review and when that comes before government in the normal course of events and before the Civil Service Association, then in the normal course of events both will have a position and it will be subject to negotiation at that time.

Mr. Makarchuk: By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that the guards have decided that the matter is not being negotiated and have orders to go on strike, what action does the minister intend to take as a result of that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, no such information has reached me. I suggest to the hon. member if he would stop trying to stir up trouble in this province we would all be a lot better off.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Shulman: Bury-Your-Head-in-the-Sand Darcy. That is what we will have to call the Treasurer.

Mr. Lawlor: When he gets bellicose, watch out.

Mr. Shulman: He is doing his best on his part to bring the government down.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I do not think the hon. member for Brantford missed his turn. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce had risen and I recognized him.

Mr. Makarchuk: A supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. The hon. member for Brantford did not place his supplementary question in time; he will please retain his seat. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

COST OF ONTARIO PLACE

Mr. Sargent: A question of the provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker: Would the Treasurer know—this is a very parochial question—the projected cost of Ontario Place and the amount of money that has been spent to date?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Off the top of my head I think the costs are something like \$23 million. The operating costs are projected to be met by the operating revenues.

Mr. Singer: It has gone up another \$5 million since the last count.

Mr. Sargent: I did not hear the Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is projected that the revenues should meet the costs. It should not be a profit-making operation, nor should it cost anything.

Mr. Sargent: I do not think the minister understood my question. I wanted to know the projected cost and what it has cost to date.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As far as I know, the total cost—I believe this is the case—is in the neighbourhood of \$23 million. I am not sure of that figure, and I do not think there is—

Mr. Sargent: Why does he not know?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well if the member really wants an answer to the question, I have tried to give it to him. That question, of course, Mr. Speaker, should have been put on the order paper, as the member well knows. We do not carry those kind of figures around in our heads.

Mr. Nixon: That is the old Darcy—a \$10-million overexpenditure.

Mr. Singer: What is \$10 million?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to that, does the Treasurer know if Ontario Place is a continuing programme for Harbour City? Is it going to be a continuous progressive landfill?

Mr. Speaker: The question is not supplementary; it is a new question.

Mr. Sargent: It has to do with Ontario Place—

Mr. Speaker: It is a new question. However, I recognize the hon. member with a new question.

HARBOUR CITY

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, sir. Do you plan to continually spend money in the development from Ontario Place into Harbour City?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I do not know that there is necessarily a connection between Harbour City and Ontario Place. However, the government of Ontario is pleased, in co-operation with Metropolitan Toronto and in particular with the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, to assist in the development of the waterfront plan of this great metropolitan area. And we will find in the estimates a commitment in the neighbourhood of \$1 million per year, which will be matched by Metro conservation to get on with the waterfront plan, which we happen to think is one of the most exciting things in this whole great metropolitan area. We are proud to be part of it.

Mr. Sargent: A further supplementary: So the minister is committed to a continuing

programme there, when the Minister of Trade and Development does not know whether he is nor not. He said in the House yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: Any questions?

Mr. Sargent: Who knows what is going on?

Mr. Speaker: Ask a question. The hon. member is making a statement. The hon. member for Lakeshore.

REPORT ON ARRESTED STRIKERS

Mr. Lawlor: A question of the Attorney General. Has the Attorney General read the report of the Ontario Police Commission on three strikers at the Trane company who were arrested? Would it be possible for him to table that report in this House?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No. 1, I have not read it. No. 2, I shall do so and then decide whether it should be tabled or not.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

SWEEP PROGRAMME

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests. Would the minister consider setting up offices or using government offices today in an attempt to encourage youth to partake in the Lands and Forests SWEEP programme, rather than have them send applications into his department?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, maybe this suggestion would be very worthwhile in next year's programme. We have received a lot more applications for this year's programme than we have positions available. I do not believe it would be advisable to establish offices at this time as we just do not have sufficient positions available. They have practically all been filled.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Have all of the vacancies in the SWEEP programme been completely filled?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I have not got that information but we have received over 10,000 applications. We have only 5,000 positions available and that 5,000 includes slightly over 2,000 junior rangers. In the SWEEP programme, it is about 1,000.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Brantford.

PAY GUIDELINES FOR PRISON ATTENDANTS

Mr. Makarchuk: I have a question of the Minister of Correctional Services. In view of the fact that the guards and the attendants at the various reform institutions have decided to go on strike, or are planning on going on strike, and the fact that the Treasurer is insensitive—or dense, I am not sure which—to the needs of the civil servants, can the minister indicate what action his department is taking or what representation he has made to the Treasury Board to ensure that they are not bound by the five per cent guidelines?

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, I have not had any notification whatsoever that the guards are going on strike. We hope that they will not. This is a very serious situation as far as we are concerned.

Mr. Makarchuk: Yes, we hope the same thing.

Hon. Mr. Apps: We certainly hope that they do not take any precipitate action such as that before everything is clarified. But I have had no real notification at all that this is contemplated.

Mr. Makarchuk: By way of supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Makarchuk: I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: I will not permit any supplementary questions on that particular question. It has been asked before. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMME FOR UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services. Is the minister developing any type of programme to employ youths now attending university, in various programmes that would make them employable with The Department of Social and Family Services; summertime employment for these youths, both male and female?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, as part of the total summer employment programme of the government, I think the hon. member will recall we did announce that there was a programme. I think it involved about 100 students who are being employed in this particular category. They are placed by us in various social service agencies and positions in order that they can do a meaningful job in this field, get some feel of it, and also help augment their income during the summer.

As well as this, we do employ a certain number of students. I cannot give the exact number at this particular minute in our department. Of course, through their work here they become involved in the total field.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I did not quite hear the minister. Did he mention 100 in all for The Department of Social and Family Services? Is that the number of youths who would be employed?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that that was part of the total programme that employs about 15,000 students for the summer. This was a special extra thing that our department, as part of the total programme was doing this year.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

The hon. member for Brantford is taking objection to the fact that I have not been orderly. May I point out to him that I am trying to be very specifically fair. If I am to be very exactly fair, the Liberal Party is entitled to two or three more speakers than the NDP. I am being fair on this.

The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is a breath of fresh air.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Breathe deeply!

GILL NET FISHING BAN

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister of Lands and Forests advise me how he expects democracy to work, in that I have here 1,000 names on a petition—submitted to him a year ago and nothing has happened yet—regarding a gill net fishing ban on the Bruce Peninsula? I have 1,000 names here.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member please direct his question?

Mr. Sargent: Why has the minister not done anything to ban gill net fishing on both sides of the Bruce Peninsula—the Georgian Bay side and the Lake Huron side—as requested by 1,000 people in the Bruce Peninsula? Why has the minister not done anything about it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Why has the government not banned gill net fishing?

Mr. Sargent: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is a good question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: That comes under the minister's department, does it not?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): The member got his gills caught.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The government believes, in the management of our fisheries, there is room for both. Commercial fishing and sport fishing are compatible and in those areas sport fishing has a priority.

Mr. Sargent: The minister does not know what he is talking about.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Pardon?

Mr. Sargent: The minister does not know what he is talking about.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Is this what the member was saying?

Mr. Sargent: No, the minister is saying it.

Hon. Mr. Snow: That is the member's opinion.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I will be glad to look into this for the hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: That is a year ago.

An hon. member: Oh come on!

Mr. Sargent: That is a new wave.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

LENGTH OF HAIR AS A CONDITION OF EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Shulman: I have a question of the House leader. I presume the provincial Treasurer is the House leader today. Is it the policy of the government to set hair length as a condition of employment as reported in today's Globe and Mail?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think that question might well wait for the Minister of Trade and Development when he returns to the House.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister over there knows about hair length.

Mr. Shulman: I have a supplementary if I may, Mr. Speaker. In the minister's department and among the employees he is responsible for, is there any condition of hair length as a condition of employment?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In my department? No, I do not think so.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Lawlor: Certainly not in the Prime Minister's department.

PROSPECTORS' LICENCES

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs who, I think, is feeling neglected over there. Will the minister recommend to his department that prospectors' licences will be issued in the same way as drivers' licences in that he has a part of a form that can be torn off and sent in for the renewal of licences? As it is now, they have to apply every year for the renewal of prospectors' licences.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this sounds to me like a very good suggestion. I will be pleased to discuss this with the officials in my department.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Brantford.

BASS CATCHES IN LAKE ERIE

Mr. Makarchuk: The minister is just walking out. No, he is coming back in. This is a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests. Can the minister indicate why commercial fishermen on Lake Erie were instructed to bury any white bass or silver bass they have inadvertently caught in their nets in their fishing operations, instead of either selling it for cat food or selling it as food on a commercial basis?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the member if he would be in favour of selling fish contaminated with mercury as cat food?

Mr. Makarchuk: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, we will have to ask the cats how they feel about that situation.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, there is a market for this fish. There is a market, and obviously the commercial operators are prepared to buy it for one reason or another, and I would assume if they are buying it that they are meeting the federal and provincial requirements in order to do what they are planning on doing with that food. So why cannot the fishermen sell it to them?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr Speaker, this matter was thoroughly looked into and we feel that we should not encourage the catching of fish that is highly contaminated with mercury. We feel there are many reasons why this is not advisable, and this is why we have issued orders that fish that is contaminated with mercury should be buried.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves, seconded by Hon. Mr. Snow that the estimates of expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, of the four departments named, be referred to standing committees as follows:

Departments of Health and Social and Family Services to human resources committee.

Departments of Highways and Transport to natural and physical resources committee.

Motion agreed to.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 15th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: I believe, when we rose last, the minister was in the process of replying to the leadoff comments. Has he finished that or does he have further comments to make?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, I had not started replying to the comments.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister has the floor when he is ready.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: First Mr. Chairman, may I say, that I listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. R. S. Smith) and the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes). It seems to me it is only some time ago since these remarks were made and if I omit questions that were posed, I am sure the hon. members will remind me when they come up under the appropriate vote.

Firstly, I begin by saying that I am in agreement with the hon. member for Nipissing in his opening remarks when he said that direct capital expenditures create employment. I wish to point out to him that our expenditure this year on the development of our park facilities will be about the same as last year. However, in order to provide more employment this summer we have extended our parks operating programme and our tree planting programme, and these are two areas, of course, that have a high labour content.

The hon. member then went on about what procedures would be followed in leasing Crown land. Mr. Chairman, the procedures for leasing Crown lots are being developed now and they will be made public sometime in the near future. Our intention is to have the best possible leasing system, incorporating conditions to safeguard the natural environment. We are also studying methods used elsewhere. We have also contacted other provinces and other states. Our regulations will have to be reviewed—and these are regulations 20 to 28 under The Public Lands Act—to provide for lease rather than sale of summer resort locations.

As mentioned in my opening remarks, leasing will preserve the public title to these recreational areas and will permit their conversion to public use if and when we require them after the lease expires.

The hon. member also referred to private land and, if I understood him correctly, he suggested that we should inquire into a method of control of sale of private lands. Mr. Chairman, this matter of private lands is entirely out of the purview of my department. There is in the Revised Statutes of Ontario, I am advised, an Act called The Aliens' Real Property Act, which is not administered by this department. I believe it

comes under the Attorney General and Minister of Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence). This Act places an alien in the same position as a citizen in respect of ownership and disposition of land. To my knowledge no province in Canada and no state in the United States has such restrictions on the disposal of private lands.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Yes, but there are plenty of other jurisdictions. We are not the whole world.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, it could be. But I am advised that one can go to Spain and buy private land if one wishes, and this is done. Also this could be a subject for the conference which the Prime Minister announced will be held in June—I believe June 22 to 24—on nationalism. But, as I say, the subject of private lands is outside of the purview of The Department of Lands and Forests.

The member said that the publication of limited data on mercury last fall did harm to the fisheries on Lake Nipissing, Mr. Chairman, last fall after sampling thousands of fish from about 105 distinct bodies of water and analysing them for mercury, I believed it would have been improper on my part not to advise the public of the results, whether they were good or bad, and I did this. I believe the public has a right to know about these matters.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Yes.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is different from the Attorney General.

Mr. Sopha: Did the minister tell the Attorney General?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am glad the hon. member for Downsview agrees with me.

Mr. Singer: I am listening.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Now, special testing was initiated on Lake Nipissing, Lake of the Woods, Rainy River—Rainy Lake, pardon me—as well as the western part of Lake Erie, to pinpoint problems more directly. This government has been spending much time and money in my department and other departments to attempt to alleviate the public distress which has resulted since mercury in fish was first discovered. My colleague, the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Guindon), is carrying on quite an intensive programme to promote our fishing industry in Canada as well as in the United States.

The member referred to national parks. If I remember correctly, I think he said that he was pleased to hear that negotiations are proceeding very favourably for the establishment of a national park on the north shore of Lake Superior, at Puckasaw, of approximately 400 square miles. We are also looking into other areas.

He also mentioned the Province of Quebec. He referred to the new park in the Gaspé. This is a park wherein the Quebec government entered into an agreement with the federal government for a 99-year lease, and to my knowledge this is the only agreement as such in Canada. I doubt very much—

Mr. R. S. Smith: That was the first one where the federal government leased the land.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, very true. That was the first one. They usually want title, and this was the first one. I doubt very much if they would ever consider such agreement with Ontario.

The member asked why logging could not be removed immediately and permanently from Quetico Park. Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect to this question of whether logging can be removed immediately and permanently, these are matters that I hope will be cleared up in the near future.

However, as the hon. member knows—he is a member of the Algonquin Park advisory committee—there are many ramifications of these questions that cannot be easily resolved to everyone's satisfaction without considerable consideration of all the factors involved.

As the hon. member knows, public hearings were held recently in Toronto, Fort Frances, Atikokan and Thunder Bay; as a result, all these submissions are presently being seriously studied. I believe that the next committee meeting will be on May 11, next week, and I hope that shortly after that we will be able to submit a progress report.

The hon. member is a member of the Algonquin Park advisory committee, which is doing very valuable work. During the past year the advisory committee, which is chaired by the hon. Mr. Frost, held many meetings; in addition, there is a task force which is supplying information to this committee. These two reports are examples of a couple of the studies they have submitted to the committee.

Recently, of course, there have been other studies, for instance, one by an independent

firm of consultants, the study of the economic impact on Algonquin Park. The committee recently sent me their report. This is the report that I believe the hon. member referred to and asked that it should be made public. I have placed great emphasis on their report with respect to assisting me in formulating the Algonquin Park government policy, I believe that it would not be appropriate for me to release this statement in advance of a government-approved policy statement. This matter has not yet been discussed by my colleagues and I do believe I cannot see what advantage it would be to release this to the public at this time. That is why I feel that it is best to proceed the way we are and, at some future date, I am prepared to make available an interim progress report. I know the public is anxious to know what has transpired.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to commend the member and all the other members of this House who are on this advisory committee because they have done some very important and very valuable work and I know that they are anxious, as well as the public, that information should be made available.

The hon. member referred to the reduction in employees in his own riding, I believe, in Sturgeon Falls, and also asked what are we doing to improve the situation and how can further layoffs be prevented. As the hon. member knows, this mill, an Abitibi mill, that produces hardboard and corrugated products, is an old mill. It was built in 1928—pardon me, 1926—and the company met with the union and the men, I understand, early this year. They had a very good meeting and decisions were taken and as a result, they reduced their staff by about 85 personnel. The mill is now operating with the optimism, I hope that the hon. member has and we all have, that the economy is picking up, and that there will be more housing and more construction. I am optimistic that this very worthwhile industry will pick up.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Power costs are putting them—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Pardon?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Their power costs are putting them in a very bad competitive position.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Their power costs?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Their power costs, and those are directly under the control of Hydro.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes. I will have to speak to my friend, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management who is responsible for Hydro.

The other question was, how did the Ontario Economic Council arrive at conclusions in its report? What part did Mr. Bayly, my deputy, play in the compilation of this report? My deputy, or former deputy, Mr. Bayly—

Mr. Sopha: The minister will not tell him, will he, that I said it appears to me that he is running the whole government?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: He is a good man—a very good man.

Mr. Sopha: It appears to me that he is a very powerful figure. As soon as the minister sits down, I am going to have some comments.

An hon. member: He seems like a very able man, too.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: He is a very ambitious man, but he went one too far with me yesterday. He blew it, you know.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, coming back to this report, in 1964, Mr. Bayly was part of a committee which submitted ideas on the forest industries in Ontario. However, this report came out in 1968. He was not a member of the group that submitted this report. On the first page, it says, "Its recommendations are, however, solely those of the council and of the author, Mr. Ian Butters."

Mr. R. S. Smith: He was on the same committee as Mr. Bayly in 1964.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In 1964. And by the way, this is a report that I requested to be made.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I realize that. The government does not accept the recommendations though.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Like a lot of reports, we do not agree with all the recommendations, but we agree with quite a large number.

Well, Mr. Chairman, these are most of the matters raised. The hon. member for Thunder Bay raised quite a few matters. He is not in his seat right now. I think maybe I will highlight some of these matters, and I think I should reply to the most important ones.

In his remarks last Monday evening, the member presented some figures on the expenditures and revenues of the department and drew the conclusion that in respect of timber, we are running a deficit operation. I think he said something like this, that we are spending \$20 million and we are taking maybe only \$18 million and then we are spending \$13 million for forest protection.

However, Mr. Chairman, I do believe that the charges against the government relate to this \$13 million for forest protection. We provide forest protection not only for timber but for the other recreational resources—fish and wildlife, parks and so forth.

Now, with reference to the revenue—and the hon. member referred to the number of people employed and so forth. In this report here—this is an independent report by a firm of economists on the forest industries, Hedlin Menzies, which came out in 1968—it is very obvious that the \$20 million that is collected in revenues, mainly stumpage, is only part of the total amount of revenues that accrue to the province.

Just briefly, Mr. Chairman, it says here that provincial government revenues that total \$104.3 million are generated by the Ontario forest industry, and to the federal government it is \$184 million. I do not believe that it is logical to say that this country's revenues are the only criterion of the value to the province.

Also, the hon. member mentioned that we are not utilizing the allowable cut to sufficient advantage and again he referred to this report and said that we were using less than half of the allowable cut.

It is quite true that we are not using the full allowable cut, but there are many reasons for it. These are the steps that we are taking to use it. First, in the past two years we have had many negotiations with the pulp and paper companies and other industries to continue to expand their existing mills and bring about new ones. And there has been an increase in the allowable cut.

Also, the integration of wood operations: During the past years there has been substantial integration of wood operations. Companies like Abitibi, Kimberly-Clark and others have built sawmills in Ontario.

Third party agreements: We are encouraging greater use of third party agreements because this allows for greater utilization of certain species that were not being used.

Volume agreements: This is another area. We are recommending greater use of volume

agreements, which makes surplus timber available to other users such as sawmills and veneer operations.

Wood chips: Another factor which has had an effect upon the potential utilization of timber has been the utilization of wood chips. In the past year, three-quarters of a million cords of pulp chips were produced and made available to pulp mills, and without this new development it would have been necessary to cut this much more additional timber in order to supply the pulp mill.

Also there is increased utilization of poplar and white birch. We call these weed species, and there is greater use of these. We are engaged with a study in co-operation with the federal Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce on the greater utilization of these species.

Remote timber: Naturally when mills were built in the 1920s they used the timber closest to them and now they have to go farther away. That is why we must take steps to make it more economical to use remote timber, and I introduced in the last few days an amendment to The Crown Timber Act whereby we will be able to lower stumpage use in remote areas. We are also building more access roads to be an incentive to cut timber in remote areas.

New mills: I believe the hon. member for Nipissing also made reference to it. Ontario has not seen too many new mills, it is quite true. There have been very few new mills in the last 10 or 15 years, except for this year. Ontario-Minnesota are building a \$45 million kraft mill at Fort Frances.

However, even though there have been no new mills built in Ontario, this province has enjoyed a substantial increase in its fourth industry base, and this has come about through the expansion of already existing industries.

Our mills modernized and expanded. For example, I just referred to the one at Fort Frances and also, unlike most other provinces, our pulp and paper industry became sizable early in the mid-Twenties. Most of our mills were built during that time and the industry has grown steadily, mainly through regular increases in plant capacity and the replacement of obsolete mills and equipment. Also what a lot of people are not aware of is that in the Province of Ontario manufacturing is carried out to a much greater degree than in other provinces. For instance, for each cunit of wood produced in Ontario the manufacturing value

amounts to \$107 in Ontario as compared to \$65 in Quebec and \$37 in British Columbia.

Also, the hon. member for Thunder Bay asked what percentage of the Ontario seasonal employment programme was spent in northern Ontario last summer. Well we spent 29 per cent of the funds in northern Ontario, that area lying north of the French and Mattawa Rivers.

The hon. member for Thunder Bay also studied the annual report over the weekend and then made reference, I believe, to page 89 under the wildlife section about the diversion of northern waters. He was very upset on hearing about this.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to put him at ease on that subject and I think this will be interesting to the hon. members.

On August 5, 1965, the Prime Ministers of Ontario and Canada announced that each government would undertake a study of Ontario's northern water resources and related economic developments. This study includes the five main river basins, the Winisk, Severn, Attawapiskat, Albany and the Moose, comprising an area of about 173,000 square miles. The objectives of the study are:

1. To assess for all purposes the quantity and quality of waters draining into James Bay and Hudson Bay.
2. To determine the present and future needs of such waters.
3. To assess the alternative possibilities of the use of these waters locally or elsewhere through diversion.

Since our department is responsible for the management of natural resources—the fish and the game and so forth—we are obliged to make sure that studies of water diversion and power development schemes include their effect on the entire range of land, water and renewable resources values.

These studies include possible ecological changes over large areas and the impact of the scheme on the local and economic well-being of the area resident. The research branch of my department has been given the responsibility of developing approaches to ecological and socio-ecological studies of any water diversion proposal which may emerge from the other studies.

Also, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, the hon. member referred to—again, reading the report—the economics branch appearing not be doing much work. I think it cuts into this, Mr. Chairman, because our economics branch,

which is now known as the resource economics branch of the resource protective products division, is composed of a very able group of persons, very efficient and very dedicated. I know in negotiations we have had, for instance, with the CIP company and other companies, they had nothing but the highest praise for our personnel in that branch.

Even though there were only two reports mentioned in this, there are many, many reports that they are compiling that are not mentioned. For the record, I think I should give this view of their work. These are the activities of the resource economics branch:

1. Resource industry promotions.
2. Economic analysis of department programme.
3. Collection and publication of statistical information.

The annual report for the year ending March 31, 1970, cites only two examples of the work undertaken by this group: the socio-economic study of private landowners and the Christmas tree market study.

However, by far the greater amount of their work since that time has been directed to assisting industry develop through the preparation of numerous reports and feasibility studies and through active negotiation with a number of major companies.

Other branch activities include the analysis of quantity and distribution of pulp chips produced from sawmill residues; the priority ranking of departmental silviculture programmes, and the preparation of the new primary wood users directory which provides factual information relating to all of Ontario's forest industry; and the application of operations research techniques for forestry problems—for instance, the construction of a mathematical model concerning the rationalization of timber licences in northwestern Ontario. That study has been going on for quite some time and, if this was to come about, it would mean a reduction of about \$5 million or more to the industries in northwestern Ontario.

Whatever applies to northwestern Ontario, of course, we could use that information for northeast and for all of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, this group works very closely also with the Ontario Development Corporation and the federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion in the allocation of financial aid programmes to the forest-based industries.

Also, I have a member of my staff who is with The Department of Trade and Development and he acts as a liaison officer. There is,

again I would like to repeat, very valuable work done by this resource economics branch.

On vote 1101:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, within the confines of the main office on Friday morning, which is a singularly appropriate time for philosophic speculation, and in the absence of press—

One wonders where they go. I do not complain myself; the press in Sudbury is very good to me which is where it counts, but they tell me there are some around here who feel like D'Artagnan in the dungeon. Nobody can hear them shouting. Maybe those news editors tell them their work is finished after the question period. I must ask Mr. Dowd someday. The Telegram is always very informative.

I want to raise the question of whether the Deputy Minister of Lands and Forest should be a person other than a professional forester or one who is trained in some aspect of the national sciences?

That proposition, the transfer of Mr. Macnee from Transport to Lands and Forests, raises a serious question in my mind about the policy of the government in respect of the administrative heads of these departments.

I had the advantage, many years ago—more than I care to remember; 20 years ago—of studying under the greatest scholar of Canadian government I suppose that this country ever produced in the person of R. MacGregor Dawson who taught political science at the University of Toronto. He taught the course in Canadian government to over 600 students, of which I was one, and in his later years became the biographer of Mackenzie King, produced two volumes of the biography, and then unfortunately passed away. R. MacGregor Dawson held it to be pre-eminent in the British parliamentary system that the minister of a department not be an expert. He said tragic results usually followed if the minister, the political head of the department, was an expert in the field.

Certainly the history of Canada demonstrates the validity of that proposition. For example, in every case where a military man has been Minister of National Defence, he has been a disaster. One was a mad disaster, who sometimes had to be physically restrained. He said the chief qualities the minister brings to a department—not necessarily in order of priority—are administrative skills,

a keen and questioning mind, a political sense, and perhaps that is the most important, expert advice he can seek and get from those employed within the department. If he is himself an expert, has an accumulation of considerable lore in the field, then he is inclined to substitute his own knowledge and views for that of his colleagues. He is inclined to override their opinions.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Sopha: No; please! I am in full flight.

Mr. Reilly: I was just wondering if he would apply the same theory to the Attorney General's department?

Mr. Sopha: No, no, I am in full flight. We are just having a quiet discussion here.

But on the other hand, in my view, as well as in Professor Dawson's, the chief administrative person, the alter ego, the deputy minister, ought to be an expert in the field. He is the man in constant communication with the minister; he guides and advises him. The minister turns to him for that solace and comfort, that assistance that his harried existence entails.

Now especially in this department which deals with the natural sciences, I am one in the House who is very surprised to see the transfer of Mr. Macnee—not a professional forester, not one trained in science—from The Department of Transport to The Department of Lands and Forests. I would think the minister suffers under very grave disabilities by reason of that.

But let me say, if it needs to be said in parenthesis so I may pass on from it, that I do not know Mr. Macnee, I have nothing to do with him personally. I am sure he is a very fine and competent civil servant, and I am satisfied that, in The Department of Transport where he was, he applied himself with vigour, energy and intelligence.

Now, let us put on the record the comment that Professor Dawson said in his early work, which was a classic of its time, on the question of amateurs, as he called them, as heads of departments. I quote from page 230 of the first edition of his work, which has now passed into three editions;

To place a member of Parliament who is a third- or fourth-rate specialist at the head of a department because he is supposedly an expert, and to give this pretender the control of those who are really masters in their field would not merely be useless, it would be utterly disastrous.

An amateur minister of first-rate capacity is in large measure dependable and safe because he knows he is technically ignorant and he is therefore willing to seek and take the best advice obtainable. The third- or fourth-rate specialist does not adequately comprehend the extent of his own ignorance and is continually setting up his judgement on technical matters against the opinion of his advisers—the latter, it appears, on the grounds of special knowledge, which he really lacks, whereas the former's interference is based on common sense and judgement, which he in all likelihood possesses in uncommon measure. But even a specialist who is first class is likely to make a poor minister.

Practice has given this an unequivocal double confirmation. Not only has the use of the amateur minister been vindicated by long experience, the expert minister, the one who has presumably a profound technical knowledge of his department's work, has proven time and again to be a monumental failure.

That is the end of the quotation.

Professor Dawson, as one who knew him, always spoke and wrote with a very acerbic use of the English language. But the amateur minister, as we have in this department, when he wants expert advice on silviculture, on the biology relating to the vast quantities of game and fish that come under his control, when he wants advice on the management of Crown land and all those things, must turn, I would think, to the next in command to give him that technical information.

Now, really, to narrow it down, to expand on this narrow but important point, I must confess that in the usual frankness that characterizes my word, I am after bigger game. It is bigger game and it is the committee on government productivity that I am after. This transfer from Mr. Macnee, the replacement of the expert, Mr. Bayly, a professional forester by the non-expert, Mr. Macnee, arose out of the first report of the committee on government productivity. It is a fair comment to say that the government has accepted that report in its entirety. They had swallowed it hook, line and sinker.

That, of course, is demonstrated by the remark made by the Prime Minister in this House on April 15, when he announced these changes, including that of Mr. Macnee. He said:

These new recommendations by the committee on government productivity herald a new management style being introduced by this government to match

the new demands placed on it as we deal with the needs and requirements of the people of Ontario in the 1970s.

Ringing words. A delicately inviting new phrase to add to the lexicon: "a new management style." That was adopted, of course, from the report—the second report of the committee on government productivity—I suspect, written by Mr. Bayly. I would be willing to bet a fiver these are his words.

The heading is, "A New Management Style."

All the above suggests is that what is required to cope with the problems of the Seventies is not a perpetuation of today's management habits but the development of a new management style. This new style will demand that government's approach to problems will be universal, rather than narrow or parochial in the departmental or functional sense; that the government will anticipate change rather than merely react to it; that the organization of the government will be flexible rather than rigid; that more productive use will have to be made of human, financial and material resources; that choices between conflicting programmes will have to be made on the basis of information which has probed deeper and been more thoroughly analysed.

I can leave off there. Do the members notice in this new corporate syndrome that there is nothing about people? There is nothing about the people that government, as an institution, has the sacred responsibility of serving. No; style is everything—style and the image. Mr. Trudeau has made it a respectable and inviting thing. It is style. Style is more important than opinion, and this in the age of television.

Let me approach it this way. My remarks are not going to be lengthy. Every so often somebody in the press writes an article on the mandarins. That is a nice word. I think it was Michael Lavoie of the Toronto Daily Star who wrote the last one. It was apparent that Mr. Lavoie did not know what a mandarin was. Quite apparent. The mandarins—and it might be useful to point this out—existed at the time of the beginning of the Christian era, at the end of the T'ang and the Sung dynasties in China, where the emperor was believed to be endowed with supernatural powers, where he was, of course, not only a direct representative of God but had some of God's qualities about him.

At the end of that era, the beginning of the Christian era, there was a return to the Con-

fucian philosophy of six or seven centuries before. The civil service had to be knowledgeable in Confucius' works, as a condition of entry. And out of that by promulgation of a decree in 196 BC, arose the absolute power of the mandarins. The mandarins were something different, quite different from the civil service of today. The mandarins had all the power—there were no ministers—and they were directly responsible to the emperor. They managed the state for him. They were the residuaries of all power.

That has been watered down like a lot of other words, like ghetto—ghetto is never used in its correct sense. But I will not tarry with that. The mandarin is supposed to denote in the common parlance, and by the writers in popular prints, the civil servant who has a very wide influence, a man of great prestige. It was said, for example, during the latter days of Norman Robertson's tenure of the Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, that at a cocktail party when Norman Robertson walked in, he immediately, notwithstanding who was present, became the focus of attention and sycophancy. They gravitated to him.

Now let me just pause to say there is lots of evidence in the history of government in Canada to support the thesis that the mandarins—so-called mandarins of the civil service—destroyed Diefenbaker. There is lots of evidence for that; that they actually destroyed him, and his effectiveness, and hastened his departure from the office of first citizen of Canada. But what is more important from my point of view, is that I have always looked with suspicion on that Ottawa bureaucracy and its mandarin qualities. They are often very difficult to deal with. They are often very abrupt. They are even impolite; I have encountered that.

Over the 12 years that I have been here I have thanked the God almighty that our civil service was not like them. They were entirely different, and we had not created or allowed to develop this individual of immense power—which is an appropriate place to say, what is the function of the bureaucracy?

What is their function? Not a management style. Not the trappings of corporate expertise. Their function is solely to respond to the needs of the people whom they serve.

They are entirely unlike the corporate executive. The corporation is engaged in the maximization of profit. Government is not. The only acceptable qualities of the bureaucrat might be summed up in that famous dictum of Socrates: he listens courteously, he

considers soberly, and he gives the decision according to the very right and justice of the case.

They serve people; they must be responsible to people. And even if people are wrong, if they have a grievance they validly and sincerely hope or feel that government has done them in, then it is the bureaucracy which must salve the wounds. To hell with this business of corporate style.

Now I want Bayly and Dick—may I address them by their last names?—Bayly and Dick, and Brannan, and Ian MacDonald and Reynolds. I want them to know that they are mandarins—that there is one man in the House who will be watching them.

They mean to set up a power centre. I want them to know that Sopha will be watching them, and their moves, because I will be down at the end of the bench, unconvinced that the public interest of Ontario is served by this gobbledygook of management style. I want the civil service of Ontario to demonstrate those fine qualities that it has over the years of their attentiveness and patience.

I like the qualities of Belanger, the regional director for social and family services at Sudbury. I like the human response of Jimmy Band in the many years which he headed up the department of public welfare, his understanding. I like the smooth efficiency of Humphries, the registrar of motor vehicles. I like the patience of Bruce Legge, the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

I am not interested in style. I am not interested in all the smoothly functioning mechanism of how the cabinet considers its work or the notion that style emanates from the top and filters down among the underlings. They use a phrase like that in this book.

Those are the things I believe in. That is the salutary penumbra within which I want to keep the civil service.

Now I think it is quite wrong, by slavish attention to this report by the cabinet, to transfer a man into a specialized department—a highly specialized department; it does not deal with broad policy questions that affect every aspect of life in Ontario.

This department deals with growing trees, a vast and plentiful resource. This department deals with the nurturing of fish and wildlife. It deals with the mechanics of the alienation of Crown lands. I have singled out these areas. It is a field singularly suited to specialized knowledge.

If I were at the head of the department, I would want to be able to turn to an expert in these aspects of the science; have him in the next room at the end of the telephone, a man whom I liked and trusted. I am speaking hypothetically—when I was reading a report that emanated from Fort Severn, from the lower reaches of the Winisk River, if there were some technical terms that I did not understand, I would want to be able to turn to my trusted deputy to fill in the gaps of my information. That is what he is for, for that type of advice.

I would like, after I made a speech, perhaps at Armstrong, and I said something that I was not entirely sure of its validity, that when I returned on Monday morning to my office, I would be able to check with the deputy and say, "Will it work from a practical and technical point of view? Is it feasible?" Mr. Bayly may say so—he is in the area of sciences. Mr. Macnee would not. He would not know, from the technical point of view.

He would have to ask Mr. Atcheson or he would have to ask Mr. Herridge, George McCormack, Jim Lockwood, any number of other people. Well, why? Why that extra step? Is that smooth functioning of the department? Hardly. But most of all I selected this focus to get off my chest what I wanted to say. I want the mandarins to know in this public place that I will be watching with interest.

I have seen that budget of the Prime Minister's office increase—what is it, by 68 per cent—68 per cent this year as a result of this report and at the end of it—I am going to sit down—but at the end of it there is much in it that makes me suspicious. At the end of the report—be it that he is the author—these others smugly say that all of the recommendations, six in number that were made in the first report, were accepted. They got them. They really gave it to them, hook, line and sinker, and they went for it.

As we expect, when there is a change in the ministry around here, this place, I am going to try to persuade the new leader of the government—it is lucky he is not here—for all those reasons that I have stated this morning—and they are philosophic reasons—for all those reasons I am going to say to the head of the government, let us tell Bayly and Reynolds and Brannan and MacDonald and Dick that they are not running the government of Ontario because nobody elected them. We were elected, we have the confidence of the people.

Ultimately, finally and in accordance with the genius of the British parliamentary system it is we who have to respond to what the people tell us, and if we do not respond then we are the ones who ought to suffer. Let us start our ministry off with that overriding, all-consuming consciousness of what government, as the servant of the people, responsive to its needs. If you see it in that focus, it has not anything to do with new management style.

I thank the House for its patience. I do not expect a reply; this was my polemic.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a few questions in regard to the statement he made earlier this morning. But first I would like him to outline to the Legislature what the redefined goals of the department are. He mentioned in his opening remarks that there has been a thorough review of the goals and objectives, that is, of the department, but he does not go on to redefine what the goals and objectives are, except in a broad statement in regard to the social and economic benefits which The Department of Lands and Forests can provide for the publicly owned land, waters and so forth. But after a two-year study surely there must be some specific goals that can be outlined in regard to that broad statement.

He also goes on to state that they are going to have or they wish to have, the participation of people in the, I believe he indicates, decision-making process of the department. I find this rather difficult to understand when he appoints advisory committees. Then, this morning, I believe, he said that the reports of the advisory committees of the general public will not be made public, but will only be an input into the development of programmes by the department itself. I think we are going to have public participation, we have to do as the minister says and provide the results of the studies, and so forth, to them. I do think they have a right to know, particularly in regard to the reports that are forwarded to the minister on behalf of the public through the advisory committees.

Perhaps he could comment on those two questions.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, the reorganization took place on April 1. Prior to that, we had 10 branches. Now we have four main divisions—resource products division, land management division, outdoor recreation divi-

sion and finance and administration division. This will make for a much more efficient operation. The advantages are that there will be a decentralization also of power and there will be more authority given to field representatives. I think the hon. member and all members agree with me that the people in the field are on site, They are knowledgeable and often there are many decisions they can make without having to refer to headquarters. I am not speaking about major policy decisions, but decisions that can be made in the field.

So there are many advantages in this new reorganization programme. I have a four- or five-page report on all the advantages I can send to the hon. member. I would pleased to send it to him if he wishes that.

Mr. R. S. Smith: That does not really deal with my question. I want to know what the goals and objectives are. The minister is talking perhaps partly about what the member for Sudbury was indicating this morning, that management philosophy should be based on the goals and objectives, not the other way around. I would like the minister to outline the two-year study produced in regard to goals and objectives of the department.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The objectives of reorganization are to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the department in meeting its objectives of public service. This can be facilitated by: 1. A decentralization of authority and responsibility, for example, as I just mentioned, decision-making in the field. 2. An improvement in planning to provide better short- and long-range allocation of resources, land, labour and capital.

Head office will increasingly concern itself with policy and strategic planning, development of legislation, policies and procedures in the obtaining of funds. It will become less concerned with operational management.

The regional responsibilities will include strategic and tactical planning, decision-making with respect to allocation of funds, and output targets to the districts. Districts will be responsible for tactical and operational planning in operations management. Much operational routine will be processed directly from districts to branches. Existing legislation and policies may inhibit decentralization and, where this is found to be the case, revisions will be recommended.

The necessary communications and information systems will be developed. Funds will be allocated to the region at the programme, sub-programme, and activity levels. Responsibility will be commensurate with funds

allocated. The field organization through time will become two-tiered. There will be more but smaller districts. The inherent capability of the field staff to meet increased responsibilities arising from decentralization is acknowledged. It is likewise acknowledged that there will be a need for staff development and training and staff relocation. Also there will be a more effective system of performance evaluation based on the achievement of output targets, and these will be developed. Within the system, head office will evaluate regions, and regions will evaluate districts or work units. Every attempt will be made to develop ideal working conditions. These will include good communications and encouragement of innovations in the interest of achieving the goals of both the department and the individual.

As for functional responsibilities, the major changes in functions of head office will be gradual, entailing a delegation of some responsibilities to the field and an assumption of a gradual role in strategic planning. Some functions will remain at head office because it is more efficient to keep them there; for example, like regular staff payrolls. Others will be kept there because of government decisions beyond our control; for example, payment of invoices. Finally, there are the requirements for experts in a department, such as lawyers, economists, nursery soil experts and so forth.

Regional functions will be greatly increased. Final decisions as to the extent of responsibility will have to be worked out in detail in co-operation with head office, branches and regional directors who must have the staff capabilities to assume their responsibilities. Some specific things which could become field responsibilities include nurseries, timber licences up to a given value or term, co-ordination and support of district fire control organizations and so forth.

Changes in district responsibilities are taking place all the time. Reorganization will not necessarily bring great changes, but it should increase the capability to make changes as required. As the planning programming budgeting system becomes more firmly established, there will be changes in emphasis in district work and responsibilities. Reorganization will facilitate this process for the reasons outlined and to provide better service to the general public. Our main aim and goal is to manage the natural resources and to provide more efficient, better service to the public who want this. And I am very optimistic that this will work out.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Basically, though, what the minister is talking about in that statement are the changes in the management structure to effect the goals and objectives. But he still has not given us a full statement of what the goals and the objectives of the department are. In other words, what does he want to get through the changes in his philosophy of management? This is what I am trying to get at. If they had a two-year study, they must have come up with some goals and objectives for the department as a service to the people of the province. The minister is talking about reaching the goals and objectives, but what are they as far as he is concerned?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, that is right. For instance, in the districts of Sudbury and Nipissing we will have three main divisions—or whatever the right word is—outdoor recreation, resource management and land management; of course, land includes land and water. There will be closer and better integration; before, as I mentioned, we had 10 times this number. For instance now, under outdoor recreation, the parks branch and the fish and wildlife branch come under outdoor recreation; commercial fishing now comes under resource products. So this reorganization should work for the better management of our resources. Today—I do not need to tell the member; he knows—outdoor recreation is becoming more and more important. We are placing more emphasis on outdoor recreation by having a separate division which will encompass these other branches.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I understand that. I guess we cannot get to what the minister's real objectives and goals are. The minister is talking about management and I am talking about what the real objectives and goals are in regard to what he wants to do for the people in the province and the resources he wants to regulate.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will refer to the annual report and if he will read the foreword on page 3, this outlines the goals and objectives—resources, economic development, outdoor recreation.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Okay. I will read that and I will accept that is what it is until I read it. But if the government did a two-year study, I am sure the minister must be aware of what the goals and objectives are and not the management philosophy or rearrangement that is going to be used to obtain those goals

and objectives. That is what the minister's first statement, the other night, did not include. It just alluded to that.

In regard to the rearrangement of the management process, will this set up another level? Am I to understand that another level will be set up between the district offices and the regional offices? Is there going to be another level in there?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: At the management level we previously had 10 branches with a chief at the head of each branch and three regional directors. They all reported to the deputy minister. Now, there will be only four executive directors, four divisions. There are three regional directors, in northwestern Ontario, northeastern and southern Ontario. So it will make for a smaller group.

As far as the districts are concerned there is reorganization there, but there are not that many changes. As mentioned in my remarks also, as time goes on we may have smaller districts again in order to provide better service to the people.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Would we expect then that the actual power of decision of regional officers will expand under this programme?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, that is right. The regional officers and the district officers will have more authority.

Mr. R. S. Smith: But there will not be any level between the district offices and the regional offices? There is no new level in there, although there likely will be more people under these three areas within the regional offices?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have 21 districts. The district foresters report to the regional directors—in the member's area, northeastern Ontario, there might be six or seven districts and they report to Mr. Lockwood who is the regional director. He is a member of the management committee of four executive directors and three regional directors.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I see. So his office—actually the Sudbury regional office—will be expanded in complement because of this change?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Quite likely, yes.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Quite likely, maybe not right away but it will be? Would this indicate that there will be a movement of people to that level from the administrative branches here in Queen's Park? Would the minister

say that there will be a movement that way and not from the district offices up into the regional offices?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I rather think it will be both ways.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Both ways? Depending on the need for people and who the minister has available.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Fine, okay. I would like to go back, Mr. Chairman, to a couple of remarks the minister made earlier this morning in regard to the leasing of Crown land.

Can the minister tell me definitely when he will have a method of lease available so that those people who have now been waiting perhaps a year for purchases of Crown lands will be allowed to lease those properties? There are some people, I think, who had been told by the district office that land in specific areas, or specific lots even, would be available to them this spring on a purchase basis.

Now I agree, as the minister knows, with the policy that he has taken in regard to leases, but on the other hand I think there is a responsibility to provide those people with that alternative now and not have them wait and miss a whole year.

Hon. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, first may I say that people have not been waiting a whole year. It was only on March 30, I believe, when the House opened in the Throne Speech that we announced that Crown lands for cottage lot purposes from henceforth would be leased instead of sold.

Now we have our subdivisions that have been planned. We have subdivisions being planned for a number of years and those subdivisions will be put up for lease. Those lots will be put up for lease sometime in the very near future. So the procedures on leasing have been arrived at. The regulations have to be amended, but I would hope that in a matter of a very few weeks our lots will be up for lease. So I do not anticipate any delays.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I know people have not been waiting to lease for a year, but they have been waiting to purchase on the subdivisions that were set up last year and that were ready to go for sale this spring. They have been waiting to purchase those lots for a year, or for maybe a little less than a year,

maybe early last summer, when the department let them know what was going to be available, but now they have got to wait until the government develops the policy under which it is going to lease them the land. So it is imperative that that policy come up as quickly as possible, so that these people can be given the opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: But, we have really expedited this and, again, I would like to say—today is what, May 7?—that I would hope to have that by the end of this month.

Mr. R. S. Smith: There was another question with regard to the sale of private lands. The minister indicates that this is not his responsibility at all, and it is the responsibility of government as a whole. But the minister is part of government as a whole and the recreational lands in the province are within his responsibility, whether they be private or Crown. His responsibility is direct with regard to Crown lands, but he certainly must have a major interest in the development of private recreational lands across the province too. At least, I should hope that this is a part of the aims and objectives of the department, that these would be included in it. So the minister does have a direct—maybe not a responsibility as yet—but an interest which should direct him toward a responsibility with regard to the sale of private recreational lands in the area, in the province.

What I asked the minister in my opening remarks is if he would do a study to find out a method by which the control of the sale of private recreational lands could be established by the provincial government. I think if this study is going to emanate from anywhere, it has to emanate from his department, because his is the most closely associated department with the recreational lands in the government, whether they be private or Crown.

If the minister wants to say that he does not agree with any type of control on the sale of private lands, that is another question. But to evade it, by saying that it is not the responsibility of his department, is evading. I would think, part of the responsibility of his department with regard to recreational lands in total in the whole province, even though the policy he has now established will control 15 per cent of the private cottage lot sales in the province—and I agree with this. But there is the other large area where now we are certainly going to find the non-Canadian citizen very active in purchasing recreational lands. Since he has closed off this 15 per cent, I am sure his interest will

move quickly to the private sales. I believe, as I think many other people in this province do, that, if it is necessary for government to control sales to non-Canadian citizens at the Crown level, it is also necessary to establish some type of control in the private sector in regard to those sales.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, again I do not agree that we, as a government should, if we are interested in outdoor recreation, have agreements with the private landowners for using their lands for public hunting in Ancaster township and also for possible easements for using the stream. But, I do not see the value of looking into the purchasing of private land.

Mr. R. S. Smith: As for private lands, what we are doing now—and I hope the minister is aware of it—is that since 1962 we have purchased 449,397 acres of land with over 80 miles on the Great Lakes frontage. These are lands that have been purchased mainly for recreational purposes, for parks, beaches, public access points, public hunting and public fishing. We are doing this continually. We are acquiring more and more private lands for the use of the public. Again I fail to see, Mr. Chairman, why we, as the government, should not try to make a study to look into the purchasing of private lands.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Is the member referring to lands that come up for taxes, for instance?

Mr. R. S. Smith: I refer to the total land sales in the recreational use areas of the province and the control of those sales to eliminate sales to non-Canadian citizens.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Does the member realize what that could mean? Does he realize the administration costs that this would entail?

Mr. R. S. Smith: I do not think the administrative costs would be prohibitive at all. It is a matter of regulation or of a new Act.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: To interfere with the sale of private lands?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Okay. Failing the minister's desire to do that, does he feel that the \$20 million programme—what was it the Treasurer called it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Oh! The \$20 million—

Mr. R. S. Smith: Land Acquisition Corporation—is that not what it was called? Does the minister feel that the Land Acquisition Corporation should be active in the purchase of recreational lands on direction from his department? Does he feel that they should have first right of refusal on private sales of recreational lands of a large area? Does he feel, or would he recommend that policy be established along with legislation to give that corporation first right of refusal on those sales? This is a degree of control but not the same.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This Ontario Land Acquisition Corporation that the member refers to was announced in the Throne Speech and in the budget. This comes under the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough). I do not know the details. I do not believe that this has been made known yet, but our department hopes that funds will be available under that programme for the acquisition of land for recreational purposes.

I believe that fund will be a sort of a large umbrella. It will acquire land for maybe housing projects and so forth. But I do hope, and I would think so, that it would also include recreational land.

Mr. R. S. Smith: On private sales of recreation lands?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: On private sales of recreation lands that are privately owned? Well, this is a matter that we could look into, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. S. Smith: That would be the watered-down policy of my first suggestion.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Item number—

Mr. R. S. Smith: Are you going to do it item by item?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be preferable if we could go—

Mr. Chairman: Item by item?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —vote by vote.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else on vote 1101? The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak only on the one portion of vote 1101, and that is to do with the junior forest ranger programme. There is no use expounding on the programme itself at all, Mr. Chairman. Every-

one knows about the programme. My concern is that the programme is now being used to its maximum. In other words—not the programme, but the facilities are not being used to their maximum.

I can recall last year making mention to the minister that the facilities for the programme should be used during the months of May, June and also September. And today, with the large numbers of unemployed youth, I think we had just an ideal setup of trying to accommodate youth to a greater degree than we are today.

We have this department being involved in a SWEEP programme in conjunction with The Department of Energy and Resources Management, if I am not mistaken. However, we still have junior forest ranger facilities that could be put to greater use. Does the minister not think that they should be used during the months of May, June and September?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the hon. member's suggestion, but we are limited to the amount of money that is budgeted for this purpose. We are fortunate this year in that we had an increased allowance. This year we will be employing 2,034 boys; last year it was about 1,860. So we are employing more junior rangers. But we are limited to the amount of money available. We are also limited to the facilities—our tree planting programme is done, of course, at this time of the year in May and June; a lot of the buildings that are used for the junior rangers are the same buildings that are used by our personnel and other people we employ for the tree planting and other programmes, which come about in May and June. But there is no doubt that if we had more funds available, we could employ students in those months of May and June rather than only in July and August. The limitations are there on budget and physical facilities.

Mr. B. Newman: I can understand the minister's comments. But this being such an unusual year, a year which we hope we will never have to witness again, where there are such large numbers of students unemployed—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Not now, Mr. Chairman, but as time goes on—

Mr. B. Newman: It will be worse?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, our projection for junior rangers is that in the next 10 years there will be an increase for the demand and then, after 10 years, a sort of a plateau where it will level off.

Mr. B. Newman: And does the minister intend to accelerate his programme over the next period of time to accommodate the increased demand and to provide job opportunities to the 17-year-olds?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just mentioned that we had increased our junior programme this year by about 170 positions.

Mr. B. Newman: Let us say 200 as a round figure.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Okay, 200. Also we are employing close to 1,000 under the SWEEP programme. Totally last year, with the junior rangers and with others under 18 in that group, we employed about 3,500 or 3,600. This year, it will be about 5,000. So we have increased it substantially over last year.

Mr. B. Newman: I am not being critical of the minister's programme, because I heartily endorse the programme. My whole thought is to make more programmes available for our school-attending youths and if we do not, the minister knows what the youths are going to think. They will immediately assume that this style of government cannot take care of the needs, and as a result their attentions will turn to a different "ism." If that is the intention of this government, then it is following the right path.

The minister mentioned that he has had roughly a 10 per cent increase in the junior forest ranger programme. My thought is not a 10 per cent increase, but a 100 per cent increase if possible. I think the minister should have clenched his teeth a little harder with Treasury Board to be able to accommodate these junior forest rangers.

May I suggest to the minister at this time too, Mr. Chairman, that where possible he use a community that has a community college and perhaps use the facilities of that college for the applications, so students could apply through the college for the junior forest ranger programme or the SWEEP programme. As it is today, the students are a little lost as to where to apply for employment with the Ontario government. There seems to be no central agency to which they can go. They can write to the minister's department and they are always—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Or the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: I am not being critical. They are always being taken care of very well, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate it very much, as do the students. But I think it would make it a little easier if they had some central location in my area especially, Essex county, where they could very easily go to the Holiday Beach facilities there. Likewise, as has been suggested, they could use the community college, St. Clair College, in the area. I know the students would like to show concern and interest and this might be one avenue by which the minister could show to them that he likewise is interested in them.

On the SWEEP programme, Mr. Chairman, I understand it is only for those over 17 years of age, that is, 18 and over. Does the minister consider any priority basis for those who may have taken the junior forest ranger programme the previous year by giving them preference in a SWEEP programme? Was that considered, or does he think, that an individual having had one chance with The Department of Lands and Forests, the opportunity then should be given to someone else?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, the member has made some very good suggestions. I think with reference to SWEEP that, if this programme were to be carried on another year, we could maybe make it have central locations where they could apply and make it a little easier.

Whether we give preference to those who were junior rangers last year for employment in the SWEEP programme—I believe there are some—I am not aware whether we give preference, and I do not know whether we should give preference either.

Mr. B. Newman: I am not necessarily asking for the preferential treatment for these youngsters, but I know they enjoy the junior forest range programme so much that they would like to continue. They know that they have had that once-in-a-lifetime experience at 17, and they want to make it twice in a lifetime. Now that the government has set up a SWEEP programme, I have been approached by quite a few as to how do they get in on it. There is no real information available. They apply to the minister's department for the SWEEP programme. Then he has the—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. B. Newman: Or Energy and Resources Management. Unfortunately, Energy and Resources Management is of no assistance to individuals from Essex county wishing to get

in on the SWEEP programme. We do not have a conservation authority in Essex county, so they cannot get in through Energy and Resources Management. As a result, I would hope that they could get in through the minister's programme. Can they?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. B. Newman: And will the individuals with the SWEEP programme from Essex county be located in Essex county?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Not necessarily.

Mr. B. Newman: Is it not a live-at-home programme? Is it a live-in programme?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: My understanding of SWEEP is that they could be hired, say in North Bay, and that they would find and pay for their own accommodation. It is not like a junior ranger programme whereby we supply the camps and they are accommodated as well as given meals.

Mr. B. Newman: Then in the SWEEP programme, in the case of the individual who obtains employment by means of this programme, are additional moneys paid to him for accommodations?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I do not believe so. I believe that they pay their own room and board and there is no special provision. But we do try, though, to provide employment to the student as close to his home as possible. There would be quite a number, I would hope, who would be able to live at home, but others do not live at home and therefore, they have to obtain accommodation and they have to pay for it.

Mr. B. Newman: May I make two suggestions to the minister then that he use the provincial parks that he does have—I am going to be parochial and refer to Essex county—he has the Holiday Beach there—that he use the SWEEP programme in conjunction with the park, so that students, or whoever gets into the SWEEP programme, can live in the city, live at home, work in the SWEEP programme and be able to commute on a regular basis. If they wish to camp at the beach or at the site on which they are going to work that is all well and good. I thought it would be good to have the programme associated with the park itself. There is enough work to do around there.

Then the second suggestion is that possibly this programme in the core cities or in the major cities could be associated directly with

the department of parks. Let the youth be hired by the minister's department but be assigned to the parks commissioner and his staff to do the type of work that he recommends that they be doing in the community, but be under the supervision of the department of parks and recreation.

I know in my own community, Harry Brumpton who happens to be the parks commissioner, would be more than pleased to have a pilot SWEEP group so that he could maybe evaluate the programme for you.

I would hope that the minister would seriously consider that, even at this late date. Assign some students to him, see how they work with the parks department and if it is workable the programme could then be expanded to accommodate unemployed school-attending youth.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We would be pleased, Mr. Chairman, to look into the suggestion of the hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1101. The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I want to get back to a question I asked the minister a while ago in regard to the Algonquin Park advisory committee report which he discussed earlier this morning. I asked you later on in regard to the aims and goals of your department and I also asked about making public the advisory committee's report to you.

We got away from that by some circuitous route, but perhaps the minister could explain to me if the statement of this morning means that the reports of any advisory committees to the minister will not be made public, that they will be used just as interdepartmental reports and will be used only to formulate the policy of the government?

There is no intention of making this report public at all and there is no intention of making the report of the Quetico advisory committee public? Is this the intention of the hon. minister and the government.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No. Specifically with the Algonquin advisory committee report, as I mentioned, I do not see the value in making this report public now. This report was only recently sent to me. It is a policy report, and it has not been looked into by my colleagues. If I were to make this public, a lot of the people who would be reading it would be thinking that this is government policy.

Mr. R. S. Smith: No, no, that is not true.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I know it is not true, but they would think that it is government policy. They think a lot of things printed in the press are government policy.

Mr. R. S. Smith: You never do anything that can be misconstrued as anything else. You never do anything like that. But you would be doing nothing, really.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I do believe that there should be an interim progress report, and I will do my best to see that this is made public in the not too distant future.

Mr. R. S. Smith: You said an interim progress report?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. R. S. Smith: By that you do not mean the report of the advisory committee?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No. It would probably incorporate a lot of the recommendations. This report of the advisory committee is to the government.

Mr. R. S. Smith: But it is not an interdepartmental report. You talk in your opening remarks about participation of people, and you want people to participate but you do not want them to do it publicly. Is this your concept of participation? There is no public discussion on what the findings are of a committee such as the advisory committee?

I thought when the committee was first formed that it was representative of the various different interest groups within Algonquin Park—and I think that this was the minister's statement at the time—and it becomes pretty obvious over the year and a half or 20 months that the committee has sat that they were coming to the point, finally, where they could send a report which would be made public and which the interest groups that they represent would be able to look at, and evaluate and then tell the government what they thought about the advisory committee's report. This was the purpose of it.

But if it is going to be treated as another interdepartmental report that is only for the minister's purpose, then I believe firstly that the members of the Legislature have no place on that committee, because they are elected people who have a responsibility to report facts back to the public as to what they recommend through the minister to the committee.

I would suggest that if this is going to be the case there is no place on the committee for

members of the Legislature, and for my own purposes if that is going to be the case I am going to have to resign from the committee. And when I do that I take with me anything that happened in there, and as I do not believe it is an interdepartmental report I do not believe there are any constraints on me as to what the report to you has indicated.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I do not know whether the minister wants to reply immediately, but surely his statement after a number of other considerations that he would not make the report public is one which cannot be accepted. To begin with, I think his reasons that it might be misconstrued as government policy are ridiculous. The report would obviously be the sort of development that all of the people concerned with the Algonquin multiple use controversy would have great interest in indeed, and I am sure all of those people would be quite capable of reading the title of the report that it was from the advisory committee. I think that even, politically, the minister makes a great error when he does not make public the recommendations from the committee and the results of their investigations. The only type of thing which could with any justification be kept secret would be a report from his own employees who would have gone into the area to look into certain matters which would be for the benefit of the minister and his chief advisers in reaching a policy decision.

I felt at the time that the advisory committee was constituted that it was simply a means of taking off the minister himself, the pressure which was coming on from a number of groups within the community that sincerely felt and vociferously said that government policy was inadequate and, in fact, was going to destroy this park, which is a proud and most valuable heritage in this province.

The hon. member for Nipissing has indicated he is not prepared to accept the minister's decision that it will not be made public, if for no other reason than that he, as a member of the Legislature, was a part of the committee. Obviously, he has public responsibilities which he must judge independently from the minister's. I do not think this is any idle threat and I can say to the minister that there has been no consultation between the two of us on this. I think he is absolutely correct in what he has said, that the minister is making a serious error, an error in every one of the categories, as I mentioned, the political one, which is not terribly important,

except that I believe that this is what is motivating him when he says he is afraid it will be misconstrued as government policy.

I think it is evident that government policy is in limbo until the minister makes a decision that is backed up by his colleagues in the cabinet council. I believe that it is up to him to show the community that he is prepared to involve the special interests within the community, and as many of those without special interests as he possibly can, in seeking the sort of background advice and position from which eventually government policy will be formed.

He knows, and we all know, that he and his cabinet colleagues will be ultimately responsible for the policy which is imposed. That is the way the responsible system works, and that is when, of course, he has got to carry his personal load as minister. But, surely, if there is any usefulness in having this advisory committee undertake these many months of work, or whatever they have been doing, there has been no indication, publicly, what they have really been doing.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They have been doing a lot.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, a lot of sitting around discussing these matters. Yes, I am sure it has all been very useful. But there is no way of telling, until we see the report itself. I can say to the minister, Mr. Chairman, that if he is not prepared to make that report public, I, as leader of the Liberal Party, will personally back the hon. member for Nipissing in his statement that he will not be able to continue on the committee and that he will not be responsible for the retention in secrecy of anything that went on in it. Why should he be?

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): There is no way of pleasing the hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, in listening to this debate and hearing the statements of the minister, it is certainly incredible and inadmissible that he should consider putting things under wraps. Too often you have done that in this government. The things that the government finds a little unpalatable are immediately suppressed. We over here find that to be very distasteful and a very undemocratic method of procedure, smacking of aristocracy, which you are al-

ways verging toward, even with respect to those committees which you have internal control over, the committees with non-elected representatives appointed through your governmental auspices, and this is done all the time, pigeon-holed and suppressed.

It is a form of inverted censorship, using public moneys against the interests of the public because the thing might happen to be a little detrimental here and there to yourself. You presume to say that the mind of the people of Ontario is so naive, that they are so little politically conscious, that they cannot discriminate between what is government policy and what are recommendations made to a government.

With a diversity of interest being represented on the committee, what other pretext or grounds are you alleging then as to why this particular report ought not to be made public? We in this party with our representatives would, I am certain, take the same stance as is taken.

We do not propose to have hard work go into the thinking and drawing up of recommendations to this ministry, time taken up of an elected official who represents a partisan interest even though he may transcend it in terms of seeking to reach some kind of communal goal, and then have that squelched, siphoned off, put aside and dismissed.

We will not permit that type of suppression as long as we sit on that type of committee. We think it wrong in principle, we think that you were ill-advised and should reconsider your whole position touching this particular committee and lo, a plethora of others.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Well I take it, Mr. Chairman, the minister being a man of eminent good sense, has just reconsidered his position and would be pleased at an appropriate time to make the committee report public?

It is, he will concede, a ludicrous proposition. We will call a press conference and release it if you will not, so you might as well release it. It is a public document in the sense that the hon. members of the Legislature had access to it; both the Algonquin committee and the Quetico committee. We shall not abuse its contents. You need not be concerned with that. We are not going to insist that it is government policy. You will make the policy.

You have obviously been making the policy about Quetico as you go along and you have yet to come to a final decision, and I think

the whole world knows that now. Certainly the minister knows that he has not arrived at a final decision. He has reminded us of it often enough.

But in that amiable sense of judicious fair play which runs through everything the minister does, I suggest that we release the report collectively as soon as it comes out and have it as a basis for debate, and not get into this kind of hassle unnecessarily. Because it will out, there is no way of containing this report. So let us not spend much time discussing it.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1101. The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The minister is not going to make any further comments in regard to the report?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, this comes under the last vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The lands vote?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The last vote.

Mr. Nixon: It comes under the first vote too. It is a matter of policy.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is asking for the weekend to reconsider his position.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This is going to make the members more at ease. First, I will say to them that they probably will be a little disappointed that this report—it is a good report but there is no dynamite in it.

Mr. R. S. Smith: No. That is right, but nobody said that.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I naturally think, subject to the consent of my colleagues on this matter, I would be prepared to release that report along with a progress report giving the whole progress report at some later date, subject of course, to the consent of my colleagues.

Mr. R. S. Smith: That is fine, but they have not seen this report.

Mr. Nixon: That is good. You are the minister. What have they got to do with it? Why does the minister not fix it up and do it himself? He does not have to worry about those fellows.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: What have they got to do with it? This is government policy. The Leader of the Opposition should know that.

Mr. Nixon: And you are the minister. I think you forget about that at times. They do not consult you too often, do they?

Mr. Lewis: The minister will never be stronger than he is now. Why does he not consult those who are here and make his decision?

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. member for Nipissing wish to ask a question?

Mr. R. S. Smith: The minister can ask the member sitting behind him. He is an expert.

An hon. member: He is a good man.

Mr. Nixon: What is the Hydro vice-chairman talking about anyway when he says the government will never be satisfied?

Mr. Boyer: The hon. member for Nipissing is trying to make a big issue out of this innocuous little report.

Mr. Nixon: Out of what?

Mr. Boyer: He is trying to make an issue out of this innocuous little report.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1101?

Mr. R. S. Smith: We will ignore the member just as they do down at Hydro.

Mr. Boyer: I notice the hon. member writes me letters from time to time.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the third part of of vote 1101, I would like to ask the minister—

Mr. Lewis: If I were the hon. member I would resign.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): That is a hobby of the member's.

An hon. member: The member would not give up that \$10,000 so easily.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): The member is trying to save them embarrassment.

Mr. R. S. Smith: There is an increase of 50 per cent of the cost of legal services this year. We went over the agricultural estimates the other night and there were similar increases there. Are these increases to be the lawyers who are on the staff of the province above the five per cent guideline that has been set by the Treasurer?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, the legal services were increased by a total of \$80,100.

Salaries and employee benefits increased \$30,700; additional workload expanded activities, \$12,000; and replacement of equipment and binding of patent records, \$37,400.

Mr. R. S. Smith: How many lawyers are employed in the legal services branch?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Five, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Five. And the increase in salaries was \$30,000?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The total staff in the legal office is 18 persons.

Mr. R. S. Smith: What were the increases for the legal staff?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The legal people?

Mr. R. S. Smith: The lawyers.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The lawyers?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Right.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The hon. member is not suggesting that they should not be included?

Mr. Nixon: The member is asking how much are they making.

Mr. R. S. Smith: All right. I am asking what is the increase in their salaries?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In their salaries?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Is it above the guidelines that the Treasurer set for everybody else in the civil service or is it the same?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I believe they come under the civil service classification and when increases were made last October, they were included.

Mr. R. S. Smith: But the minister must be—

Mr. Nixon: Tell the members what they were.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The amount?

Mr. Nixon: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We would be pleased to give that information to the hon. member. To be very frank, our very able legal people are not being paid any more than other departments.

Mr. Nixon: We just want to compare it with the five per cent ceiling.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1101?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Just one more question on the SWEEP programme. Could the minister describe what types of programmes these are? At the district levels I do not think they have been made aware yet of the type of programme each district will be allowed to run, and since it is only a couple of weeks away to the time when they will be starting, perhaps they should be told what type of programmes will be approved. How many people will be allotted to each district?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This SWEEP programme came about through the environmental enhancement programme and the work to be performed will be such as timber improvement, clearing and pruning of trees, tree plantation, tree nursery feeding, road dusting, environmental clearing, nature trail construction, developing snowmobile trails and canoe routes, land inventory for lake management plans, lake level surveys, forest fire hazard reduction, maintenance of ground and buildings, pest control, field census, water samplings, inventory of fish and game population and game habitat improvement.

Mr. R. S. Smith: How many districts have submitted programmes for approval, or is this the way it is being done?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: How many districts? I would think all 21 of our districts will be included in this programme.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Have they all submitted programmes for approval?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. R. S. Smith: And how many people—there will be a total of 1,000, did you say?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: About 1,000, yes.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Will this 1,000 be spread over part of the province in regard to distribution, because the rest of the SWEEP programme under Energy and Resources is only going to apply to the southern part of the province?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This will apply to all parts of the province, and northern Ontario of course will be receiving a large part of it because a lot of the tree planting and portage clearing is to be done in the north.

Mr. R. S. Smith: There will be a balance between this and the other SWEEP programme under Energy and Resources to provide the same opportunities in each part of the province?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 1101 carry?

Mr. Lewis: Just before you carry it, a question more than a comment: If one wants to raise the question of access to beaches, is that best confined to the recreation vote or should it be under legal services?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, this would be under vote 1102, the next vote.

Mr. Lewis: On 1102, fine.

Vote 1101 agreed to.

On vote 1102:

Mr. Chairman: Page 190. This is probably better discussed by items within the vote, so we will deal with item 1. Is there anything under programme administration? Item 1, vote 1102, carried? Carried.

Item 2, forest protection. Anything under forest protection? The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I just have a couple of short questions: This includes fire protection, and the next part of the vote is the extra budget. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Does forest protection include the silvicultural activities of the department?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, silviculture, Mr. Chairman, I believe would come under timber.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Under the fourth vote then, eh?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right, item 4.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, under this vote, does this cover protection of—for example, we hear from time to time that the maple tree is developing a disease similar to the elm tree? Is this the vote in which one discusses this?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Forest protection. It should come under forest protection.

Mr. Spence: It has been brought to my attention quite a number of times in different parts of the province that further disease is striking the maple tree. Could the minister enlighten me if this is the case or has he been approached by some people who are concerned about it, that the maple tree is going

to be wiped out the same as the elm trees across the province?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This is just a temporary problem. It is not like the dutch elm disease which is very serious and for which up until now there has been no known cure, but the maple one is being looked into and we hope to have it removed.

Mr. Spence: Does the minister's department spray them, where people find this disease taking place?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am advised, yes. Spraying is one of the methods and we are doing this now.

Mr. Spence: In case there are complaints from the different parts, contact the minister's office; is this it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Whatever is the easier, Mr. Chairman, either my office or the local district office.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further under item 2? The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Yes; if the famous elm disease syndrome comes under this forest protection branch, Mr. Chairman, could the minister tell the House how many elms have been cut down, how many remain to be saved, and what is the extent of elm tree disease dispersion across the Province of Ontario? What, in effect, has been the value of the special government programmes to provide temporary employment in cutting down diseased elms? Can we have some specifics about this problem and programme?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, it is a programme that will have to be carried on over a number of years. What was done this winter under the seasonal employment programme was very helpful in removing dead elm on Highways 400 and 401.

The announcement by my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), about a month ago that farmers will be eligible for a \$5 grant for removal of elm trees on their property, I believe, is a step in the right direction. Also we have many municipalities and others which have written to us that they would like to see a programme implemented. We hope to have a programme implemented whereby grants would be given to municipalities on a sharing basis for the removal of dead elm. This material has been forwarded.

We have a lot of information on the areas where we could commence doing this. I would say that the main obstacle—if I may use those words—is the question of getting the funds available. It is a very desirable project and I hope that this programme could be implemented this year. With the way unemployment could be this fall, I think it would be a good programme to have.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, this raises some interesting implications. The minister is really hard done by if one listens to him. All his programmes suffer the penurious outlook of his colleagues. They refuse to give him any money. He could employ a great many more young junior forest rangers but it is the problem of money. He could buy more escarpment land, but it is a problem of money. He could cut down more elm trees, but it is the problem of money. I know of no other department which has such really grievous problems and complains so quietly, almost with pathos about them. We want to help the minister; we want to help him get a few more dollars.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It would cost at least \$10 million to remove the dead elm trees in this province.

Mr. Lewis: It would cost \$10 million to remove the dead elm to beat the disease?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am inclined to think as much as \$10 million a year.

Mr. Lewis: Ten million dollars a year. For how many years and to remove how many trees?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: For quite a number of years.

Mr. Lewis: I would like to know what these eloquent moans are across the floor except perhaps that on a Friday they are up earlier than normal. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly legitimate that if someone throws out a figure of \$10 million a year, he must surely have some source on which the estimate was based. Is it not too much to ask how they arrive at such lump sums and how many people we are talking about in terms of employment?

I think, if memory serves me, his previous plan employed—I am confused now; it was both a municipal works plan and a diseased elm plan, but I think it was 3,500 or so, was it not, at a cost of what?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The member is referring to the plan we had last winter?

Mr. Lewis: The plan covering this winter. It was the government's most imaginative response to the problems of unemployment in Ontario—cutting down elm trees. The minister must know something of it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman I do not have these figures, because this came directly from The Department of Highways, but I would be pleased to get those figures for the hon. member as to the number of employees.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I should not really be asking the minister again—it is almost by way of repetition—but in terms of his own future programme, does this branch have at hand an estimate of the number of trees that are diseased, roughly where they are in the province, how many men would be required to cut them down, how long a time we can wait before they are cut down and what the costs are? Do we have some sense of that in the department?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We estimate that we have somewhere between 15 to 20 million trees to be removed; we also know the areas. We have a lot of information. This information has been gathered over a period of years. We know the areas. We have also had dealings with municipalities and, as I said earlier, I am optimistic that sometime—perhaps this fall will be a good time—we could have a programme on a cost-sharing basis with municipalities to remove these trees.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Is the minister speaking of a 50-50 shared-cost programme, or 80-20? Has he come to a formula?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This has not been decided.

Mr. Lewis: That has not been decided. Does he have a programme in mind which would run over a number of years in a systematic way, gradually eliminating diseased elms entirely from Ontario, if that is possible?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: That is what he has in mind. But he has not costed it yet?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No. We know that in Toronto, for instance, it is very expensive—it costs somewhere around \$200 to remove a dead elm—while in smaller municipalities the cost is considerably less. But in the cities it is a very high cost.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister know how many trees were actually removed under the

programme over the winter along Highways 400 and 401? Could he give us a dollar cost?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I could obtain that information. I will obtain it and send it to the hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Would you mind? Before the vote, it should be rather interesting to know how many people were actually employed and for what periods, so we get a return on investment, as it were.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oshawa.

Mr. Pilkey: Mr. Chairman, just to follow that questioning through. It appears to me, under this programme, that Highways is involved, Agriculture is involved, Lands and Forests is involved. Why all the duplication of administration in this field? Highways was in charge of the employees; Agriculture got into the act by allowing farmers \$5 for each tree that was cut down; you were involved through your department.

Why is this whole programme not centralized and I would think most legitimately under your department, as opposed to fragmenting the programme through Agriculture and Highways as well?

Mr. Boyer: That is team work.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that there is fragmentation. The programme that was announced by the Minister of Agriculture and Food is on private agricultural lands whereby they will get \$5. There are no complications there; this is an incentive to farmers.

The programme last year was administered by The Department of Highways because those trees were mainly adjacent to highways. We are involved. Should there be a programme with municipalities, again this would probably come under my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales), because this would be a sharing programme. But we have the expertise in our department, personnel who can evaluate the areas where the trees have to be removed, so that there has to be an involvement of several departments. But we work very closely so there is no fragmentation, there is no problem there.

Mr. Pilkey: With great respect, Mr. Chairman, this government has not always demonstrated that. At times I wonder if you talk to one another.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Oh come now!

Mr. Pilkey: It is true. Sometimes I wonder whether they talk to one another.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: At least we are not dictators.

Mr. Pilkey: The minister suggested that in a city it is \$200 per tree, and the Minister of Agriculture as an incentive to farmers gave them \$5. I suppose that is a legitimate cost; \$5 is not a great deal of money for doing that kind of a job. Why is the programme not expanded to people on private lands other than farmers? The policy does not go beyond the farmer who has in excess of \$3,000 income, as I recall the announcement by the Minister of Agriculture.

It seems to me that if that is a viable cost for cutting down a tree through your department, then it should be expanded to private lands and we get the job done that much cheaper. You said that you did not know what the average cost was for cutting the trees down on 401 and 400, as we relate it to the number of people who were employed.

I suspect very strongly it was at least \$5 per tree—maybe in excess of that. So it would appear to me that the programme could be expanded to those people on private lands who are not engaged in the agricultural industry, and I want to know if the minister has given this any consideration?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It is a very good suggestion, Mr. Chairman, and I think this could be incorporated. In this programme the municipalities would be involved. Naturally the municipalities look after private lands which are non-agricultural. The member is making the point, I believe, that not only agricultural land but other private lands could be included. It is a very good suggestion.

Mr. Pilkey: I make that observation on the basis of the programme of \$5. The minister talked about a shared cost with the municipalities. With great respect to the minister through you, Mr. Chairman, the municipalities are being killed with these shared-cost programmes.

The taxes in the municipalities are high enough and every time a government comes up with a programme, they say it is a shared cost, 50-50 or 75 by the provincial government, 25 per cent by the municipalities, and the municipalities are finding themselves in a very precarious position in terms of finances. They are just cutting every programme as it is. And to initiate another shared-cost programme with the municipalities just seems ludicrous to me.

If we are really serious about cutting down the diseased elm trees in the Province of Ontario, I think the costs ought to be ours as a province, as opposed to the municipalities.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Same kind of leadership! It starts at Ottawa.

Mr. Spence: There is considerable interest among a lot of people. What is an elm tree? I have had a number of telephone calls. Is it two inches in diameter, four inches or six inches and what is the difference between a sapling and an elm tree?

Mr. Lewis: And its nationality is not Dutch, in spite of the name of the disease.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Only the disease.

Mr. Lewis: Precisely.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Any size is a tree.

Mr. Spence: Even if it is only two inches?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Even if it is only two inches.

Mr. Nixon: That is quite a policy statement.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): In the Dutch elm disease programme, how many board feet of merchantable material was recovered?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: As I mentioned earlier, The Department of Highways looked after this programme. I would be pleased to get that information for the hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, many publications have come out of the department in the last few months, and there really have been many—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: In one of them, I remember reading some reference to the elm difficulties and that a certain spray protection was going to preserve trees in some areas. Has there been some effort made to be sure that some growth of elm trees will be carefully protected and preserved so that we can show the kids what they used to be like?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, Mr. Chairman,—

Mr. Nixon: I do not think the minister is going to be able to save one tree.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We never give up, and there is a lot of research on this matter, not

only by our department, but the federal department as well.

Mr. Nixon: Is it the minister's department that thought of the zinc nails?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I do not believe so. I appreciate the member's suggestion. We are trying to find a way to preserve some of the existing elms. This is research continuing on at the moment. There has been, to my knowledge, no known cure.

Mr. Lewis: It is the whole—

Mr. Chairman: Anything else on item 2?

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister mean all Ontario elms are destined for doom? Is that it as it now stands? He is simply setting up the programme to take them all down?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Also, what is important, Mr. Chairman, is the replacement programme. As the trees are being removed we should replace them.

Mr. Lewis: I want to add just one little footnote and then leave it. I was rather encouraged by what the minister said because one of his other cabinet colleagues—the House leader for today, Mr. Chairman—has just thrown \$125 million down the drain by way of a rebate in a programme which may not create one additional physical job.

The hon. minister has just indicated to us that the government can create what obviously amounts to several thousands of jobs. The hon. minister is nodding his head in assent. Why does the hon. minister not cast his eye quietly over to the part of the House where a minister sits and creates several thousands of jobs; admittedly, not the most permanent jobs in the world, but jobs that will give people employment.

All he needs, in that sense, are some millions of dollars to do it. The government has got a programme which is tossing \$125 million away. The minister can go back to the Treasury Board and ask for a five per cent rebate on the \$125 million programme and put a few thousand people to work in Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2? Carried.

Anything on item 3?

Mr. R. S. Smith: I would just like to ask the minister what percentage of the air service is used in protection and for departmental work as opposed to the air service that is provided for the rest of the government?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Between 25 to 50 per cent of our aircraft are used for fire protection.

Mr. R. S. Smith: But what percentage is used for departmental work as compared to what is provided to other departments of the government?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The majority of our planes are used for departmental purposes, such as wintertime surveys of deer and moose. We only have fewer than five planes available specifically for transportation purposes.

Mr. Nixon: Are they all Twin Otters?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, an Executive Twin Otter, a Kingair and a Beechcraft Duke—those are the three executive ones.

Mr. Sopha: At one time the minister had more than the Americans had in Vietnam.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We are reducing our—

Mr. R. S. Smith: There are only three planes then, and these are used—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: These are the three planes strictly for passenger service. We also have, I believe, 27 turbo Beavers and 10 Otters; these are the planes that are used for management purposes. At the same time, we can use them for the—

An hon. member: This is the first time they have admitted they had three planes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —transportation of personnel.

Mr. Sopha: He offered me a ride one time and then cancelled it.

Mr. R. S. Smith: What the minister is saying is—

Mr. Sopha: He wrote me a letter.

Mr. R. S. Smith: What the minister is saying is that he has three planes that are in the continual service of the government, but not particularly The Department of Lands and Forests; their particular service is to the needs of the ministry and the government.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Maybe this would answer the member's question—90 per cent of our flying by our aircraft is for management purposes.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Yes, but I think the hon. minister has said, for the first time, that there are three planes that are used—

Mr. Nixon: I did not know he had use for them.

Mr. R. S. Smith: —for the transportation—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, transportation.

Mr. R. S. Smith: —mostly perhaps of government officials.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right. I hope that we have the hon. member for Nipissing—

Mr. R. S. Smith: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I hope the member has been on our planes.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I have not been on the executive ones; just the ones the hon. minister is using for management of the programmes.

Mr. Chairman, I have some questions on the next part.

Mr. Chairman: Are we finished with item 2? Carried.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue) Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the members, on Monday we will reserve the right to call numbers 1, 3 or 15. I would think we will probably begin with number 15 and return to the discussion that was on the floor today.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1:00 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, May 7, 1971

Reconsidering decision to remove financial support from Fanshawe school, question to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Nixon	1333
Circumstances under which OPP carried out raids on denturists, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Singer, Mr. Lawlor	1333
Necessary time limit for immigrant to be eligible for welfare, questions to Mr. Wells, Mr. Nixon	1334
Compensation to Mr. Francotti for ten days he served in jail, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Shulman	1335
Compensation to Sidney Caplan for embezzlement of \$556,000 by lawyers, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Shulman	1335
Steps to reopen Toronto detoxification centre, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Shulman	1335
New inquest into North Bay case where coroner permitted his brother to act, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Shulman	1336
Number of inmates of Ontario jails and institutions awaiting trials, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Sargent	1336
High school teachers in Kirkland Lake taking over jobs as forest rangers, question to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Lawlor	1336
Eliminating problem of loss by Ontario brokers to avoid sales tax on commission business, question to Mr. Winkler, Mr. Deacon	1336
Eliminating five per cent guidelines for civil servants, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Makarchuk	1337
Dentistry Act, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Singer	1337
Amalgamating Departments of Health and Social and Family Services, questions to Mr. Wells, Mr. Peacock	1337
Surcease of mining revenue payments to Sudbury as means of financing local government, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Sopha	1338
Collecting extra costs from Orange Productions for policing rock festival, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Singer	1339
Ontario representation at Supreme Court hearings on marketing legislation, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Sopha, Mr. Singer	1339
Number of municipalities setting up rent review boards, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Singer	1339
Furnace explosion at St. Daniel's School in Ottawa, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Burr	1340
Two-man police patrols for night duty, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Haggerty	1340
Action to satisfy wage demands of guards at reform institutions, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Makarchuk	1340
Projected cost and expenditures to date on Ontario Place, question to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Sargent	1341
Ontario Place continuing programme for Harbour City, question to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Sargent	1341

Report of Ontario Police Commission on arrest of three Tranc Company strikers, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Lawlor	1342
Encouraging youth to partake in Lands and Forests SWEEP programme, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. B. Newman	1342
Representations to Treasury board to ensure reform institution guards not bound by five per cent guideline, question to Mr. Apps, Mr. Makarchuk	1342
Summertime youth employment with Department of Social and Family Services, question to Mr. Wells, Mr. B. Newman	1342
Petition re gill net fishing ban on Bruce Peninsula, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Sargent	1343
Government policy of setting hair length as condition of employment, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Shulman	1343
Prospectors' licences being issued same way as drivers' licences, question to Mr. Bernier, Mr. T. P. Reid	1344
Burying white or silver bass inadvertently netted by commercial fishermen, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Makarchuk	1344
Motion to refer four departmental estimates to standing committees, agreed to	1344
Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Brunelle, continued	1344
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	1368

JOURNALS AND PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION DES JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCEDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2

